

Appendix 9.1

L VIA Methodology and Assessment Criteria



Introduction

The purpose of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) when produced in the context of an EIA is to identify and report any likely significant landscape and visual effects.

In the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), potential likely significant landscape and visual effects have been identified. Chapter 9 is not, however, intended to constitute a final or complete LVIA.

The following appendix sets out the methodology and criteria against which the preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects has been undertaken in Chapter 9. It is proposed that the same methodology and assessment criteria will be applied to the LVIA presented in the subsequent Environmental Statement (ES) although a more detailed justification for the judgements given will be set out in the ES.

The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) are widely recognised as the primary source of guidance for LVIA in the UK but clearly state that:

“The guidance concentrates on principles while also seeking to steer specific approaches where there is a general consensus on methods and techniques. It is not intended to be prescriptive, in that it does not provide a detailed ‘recipe’ that can be followed in every situation. It is always the primary responsibility of any landscape professional carrying out an assessment to ensure that the approach and methodology adopted are appropriate to the particular circumstances.” (paragraph 1.20)

GLVIA 3 also states that: *“professional judgement is a very important part of the LVIA”* (paragraph 2.23) and that *“in all cases there is a need for the judgements that are made to be reasonable and based on clear and transparent methods so that the reasoning applied at different stages can be traced and examined by others.”* (paragraph 2.24).

It goes on to state that *“there are no hard and fast rules about what effects should be deemed significant but LVIA’s should always distinguish clearly between what are considered to be the significant and non-significant effects.”* (paragraph 3.32)

Wherever possible, identified effects are quantified, but as noted above, the nature of landscape and visual assessment requires interpretation using professional judgement. In order to provide a level of consistency to the assessment, the prediction of magnitude and the assessment of significance of the residual landscape and visual effects are based on pre-defined criteria as set out in this appendix.

Landscape and visual assessments are separate, though linked processes which GLVIA3 notes are *“related but very different considerations”*. The assessment of the potential effect on the landscape is carried out as an effect on the environmental resource (i.e. the landscape). Visual effects are assessed as the inter-related effect on people.

- Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape elements which may give rise to changes in its distinctive character and how this is experienced, including consideration of aesthetic and perceptual aspects.
- Visual effects relate to changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people’s responses to the changes and to the overall effects with respect to visual amenity.

Establishing the Baseline

The baseline for consideration of landscape and visual effects is evaluated through desk study and site work and is the current situation at the time of the assessment, unless noted otherwise. Other operational developments and those under construction are considered as part of the baseline and included as part of the assessment of landscape and visual effects.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Direct and indirect effects are defined in GLVIA3. Direct effects may be defined as resulting “*directly from the development itself*” (paragraph 3.22). An indirect (or secondary) effect is one that results “*from consequential change resulting from the development*” (paragraph 3.22) and is often produced away from the site of the proposed development or as a result of a complex pathway or secondary association.

Landscape Effects

The starting point for an assessment of landscape effects is a desk-based assessment of published landscape studies, which may include landscape character assessments, sensitivity and capacity studies and/or landscape designation reviews. Relevant documents are listed as appropriate in the LVIA and relevant extracts may be included where this is judged appropriate. Desk based assessment is supplemented by field work to verify the key characteristics of the landscape.

In accordance with GLVIA3, the significance of landscape effects is determined by combining judgements regarding the sensitivity of the receiving landscape and the magnitude of the landscape effects arising from the Proposed Development.

An assessment of the degree to which the proposed development changes the “*distinct and recognisable pattern of elements, or characteristics, in the landscape that make one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse*” (‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England, 2014), enables a judgement to be made as to the significance of the effect in landscape character terms.

In order to reach an understanding of the effects of development upon the landscape resource it is necessary to consider different aspects of the landscape baseline including:

- Landscape fabric/elements: The individual features of the landscape, such as hills, valleys, woods, hedges, tree cover, vegetation, buildings and roads for example which can usually be described and quantified.
- Landscape key characteristics: The particularly notable elements or combinations of elements which make a particular contribution to defining or describing the character of an area, which may include experiential characteristics such as wildness and tranquillity.

Landscape Sensitivity

It should be noted, as stated in GLVIA3, “*LVIA sensitivity is similar to the concept of landscape sensitivity used in the wider arena of landscape planning but is not the same as it is specific to the particular project or development that is being proposed and to the location in question*”. (paragraph 5,39)

In LVIA, landscape sensitivity is assessed by combining judgements about the value attached to a landscape and its susceptibility to the type of change and nature of the development proposed. The overall sensitivity of the landscape to a particular development is described in Chapter 9 of the PEIR as **High, Medium** or **Low**.

- Landscape Value:** Landscape value varies in relation to the different stakeholders and different parts of society that use or experience a landscape. It reflects the importance attached to a landscape. Sometimes it is used as a basis for designation or recognition which expresses national or local authority consensus, because of its special qualities/attributes. Although factors such as formal designations are an important component when determining landscape value, other aspects are also considered as part of the judgement process as explained in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02-21 *Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations*. These include issues related to natural and cultural heritage (for example ecological, geological or heritage matters), landscape condition, associations (in terms of connections with people, arts or events), distinctiveness (i.e. a sense of unique identity in the landscape), recreational opportunities, perceptual aspects (including scenic quality, wildness and tranquillity) and landscapes with a clearly identifiable role or function. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the value attributed to the landscape is described as: **National, Regional, or Community**.
- Landscape Susceptibility:** Landscape Susceptibility according to GLVIA3 means “*the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the proposed Development without undue consequences for maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies*” (paragraph 5.40). The susceptibility of the landscape varies depending on the type of development proposed and the particular site location. Judgements on landscape susceptibility include references to both the physical and aesthetic characteristics and the potential scope for mitigation. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the susceptibility of the landscape is described as **High, Medium or Low**.

The criteria and the detailed judgements regarding susceptibility and value of landscape receptors are identified within the sensitivity tables included within **Appendix 9.3** to this assessment.

Sensitivity is judged taking into account the component judgments about the value and susceptibility of the receptor as illustrated by **Table A9.1** below. Where sensitivity is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment will be adopted.

Table A9.1 Landscape Sensitivity Criteria

		Susceptibility		
		High	Medium	Low
Value	National	High	High/medium	Medium
	Regional	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low
	Community	Medium	Medium/Low	Low

Magnitude of Landscape Change

The magnitude of landscape change arising from the proposed development at any particular location is assessed in terms of “*size or scale, the geographic extent of the area or receptor that is influenced and its duration and reversibility*” (paragraph 5.48).

Judgements concerning the **Scale** of the change take account of:

- Degree of loss or alteration to key landscape features/elements; characteristics; and for designated areas – special qualities and/or purposes of designation.
- Distance from the Proposed Development.
- Landscape context to the Proposed Development.

The approach to assessing effects on landscape character is to consider the key characteristics for the Landscape Character Area (LCA) within which the proposed development is located (the host LCA) and if relevant the adjacent LCA's (non-host) and identify which of these the proposed development would affect. A large scale change in landscape character is likely to occur where key characteristics would be lost or substantially changed. A small scale change is likely to occur where key characteristics are altered to a lesser degree and this can be influenced by distance and surrounding context.

Where particular views are a key characteristic of a LCA, large or medium scale landscape character effects may occur where the proposed development becomes a key feature of those views. A similar approach applies to designated landscapes, for which the effects on the defined purposes of designation and special qualities are considered.

In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the scale of landscape change is described as: **Large, Medium or Small**.

Having established the scale of change to the landscape baseline, the **Geographic Extent** of the change can be identified. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the geographical extent of landscape change is described as: **Wide, Intermediate, Localised or Limited**.

Duration and Reversibility can be linked depending on the nature of the development. Reversibility is a judgement about the practicality of reversing the landscape effects of the proposed development (for example, solar farms are ultimately largely reversible whilst housing is permanent). Duration reflects how long the change will last. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the duration of the change would be considered:

- short term when lasting less than 2 years;
- medium term when lasting between 2 and 10 years;
- long term when lasting between 10 and 40 years, and
- permanent for more than 40 years.

Magnitude is considered taking into account the three contributory factors as illustrated by the diagrams presented in **Figure A9.1** below.

Visual Effects

In accordance with GLVIA3, the significance of visual effects is determined by combining judgements regarding the sensitivity of visual receptors (people who view the landscape) and the magnitude of the change they experience arising from the Proposed Development.

Visual Receptor Sensitivity

In LVIA, visual receptor sensitivity is assessed by combining judgements about the value attached to views and the susceptibility of the viewer to the type of change and nature of the development proposed. The overall sensitivity of the visual receptor to a particular development is described in Chapter 9 of the PEIR as **High, Medium or Low**.

- Value of Views:** The value of public views, which is the focus of GLVIA3, will vary depending on the nature, location and context of the view and the recognised importance of the view. Considerations include cultural associations; designation or policy protection; views of or from landmarks; and/or the scenic quality of the view. It should be noted that the value attributed relates to the value of the view only (e.g. a National Trail is nationally valued for access, but not always for the available views from every section). In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the value attributed to visual amenity is described as: **National, Regional, or Community**.
- Susceptibility of Visual Receptors:** Those living within view of the Proposed Development are usually regarded as the highest susceptibility group as well as those engaged in outdoor pursuits for whom landscape experience is the primary objective. The susceptibility of potential visual receptors will also vary depending on the activity of the receptor. For visual receptors, susceptibility and value are closely linked - the most valued views are also likely to be those where viewer's expectations will be highest. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, visual receptor susceptibility is defined in accordance with the criteria below.

High - Local residents; users of outdoor recreation focussed on the appreciation of views including footpaths, beauty spots and picnic areas and people experiencing views to or from important features of physical, visual, cultural or historic interest.

Medium - Local road users and travellers on trains. People engaged in outdoor recreation with some appreciation of the landscape e.g. road cycling, nature conservation, golf and water based recreation.

Low - Workers, users of facilities and commercial buildings (indoors) experiencing views from buildings. Road and rail users on fast moving commuting or trunk routes. Visual receptors where views are incidental to the activity and/or location.

Sensitivity is judged taking into account the component judgments about the value and susceptibility of the receptor, as illustrated by **Table A9.2** below. Where sensitivity is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment will be adopted.

Table A9.2 Visual Sensitivity Criteria

		Susceptibility		
		High	Medium	Low
Value	National	High	High/medium	Medium
	Regional	High/Medium	High/Medium	Medium/Low
	Community	High/Medium	Medium	Low

Magnitude of Visual Change

The magnitude of visual change arising from the Proposed Development is assessed in terms of its size or scale, geographic extent of the area or receptor that is influenced and its duration.

Representative viewpoints are used in the LVIA as ‘samples’ on which to base judgements of the scale of change on visual receptors. The wider extent of the effect and its duration are not captured in the viewpoint analysis (as a viewpoint cannot capture these factors for an entire route or area). As duration and extent are necessary considerations in determining magnitude of change, judgements concerning magnitude and significance are provided for visual receptors and not for representative viewpoints. The only exception to this rule would be a specific viewpoint – where people visiting that location to look at the view are assessed as a visual receptor group in its own right.

With the exception of specific viewpoints (as noted above), each route (e.g. a footpath or road) and receptor group (e.g. a community or village) will encompass a range of possible views, which might vary from no view of the development to very clear, close views. Therefore effects are described in such a way as to identify where views towards the development are likely to arise and what the scale and duration and extent of those views is likely to be. In some cases this will be further informed by a nearby viewpoint and in others it will be informed with reference to ZTV studies, aerial photography and site visits. Each of these individual effects are then considered together in order to reach a judgement of the effects on the visual receptors along that route, or in that place.

The **Scale** of change arising from the proposed development as experienced by a visual receptor group reflects the degree to which the nature of the views from that location would be changed taking into account:

- the distance from the proposed development;
- the degree to which the proposed development is visible or screened;
- the angle of view in relation to main receptor activity or main focus of the view;
- the horizontal and vertical field of view occupied by the proposed development; and
- the extent and nature of other built development visible.

In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the scale of change in view is described as: **Large, Medium or Small**.

The approach to assessing effects on views is to consider the full 360 degree view from any given receptor – not just those towards the development and/or shown in visualisations. It is assumed that the change would be seen in clear visibility and the assessment is carried out on that basis. Seasonal variations in visibility due to varying vegetation cover is also taken into account in all judgements.

For visual receptors moving through the landscape (e.g. road and rail users), the length of their journey during which they would see the proposed development is reflected in the judgement of the **Geographic Extent** of effects. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the geographical extent of visual change is described as: **Wide, Intermediate, Localised or Limited**.

Duration reflects how long the change will last and judgements are framed in the same way as described above for landscape effects. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the duration of the change would be considered:

- short term when lasting less than 2 years;
- medium term when lasting between 2 and 10 years;

- long term when lasting between 10 and 40 years, and
- permanent for more than 40 years.

Magnitude is considered taking into account the three contributory factors as illustrated by the diagrams presented in **Figure A9.1** below.

Combining Scale of Change, Extent and Duration to Determine Magnitude of Landscape and Visual Effects


Scale of change is the first and primary factor in determining magnitude. Geographical extent and duration of the effect are modifying factors to the overall magnitude judgement which may be higher if the effect is particularly widespread and/or long lasting, or lower if it is constrained in geographic extent and/or timescale.

The diagrams presented below in **Figure A9.1** illustrate in outline how these two modifying factors are considered in a two-stage process. A judgement is first formed about the scale of the change to the landscape or visual receptor. The geographic extent of the effect is then considered as a modifying influence in the first part of Figure A9.1 (Stage 1). The result or outcome of Stage 1 is then considered again in relation to the duration of the effect as illustrated in the second part of Figure A9.1. The outcome of Stage 2 is the overall magnitude of effect judgement reported in the assessment. Figure A9.1 IS not intended to be interpreted rigidly as a chart to provide definitive answers; professional judgement is employed as appropriate to arrive at an overall magnitude judgement.


In Chapter 9 of the PEIR, the magnitude of effects is described as **Substantial, Moderate, Slight or Negligible**. Where magnitude is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment will be adopted. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR preliminary judgments are simply stated. Within the LVIA chapter of the ES the judgements will be fully justified as necessary.

Figure A9.1 Scale of Effect Diagrams

Stage 1 - Modifying Influence of Geographic Extent on Magnitude of Effect



Stage 2 - Modifying Influence of Duration on Magnitude of Effect



Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects

The significance of any identified landscape or visual effect is described in Chapter 9 of the PEIR as **Major, Moderate, Minor or Negligible**. These categories are based on the consideration of sensitivity with the predicted magnitude of change. **Table A9.3** below is not used as a prescriptive tool and illustrates the typical outcomes, allowing for the exercise of professional judgement. In some instances, a particular parameter may be considered as having a determining effect on the analysis.

Table A9.3 Significance of effect criteria

		Magnitude of Change			
		Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible
Receptor Sensitivity	High	Major	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Minor
	Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor/Negligible
	Low	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Negligible

Where the effect has been classified as Major or Major/Moderate, this is considered to be equivalent to likely significant effects. Where ‘Moderate’ effects are predicted, professional judgement will be applied to determine whether the effect is significant or not ensuring that the potential for significant effects to arise has been thoroughly considered. In Chapter 9 of the PEIR preliminary judgments are simply stated. Within the LVIA chapter of the ES the judgements will be fully justified as necessary.

Beneficial/Adverse

Landscape and visual effects can be beneficial or adverse and in some instances may be considered neutral. Neutral effects are those which overall are neither adverse nor positive but may incorporate a combination of both. Whether an effect is beneficial, neutral or adverse is identified based on professional judgement. GLVIA3 indicates at paragraph 2.15 that this is a “particularly challenging” aspect of assessment, especially in the context of a changing landscape.

However, for the avoidance of doubt, in this LVIA it has been assumed that where new infrastructure is introduced into the landscape or views, this will generally constitute an adverse effect. Any variation from this stance will be clearly justified in the LVIA.

Cumulative Effects

The overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that *“When considering cumulative effects, the ES should provide information on how the effects of the applicant’s proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)”*.

Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment Relevant to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, paragraph 1.4 states that *“For the purposes of this Advice Note, ‘other existing development and/or approved development’ is taken to include existing developments and existing plans and projects that are ‘reasonably foreseeable’.*” It also states at paragraph 3.4.2 that *“The assessment should be undertaken to an appropriate level of detail, commensurate with the information available at the time of assessment.”*

Table 2 of Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17 sets out three ‘Tiers’ of ‘other existing development and/or approved development’ and at paragraph 3.4.3 it details the level of assessment that should be undertaken for each ‘Tier’. The LVIA presented in the ES will adopt this guidance and assess cumulative landscape and visual effects depending on the status of ‘other existing development and/or approved development’ at the time of submission.

An assessment of cumulative effects should focus on whether there are any potential significant cumulative impacts which are reasonably foreseeable and which are likely to influence the decision making of the proposed development, rather than an assessment of every potential cumulative effect, which in practice means focussing on other nearby development proposals and the effects that might arise from the combined influence of those developments on landscape and visual receptors.

The cumulative assessment is based on the same landscape and visual baseline and receptor groups as the main LVIA, and the methodology is also the same in terms of forming and expressing judgements.

- Cumulative effects on landscape receptors arise from combined direct and/or indirect effects on the same receptor – such as two developments within the same character area; or one development within, and one visible from, a designated area.
- Cumulative effects on visual receptors arise either from two (or more) developments both being visible from the same place; or from sequential views as people travel.

Methodology for Production of ZTV Plans and Visualisations

All Zone of Theoretical Visibility Maps (ZTVs), photography, visualisations (wirelines and photomontages) and their graphical presentation has been undertaken in line with the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19, Visual Representation of Development Proposals.

Visibility Maps: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) maps have been generated using GIS to assist in identifying areas where visibility would not occur as well as viewpoint selection, illustrate areas from where part or all of the proposed development may be visible and to indicate its potential influence in the wider landscape.

Specifically, the ZTVs have been generated using the Viewshed routine in the Visibility Analysis plugin for QGIS software.

Two types of ZTV have been presented in the LVIA:

- **Standard Screening ZTVs** – which take account of buildings and significant blocks of woodland in the landscape; and
- **Detailed Screening ZTVs** which also take account of hedgerows and other vegetation over 2.5m in height.

In both cases the viewer's eye height has been set at 2m above ground level and in both cases the ZTVs include an adjustment that allows for the Earth's curvature and light refraction.

The Standard Screening ZTVs show the maximum theoretical extent of visibility for the structures modelled (as indicated on the individual ZTVs) taking into account the screening effect of topography, principal woodlands and buildings. In order to generate the Standard Screening ZTVs a digital surface model (DSM) has been derived from the DEFRA LIDAR 2020 2m digital terrain model (DTM) with the locations of woodland and buildings taken from the OS Open Map Local dataset. Heights of buildings and woodland are taken from the DEFRA LIDAR 2020 2m DSM height data. Visibility on these ZTV outputs is illustrated using a 5m x 5m grid size. These ZTVs do not take into account some localised features such as hedgerows or individual trees and therefore tend to give an exaggerated impression of the extent of visibility. This is particularly the case in relatively flat landscapes which contain hedgerows and other vegetation not captured in the OS Open Map Local dataset. The actual extent of visibility on the ground will be less than suggested on the plan.

The Detailed Screening ZTVs provide an extra layer of detail as they take account of additional vegetation in the landscape (over 2.5m in height) not captured in the Standard Screening ZTVs. This typically includes hedgerows, tree belts, small clusters of trees and also individual trees. In order to generate the Detailed Screening ZTVs a detailed digital surface model (DSM) has been derived from the DEFRA LIDAR 2020 2m digital terrain model (DTM). The locations of buildings are again taken from the OS Open Map Local dataset but woodland and other vegetation (over 2.5m in height) is taken from the Environment Agency's Vegetation Object Model (VOM) dataset. Heights of buildings and woodland are taken from the DEFRA LIDAR 2020 2m DSM height data. Visibility on these ZTV outputs is illustrated using a 2m x 2m grid size. Whilst these ZTVs still do not take into account some localised features such as vegetation below 2.5m in height, ground truthing in low lying landscapes has consistently found these ZTVs to be considerably more accurate than the Standard Screening ZTVs. Nevertheless, it is important to understand their limitations. Firstly, it should be noted that hedgerows in the UK are typically deciduous and in winter months may not act as an absolute visual barrier – filtered views through hedgerows are sometime possible. Secondly, it should also be noted that hedgerows are often cut lower (below 2.5m) in winter months and depending on when the LIDAR data was captured visibility may extend further in winter months.

The actual extent of visibility on the ground will still typically be less than suggested on the plan. However, at Springwell, the Detailed Screening ZTVs have been extensively tested/ground truthed in the field in winter and it is the professional opinion of the assessors that they provide a reasonable and accurate reflection of potential visibility of the Proposed Development.

Viewpoint Photography

All photography presented in the LVIA has been taken in accordance with guidance outlined in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19.

All photography has been taken using a Canon EOS 5D MK IV digital SLR camera with a high quality fixed 50mm focal length lens. This camera has a Full Frame Sensor (FFS).

For all viewpoints, the camera has been mounted on a panoramic head equipped tripod, levelled and set up with the camera at 1.5m height Above Ground Level (AGL).

At each viewpoint, a series of photographs (landscape orientation) have been taken to capture a 360 degree panorama. The panoramic head has been set to 20 degrees between shots giving a 50% overlap between adjacent shots.

At each viewpoint the OS grid coordinates have been captured using a hand held GPS system.

Stitching of Photographic Panoramas

For each of the viewpoints in the PEIR, photographs have been stitched and presented as panoramas. Photographs have been stitched using PTGui software.

Visualisations: Annotated Photographs (LI Type 1)

Most of the viewpoints in the PEIR are illustrated as Type 1 Visualisations as outlined in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19. Many of the viewpoints in the final ES will also be presented as Type 1 Visualisations. The purpose of Type 1 visualisations is to represent context to the viewpoint, communicate the extent of the development and highlight any notable features in the view.

In each case the viewpoints are presented to illustrate, as a minimum, a 90 degree horizontal field of view and are presented in cylindrical projection. Where the horizontal extent of the Proposed Development extends beyond 90 degrees, a series of 90 degree annotated

visualisations may be presented to illustrate the panoramic views obtained at the viewpoint. The photographs are annotated to indicate the extent of the proposed development and highlight any important features within the view.

Visualisations: Annotated Photomontages and Photowires (LI Type 3)

It is anticipated that LI TGN 06/19 Type 2, 3 and possibly Type 4 visualisations will be included in the ES. A methodology for production of these illustrations will be provided in the ES.

Glossary of Terms Used in the LVIA

Term	Definition
CLVIA	Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Direct Effect	A direct (or primary) effect may be defined as an effect that is directly attributable to the development
GLVIA3	'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition', published jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment 2013.
Indirect Effect	An indirect (or secondary) effect is an effect that results indirectly from the proposed project as a consequence of the direct effect, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects.
Key Characteristics	Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place.
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
Landscape Capacity	The amount of change which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate without significant detrimental effects on its character. Capacity is likely to vary according to the type and nature of change proposed.
Landscape Character	The distinct and recognisable pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.
Landscape Character Areas	These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular landscape type
Landscape Character Types	These are distinct types of landscape that are relatively homogeneous in character. They are generic in nature in that they may occur in different areas in different parts of the country, but wherever they occur, they share broadly similar combinations of geology, topography, drainage patterns, vegetation and historical land use and settlement pattern, and perceptual and aesthetic attributes.
Landscape Effects	Effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right

Term	Definition
Landscape Elements	Individual components which make up the landscape such as trees and hedges.
Landscape Features	Particularly prominent or eye-catching elements, like tree clumps, church towers or wooded skylines.
Landscape Quality or Condition	This is a measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which a typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements
Landscape Receptor	Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Landscape Resource	The combination of elements that contribute to landscape context, character and value.
Landscape Value	The relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities
Level of Effect	Determined through the combination of sensitivity of the receptor and the proposed magnitude of change brought about by the development.
Magnitude (of effect)	A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration.
Mitigation	Measures including any process, activity or design to avoid, reduce, remedy or compensate for adverse environmental impact or effects of a development.
Photomontage	A visualisation which superimposes an image of a proposed development upon a photograph or series of photographs.
Residential Visual Amenity	A collective term describing the views and visual amenity from a residential property, relating to the type, nature, extent and quality of views that may be experienced from the property and its 'domestic curtilage' including gardens and access driveway. Residential Visual Amenity is only one component of the overall Residential Amenity, others being for example noise, shadow flicker and access amongst others.
Residual Effects	Potential environmental effects remaining after mitigation.
Sense of Place	The essential character and spirit of an area: genius loci literally means 'spirit of the place'.
Sensitivity	A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.
Significant Effects	It is a requirement of the EIA Regulations to determine the likely significant effects of development on the environment which should relate to the level of an effect and the type of effect. Where possible significant effects should be mitigated. The significance of an effect gives an indication as to the degree of importance (based on the magnitude of the effect and sensitivity of the receptor) that should be attached to the impact described. Whether an effect

Term	Definition
	should be considered significant is not absolute and requires the application of professional judgement.
Type or Nature of Effect	Whether an effect is direct, indirect, temporary or permanent, positive (beneficial), neutral or negative (adverse) or cumulative.
Visual amenity	Value of a particular place in terms of what is seen by visual receptors taking account of all available views and the total visual experience.
Visual Effect	Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.
Visual Receptors	Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal
Visualisation	Computer simulation, photomontage or other technique to illustrate the appearance of a development.
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)	Area within which a proposed development may have an influence or an effect on visual amenity.