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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is a baseline report and landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposed Eden Westwood development at Tiverton, Junction 27 of the M5, as shown on Plan L1. It has been prepared by SLR Consulting Limited, chartered landscape architects, on behalf of Friends Life Limited, using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment, Third Edition, 2013.

1.2 The methodology used to prepare this chapter is included at Appendix 1.

1.3 The landscape and visual impact assessment has been based on the following plans included at Appendix 2:

- L1: Topography
- L2: Landscape Planning Context
- L3: Landscape Character
- L4: Local Landscape Context
- L5: Viewpoints Plan
- L6: Zone of Theoretical Visibility: On Completion

The Proposals

1.4 Those elements of the proposals with particular relevance to this assessment include:

- construction of an Eden facility including a statement Eden Ark building and learning fields;
- construction of a themed hotel complex;
- construction of a new hotel, adjacent to the M5;
- construction of a new designer outlet centre with associated car parking and access roads;
- construction of a new surf lake and water sports centre with associated hard and soft landscape;
- construction of a petrol filling station adjacent to the A38 and a new service station to the east of the M5 motorway;
- construction of a new junction off the A38 and access roads;
- construction of attenuation ponds and swales;
- incorporation of outdoor adventure activities;
- the provision of structure planting, in particular around the periphery of the site; and
• lighting and car parking.

1.5 A proposed pedestrian bridge does not form part of this assessment but will be included as a potential cumulative impact proposal once other cumulative sites have been confirmed. The proposed pedestrian bridge is illustrated within Viewpoint 12 Photomontage, within appendix 3.
2.0 SCOPE

2.1 This assessment considers effects on landscape and views as separate issues. Landscape effects relate both to physical changes to landscape elements, for example, landform, watercourses, footpaths, trees, hedgerows and other types of vegetation, and to the resulting landscape character. Visual effects relate to changes in people's views.


>'The [EU] Directive [covering EIA] is clear that the emphasis is on the identification of likely significant environmental effects...' (para. 1.17, page, 9)

2.3 The Guidelines also note in relation to Scope, at paragraph 6.2, page 98, that:

>'...The emphasis must be on a reasonable approach which is proportional to the scale and nature of the proposed development...'

2.4 The landscape and visual chapter includes a summary of relevant responses to the scoping report including to the local authority and statutory consultees.

2.5 This chapter considers effects on:

- landscape elements;
- landscape character; and
- views experienced from publicly accessible viewpoints.

Study Area

2.6 The spatial scope of this assessment was determined by the theoretical extent to which the proposed development is likely to be visible within the surrounding landscape, up to a limit of 7km, beyond which our site appraisals, as well as professional experience on other assessments for this type of development, has shown that any landscape or visual effects would be negligible. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of the proposed development was established by computer modelling, as described in the Methodology, and is included at Appendix 1.

Timescales

2.7 This assessment considers landscape and visual effects as follows:

- **During Construction**: in winter;
- **On Completion**: in winter, without the benefit of effective planting mitigation; and
- **15 Years After Completion**: in summer with the benefit of effective planting mitigation.
3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 The methodology is set out in Appendices 1 and 7, however, for ease of reference; the assessment of significance is set out below.

3.2 The significance scale shown in Table 2 is used to guide the assessment of the significance of both landscape and visual effects, from a combination of the assessment of receptor sensitivity and the magnitude of effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity of Receptor</th>
<th>Major Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Effect</th>
<th>Slight Effect</th>
<th>Negligible Effect</th>
<th>Neutral Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.4 For the purposes of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Moderately Significant effects are not considered to be Significant, in the meaning of the EU directive and UK national guidance in the Town and Country (EIA) Regulations 2011.
4.0 BASELINE

Landscape Planning Policy Context

4.1 Plan L2 shows the location of the site in relation to landscape planning designations.

National

4.2 National planning policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012. The overarching objective is to help achieve sustainable development. Relevant NPPF policies are summarised below.

4.3 Section 11 of the NPPF makes reference to the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, the weight to be given to criteria based policies, such as landscape character designations, and the need to create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure.

4.4 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states:

• ‘The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

• protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.’

4.5 Twelve core planning principles are set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF, and include:

• ‘encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value...

• conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.’

Mid Devon Local Plan

4.6 Mid Devon District Council is currently reviewing the Local Plan for development in Mid Devon over the next 15-20 years. The current adopted policy is set out in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies documents. The site is not covered by any landscape planning designations, however, relevant policies are set out below.

4.7 In relation to local distinctiveness, Policy COR2 of Mid Devon Local Plan, states:

‘Development will sustain the distinctive quality, character and diversity of Mid Devon’s environmental assets through:

a) high quality sustainable design which reinforces the character and legibility of Mid Devon’s built environment and creates attractive places...

...c) the preservation and enhancement of the distinctive qualities of Mid Devon’s natural landscape, supporting opportunities identified within landscape character areas....’
4.8 In relation to good design, Policy DM2 of Mid Devon Local Plan, states:

‘Designs of new development must be of high quality, based upon and demonstrating the following principles:

a) Clear understanding of the characteristics of the site, its wider context and the surrounding area;

b) Efficient and effective use of the site, having regard to criterion (a);

c) Positive contribution to local character including any heritage or biodiversity assets and the setting of heritage assets;

d) Creation of safe and accessible places that also encourage sustainable modes of travel such as walking and cycling;

e) Visually attractive places that are well integrated with surrounding buildings, streets and landscapes, and do not have an unacceptably adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of the proposed or neighbouring properties and uses, taking account of:

i) Architecture

ii) Siting, layout, scale and massing

iii) Orientation and fenestration

iv) Materials, landscaping and green infrastructure…’

4.9 In relation to green infrastructure in major development, Policy DM28 of Mid Devon Local Plan, states:

‘Major development proposals must demonstrate that green infrastructure will be incorporated within the site as follows…

….c) Green corridors and public rights of way to link the site to the wider GI network, provide walking and cycling opportunities and avoid habitat fragmentation;

d) New green infrastructure such as the creation of native woodland where possible….

….Where evidence demonstrates that meeting these criteria would render the development unachievable, the Council will consider off site provision in lieu of one or more of the policy criteria. The Council will balance the benefits of the development against the objectives of this policy.’

4.10 Birdwell Grade II Historic Park and Garden lies approximately 0.45km to the south-east of the site. Sampford Peverell Conservation Areas lies approximately 1.3km to the west of the site, Uffculme Conservation Area lies approximately 2km south-east of the site and the Great Western Canal has been designated as a conservation area, running approximately 0.7km to the north-west of the site. Policy DM27 in relation to development affecting heritage assets, states:

‘Heritage assets and their settings are an irreplaceable resource. Accordingly the Council will:’
a) Apply a presumption in favour of preservation in situ in respect of the most important heritage assets

b) Require development proposals likely to affect heritage assets and their settings, including new buildings, alterations, extensions, changes of use and demolitions, to consider their significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness, and the opportunities to enhance them.

c) Only approve proposals that would be likely to substantially harm heritage assets and their settings if substantial public benefit outweighs that harm or the requirements of requirements of paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met.

d) Where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, that harm will be weighed against any public benefit, including securing optimum viable use….

Tiverton and Halberton Neighbourhood Plan

4.11 The southernmost area of the site lies within the Tiverton and Halberton Neighbourhood Plan as designated on 28 July 2015. The neighbourhood plan has yet to publish its proposals.

Landscape Character

4.12 Published sources describing landscape character at the National, Regional and District level are:


- Devon’s Landscape Character Assessment, 2013 (web link http://www.devon.gov.uk/landscapecharacter); and


4.13 Plan L3 illustrates the landscape character areas applicable to the site and surrounding area.

National Landscape Character

4.14 The site lies within the Devon Redlands Character Area no. 148. Key characteristics of the Devon Redlands Character Area, of relevance to the site and locality, include:

- Hilly landscape of villages, hamlets, farmsteads, hedgebanks and winding sunken lanes, rising in height towards the fringes of the NCA. Steep-sided but flat-bottomed river valleys cut through the hills, opening onto wide flood plains which are important for wintering wildfowl nearer the coast.

- Large woodlands confined mainly to steep valley sides. In upper valleys small, broadleaved woodlands and copses give a strong sense of enclosure and provide valuable habitat for wildlife. There is a high concentration of ancient semi-natural
woodland in the northern part of the NCA.

- Mixed farming predominates, but as the land rises in the transitional areas towards Dartmoor and Exmoor pasture becomes widespread. Fields tend to be small and irregular with dense hedgerows on top of earthbanks in the transitional areas, while there is a larger, more open field pattern elsewhere.

- A high frequency of designed landscapes.

- Significant urban development around the estuaries and along the coast. The motorway and trunk road network linking Devon and Cornwall with the rest of the country cuts through the landscape, exposing the red sandstone. It converges around Exeter, a historic city and now a key regional centre.

Regional Landscape Character

4.15 Devon’s Landscape Character Assessment 2013 characterises the area encompassing the site and the immediate surrounding study area as the Culm Valley Lowlands, as shown on Plan L2. The key characteristics of this character area, of relevance to the site and locality, include:

- Relatively low and gently undulating landform, separating the wide, flat-bottomed valleys of the rivers Culm, Tone and Lowman;

- Relatively few woodlands, but abundant hedgerows, hedgerow trees and riparian vegetation, giving the landscape a well-treed appearance;

- Predominantly pastoral use on medium-quality soils in the east of the area; more widespread arable cultivation in the western part of the area where soils are more fertile;

- Field boundaries consisting of thick hedgerows with mature hedgerow trees including numerous oaks;

- Valley-bottom wetlands and occasional blocks of woodland and surviving heathland; hedgerows and verges that also provide wildlife habitats and corridors;

- Numerous surviving orchards, particularly around Holcombe Rogus and Halberton, which are characteristic landscape features and add biodiversity value;

- Archaeological and historic sites from many periods, including prehistoric barrows, Roman forts, and medieval buildings (e.g. village churches and Cannonsleigh Abbey) that lend a sense of time-depth;

- Parkland estates locally influencing landscape character;

- Grand Western Canal and other historic river features including weirs, bridges and large mill buildings;

- Relatively densely settled with towns and large villages along the rivers (Cullompton, Willand, Uffculme, Sampford Peverell) and near Tiverton; smaller nucleated villages and scattered farms throughout;

- An important transport corridor between Devon and Somerset, containing historic and modern routes including the Grand Western Canal, the London-Exeter railway
line, the A38 and the M5;

- A network of steep, narrow lanes enclosed between high hedgebanks connecting villages and farms;
- By Devon standards, a ‘busy’ landscape but with some parts retaining a more remote and peaceful feel, particularly in the northern part of the area; and
- Unexpected long views....

4.16 Relevant guidelines for conserving and enhancing this area are set out in Devon’s Landscape Character Assessment 2013, as follows:

- Protect and enhance the characteristic ‘patchwork’ landscape, particularly where it forms a ‘gateway’ into Devon from the M5, A38 and railway line;
- Protect and manage hedgerows, hedgebanks and hedgerow trees, replacing lost sections or trees where possible, to ensure their continuation within the landscape;
- Protect the Grand Western Canal and its associated features, encouraging its use for education, recreation and as a wildlife habitat;
- Plan to increase green infrastructure links between larger settlements and the countryside, through (for example) provision of crossings over main roads and railway lines, and opening-up access into the River Culm valley, possibly using the disused railway line;
- Plan screening for insensitive development e.g. housing and industrial estates and large farm buildings;
- Plan well sited and designed future development that incorporates a green infrastructure framework.

4.17 Other landscape character areas within the study area include:

- Bampton and Beer Downs; and
- Cullompton Rolling Farmland.

District Landscape Character

4.18 The Mid Devon Landscape Character Assessment characterises the area encompassing the site as 3E Lowlands Plains Landscape Character Type. The key characteristics of this character type area:

- Gently rolling middle ground to lowland with smooth, rounded hilltops that have concave lower and convex upper slopes;
- Primarily managed as arable farmland with some areas of improved grassland. Mixed farming is the main agrarian pattern, with ley grassland forming an important part of the rotation of crops including barley, wheat, cabbage, corn and oil seed rape;
- An agrarian landscape with medium to large scale field patterns;
• Fields are divided by hedgerows and hedgebanks, with the hedges forming spines along the rolling hills, with rib-like hedges crossing the convex slopes down into the valleys. These hedges are distinctive in their regularity and simplicity;

• Hedgerow trees are infrequent within the type. Individual trees within amalgamated fields indicate the positions of lost hedges;

• Copses and discrete woodlands are characteristic. In some areas the fields are defined by hedgerow trees with isolated clumps of trees on hillsides or ridge lines;

• Whilst there are a number of outlying, regularly distributed farms and villages, hamlets and small groups of houses, this is generally a sparsely populated area;

• Some orchards, once typical of the area, remain and there are small areas of market gardening;

• The landscape is dotted with large-scale farmsteads which tend to be located on the rolling sides of the land, above the valley floor. Villages tend to be located either near to valley crossing points or on the higher ground;

• The tree cover is enriched by parks around small manor houses. To the east of the district there are two parklands including Bridwell Park and Bradfield House, Uffculme. These have a parkland and large-scale pastoral character created through the absence of hedges and are characterful of clump tree planting within extensive shelterbelts;

• Views are highly variable. The landscape is semi-open with some long extensive views afforded from on top of hilltops. Where hedges are high, views are mostly farmed or confined with glimpses into and out only present from field gate openings;

• Roads are straight or very gently winding in nature and characterised by narrow routes that are lined with traditional hedgebanks. Land is traditionally highly valued for agriculture, and very little waste in the form of verges and wide roads;

• The landscape typically has short vistas terminated by a backdrop of curving hills with occasional long views from prominent locations, giving rise to a patchwork of irregular shaped fields with green pastures.

4.19 Other landscape character types within the study area include:

• 3A – Upper Farmed and Wooded Valley Slopes;

• 3B – Lower Rolling Farmed and Settled Valley Slopes; and

• 3C – Sparsely Settled Farmed Valley Floors.

Landscape Context

4.20 The site lies adjacent to part of the M5 motorway at junction 27, approximately 1.3km east of the village of Sampford Peverell and 1.15km west of the village of Uffculme.

4.21 To the west of the site, beyond the M5, the ground rises gently towards the Grand Western Canal and then ascends steeply beyond Sampford Peverell, to a high ridgeline made up of a series of rolling rounded hills, reaching a maximum height of
248 AOD, as shown on Plan L1. To the east of the site, steep rounded hills are located towards Uffculme, before descending to form a side of the Culm Valley. Beyond this the ground continues to ascend steeply towards the village of Hemyock with a hilltop reaching approximately 268m AOD north of the village within the Blackdown Hills.

4.22 Farmsteads abut the site to the north and south. Waterloo Inn Caravan Park and public house lie adjacent to the north-eastern corner of the site. Turnpike nurseries abut the eastern site boundary.

4.23 Mature vegetation surrounds most of the site, consisting predominantly of mature oaks within field boundaries, and within woodland copses.

4.24 A number of footpaths are located in proximity to the site to the east, north-east and south-west of the site. The Grand Western Canal Towpath long distance footpath is located on the towpath of the Grand Western Canal located to the north and east of the site.

**Site Context**

4.25 The site comprises an irregular shape, which extends to 70 ha, and is bounded by:

- the M5 motorway and associated slip roads to the west;
- the A38 and Waterloo Caravan Park to the north;
- the B3181 to the east;
- a public right of way and land associated with Mountstephen House to the south; and
- Mountstephen Farm to the south-west.

**Landscape Character of the Site**

4.26 SLR Consulting has undertaken its own local landscape character assessment of the site, in order to identify any variations to the above published landscape character assessments and describe the site character and elements in more detail. This description, together with an assessment of the landscape value and sensitivity of the site is given in Appendix 4. The main attributes of the site are summarised below.

**Landform/Physical Features**

4.27 The topography Plan L1 shows the site to slope gently westwards from approximately 90m to 75m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

**Landcover**

4.28 The site comprises of agricultural fields used for grazing and crops.

Several small woodland copses and Homebush Planation lie within the southern part of the site. Other vegetation is limited to field boundaries consisting of tree lined hedgerows.
Boundary vegetation comprises:

- to the north - trees and native shrubs located intermittently along a gappy hedgerow;
- to the east - hedgerows of varying height and maturity, aligned with trees;
- to the south - a low level hedgerow aligned sporadically with individual trees; and
- to the west - a motorway verge consisting of scrub vegetation with groups of native shrubs and trees in places.

Buildings/Settlement Type

4.29 A petrol station, hotel, fast food establishment and coffee shop are located within the site in proximity to the western boundary and the M5/A38 roundabout junction. Two farms and business units also feature within the site.

Communications and Infrastructure

4.30 The M5 motorway and A38, which links to the junction 27 roundabout over the motorway, abut the western and northern boundary of the site respectively. The B3181 abuts the eastern site boundary, which connects the A38 to the village of Willand to the south. A lane, which is partly not accessible for vehicles, dissects the site form the centre of the eastern boundary to the service station within the north western corner of the site.

Public Rights of Way/Recreation

4.31 No public rights of way cross the site. A footpath runs along the southern boundary along a farm access track, before continuing westwards beyond the M5.

Field Pattern and Boundaries

4.32 The site consists of fourteen fields in the northern part of the site that are regular in shape and small in size. The southern part of the site consists of a further ten fields that are varied in size and regularity. Internal field boundaries consist of tree lined hedgerows.

Aesthetic Factors

4.33 The site is enclosed and contained by its boundary vegetation, assisting in filtering views of the site from the surrounding area.

4.34 Overall the site is large in scale, however small fields enclosed by mature vegetation make parts of the site feel intimate.

4.35 The north and western site boundaries are open in places with long distant views visible; however the busy M5 motorway and A38 act as visual detractors.

Landscape Value

4.36 The character of the site and the landscape elements listed above have been assessed against criteria set out in the methodology, Appendix 1. The results are tabulated in the Landscape Value Assessment Sheet, Appendix 4.
4.37 Overall values for each landscape receptor are assessed as follows:

**Medium Value**
- Landform/Physical Features;
- Landcover;
- Field Pattern, Boundaries; and
- Aesthetic Factors.

**Low Value**
- Buildings and Settlement Type;
- Communications/Infrastructure; and

4.38 The overall landscape value of the site has been identified as medium.

### Key Views of the Site

4.39 Plan L6, Zone of Theoretical Visibility, shows the theoretical extent to which the proposed development is likely to be visible from the surrounding landscape. However, this is a worst case, since it only takes account of topography and the main areas of surrounding woodland and settlement, not only the screening provided by existing trees and field boundary hedgerows.

4.40 Plan L4 shows the location of typical publicly accessible viewpoints of the site from the surrounding landscape and longer distant views, as shown on Plan 6. Annotated panoramic photographs are included at Appendix 3, with the baseline view for each described in Visual Effects Table in Appendix 4. Viewpoints have been provided to the local authority in advance. They have been accepted as being appropriate but further viewpoints may be requested by the Council.

4.41 The site is primarily visible in local views from roads and footpaths lying within 1km distance, including views from:
- a public right of way leading to Mounstephen Farm (**Viewpoint 1**);
- the B3181 (**Viewpoints 2, 3 and 6**);
- a pedestrian bridge and a vehicular bridge over M5 (**Viewpoints 4 and 7**);
- the A38 adjacent to Jersey Farm, and adjacent to The Old Well Garden Centre (**Viewpoints 5 and 8**);
- a public right of way near Houndaller Farm (**Viewpoint 9**);
- the Grand Western Canal Towpath (**Viewpoint 12**).

4.42 Potential medium distance glimpsed views include those from the following visual receptors:
- A rural lane south of Burlescombe (**Viewpoint 10**);
4.43 Potential long distance glimpsed views include those from the following visual receptors:

- road between Halberton and Sampford Peverell (Viewpoint 15);
- a rural lane (Viewpoint 16);
- vehicular bridge over the Grand Western Canal (Viewpoint 17); and
- public right of way south-east of Tiverton (Viewpoint 18).

Value of Views

4.44 Each viewpoint has been assessed against the criteria set out in the methodology. The results are tabulated in the Visual Effects Table in Appendix 4.

4.45 Values ascribed to views are:

High Value

- Grand Western Canal Towpath (Viewpoint 12), due to it being an important long distance footpath within a conservation area, where the open setting of agricultural fields and woodland form part of the experience.

Medium Value

- Public right of way adjacent to Boehill Farm (Viewpoint 13) due to the elevated nature of the view along the footpath;
- Vehicular Bridge over the Grand Western Canal (Viewpoint 17) due to it being in a conservation area; and
- Public right of way south-east of Tiverton (Viewpoint 18) due to the elevated and panoramic nature of the view along the footpath.

Low Value

- All other viewpoints have been assessed as having a low value, because they have no designations and are not particularly important as a viewpoint and with no cultural associations.

Existing Lighting

4.46 Most of the site is unlit. However extensive lighting is present from a petrol station and coffee shop that is located within the site. Part of the Waterloo Inn Caravan Park is also situated within the site and provides some visible lighting sources. The area is affected by some upward glow of surrounding villages, and the lights of moving traffic on the M5 motorway running parallel with the site.
5.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Susceptibility to Change

5.1 This section describes:

- the susceptibility to change and overall sensitivity for landscape character areas, landscape elements and views;
- proposed landscape design strategy and mitigation measures; and
- assessment of effects during construction/on completion and in Year 15 after completion.

Susceptibility of Landscape Receptors to Change and Overall Sensitivity

5.2 Reference should be made to the Landscape Effects Table in Appendix 4.

5.3 The assessment of the susceptibility to change of each landscape receptor and its overall sensitivity is summarised below. The overall sensitivity of each receptor has been made by review of the susceptibility of the receptor to change in relation to the value attributed to that receptor.

National, Regional and District Landscape Character

5.4 The susceptibility to change of National Character Area (NCA) 148: Devon Redlands, Devon Landscape Character Area: Culm Valley Lowlands and MDDC Landscape Character Type (LCA) 3E: Lowlands Plains is identified as medium, as they have the ability to absorb development without a significant change in character. This is also the case for all other landscape character areas and types.

5.5 This has resulted in the overall sensitivity of character areas and types as being identified as medium.

Overall Landscape Character of the Site

5.6 The overall susceptibility to change, and sensitivity, of the landscape character of the site has been identified as medium, as its well defined field boundaries of mature vegetation create a strong field pattern within a rural and agricultural setting. This grading is based on assessment of its individual elements and their respective susceptibility and value.

5.7 This has resulted in the sensitivity of the overall landscape character of the site being identified as medium.

Landscape Elements

5.8 The susceptibility to change of the landscape elements on site is identified in Landscape Effects Table in Appendix 4.

5.9 The overall sensitivity of each landscape element on site is as follows:

Medium Sensitivity

- Landform/Physical Features;
• Landcover;
• Communications/Infrastructure;
• Field Pattern, Boundaries and Features; and
• Aesthetic Factors.

Low Sensitivity
• Buildings and Settlement Type.

Susceptibility of Visual Receptors to Change and Overall Sensitivity

5.10 The assessment of the susceptibility to change, and overall sensitivity, of the visual receptors and its sensitivity is summarised below. The overall sensitivity of each receptor has been made by review of the susceptibility of the receptor to change in relation to the value attributed to that receptor.

5.11 The susceptibility to change of the visual receptors is identified in Visual Effects Table in Appendix 4.

5.12 The sensitivity of viewpoints assessed is as follows:

Low Sensitivity
• Viewpoints 2, 3 and 6: B3181 (for vehicles);
• Viewpoint 4: Pedestrian Bridge over M5;
• Viewpoint 5: A38 adjacent to Jersey Farm;
• Viewpoint 7: Vehicular Bridge over M5;
• Viewpoint 8: A38 adjacent to The Old Well Garden Centre;
• Viewpoint 11: Burlescombe (for vehicles);
• Viewpoint 14: Whitnage Road, Sampford Peverell;
• Viewpoint 15: Road between Halberton and Sampford Peverell;

Medium Sensitivity
• Viewpoint 1: Public right of way leading to Mounstephen Farm;
• Viewpoints 2, 3 and 6: B3181 (for pedestrians);
• Viewpoint 9: Public right of way near Houndaller Farm;
• Viewpoint 10: Rural lane south of Burlescombe;
• Viewpoint 11: Burlescombe (for pedestrians);
• Viewpoint 13: Public Right of Way adjacent to Boehill Farm;
• Viewpoint 16: Rural Lane;

• Viewpoint 17: Vehicular Bridge over the Grand Western Canal; and

• Viewpoint 18: Public Right of Way south-east of Tiverton.

*High Sensitivity*

• Viewpoint 12: Grand Western Canal Towpath.

**Landscape Design Strategy and Mitigation**

5.13 The landscape design strategy, together with any incorporated mitigation proposals is are illustrated on the Development Proposals contained in Appendix 7, and are set out as follows:

• retention of existing trees and hedgerows, where practical, beneficial and appropriate, to be agreed with the local authority as part of a landscape and ecology management plan;

• reinforcement of site boundaries with additional indigenous woodland tree planting designed to complement the local vegetation character, in order to integrate the development within the surrounding landscape, further filter views of buildings from surrounding countryside to the north, and create an articulated edge to the development;

• woodland structure planting around periphery of the site and adjacent to the M5 motorway;

• extension of indigenous copses and plantations within the southern part of the site, through additional tree planting, enhancing the field pattern and providing a green infrastructure link through the site;

• southern part of the site as open space;

• buildings incorporating green roofs;

• incorporation of new structure planting throughout the development, comprising both locally indigenous species, designed to provide a strong landscape framework and setting for the new development; and contribute to different character areas within the development;

• ornamental and semi ornamental planting within the central area of the site; and

• Devon farming educational exhibits and farming display planting.

**Assessment of Landscape Effects**

5.14 Full details of the landscape effects, including effects on the landscape resource and on landscape character, are set out in the Landscape Effects Table at Appendix 4, following implementation of new planting and mitigation. The following provides a summary of the significant and moderately significant effects, together with the reasons for those effects.
Landscape Character (All Periods)

5.15 Development of any green field site will change its character. In this case, new built development will give rise to a significant adverse landscape effect on landscape character.

5.16 There will be no significant or moderately significant adverse effects upon its wider landscape character areas and types. This is because the changes will be localised, with proposed green infrastructure of the new development aimed at softening development in accordance with the existing character of the area.

Site and Landscape Elements

**During Construction**

5.17 Construction activities will include the removal of buildings within the site, limited tree and hedgerow removal along A38 to accommodate access road and junction, limited field boundary removal within the site to accommodate internal road network and built form, excavation of attenuation features and the proposed surf lake, construction of buildings including the iconic Eden Ark, hotels, petrol station and retail units.

5.18 A significant effect will arise to the overall landscape character of the site, as it changes from an agricultural landscape to a development site, as well as to aesthetic factors as the site will become busy with construction traffic and building activity.

5.19 Moderately significant adverse landscape effects will arise to:

- landform/physical features, due to excavations required for the attenuation features and surf lake, and the minor excavations required for the construction of roads and built form;
- landcover due to the tree and hedgerow removal, as outlined above; and
- buildings and settlement type due to the construction activities associated with the new development; and
- communications/infrastructure due to the removal of an existing lane running through the site, and the A38 and M5 motorway being temporarily affected during construction; and
- field pattern, boundaries and features due to the limited lengths of field boundaries removed and the partial loss of field pattern to accommodate development.

**On Completion**

5.20 On completion the adverse landscape effect upon the landscape character of the site will reduce to being moderately significant, a mixed use development set within a rural landscape, adjacent to the M5 motorway. The adverse landscape effect upon the landform/physical features, and field pattern, boundaries and features will reduce to being not significant. There will be a long term moderately significant benefit to the aesthetic factors of the site as the iconic Eden Ark building and associated gardens will be complete. There will also be a long term benefit to buildings and settlement type although this effect will be not significant. There will be a long term benefit to public rights of way/recreation of moderate significance as new public rights of way will be provided.
15 Years After Planting

5.21 15 years after planting and beyond, the beneficial landscape effect upon aesthetic factors will increase to being significant as vegetation will have matured to soften the aesthetical appearance of the site and will integrate the built development into the wider setting. There will be continued benefits to public rights of way/recreation of moderate significance. There will be long-term benefits to the landcover and field pattern, boundaries and features as vegetation matures, although these benefits will be not significant.

Assessment of Visual Effects During Construction and On Completion

5.22 Full details of the visual effects are set out in the Visual Effects Table in Appendix 4. The following provides a summary of the significant and moderately significant effects, together with the reasons for those effects.

Visual Effects During Construction

5.23 Construction activities will be set out above.

5.24 There will be a significant adverse visual effects during construction from the B3181 (Viewpoint 3) due to the proximity of construction activity to pedestrians.

5.25 There will be moderately significant short-term adverse visual effects on the following local viewpoints, which directly overlook the site from:

- public right of way leading to Mounstephen Farm (Viewpoint 1) due to the proximity of construction activity to the receptor;
- B3181 (Viewpoint 2), due to the proximity of construction activity to pedestrians;
- B3181 (Viewpoint 3), due to the proximity of construction activity to vehicles;
- A38 adjacent to Jersey Farm (Viewpoint 5), due to the proximity of construction activity to the receptor and the removal of hedgerow vegetation in the foreground; and
- Grand Western Canal Towpath (Viewpoint 12), due to the open and slightly elevated nature of the view from an important long distance footpath within the district.

Visual Effects On Completion

5.26 On completion, the buildings, surf lake, roads, attenuation features and planting will all be complete, albeit the planting will not yet be effective in visual terms. The adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 and 5 will remain as stated during construction. The adverse visual effects on Viewpoint 12 will reduce to being ‘not significant’ as views will be limited to the iconic building, which have a benefit in the view.

Visual Effects 15 Years After Completion

5.27 Residual visual effects are those remaining 15 years after completion, when proposed planting will have had the benefit of over 15 years establishment and will be up to 8-9m in height, depending on the species and their initial planting height.
5.28 15 years after completion, there will be no significant or moderately significant adverse visual effects.
6.0 SUMMARY

Baseline

6.1 The site lies adjacent to part of the M5 motorway at junction 27, approximately 1.3km east of the village of Sampford Peverell and 1.15km west of the village of Uffculme. It comprises agricultural fields used for grazing and crops. A petrol station, hotel, fast food establishment and coffee shop are located within the site in proximity to the western boundary and the M5/A38 roundabout junction. Two farms and business units also feature within the site.

6.2 The site occupies ground that gently slopes westwards from approximately 90m to 75m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). It is bounded by:

- the M5 motorway and associated slip roads to the west;
- the A38 and Waterloo Caravan Park to the north;
- the B3181 to the east;
- a public right of way and land associated with Mountstephen House to the south; and
- Mountstephen Farm to the south-west.

6.3 The Mid Devon Landscape Character Assessment characterises the area encompassing the site as the Lowlands Plains Landscape Character Type.

6.4 The key characteristics of this character type include gently rolling ground, with rounded hilltops, arable farmland with some areas of improved grassland, copses and discrete woodlands, and an agrarian landscape with medium to large scale field patterns divided by hedgerows and hedgebanks, with infrequent hedgerow trees. The landscape character area is semi-open with some long extensive views afforded from on top of hilltops although views are highly variable.

Landscape Effects

6.5 There will be no significant or moderately significant adverse landscape effects upon the site’s wider landscape character areas and types, as the changes will be localised, with proposed green infrastructure of the new development aimed at softening development and enhancing the existing character of the area.

6.6 During construction, a significant effect will arise to the overall landscape character of the site, as it changes from an agricultural landscape to a development site, as well as to aesthetic factors as the site will become busy with construction traffic and building activity.

6.7 Moderately significant adverse landscape effects will arise to:

- landform/physical features, due to excavations required for the attenuation features and surf lake, and the minor excavations required for the construction of roads and built form;
- landcover due to the tree and hedgerow removal, as outlined above; and
• buildings and settlement type due to the construction activities associated with the new development;

• communications/infrastructure due to the removal of an existing lane running through the site, and roads being temporarily affected during construction; and

• field pattern, boundaries and features due to the limited lengths of field boundaries removed and the partial loss of field pattern to accommodate development.

6.8 On completion the adverse landscape effect upon the landscape character of the site will reduce to being moderately significant as it will become a mixed use development set within a rural landscape, adjacent to the M5 motorway. The adverse landscape effect upon the landform/physical features, and field pattern, boundaries and features will reduce to being not significant.

6.9 There will be a long term moderately significant benefit to the aesthetic factors of the site as the iconic Eden Ark building and associated gardens will be complete. There will also be a long term benefit to buildings and settlement type although this effect will be not significant. There will be a long term benefit to public rights of way/recreation of moderate significance as new public rights of way will be provided.

6.10 15 years after planting and beyond, the beneficial landscape effect upon aesthetic factors will increase to being significant as vegetation will have matured to soften the aesthetical appearance of the site and will integrate the built development into the wider setting. There will be continued benefits to public rights of way and recreation of moderate significance. There will be long-term benefits to the landcover and field pattern, boundaries and features as vegetation matures, although these benefits will be not significant.

**Visual Effects**

6.11 There will be a significant adverse visual effect during construction from the B3181 due to the proximity of construction activity to pedestrians.

6.12 There will be moderately significant short-term temporary adverse visual effects on the following local viewpoints, which directly overlook the site from:

• public right of way leading to Mounstephen Farm due to the proximity of construction activity to the receptor;

• B3181, due to the proximity of construction activity to pedestrians;

• B3181, due to the proximity of construction activity to vehicles;

• A38 adjacent to Jersey Farm due to the proximity of construction activity to the receptor and the removal of hedgerow vegetation in the foreground; and

• Grand Western Canal Towpath due to the open and slightly elevated nature of the view from an important long distance footpath within the district.

6.13 On completion, the built form and associated planting will all be complete, albeit the planting will not yet be effective in visual terms. The adverse visual effects on the viewpoints above will remain as stated during construction, apart from the adverse visual effect on the Grand Western Canal Towpath which will reduce to not significant, as views will be limited to the iconic Eden Ark building which has a benefit
6.14 15 years after completion, the proposed planting will have had the benefit of over 15 years establishment. There will be no significant or moderately significant adverse visual effects in the longer term.
APPENDIX 1 : METHODOLOGY

Introduction

1.1 The methodology has been developed over a number of years, based on experience and the Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’, Third Edition, 2013.

1.2 The assessment of landscape and visual effects aims to be as objective as possible, however, as the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment explain:

‘Professional judgement is a very important part of LVIA. While there is some scope for quantitative measurement of some relatively objective matters, for example the number of trees lost to construction… much of the assessment must rely on qualitative judgements, for example about what effect the introduction of a new development or land use change may have on visual amenity, or about the significance of change in the character of the landscape and whether it is positive or negative’.

(page 21, paragraph 2.23)

1.3 The methodology was submitted to the Local Planning Authority, prior to the preparation of this Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as part of the scoping exercise.

1.4 In all cases, the assessment of effect makes comparison with the baseline year 2016, during which the latest site surveys were carried out.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

1.5 A computer generated ZTV plan was created in order to establish the approximate extent to which the proposed development is likely to be visible in the surrounding area. This was generated by selecting spot locations to simulate the outer limits of the development footprint and then adding maximum heights (assessment points) of the proposed development to the computer model, based on information provided by the architect. The ZTV computer software processes the landform data and other selected features influencing the extent of visibility (visual barriers), for example, woodland and settlements, in order to identify the theoretical extent of the area from which the proposed development is likely to be visible. It is also used as a guide to the preliminary selection of representative viewpoints for the visual impact assessment. It is important to note that the ZTV illustrates the worst-case scenario in that it only takes into account landform and the principal areas of woodland and settlements.

1.6 Because the ZTV plan is theoretical, the extent of visibility has been further assessed on-site, including the selection of typical viewpoints.

Data Trawl

1.7 After establishment of the initial study area, a data trawl has been undertaken to collect baseline information, including topography, landscape planning policy designations, published sources of landscape character and other relevant information. The findings of the data trawl are summarised in the text and illustrated on Plans L1 – L4 inclusive, included at Appendix 2.
1.8 The published sources or copyright details of baseline data are acknowledged on relevant drawings.

**Site Appraisal**

1.9 Following the data trawl and a preliminary desktop study, site visits were made in 2013, 2015, and 2016 by Chartered Members of the Landscape Institute in order to undertake a landscape and visual appraisal in relation to the proposed development, including review of the computer generated ZTV, identification of key views, assessment of landscape value and local landscape character, identification of typical viewpoints as a basis on which to undertake the visual impact assessment, and preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects.

**Selection of Viewpoints**

1.10 The selection of viewpoints has been made on the basis of the following types of publicly accessible viewpoints, as follows:

- representative viewpoints (for example, representing views of users of a particular footpath); and
- specific viewpoints (for example, a key view from a specific visitor attraction).

1.11 No provide viewpoints were assessed.

1.12 The following terminology is used to describe the approximate distance between the viewer and the proposals;

- local under 1km
- medium distant 1-2km
- distant: over 2km

1.13 The type of view and the number of viewers are described in the following terms;

- glimpsed (i.e. in passing) / filtered / oblique / framed / open views; and
- few / moderate / many viewers.

**Local Landscape Character Assessment**

1.14 Local landscape character has been assessed on site with reference to the guidelines set out in the ‘Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland’. The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002. The findings of the site assessment are included in the baseline section of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

**Assessment Stages**

1.15 A three-stage assessment process has been adopted for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, in accordance with the Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidelines. Firstly, the nature of receptors (sensitivity) has been assessed. Secondly the nature of effects (magnitude) likely to result from the proposed development has been assessed.
Lastly, the significance of the identified effects on receptors has been assessed, as required by the Environmental Impact Assessment EU Directive and UK Regulations.

**Sensitivity of Receptors**

1.16 The sensitivity of receptors has been assessed by undertaking an appraisal of landscape value or the value of views, in relation to an assessment of each receptor’s susceptibility to change of the type of development proposed.

**Magnitude of Effects**

1.17 The assessment of the magnitude of effects combines an assessment of the size or scale of effects likely to arise on landscape and views, with an assessment of the geographical extent over which those effects are likely to be experienced and their duration and potential reversibility.

**Significance**

1.18 The significance of likely landscape and visual effects has been judged by assessing the sensitivity of receptors in relation to the magnitude of effects, for example, a moderate to high magnitude of effect on a highly sensitive receptor is likely to be significant, whereas a similar effect on a receptor of lower sensitivity is less likely to be significant.

1.19 The methodology and criteria used to undertake the above assessments are set out below.

**Sensitivity of Receptors**

**Landscape Value**

1.20 As part of the baseline description, the value of potentially affected landscape receptors has been assessed, including landscape character and the individual elements or features which contribute to landscape character. Landscapes may be valued at community, local, national level or above. Existing landscape designations have been taken as the starting point for this assessment, as shown on Table 1 below. However, the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be assessed and this is considered after Table 1.

1.21 Table 1 sets out the relative importance of generic landscape designations and descriptions, identifying those designations applicable to the study area in the third column:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Designation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual Designation for this Site</th>
<th>Importance (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>Unique sites, features or areas of international importance with settings of very high quality.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>International (High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park, AONB’s, curtilage of Grade I, II and II* Listed Buildings,</td>
<td>Sites, features or areas of national importance with settings of high quality.</td>
<td>Birdwell Grade II Historic Park and Garden lies approximately 0.45km to the south-east of the site.</td>
<td>National (High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, Scheduled Monuments,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Areas, Areas of Great Landscape Value, National Trails</td>
<td>Sites, features or areas of regional importance with intact character.</td>
<td>Sampford Peverell Conservation Areas lies approximately 1.3km to the west of the site.</td>
<td>Regional (High / Medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uffculme Conservation Area lies approximately 2km south-east of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Western Canal has been designated as a conservation area, running approximately 0.7km to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the north-west of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Grand Western Canal Towpath long distance footpath is located on the towpath of the Grand Western Canal located to the north and east of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Local Landscape Importance, Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)</td>
<td>Sites, features or areas of district importance.</td>
<td>A footpath runs along the southern boundary along a farm access track, before continuing westwards beyond the M5.</td>
<td>District (Medium / Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other footpaths are located in proximity to the site to the east, north-east and south-west of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably no designation, e.g. Public Open Space or local footpath</td>
<td>General countryside area valued at the local level.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Local (Medium / Low)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.22 Whilst the assessment of value is partly based on landscape planning designations, other criteria are used by SLR Consulting to assess the landscape value of:

- undesignated landscape character areas in the study area;
- the site; and
- landscape elements within the site.

1.23 Landscape elements within a site comprise:

- landform/physical features;
- landcover, including tree cover;
- buildings and settlement type;
- communications/infrastructure;
- public rights of way/recreation;
- field pattern, boundaries and features;
- historic landscape character; and
- aesthetic factors.

1.24 Undesignated landscape character areas, the site and landscape elements are assessed against the following criteria set out in Table 2 and given a high, medium or low value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Condition</td>
<td>Intactness of the landscape/condition of individual elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Quality</td>
<td>General appeal of the landscape to the senses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarity</td>
<td>Rarity of landscape character areas, types or features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Conformance to published landscape character assessment descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Interest</td>
<td>The presence of cultural heritage interest or associations with writers, artists or historic events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranquillity</td>
<td>A landscape valued for its tranquillity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>The presence of dark night skies or light pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.25 An overall assessment has been made for each receptor, based on the assessments made using each of the above criteria, in terms of high, medium and low value. For example, an intact landscape in good condition, where scenic quality, tranquillity, and or cultural heritage features make a particular contribution to the landscape, or where there are important cultural or historical associations, is likely to be highly valued. Conversely, a degraded landscape in poor condition, with no particular scenic qualities or cultural interest is likely to be considered of only low landscape value.
Value of Views

1.26 Visual receptors generally comprise users of public rights of way or other outdoor recreational facilities; and also, vehicle travellers who may be visiting, or living or working within the study area and their views at particular places.

1.27 The value attached to views has regard to a number of factors, including:

- Recognition through planning designations or heritage assets: and
- The popularity of the viewpoint, its appearance in guidebooks, literature or art, on tourist maps and the facilities provided for its enjoyment.

1.28 The assessment of the value of views is summarised in Table 3 below, in terms of High, Medium and Low value. These criteria are provided for guidance only and are not intended to be absolute:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Views from landscapes/viewpoints of national importance, or highly popular visitor attractions where the view forms an important part of the experience, or with important cultural associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Views from landscapes/viewpoints of regional/district importance or moderately popular visitor attractions where the view forms part of the experience, or with local cultural associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Views from landscapes/viewpoints with no designations, not particularly popular as a viewpoint and with minimal or no cultural associations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Susceptibility to Change

1.29 The ability of a landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific nature of the proposed development without undue harm or undue adverse consequences for the baseline condition is referred to as ‘susceptibility to change’.

Susceptibility of Landscape Receptors to Change

1.30 Susceptibility of landscape receptors to change has been assessed using the following criteria, with reference to the baseline conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Little ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Some ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Substantial ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue harm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.31 The susceptibility of different types of people to changes in views is mainly a function of:
the occupation or activity of the viewer at a given location; and

- the extent to which a person’s attention or interest may therefore be focussed on a view and the visual amenity experienced at a given view.

1.32 The assessment of a visual receptor to change is specific to the proposed development. However the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment offer the following generic guidance as a starting point for the assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susceptibility</th>
<th>Type of Receptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>People with a proprietary or particular interest in a view, or with a prolonged viewing opportunity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People using long distance recreational routes whose attention is likely to be focussed on the landscape and views;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where views of the surroundings are an important part of the experience; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents, for example Bath Spa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>People with a moderate interest in the view and their surroundings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Travellers by road, rail or other transport modes along scenic routes, where the appreciation of the view contributes to the enjoyment and quality of the journey; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Users of public rights of way where the view is of moderate interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>People with a momentary or little interest in the view and their surroundings, as their focus is on other activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People engaged in, and focused on, outdoor sport or recreational activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People at their place of work, where the setting is not important to the quality of working life; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Road users, where the view is fleeting and incidental to the journey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.33 The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment qualifies the above examples as follows:

‘This division is not black and white and in reality there will be a gradation in susceptibility to change. Each project needs to consider the nature of the groups of people who will be affected and the extent to which their attention is likely to be focussed on views and visual amenity’.

(page 114, paragraph 6.35)

Sensitivity

1.34 The assessment of receptor sensitivity combines judgements on the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of development proposed and the value attributed to that receptor.

Magnitude of Effects

1.35 The magnitude of a landscape or visual effect is assessed in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced by that effect, and its duration and degree of reversibility.

Size and Scale of Effects
1.36 The size and / or scale of effects relates to the scale of changes in the landscape, such as the loss or addition of features and the scale of the change in views.

Geographical Extent of Effects

1.37 The geographical extend of effects relates to:

- the area over which landscape effects are likely to be experienced, i.e. this could be at the site level, the immediate setting of the site, or landscape character type or area; and
- the area over which visual effects are likely to be visible.

Duration

1.38 The following terminology is used to describe the duration of the proposals:

- short-term: under 2 years
- medium-term: 2 – 15 years
- long-term: over 15 years

1.39 Effects may be temporary, permanent or reversible over time. For example, visual effects arising from construction activities may be limited solely to the construction period and therefore only temporary, or they may be permanent, for example, where construction necessitates some clearance of existing vegetation.

Reversibility

1.40 Effects may be reversible, for example, restoration of a quarry following mineral extraction. The assessment therefore considers the practicality of effects being reversed with an approximate timeframe for reversibility.

Nature of Effects

1.41 The nature of effects may be positive or negative (beneficial or adverse) direct or indirect. Direct effects are those which result directly from a development itself, whereas indirect or secondary effects may arise as a consequential change resulting from development, for example, changes to downstream vegetation as a result of alterations to a drainage system.

Magnitude of Landscape Effects

Size and Scale of Effects

1.42 The size and scale of change in the landscape takes into consideration the following factors:

- the extent / proportion of landscape elements lost or added;
- the contribution of that element to landscape character and the degree to which aesthetic / perceptual aspects are altered; and
• whether the effect is likely to change the key characteristics of the landscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.

1.43 The criteria used to assess the size and scale of landscape effects are based upon the amount of change that will occur as a result of the proposals, as described in Table 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major adverse landscape effect</td>
<td>The proposals will result in a total change in the key characteristics of landscape character; will introduce elements totally uncharacteristic to the attributes of the receiving landscape; and / or will result in a substantial or total loss, alteration or addition of key elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate adverse landscape effect</td>
<td>The proposals will result in a partial change in the key characteristics of landscape character, will introduce elements partially uncharacteristic to the attributes of the receiving landscape; and / or will result in partial loss, alteration or addition of key elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight adverse landscape effect</td>
<td>The proposals will result in a small change in the key characteristics of landscape character, will introduce elements that are not uncharacteristic to the attributes of the receiving landscape, and / or will result in a minor loss, alteration or addition of elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible adverse landscape effect</td>
<td>The proposals will result in a just discernible change to landscape character / elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The proposals will not cause any change to landscape character / elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible landscape benefit</td>
<td>The proposals will result in a just discernible improvement to landscape character / elements / features / characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight landscape effect</td>
<td>The proposals will achieve a degree of fit with the landscape character / element / features / characteristics and go some way towards improving the condition or character of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate landscape benefit</td>
<td>The proposals will achieve a good fit with the landscape character / elements / features / characteristics, or would noticeably improve the condition or character of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major landscape benefit</td>
<td>The proposals will totally accord with the landscape character / elements / features / characteristics, or would restore, recreate or permanently benefit the condition or character of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visual Effects Magnitude

1.44 The magnitude of a visual effect is assessed in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and degree of reversibility.

Size and Scale of Effects

1.45 The size and scale of change in the view relates to the degree of contrast or integration likely to result from the proposed development and is influenced by the relative time over which a view is experienced and whether it is a full, partial or glimpsed view.

1.46 The following criteria are used to assess the size and scale of visual effects, based on the degree of change to the view or composition:
Table 7: Visual Effects – Size / Scale of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major adverse or beneficial visual effect</td>
<td>The proposals will cause a dominant or complete change or contrast to the view, resulting from the loss or addition of substantial features in the view and will substantially alter the appreciation of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate adverse or beneficial visual effect</td>
<td>The proposals will cause a clearly noticeable change or contrast to the view, which would have some effect on the composition, resulting from the loss or addition of features in the view and will noticeably alter the appreciation of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight adverse or beneficial visual effect</td>
<td>The proposals will cause a perceptible change or contrast to the view, but which would not materially affect the composition or the appreciation of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible adverse or beneficial visual effect</td>
<td>The proposals will cause a barely perceptible change or contrast to the view, which would not affect the composition or the appreciation of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The proposals will cause no change to the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>There will be a change to the composition of the view, but the change will be in keeping with the existing elements of the view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effects

1.47 The scale shown in Table 8 below, is used to guide the assessment of the significance of both landscape and visual effects, from a combination of the assessment of receptor sensitivity and the magnitude of effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity of Receptor</th>
<th>Major Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Effect</th>
<th>Slight Effect</th>
<th>Negligible Effect</th>
<th>Neutral Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.49 For the purposes of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, ‘Moderately Significant’ effects are also considered to be ‘Significant’, but to a lesser degree that (wholly) ‘Significant’ effects.