



Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal

Tars Barn Farm, Church Lane, Barnham, West Sussex.

For Paul Voller

November 2018-February 2019

TF Project No: 2009



The terra firma Consultancy Ltd.
Suite B, Ideal House, Bedford Road, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU32 3QA
Tel: 01794 666666

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The Site	1
2.1. Location.....	1
3. Proposed Development.....	1
4. Planning Policies and Designations	2
4.1. Designations.....	2
4.2. Arun Local Plan 2011-2031	2
4.3. Parish level: Development Plan (NDP), Neighbourhood Plans, Parish Plan and Village Design Statements	3
5. Landscape Character Assessment	4
5.1. National Character Assessment: (NCA, 2014)	4
5.2. LCA SC9: Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain	4
6. Design evolution	4
6.2. Pre-Application advice.....	4
6.3. Development Proposals	5
6.4. Landscape – primary mitigation proposals	5
7. Scope and methodology of study	6
7.1. Methodology Guidance.....	6
7.2. Scoping of the study	6
7.3. Scoping Landscape Effects	6
7.4. Scoping Visual Effects.....	6
7.5. Desktop research	7
7.6. Surveys and method statements	7
7.7. Evaluation criteria.....	7
7.8. Limitation and assumptions	7
7.9. Predicted night time effects	8
8. Landscape baseline conditions	9
8.1. The Site	9
8.2. Landscape character of the site and its setting	10
8.3. LLCA1: Eastern Valley Slope – Settlement Edge (including the site).....	10
8.4. LLCA2: – Stream valley and floodplain.....	10
8.5. LLCA3: Western Valley Slope	11
9. Appraisal of landscape effects	11
9.1. Landscape Effects.....	11
9.2. LLCA1: Eastern Valley Slope – Settlement Edge (including the site).....	11
9.3. LLCA2: – Stream valley and floodplain.....	13
9.4. LLCA3: Western Valley Slope	14
9.5. Landscape effects on LCA SC9: Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain	15
9.6. Summary of Landscape Effects.....	16
9.6. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects	16
10. Visual baseline conditions.....	17
10.1. Baseline criteria.....	17
11. Appraisal of visual effects	17
11.1. Sensitivity and magnitude.....	17
11.2. Views from within the local settlement area (viewpoints 11, 12, 14, 15, 16).....	17
11.3. Views from public footpaths (viewpoint 23, 24)	18
11.4. Views from railway (viewpoint 1)	18
11.5. Summary of visual effects	19
11.6. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects	19
12. Summary of appraisal findings	20
12.1. Landscape effects arising from the proposed development	20
12.2. Visual effects arising from the proposed development	20
13. Conclusions	20
14. References.....	21
Appendix 1: landscape Proposals	22

Appendix 2: Figures and Plates	23
Appendix 3: LVIA Methodology	1
1. Evaluation Criteria for Landscape Effects Assessment	1
1.1. Reporting on the landscape baseline	1
1.2. Landscape receptors.....	1
1.3. Effect on landscape receptor.....	1
1.4. Sensitivity of landscape receptor	1
1.4.1. Determining value of landscape receptor.....	1
1.4.2. Determining the landscape receptor's susceptibility to type of change	2
1.4.3. Level of sensitivity of landscape receptor	2
1.5. Magnitude of landscape effect.....	3
1.6. Landscape effects and significance.....	4
1.7. Definition of significance.....	4
1.8. Mitigation and residual effects.....	4
2. Evaluation Criteria for Visual Effects Assessment	5
2.1. Reporting on the visual baseline	5
2.2. Photographs	5
2.3. Visual receptors.....	5
2.4. Effect on visual receptor	5
2.5. Sensitivity of the visual receptor	5
2.5.1. Determining value of visual receptor.....	5
2.5.2. Determining the visual receptor's susceptibility to type of change	5
2.5.3. Level of sensitivity of the visual receptor.....	6
2.6. Magnitude of visual effect.....	6
2.7. Significance of visual effect	7
2.8. Definition of significance.....	8
2.9. Mitigation and residual effects.....	8
3. Appropriateness of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Analyses	8

Job No.	Date	Author	Chk	
2009	07.02.19	LF	AC	Proof reading and first issue

REVISION HISTORY

Rev.	Date	By	Chk	Details
A	27.02.19	LF	PB	Incorporating minor Planning Consultant comment.
B	08.01.19	DP	PB	Update of fields and formatting

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The terra firma Consultancy was appointed in November 2018 to carry out a landscape and visual impact appraisal to support the development of land at Tars Barn Farm, Barnham for residential development and associated landscape and drainage works.
- 1.2. This report provides an impartial assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the proposals. The objectives of the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) are as follows:
- To identify and describe the elements and characteristics of the landscape and visual amenity within the study area;
 - To systematically evaluate potential effects of the proposed development on the character of the physical landscape and visual amenity in order to influence the design process and avoid / prevent, reduce or mitigate adverse effects and incorporate enhancements where possible.
- 1.3. This report describes the following:
- The proposed development;
 - The site location (the term Site is used to describe the area within the application boundary);
 - Summary of the planning policy and landscape-related designations context;
 - The evolution of the design and inherent mitigation;
- Followed by:
- Scope and methodology of the study;
 - The landscape baseline, landscape effects, mitigation strategy and residual landscape effects;
 - The visual baseline, visual effects, mitigation strategy and residual visual effects;
 - A summary of potential effects;
 - Opportunities for further enhancement;
 - Conclusions and compliance with planning policy.

2. THE SITE

2.1. Location

- 2.1.1. The site is located amongst a number of residential properties on Church Lane, which together form the southern edge of the settlement of Barnham. The site is accessed off Church Lane with good connectivity to the centre of the village and railway station (as illustrated on site location plan **figure 1**).
- 2.1.2. The site lies in the north western part of the district of Arun in the county of West Sussex and over 3kms south of the South Downs National Park. **Figures 2-9** illustrate this context.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1. **Appendix 1** contains the landscape proposals drawing produced by The *terra firma* Consultancy which gives further detail on the overall layout, architectural layout (designed by Kim Crossley Architects), orientation of new buildings and the proposed landscape mitigation planting. These are the proposals being submitted for consideration by the planning authority and against which, the potential landscape and visual effects have been assessed.
- 3.2. **Section 6 Design Evolution** explains the development proposals in more detail and the iterative design approach by the consultant team taken based on the preliminary findings

of the LVIA and Opportunities and Constraints identified (**figure 14**).

4. PLANNING POLICIES AND DESIGNATIONS

4.1. Designations

- 4.1.1. Designations relevant to landscape and visual matters within the 3 km study area are shown on **figures 2,4,5 and 6** and listed below along with relevant purposes and guidelines:
- 4.1.2. The potential effects of the proposed development on these designations will be taken into account in the appraisal process by considering their contribution to the sensitivity of the landscape character area and, local landscape character as identified by fieldwork.
- 4.1.3. **Local Plan**
- 4.1.4. The Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 sets out planning policy for the area and while the site is not covered by any specific designation other than countryside, the close proximity of Barnham town centre, the railway, two recreation grounds, a conservation area and a large strategic housing allocation are all factors to be taken account in this study. Potential effects on the National Park were examined but felt to be non-existent given the nature of the proposals and distance involved.
- 4.1.5. **Conservation Area and Listed Buildings**
- 4.1.6. Listed heritage assets within the study area are shown on **figure 6**. Potential effects on intervisibility and setting of those within 1 km of the site were examined and found to be non-existent.
- 4.1.7. **Public Rights of Way**
- 4.1.8. The extensive network of public rights of way (footpaths, bridleway and National Trails) within 3kms of the Site are shown on **figure 9**. Those within 1 km of site were walked along with other potential stretches where elevation may potentially have allowed a view to site. **Figures 7 and 8** clearly shows areas where topography can clearly rule any intervisibility out and **figures 10-14** show the photographic record of this fieldwork. The closest footpath allowing views of site is PRW 323 approximately 400m to the west.
- 4.1.9. The Site is not accessible to the public.
- 4.1.10. **Landscape and Ecological designations**
- 4.1.11. There are a number of sensitive landscape and ecological designations within 3kms of the Site (**figure 4**). The only ones potentially impacted are the public open spaces at...
- 4.1.12. The Site is not subject to landscape or ecological designation.

4.2. Arun Local Plan 2011-2031

- 4.2.1. The Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 was adopted by resolution of Full Council on 18th of July 2018. The strategic policies within support proposals that will retain and protect the landscape character.
- 4.2.2. Barnham is identified as one of 'The Six Villages' in the plan and 4.16-4.18 sets out the desire to 'retain their character with limited new development to meet their needs'. The landscape of the area described generally as 'low lying, views across flat agricultural landscape'.
- 4.2.3. The strategic objectives set out under section 4 include the plan to 'deliver a range of housing mix and types in locations with good access to employment, services and facilities to meet the District's housing requirements' while protecting and enhancing the area's landscape.

4.2.4. Relevant policies carried over from the previous plan include;

- POLICY GEN3 Protection of the Countryside
- POLICY GEN28 Trees and Woodlands
- POLICY GEN29 Nature Conservation Across the District
- POLICY AREA 2 Conservation Areas

These policies support proposal that will protect of the local environment

- Policy C SP1 - Countryside
- Policy LAN DM1 – Protection of Landscape Character
- Policy D SP1 – Design
- Policy D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
- Policy ECC SP1 Adapting to climate change. Resilience of buildings and building materials to extreme weather events; and Capacity of drainage systems and incorporation of Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)
- Policy ENV SP1 Natural Environment
- Policy ENV DM4 – Protection of trees. For any trees which are removed as part of a development, at least an equivalent number of a similar species and age (where practical) are planted on the proposed development site. Sufficient space for replacement trees to mature without causing future nuisance or damage shall be provided. The planting of new trees shall form an integral part of the design of any development scheme.
- Policy W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
- Policy QE DM2 Light pollution

4.3. Parish level: Development Plan (NDP), Neighbourhood Plans, Parish Plan and Village Design Statements

- The Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-29 anticipates applications for new housing and sets out guidance of direct relevance to the proposal under 5.2;
- ES3 Local/gap/green infrastructure corridor
- ES4 Protection of open views
- ES5 Quality of design
- ES6 Contribution to local character
- ES10 Trees and Hedges
- Hedges H2 Windfall sites
- H4 Integration of new housing into surrounds
- H5 Outdoor space
- H6 Attention to detail

4.3.2. Church Lane (from which the site is accessed) is described as leading to the historic heart of Barnham with the church, Barnham Court and its surrounding Conservation Area. However, it is important to note in this context that the site is located at the northern end of Church Lane and consequently it relates to the main settlement of Barham as it extends south of the railway line.

- 4.3.3. Local green space is identified at Murrell's Field (to the immediate east of the site across Church Lane) and local open space off Marshall Close (some 100m to the north).

5. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT

5.1. National Character Assessment: (NCA, 2014)

- 5.1.1. The site and surrounding landscape are within NCA profile South Coast Plain and local landscape character Area SC9: Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain (West Sussex Landscape and Guidelines 2003) (**figure 3**).
- 5.1.2. While the NCA give a good indication of the wider character its relevance and value is limited. For sites that involve developments that are of small-scale in nature such as this, it is more instructive to consider the specific attributes that define the landscape character at a more localised level.

5.2. LCA SC9: Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain

- 5.1. The site lies wholly within the landscape character area identified as SC9 and is described by the following:

5.2.1. Relevant Key Characteristics to the site and context

- *Low lying flat open landscape.*
- *A low density of hedgerows and hedgerow trees with occasional shelterbelts.*
- *Scattered, historically nucleated villages with mixed building materials of flint, brick, half timber and stone.*
- *Frequent urban fringe influences of horse paddocks, light industry and disused airfields, with busy minor and major roads.*
- *The urban fringes associated with Bognor are particularly obvious, with sporadic urban development in suburban settlements of Tangmere, Barnham, Yapton and Westergate.*

5.2.2. Sensitivities:

- *Key views to the South Downs.*
- *Development on settlement edges of Bognor and suburban settlements of Tangmere, Barnham, Yapton and Westergate.*

5.2.3. Landscape Management Guidance:

- *Maintain and strengthen field boundaries such as hedgerows and shelterbelts.*
- *Encourage and promote land management schemes to increase species rich grassland areas.*
- *Encourage the planting of shelterbelts around horse paddocks, using native species to give visual and wildlife benefits.*
- *Enhance the visual prominence of rivers through the establishment of waterside vegetation features.*

6. DESIGN EVOLUTION

- 6.1.1. Initial assessment work identified a number of constraints and opportunities (see **figure 14**) and these were considered by the design team. These constraints were balanced against other considerations and, where possible, the opportunities for primary mitigation and enhancement incorporated into the design proposals described below.

6.2. Pre-Application advice

- 6.2.1. The design and treatment of the building's western elevation treatment has been discussed

with Arun's Planning Officers.

- 6.2.2. Following pre-application planning advice, the issues of height, screening and orientation away from neighbouring properties, and predicted visual effects have been addressed.

6.3. Development Proposals

- 6.3.1. For the purpose of this appraisal the architectural proposals and supporting drawings information and indicative visualisations produced by Kim Crossley Architects has been used to determine the visual and landscape effects arising from the development.
- 6.3.2. The site is currently grassland within the landholding of Tars Farm, contained between Tars Farm House to the southeast, Tars Farm Stables to the northwest and existing residential development to the northeast and southwest. It is bordered on the south side by a well-established evergreen hedge and to the other 3 sides by post and rail fencing of different style.
- 6.3.3. The scheme is for four new two storey, brick built, detached dwellings of traditional style with pitched roofs, each with associated garage, garden and driveway. The development is accessed from an upgraded and slightly realigned existing driveway that leads off Church Lane to access Tars Farm House and Tars Farm Stables. This road, its verges and an attenuation pond area to the western boundary of the scheme will remain in client ownership and will be maintained by a management company. For further detail on the site planning, landscape design, architectural massing and external treatment refer to the Design and Access Statement.

6.4. Landscape – primary mitigation proposals

- 6.4.1. To minimise the initial predicted impacts and provide a high quality design (to meet the requirements of local plan policies listed earlier) a range of primary mitigation measures have been incorporated into the architectural proposals and external layout which allows for the realisation of the landscape strategy emanating from LVIA findings. These included the explorations of different layout options following the response to an earlier scheme that was adopting a more linear approach felt by the LPA to be inappropriate.
- 6.4.2. A Landscape Opportunities and Constraints diagram (see **figure 14**) was produced following LVIA fieldwork and this informed landscape proposals that accompany the scheme.
- 6.4.3. These proposals can be regarded as primary mitigation and include;
- A green infrastructure of existing trees and hedges reinforced and connected by newly planted indigenous trees and hedgerow with further areas of biodiversity improvement at the attenuation pond as well as along verge and boundary edges where longer grass swards and wildflower mixes can be encouraged.
 - Tree plantings placed so as to increase screening to the new development in areas identified by the LVIA as well as between dwellings, while allowing best views out for the occupants and softening those long views in that remain available.
 - Attention to character of proposals so that planting material appropriate to rural edge and hard materials utilising brick wall and post and rail fence in preference to closeboard fence.

7. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

7.1. Methodology Guidance

- 7.1.1. This study has been undertaken in a systematic fashion based on the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' 3rd Edition (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and The Landscape Institute, 2013), referred to in this report as GLVIA3 and 'Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland' (The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002).

7.2. Scoping of the study

- 7.2.1. Based on preliminary fieldwork, this appraisal finds the geographical scope of the landscape and visual baseline should be reduced to a distance of 1km from the site.
- 7.2.2. Due to the small-scale nature of the development the potential for significant landscape and visual effects beyond 1km is highly unlikely and should therefore be scoped out.
- 7.2.3. Initial findings were shared with LPA officers in January 2019 and the approach was agreed.

7.3. Scoping Landscape Effects

- 7.3.1. A study has been made of the landscape of the site and immediate surroundings in detail. This has taken into account surveys and work by others (e.g. topographical, ecological and arborist). The wider area has been studied in terms of designations, landform, and landscape character and historic landscape character in order to inform context and visibility.
- 7.3.2. The landscape character of the wider area, as described by landscape character assessments carried out at a County level has been reviewed and used as context. A detailed character assessment of the site and its immediate setting has been carried out as part of this appraisal.
- 7.3.3. An appraisal will then be made of the landscape effects of the proposed development based on defined local landscape character areas (**figure 3**).

7.4. Scoping Visual Effects

- 7.4.1. In order to carry out a robust photographic survey, the geographical extent of the site's visibility has been assessed through the generation of a zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) (**Figure 8**) supported by topographical information (**figure 7**).
- 7.4.2. It should be noted that the establishment of a ZTV is a potentially misleading exercise, showing an indiscriminate level of visibility using a 'bare earth' scenario, without consideration for vegetation and built form that may often prevent views, and takes no account of the extent of publicly accessible viewpoints, which generally greatly reduces the impacted area. To this end it is a desktop exercise and is purely a tool to inform the scope of fieldwork that has then to be tested in the field to check the reality of the situation.
- 7.4.3. The geographical scope of the visual study was established through the creation of a computer-generated zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) which ruled out some areas where landform would block views. The remaining areas of potential visibility were then checked in the field by visiting publicly accessible areas and photographs were taken to record views towards the site.
- 7.4.4. **Figures 10 and 11** indicate the viewpoints identified during the preliminary investigations. They explain the site's visibility based on buildings with a ridge height of 8m. This in turn

helps in identifying the worst case potential representative viewpoints for the LVIA appraisal within a radius of approximately 3km measured from the centre of the site.

- 7.4.5. The ZTV was then checked by driving and walking publicly accessible routes and spaces, noting where views were available and where they were lost and estimating the site's visibility from publically accessible locations.
- 7.4.6. The visibility of the Development Site (e.g. evidence found of the ground plane, existing vegetation and buildings) that is seen from the chosen viewpoints has then been categorised and identified as being either clearly visible, partially visible, partially visible in winter or no view found. This process, together with an analysis of other relevant map data, such as topography, woodland cover and built form, forms the basis for the visual appraisal.
- 7.4.7. Photographs taken from each of the representative viewpoints 1-30 are shown on **figure 12 series** and on site A-E on **figure 13**.
- 7.4.8. An appraisal is then made of the visual effects of the proposed development.
- 7.4.9. The appraisal will draw conclusions from the study and recommend any possible opportunities for mitigation that might be included within the scheme layout.

7.5. Desktop research

- 7.5.1. The desktop survey included the review of OS maps, aerial photography, landscape character assessment documents and related planning policy, as well as the applicant's development brief and reports by other consultants on the team.

7.6. Surveys and method statements

- 7.6.1. The ZTV was created in ArcMap by importing a georeferenced Ordnance Survey (OS) map base and bare-earth digital terrain model (DTM). The DTM shows only landform and does not account for structures or vegetation which rise above ground level and potentially screen views. Points were added to represent heights of proposed built form in a number of locations across the site. Running a view shed analysis then showed areas from which a 1.65m height viewer could potentially see proposed built form with no structures or vegetation blocking views. Areas with potential views of the proposed development were visited (where publicly accessible) and photographs taken to record the nature of views. Any areas from which there was no visibility were ruled out of the fieldwork.

The photographic survey was undertaken in autumn, meaning that deciduous vegetation was losing leaf cover but still provided some screening, demonstrating medium case visibility. Where seasonal changes in screening are likely to be relevant this has been noted in the photograph descriptions.

7.7. Evaluation criteria

- 7.7.1. The evaluation criteria for both the landscape and visual effects are set out in **Appendix 3** LVIA Methodology.

7.8. Limitation and assumptions

- 7.8.1. Limitation and assumptions of the study can be summarised as follows:
 - Distances of viewpoints were approximated from the centre of the site;
 - Where no direct view of the site was available, direction may have been estimated.
 - Visibility from individual private buildings or land has not been checked as part of the LVIA fieldwork. Where important, views from private buildings have been estimated from within the site.

- Ground heights were estimated from OS mapping where topographic information was not available.

7.9. Predicted night time effects

- 7.9.1. With reference to GLIVA's requirement regarding proportionality an appraisal of the night-time effects has not been included within the scope of this LVIA.
- 7.9.2. If required by the local planning authority further information and assessment of potential for light spill from the building would need to be undertaken at a later stage and the results used to reviews this LVIA's findings.

8. LANDSCAPE BASELINE CONDITIONS

8.1. The Site

- 8.1. The Tars Farm House site is located off Church Lane on the southeastern edge of Barnham in what the Historical Landscape Character Map terms 'Expansion' and 'Informal Fieldsapes'.
- 8.2. Although within the low lying South Coast Plain and Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain landscape character areas (see **figures 3** Landscape Character Areas and **7** topography) the site itself slopes significantly (down from Church Lane and to northeast) and although green field, is more typical of urban edge than agricultural fieldscape. Smaller in size and influenced by buildings in close proximity, the slope and field are not typical of the wider, flatter and more open landscape characteristics of the plain although long views out do make a connection to it which includes distant views of the South Downs behind. Just beyond and below the site, the land falls to hardstanding and then a stream. The characteristics of the stream and its valley form their own character running south from the village centre in a gently meandering and predominantly tree-lined manner. The ground then rises the other side to more paddocks and farm buildings before arriving at the railway line where the landscape opens up beyond to a flatter, arable landscape where the characteristics of the plain are more evident.

Site features

- 8.1.1. Photographs taken on the Site (**figures 13a and 13b**) illustrate the condition, boundary treatment and views seen from within or immediately adjacent the proposed development area. At the site entrance there is an immediate view into the site available if one is directly aligned (thick vegetation either side prevents wider view) from Church Lane. This also allows a glimpsed longer view across the stream valley that culminates at the railway and Barnham settlement boundary to northeast while also offering a view to the top of the Downs in the far distant corner.
- 8.1.2. Within the Site curtilage:
- Metalled access road connecting from Church Lane with grass verges, occasional stretches of kerb edge.
 - Tars Farm hedges and access south of entrance to be maintained. Access to stables, fields and farm buildings beyond stream to be maintained.
 - Boundary north of road well hedged but for some gaps in north eastern corner adjacent the stables. Good quality existing oak to be retained and protected as a priority.
 - A shed downslope on the eastern boundary would be removed for area extending for attenuation pond. The ...tree is to be retained.
 - Grassed field enclosed by post and rail and stock fencing to three sides and hedge to the south. There are good views out the countryside to the east, particularly from the highest part at the southwest.

Vegetation

- 8.1.3. The Arboricultural Assessment by EcoUrban Ltd assesses low risk to any existing trees and notes that none will be removed. The most significantly graded tree is the A category Oak on the northern boundary and this will be given special protection measures for construction nearby (i.e. no dig and materials contained by cellular containment system).

Ecological

- 8.1.4. The ecological report produced Syntegra Consulting notes the site as 'poor, semi-improved grassland' and areas of most ecological value to be found toward the lower slope and stream edge.

8.1.5. Adjacent properties

- 8.1.6. The neighbouring property of Tars Farm House sits within its garden adjacent to the site's eastern boundary. A C20th, two storey red brick building with pitched tiled roof and prefab concrete outbuilding.
- 8.1.7. Tars Farm stables sits adjacent to the site's northwestern boundary. A recent development in single storey timber with hardstanding.

8.2. Landscape character of the site and its setting

- 8.2.1. The site lies within LCA SC9 as described in section 5.2.1. In accordance with this appraisal methodology and to give a more detailed understanding of landscape character of the site and its immediate setting, the surrounding landscape directly affected, has been divided (by terra firma during fieldwork assessment) into 3 local landscape character areas (LLCAs).
- 8.2.2. Each of these have the potential to be affected by the proposed development and therefore will form the landscape character receptors and baseline against which the proposals can be assessed. Fieldwork discounted any landscape effects on the main settlement of Barnham or the wider landscape beyond the railway line.

8.3. LLCA1: Eastern Valley Slope – Settlement Edge (including the site)

- 8.3.1. Topography: valley side falling 5m from Church Lane to stream.
- 8.3.2. Land Use: mixture of paddock, domestic garden and public open space.
- 8.3.3. Field pattern: small enclosures.
- 8.3.4. Settlement pattern: linear along Church Lane but with precedent of spreading down the slope, increasing toward centre of the village.
- 8.3.5. Vegetation: Hedged boundaries, specimen trees and pockets of woodland integrate the built form into a well vegetated scene. Mature trees in rear gardens (including evergreens) provide notable features and clumps on higher ground.
- 8.3.6. Access: a public footpath passes through this LLCA leading out to the countryside beyond.
- 8.3.7. Historic Landscape Character: The West Sussex County Council's detailed Historic Landscape Character Assessment indicates the historic landscape character for this LLCA as being both *Expansion* and *Informal Fieldsapes* (**figure 5**). These are not rare and in fact are among the most frequently occurring categories.
- 8.3.8. Materials / Boundary treatment: Buildings are typically C20th two storey detached, with large gardens, built in a mix of styles and materials ranging from traditional flint / red brick to modern red brick, rendering and clay tiles. Gardens / field boundaries include a mixture of native trees, hedges and orchard fruit trees. Paddocks and outbuildings occur on lower part of the slope.
- 8.3.9. The perception and general experiential qualities of this area are of quiet residential nature at the countryside edge.

8.4. LLCA2: – Stream valley and floodplain

- 8.4.1. Topography: valley bottom running either side of stream to about 1.5 up valley sides , containing flood zone.
- 8.4.2. Land Use: mixture of paddock, domestic garden and public open space.
- 8.4.3. Field pattern: small enclosures.

- 8.4.4. Settlement pattern: occasional buildings and the stables but no dwellings.
- 8.4.5. Vegetation: streamside habitat, hedgerows and generally indigenous trees.
- 8.4.6. Access: Public footpaths pass through this LLCA leading out to the countryside beyond.
- 8.4.7. Historic Landscape Character: The West Sussex County Council's detailed Historic Landscape Character Assessment indicates the historic landscape character for this LLCA as *Informal Fieldscapes*. (**Figure 5**). This is not rare and is in fact among the most frequently occurring categories.
- 8.4.8. Materials / Boundary treatment: rural edge with low key bridges and mix of outbuilding styles.
- 8.4.9. The perception and general experiential qualities of this area are of quiet rural nature but aware of adjacent settlement edge.

8.5. LLCA3: Western Valley Slope

- 8.5.1. Topography: valley side rising from stream to railway.
- 8.5.2. Land Use: farmland and paddock.
- 8.5.3. Field pattern: larger field subdivided with timber fencing.
- 8.5.4. Settlement pattern: small collection of isolated barns.
- 8.5.5. Vegetation: grassland with hedged and wooded outer boundaries.
- 8.5.6. Access: Public footpaths pass through this LLCA leading out to the countryside beyond.
- 8.5.7. Historic Landscape Character: The West Sussex County Council's detailed Historic Landscape Character Assessment indicates the historic landscape character for this LLCA as being *Expansion* with a field of '*formal enclosure*' to the north (**figure 5**). These are not rare and in fact are among the most frequently occurring categories.
- 8.5.8. Materials / Boundary treatment: Buildings are a mix of utilitarian C20th and ruins of older brick and flint barns. Fencing is timber. Outer field boundaries include a mixture of native trees and hedges.
- 8.5.9. The perception and general experiential qualities of this area are of open, rural nature but aware of activities of adjacent settlement edge (i.e. railway, housing, equine activity).

9. APPRAISAL OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

9.1. Landscape Effects

- 9.1.1. Landscape effects are considered through the appraisal of the sensitivity of the receptor (value and susceptibility to change) and the magnitude of the landscape effect (size or scale, duration and reversibility) as described in the evaluation criteria (**Appendix 3**).

9.2. LLCA1: Eastern Valley Slope – Settlement Edge (including the site)

Description

- 9.2.1. The overall perception and experience of this LLCA is one of a pleasant, peaceful and rural location. Generally quiet and tranquil but includes domestic curtilage, leisure and equine activities.
- 9.2.2. Aesthetic Aspect - sloping, largely enclosed gardens, public open space and paddocks. Contained by vegetation but some good views out.

9.2.3. The landscape condition is generally intact and with elements of the landscape character well represented, however in places the condition is slightly unkempt with paraphernalia of equine activity. Condition has been appraised as being generally good.

9.2.4. Sensitivity

9.2.5. Value

9.2.6. LLCA 1 is assessed to be of **medium value** (in accordance with the methodology).

9.2.7. Of value and importance within this LLCA are the far-reaching views, particularly gained from higher ground. Views west across the railway line and open farmland from higher ground culminate in the ridges of the South Downs.

9.2.8. Susceptibility to change:

9.2.9. Recent and ongoing changes to adjacent properties, gaps in field boundary vegetation and the wider range of building materials and styles being employed (compared to that within the Conservation Area) indicates LLCA 1 would be able to accommodate the type of development without undue effect to the rising topography and sense of wooded enclosure and could be judged to have moderate susceptibility to change.

9.2.10. In addition the proposed development will not affect the skyline or alter the perception of visual interconnectivity seen between LLCA1 and LLCA 3.

9.2.11. On balance, the combination of medium value with a moderate susceptibility equates to LLCA1 being a landscape receptor that is **medium sensitivity**.

9.2.12. Magnitude of effect:

9.2.13. The scale and nature of the proposed development is unlikely to result in any undue consequences on the baseline key characteristics and sensitivities of LCA SC9 (see 5.2.1).

9.2.14. An assessment of the development proposals against the baseline indicates:

- The coherence of building materials seen within LLCA1 will be maintained and improved. A coordinated, unified approach to the use of flint, brick and tile as a building material is consistent with other buildings in close proximity.
- LLCA1 is already much developed and the proposals lie well within a contained site which has existing buildings further out from the settlement, a good green infrastructure and has capacity to absorb and integrate it.
- No new access is required and alterations are minimal. The tranquil character of the lane and valley will be maintained.
- The retention of the existing trees and hedges, a site layout that clusters the buildings while giving opportunity for substantial new plantings to integrate the development, respects the character of the LLCA. Additional tree planting within the site and new hedge planting along the boundaries replaces a mix of fencing
- The deciduous woodlands and network of hedgerows on the lower slopes that form a strong wooded edge to the floodplain will not be affected.

9.2.15. However, the development proposals would have a low adverse magnitude of effect on the localised topography from re-grading works.

9.2.16. The development proposals would have a high adverse magnitude of effect on the loss of green field at the edge of settlement.

9.2.17. There are some limited views available that will either be lost (glimpsed view to wider landscape at entrance from Church Lane) and view towards LLCA1 from the railway that have been mitigated with landscape proposals but do nonetheless alter the perception of LLCA1 at certain points and could be said to have a low adverse magnitude of effect.

9.2.18. On balance and for the reasons given above the development proposals are assessed as having a **low adverse magnitude of effect**.

9.2.19. Significance of effect:

9.2.20. Combining a medium sensitivity with low adverse magnitude of effect results in **minor adverse landscape impact**. The landscape effect is not significant in line with the methodology (Appendix 3).

9.3. LLCA2: – Stream valley and floodplain

Description

9.3.1. The overall perception and experience of this LLCA is one of low noise levels, a sense of naturalness arising from the presence of water, a well wooded/tree lined stream corridor and valley sides with varied topography contributing to a sense of remoteness and tranquillity although not far from settlement.

9.3.2. Views (described and appraised separately) are restricted by intervening vegetation and topography.

9.3.3. Aesthetic Aspect - attractive and of some scenic beauty although at times let down by paraphernalia of adjacent domestic and equine activity.

9.3.4. The landscape condition is variable but on balance good.

9.3.5. Sensitivity

9.3.6. Value

9.3.7. LLCA 2 is assessed to be of **medium/high value** (in accordance with the methodology).

9.3.8. Of value and importance within this LLCA is the scenic and natural values of the stream corridor as a tranquil resource close to the settlement edge.

9.3.9. Susceptibility

9.3.10. The stream corridor is narrow and key characteristics include adjacent trees and vegetation. These are potentially under much risk of encroachment in terms of removal from adjacent house owners seeking views out to countryside. Less so from development per se due to floodplain restrictions. LLCA 2 would have **medium/high susceptibility** to change, depending on the type of proposed development.

9.3.11. The combination of medium high value with a medium high susceptibility equates to LLCA2 being a landscape receptor of **medium/high sensitivity**.

9.3.12. Magnitude of effect:

9.3.13. The small-scale nature of the proposed development is unlikely to result in any undue consequences on the baseline key characteristics and sensitivities of LCA SC9 (see 5.2.1).

9.3.14. An assessment of the development proposals against the baseline indicates:

- The development proposal will not affect the stream corridor directly.
- The additional planting proposed along the Site's western boundary adjacent to LLCA 3 may further strengthen the setting of LLCA 2.
- The Development's attenuation pond will protect the stream corridor from increased risk of flooding.

9.3.15. There could be risk that improvements to the stream corridor in terms of establishing new trees and further vegetation could be resisted by new occupants of development requiring views out.

9.3.16. On balance, the small-scale, localised nature of the proposed development will not result in a loss or alteration of features that define this LLCA. A **nil magnitude** of landscape effect.

9.3.17. Significance of effect:

9.3.18. Combining a **medium/high** sensitivity with **nil** magnitude of effect results in **neutral landscape impact**. The landscape effect is not significant in line with the methodology (Appendix 3).

9.4. LLCA3: Western Valley Slope

Description

9.4.1. The overall perception and experience of this LLCA is one of a pleasant, peaceful and rural location at edge of settlement. Generally quiet and tranquil but for influence of the railway and includes buildings and equine activities.

9.4.2. Aesthetic Aspect – open, attractive fields sloping down to stream with varying methods of fenced and hedged enclosure and some agricultural buildings.

9.4.3. The landscape condition is generally intact and with elements of the landscape character well represented, however in places the condition is slightly unkempt with paraphernalia of equine activity. Condition has been appraised as being generally good.

9.4.4. Sensitivity

9.4.5. Value

9.4.6. LLCA 3 is assessed to be of **medium value** (in accordance with the methodology).

9.4.7. Of value and importance within this LLCA are the far-reaching views, particularly gained from higher ground. Views west across the railway line and open farmland from higher ground culminate in the ridges of the South Downs.

9.4.8. Susceptibility to change:

9.4.9. LLCA 3 performs a transitional role at settlement countryside edge and with its existing buildings and equine uses and the railway beyond, would not be unduly effected by the proposed development in LLCA1 and would be able to accommodate some development itself without undue effect so long as the fundamentally green and open aspect were to be maintained. It could be judged to have moderate susceptibility to change depending on the type of proposed development.

9.4.10. On balance, the combination of medium value with a moderate susceptibility equates to LLCA1 being a landscape receptor that is **medium sensitivity**.

9.4.11. Magnitude of effect:

9.4.12. The scale and nature of the proposed development is unlikely to result in any undue consequences on the baseline key characteristics and sensitivities of LCA SC9.

9.4.13. An assessment of the development proposals against the baseline indicates:

- LLCA1, where the proposals are located, is in close proximity but is already much developed and the proposals lie well within a contained site which has existing buildings further out from the settlement, a good green infrastructure and has capacity to absorb and integrate it.
- No access or physical change is required within LLCA3. The development proposal will not affect the character area directly.

9.4.14. There are direct visual connections across the stream valley to the development site which is currently green field and the perception at certain points could be said to be effected but this will be pulled out in the visual assessment.

9.4.15. On balance and for the reasons given above the development proposals are assessed as having a nil magnitude of landscape effect.

9.4.16. Significance of effect:

9.4.17. Combining a medium sensitivity with nil magnitude of effect results in **neutral landscape impact**. The landscape effect is not significant in line with the methodology (Appendix 3).

9.5. Landscape effects on LCA SC9: Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain

The site lies wholly within the landscape character area identified as SC9 by the West Sussex Landscape Character Assessment.

9.5.1. Sensitivity

9.5.2. Value

9.5.3. LCA SC9 is assessed to be of **medium value** (in accordance with the methodology).

- Identified as of particular value and importance within this LCA are *Key views to the South Downs and Development on settlement edges of Bognor and suburban settlements of Tangmere, Barnham, Yapton and Westergate..*

9.5.4. Susceptibility to change:

9.5.5. LCA SC9 is assessed as **medium** susceptibility (in accordance with the methodology)

- *Low lying flat open landscape.*
- *A low density of hedgerows and hedgerow trees with occasional shelterbelts.*
- *Scattered, historically nucleated villages with mixed building materials of flint, brick, half timber and stone.*
- *Frequent urban fringe influences of horse paddocks, light industry and disused airfields, with busy minor and major roads.*
- *The urban fringes associated with Bognor are particularly obvious, with sporadic urban development in suburban settlements of Tangmere, Barnham, Yapton and Westergate.*

9.5.6. The combination of medium value with a medium susceptibility equates to LCA SC9 being a landscape receptor that is **medium sensitivity**.

9.5.7. Magnitude of effect:

9.5.8. The scale and nature of the proposed development is unlikely to result in any undue consequences on the baseline key characteristics and sensitivities of LCA SC9.

9.5.9. An assessment of the development proposals against the baseline indicates that they can deliver positive outcomes in addressing the management guidance suggested for the LCA;

- *Maintain and strengthen field boundaries such as hedgerows and shelterbelts.*
- *Encourage and promote land management schemes to increase species rich grassland areas.*
- *Encourage the planting of shelterbelts around horse paddocks, using native species to give visual and wildlife benefits.*
- *Enhance the visual prominence of rife through the establishment of waterside vegetation features.*

9.5.10. On balance and for the reasons given above the development proposals are assessed as having a **nil magnitude** of landscape effect.

9.5.11. Significance of effect:

9.5.12. Combining medium sensitivity with a nil magnitude of change results in a **neutral** landscape effect and is not significant.

9.6 Summary of Landscape Effects

9.6.1 Summary Table 2. Significant predicted landscape effects.

LLCA	Sensitivity of LLCA	Magnitude of landscape effect	Result	Significance
LLCA1: Eastern Valley Slope – Settlement Edge	Medium	low adverse	Minor adverse	Not significant
LLCA2: Stream Valley and Floodplain	Medium/High	nil	Neutral	Not significant
LLCA 3: Western Valley Slope	Medium	nil	Neutral	Not significant
LCA SC9; Chichester to Yapton Coastal Plain	Medium	nil	Neutral	Not significant

9.6. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects

9.6.1. Measures to avoid / prevent, reduce or mitigate the potential adverse effects have been identified early in the iterative design process and measures included within the landscape strategy.

9.6.2. None of the landscape effects are significant and no residual landscape effects remain. However the proposed long-term measures (listed below) will ensure the establishment of new planting.

9.6.3. The development proposals include for:

- Soil stripping and storage. Material will be carefully managed to enable reuse on the site where possible; topsoil and subsoil will be stored separately to avoid contamination; and soil storage bunds will be carefully shaped to ensure soils are free draining and not compacted.
- Protection of existing trees and hedges. This will be undertaken in accordance with Arborist advice and method statements.
- A management plan will be produced to ensure the maintenance of new planting will be undertaken, for a minimum of 5 years from time of planting.

10. VISUAL BASELINE CONDITIONS

10.1. Baseline criteria

- 10.1.1. Viewpoints represent as wide a range of situations as possible within the area of theoretical visibility as defined by the ZTV within the study area (**see figure 8**) and include views representative of a range of contexts and view receptors, at a range of distances.
- 10.1.2. **Figures 10 and 11** indicate the location of visited representative viewpoints. **Figures 12a to 12k** contain the photographs annotated to describe the direction of the view, the nature of the viewpoint (i.e. location) and the visibility of the existing site. This forms the visual baseline
- 10.1.3. The potential visibility of the proposed development and any seasonal changes to that visibility are also considered and used to inform the assessment of effects in **Section 12** below.
- 10.1.4. Where the fieldwork has confirmed that proposed development is unlikely to be visible, these photographs have been included as supporting evidence, annotated giving reasons why not being taken forward for further appraisal.
- 10.1.5. Close views are defined as those located between 0m and 0.5km, mid-range views between 0.5km and 2km, and distant views greater than 2km. The visual study zone has been limited to 3 km, beyond which views are unlikely to be affected. In this instance the only views available of site were close range.
- 10.1.6. Views from private houses which cannot be checked as part of this LVIA have been estimated by assessing the visibility looking from within the site and the estimation of the potential effects is based on the appraiser's professional judgement.

11. APPRAISAL OF VISUAL EFFECTS

11.1. Sensitivity and magnitude

- 11.1.1. Visual effects are considered through the appraisal of the sensitivity of the receptor (value and susceptibility to change) and the magnitude of the visual effect (size or scale, extent, duration and reversibility) as described in the evaluation criteria (Appendix 3).
- 11.1.2. Views of a similar nature are grouped together and an overall assessment of effects is made on the group of views as a whole where possible and ensuring a balanced overview is maintained, taking into account varying levels of visibility.

11.2. Views from within the local settlement area (viewpoints 11, 12, 14, 15, 16)

- 11.2.1. Refer to **Figure 10** (viewpoint location diagram) and **12e and f**. (photographic evidence). For the far larger part of the local settlement area of south Barnham there were no views of site available at all due to built form, topography and vegetation (see viewpoint photographs 8,10,13,17,20,25). There is no intervisibility with the Conservation Area or any Listed Buildings (Figure 6). Views from inside private houses cannot be verified as part of the LVIA fieldwork but are taken into account.

Sensitivity

- 11.2.2. Receptors will be local residents and walkers with a high interest in their local surroundings. Drivers can be deemed to have a lower appreciation of their wider surroundings due to travelling at speed.
- 11.2.3. These receptors are regarded as **high sensitivity** although the sensitivity of drivers' sensitivity would be limited.

Magnitude of change:

- 11.2.4. These are all limited views, mostly glimpsed through thick intervening vegetation that may well entirely screen in summer with the exception of the opening afforded by the site access from Church Lane. Immediately adjoining neighbours will have direct views but these are not publicly accessible. The recreation grounds at Murrells Field and Marshalls Close would be particularly sensitive but the site is barely visible from either.
- 11.2.5. Any change to the site from these viewpoints can be easily mitigated with strategically placed plantings but there would nevertheless be a substantial change in nature of view for immediate neighbours and the access point from Church Lane at viewpoint 14 and on balance one should therefore accord a **low adverse magnitude** of visual effect.
- 11.2.6. Combining the high sensitivity with the low magnitude of effect results in a **moderate visual effect** which is not significant.

11.3. Views from public footpaths (viewpoint 23, 24)

- 11.3.1. Refer to **Figure 10** (viewpoint location diagram) and **12h and i.** (photographic evidence). For the far larger part of the local public rights of way system (Figure 9) there were no views of site available at all due to built form, topography and vegetation (see 2,3,4,5,6,21,22,26,30 or from roads 27,28,31).

Sensitivity

- 11.3.2. Receptors are likely to have a high of interest in their surroundings and expectation of recreational enjoyment of the countryside.
- 11.3.3. All receptors are **high sensitivity**.

Magnitude of change:

- 11.3.4. These are limited views from the footpath system and at their closest point 300m distance at an angle.
- 11.3.5. Any change to the site from these viewpoints can be easily mitigated with strategically placed plantings but there would nevertheless be a change in nature of view for which one accord a low adverse magnitude of visual effect.

- 11.3.6. Combining the high sensitivity with the low magnitude of effect results in a **moderate visual effect** which is not significant.

11.4. Views from railway (viewpoint 1)

- 11.4.1. Refer to **Figure 10** (viewpoint location diagram) and **12a** (photographic evidence). For the far larger part of the rail journey there are no views of site available at all due to built form, topography and vegetation (see viewpoints 2, 7, 9). There is a possible glimpsed oblique view of the site from Barnham Rail Station platform in winter.

Sensitivity

- 11.4.2. Receptors are railway passengers who would be moderately sensitive and susceptible to changes in their journey.
- 11.4.3. Railway passengers are **moderate to high sensitivity**.

Magnitude of change

- 11.4.4. Views of the Site from the train line (based on views adjacent to the line) are largely obscured by intervening buildings, topography and vegetation but there is availability as the train nears the station from the southwest at viewpoint 1 and there would nevertheless be a change in nature of view for this part which one accord a **low adverse magnitude** of visual effect.

11.4.5. Combining the medium sensitivity with the low magnitude of visual effect results in a **low adverse visual effect** which is not significant.

11.5. Summary of visual effects

11.5.1. Summary Table 1. Significant predicted visual effects.

Representative viewpoints	Sensitivity of view receptor	Magnitude of visual effect	Result	Significance
Views available from settlement.	High	Low	Moderate adverse	Not Significant
Views available from public footpaths.	High	Low	Moderate adverse	Not Significant
Views available from railway.	Medium	Low	Low adverse	Not Significant

11.6. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects

11.6.1. In line with the methodology any adverse and significant effects would require further mitigation. This appraisal concludes that whilst a number of moderate adverse effects have been found, none are considered significant and require further mitigation measures.

11.6.2. The development proposals seek to:

- Produce a well-designed collection of houses contained within existing and proposed plantings of appropriate scale and nature with particular emphasis on native hedgerows on boundaries and specimen trees for the long term improvement of the site and local area.
- These plantings will further reduce any visual effects with the passage of time.

12. SUMMARY OF APPRAISAL FINDINGS

12.1. Landscape effects arising from the proposed development

12.1.1. The appraisal has shown that the proposed development will have:

- A **minor adverse** but insignificant landscape effect to LLCA 1 - the Eastern Valley Slope Farmland and Settlement edge.
- There will be **no adverse or significant** landscape effects on LLCA 2 - the Stream Valley and Floodplain.
- There will be **no adverse or significant** landscape effects on LLCA 3 - the Western Valley Slope.
- There will be **no adverse or significant** landscape effects on LCA SC9 – the Chichester to Yapton coastal Plain. .

12.2. Visual effects arising from the proposed development

12.2.1. The appraisal has shown that:

- A **moderate adverse** but insignificant visual impact to limited views available within adjacent settlement.
- A **moderate adverse** but insignificant visual impact to limited views available from nearby public rights of way.
- A **low adverse** and insignificant visual impact to limited views available from the railway.
- There will be **no adverse or significant** visual impact on the majority of the study area.

13. CONCLUSIONS

- 13.1.1. The *terra firma* Consultancy has carried out a landscape and visual impact appraisal in order to understand the potential effects of a proposed development at Tars Barn.
- 13.1.2. Following a process of fieldwork and desktop research (which highlighted relevant planning policy, designations, guidelines and baseline conditions), the local landscape character context and visual envelope of the proposed development has been set out, and on that basis, an impartial and objective assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects has found the visual and landscape effects summarised in section 12.
- 13.1.3. This appraisal finds that there are no significant landscape or visual effects arising from this development and that the proposals benefitted from the baseline findings in informing the landscape scheme that is integral to it.
- 13.1.4. Although the proposals seek to develop a green field site, there is the infrastructure and capacity to integrate the proposed development into the landscape in a way that also offers improvements and this is the intention of the submitted scheme.

14. REFERENCES

- National Planning Policy Framework (2018)
- The Landscape Institute and IEMA 'Guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment' 3rd Edition (2013)
- The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage: 'Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland' (2002)
- Arun District Council Local Plan (2018)
- Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan (2014)
- Arun District 'The Green Infrastructure Study (June 2012)
- Landscape Character Assessment of West Sussex, West Sussex County Council (2003) including a Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape (Oct. 2005)
- Ordnance Survey Maps, OL10 Arundel & Pulborough
- Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation study (<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/land-wasteand-housing/landscape-and-environment/sussex-historic-landscape-characterisation>)
- Arboricultural Assessment for Tars Barn by EcoUrban Feb 2019.
- Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy for Tars Barn by Opus International Consultants 2018
- Preliminary Ecological Assessment for Tars Barn by Syntegra Consulting 2018
- Proposals by Crossley Design Architecture and terra firma Consultancy landscape architects 2019.

APPENDIX 1: LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS

Landscape Proposals drawing 2009-TF-00-00-DR-L-1001 (The *terra firma* Consultancy)

APPENDIX 2: FIGURES AND PLATES

Figure 1: Site Location

Figure 3: Excerpts from Local Plan

Figure 3: Landscape Character

Figures 4; Site Location and Landscape Designations

Figure 5: Historical Landscape Character Map

Figure 6: Heritage Designations

Figure 7: Topography

Figure 8: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

Figure 9: Public Rights of Way

Figure 10: Viewpoint Location Diagram (up to 1km)

Figure 11: Viewpoint Location Diagram (up to 3km, distant viewpoints)

Figures 12 a-k: Viewpoints LLCA's

Figure 13 a-b: Site Photos

Figure 14: Opportunities and Constraints

APPENDIX 3: LVIA METHODOLOGY

1. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR LANDSCAPE EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

1.1. Reporting on the landscape baseline

The landscape baseline report should:

- Map, describe and illustrate the character of the landscape by appropriate means;
- Identify landscape based designations and others (conservation, heritage etc.) that may be impacted by the development;
- Identify and describe the individual elements and aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape that contribute to the character;
- Indicate the condition of the landscape;
- Establish the relative value of the landscape as attached to it by society.

1.2. Landscape receptors

The landscape receptors need to be identified; these are components of the landscape such as individual elements or features or landscape character areas that are likely to be affected by the scheme. These character areas are as determined by field work (Local Landscape Character Areas; LLCA) or identified in published Landscape Character Assessments at District level or higher as relevant).

Criteria has been set for the selection of LLCAs within likely envelope of influence. The process of identification starts with a study of baseline mapping, describing all within the possible area. For an area to be taken forwards as a receptor it must meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Shared boundary with the site;
- Physical connection/s with the site (PROWs, roads, vegetation belts);
- Views of or across the site (particularly where a view of the site is a key characteristic of the LLCA);
- Perceptual connections with the site (e.g. sounds, smells).

Note: If intervisibility is the only criteria this is considered within the visual assessment through assessment of the effect on representative views.

1.3. Effect on landscape receptor

The likely landscape effect is described and for each effect the significance of the landscape effect can be assessed by combining the level of sensitivity of the landscape receptor with the magnitude of the landscape effect.

1.4. Sensitivity of landscape receptor

The sensitivity of the landscape or feature of the landscape as a receptor needs to be established. This is determined by combining judgements on value with those on susceptibility to type of change or type of development proposed.

1.4.1. Determining value of landscape receptor

Value can be understood through relevant landscape designations, the use of available landscape character assessments (as a starting point) and information on status of features (such as conservation areas and tree preservation orders). The basis for judgements should be linked back to evidence from the baseline study.

A range of other factors can also help in the identification of value:

- Landscape quality (condition) of physical state: includes extent to which typical character is represented, intactness and condition of individual elements
- Scenic quality: level of appeal primarily to the senses (not wholly visual)
- Rarity: presence of individual elements or features, or rare Landscape Character Type
- Representativeness: where a particular character, or element / feature is considered particularly important example
- Conservation interests: where features of interest add value to landscapes such as wildlife, archaeological, or historical / cultural interest. These can have value in their own right.
- Society: the relative value attached to the landscape by society, either formally or informally.
- Perception: recognition of perceptual aspects such as scenic beauty or tranquillity
- Associations: connections to art, literature or events that contribute to perception of value and material available on local or community interests.

Judgements on value should be determined on a scale of high, medium or low:

HIGH ↑ ↓ LOW	High value, with acknowledged or perceived positive character and quality. Moderate value, with acknowledged or perceived positive character and quality that may have been reduced through alteration or degradation of character or features. Low value, without acknowledged or perceived positive character and quality.
--	---

1.4.2. Determining the landscape receptor's susceptibility to type of change

Susceptibility to change is the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the type of change or type of proposed development without undue consequence for the maintaining of the baseline situation, or the achievement of landscape planning policy or strategies. The basis for judgements should be linked back to evidence from the baseline study.

Judgements on susceptibility to change should be determined on a scale of high, medium or low:

HIGH susceptibility to change ↑ ↓ LOW susceptibility to change	Not able to accommodate proposed type of change or type of development without detrimental consequences to the baseline situation or landscape planning policies and strategies. Moderately susceptible to change; may be able to accommodate proposed type of change or type of development without detrimental consequences to the baseline situation or landscape planning policies and strategies. Low susceptibility to change; able to accommodate proposed type of change or type of development without undue consequences to the baseline situation or landscape planning policies and strategies.
--	--

1.4.3. Level of sensitivity of landscape receptor

By combining judgements on value with those on susceptibility to type of change or type of development proposed, the level of sensitivity of a landscape receptor should be defined as **high, medium or low**.

Where judgements on value and susceptibility to change differ (e.g. value may be high, with a medium susceptibility to change) professional judgement will be used to determine the overall sensitivity.

1.5. Magnitude of landscape effect

The magnitude of the landscape effect of the proposals needs to be established and is dependent on:

- **Size or scale:** this should take into consideration the extent of the loss of the existing landscape, the proportion of the total extent this represents and the contribution of the element to the character of the landscape; the degree to which the aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered; and whether the effect changes the key distinctive characteristics of the landscape.
- **Extent:** consideration of the geographical area over which landscape effects are felt
- **Duration:** long, medium or short term.
- **Reversibility:** this is a judgement on the reversibility of a proposal in, say, a generation.

The magnitude of the landscape effect can be **high, medium, low or nil** and can be either **adverse or beneficial**. This is defined more fully below:

Adverse	High	• Major loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Major loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Major loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Extensive geographical area affected. • Long-term / irreversible effect.
	Medium	• Moderate loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Moderate loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Moderate loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Medium sized geographical area affected. • Medium-term and effect that may be partially reversible.
	Low	• Minor loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Minor loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Minor loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Small sized geographical area affected. • Short-term and effect that may be reversible.
Neutral	Nil	• No perceptible loss or alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.
Beneficial	Low	• Minor beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.
	Medium	• Moderate beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.
	High	• Major beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.

1.6. Landscape effects and significance

The landscape effect is a combination of the level of sensitivity of the landscape receptor and the magnitude of the landscape effect, which can be adverse, beneficial or neutral.

		Sensitivity of Landscape		
		High	Medium	Low
Magnitude of landscape effect	High adverse	Major adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
	Medium adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse
	Low adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse	Minor adverse
	Nil	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
	Low beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial
	High beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial

1.7. Definition of significance

Significance may vary with location and context and with the type of proposal, but typically effects are assessed to be significant where they typically are major or major/moderate adverse (indicated by shading illustrated in the table above).

A scale of significance can be reasonably described as follows:

- *Major loss or irreversible adverse landscape effects over an extensive area, and / or on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects key to the character of highly valued landscape receptors* are defined to be effects of key importance for consideration in the decision making process and / or of national importance and therefore significant.
- *Major/Moderate loss or irreversible adverse landscape effects over a large area, and / or on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects typical of the character of highly valued landscape receptors* are defined to be effects of key consideration in the decision making process and / or of regional or district importance therefore significant.
- *Moderate loss or adverse landscape effects over an area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects typical of the character of valued landscape receptors* can be defined to be effects likely to be a lesser consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance but not generally significant. Where seen in combination in cumulative assessments, moderate effects could become significant.
- *Moderate/minor loss or adverse landscape effects over an area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key to the character of valued landscape receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance and therefore not significant.
- *Minor loss or reversible adverse landscape effects over limited area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key to the character of landscape receptors* are defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of very local importance and therefore not significant.

1.8. Mitigation and residual effects

Where adverse landscape effects are judged to be significant, mitigation proposals are described where possible. Any significant residual landscape effects remaining after mitigation are then summarised.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR VISUAL EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

2.1. Reporting on the visual baseline

The visual baseline report should:

- Identify the area in which the development may be visible;
- Identify the different groups of people who may experience views of the development;
- Identify representative viewpoints where views will be affected and the nature of those views, including where these are within the site area;
- Identify any recognized viewpoints (known viewpoints in the landscape);
- Identify any views characteristic of the landscape character area;
- Identify any illustrative viewpoints (that might identify a particular effect or issue).

2.2. Photographs

Photographs were taken using a Nikon D5300 digital SLR camera with an 18-55mm variable zoom lens, set at a focal length of 35mm, which is accepted as being equivalent to a fixed 50mm lens on a non-digital SLR, which is in turn generally accepted to most closely represent views seen with the naked eye. It has been noted against photographs where a wide-angle focal length setting was used in order to show close up foreground views, or where a zoom setting was used to show more detail in a distant view.

2.3. Visual receptors

The visual receptors need to be identified; these are the people within the area who will be affected by the changes in views and visual amenity.

2.4. Effect on visual receptor

The likely visual effect is described and for each effect the significance of the visual effect can be assessed by combining the level of sensitivity of the visual receptor with the magnitude of the visual effect.

2.5. Sensitivity of the visual receptor

The sensitivity of the visual receptor needs to be established. This is determined by combining judgements on value of a particular view with those on susceptibility to type of change or type of development proposed.

2.5.1. Determining value of visual receptor

This is a judgement of value attached to the particular view, through planning designations, recognition of historic, tourism or cultural value, or through community or perceived value. The basis for judgements should be linked back to evidence from the baseline study.

Judgements on value should be determined on a scale of high, medium or low:

	High value within a high quality landscape, or a recognized viewpoint (at any level from local to national).
	Moderate value within a medium quality landscape.
	Low value within a low quality landscape.

2.5.2. Determining the visual receptor's susceptibility to type of change

Judgements are dependent on the occupation or activity of people experiencing the views and the extent their attention or interest is likely to be focused on the on views and the visual amenity they

experience at particular locations.

Judgements on susceptibility to change should be determined on a scale of **high, medium or low**:

HIGH ↑ ↓ LOW	Visual receptors particularly susceptible to change in general due to a high level of interest in the surrounding landscape. Receptors most susceptible to change are likely to include residents at home, people engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape, visitors to heritage assets where the landscape contributes to the experience and communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area. Visual receptors moderately susceptible to change in general due to a moderate level of interest in the surrounding landscape. Travellers on road, rail and transport routes are likely to fall into a category of moderate susceptibility to change, however where travel involved scenic routes this is likely to increase as awareness of views is heightened. Visual receptors with a low susceptibility to change in general due to a low level of interest in the surrounding landscape. Receptors least susceptible include people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation that does not involve or depend appreciation of views and people at their place of work where attention is not focused on their surroundings
--	--

2.5.3. Level of sensitivity of the visual receptor

By combining judgements on value of view with those on susceptibility to type of change or type of development proposed, the level of sensitivity of a visual receptor should be defined as **high, medium or low**.

Where judgements on value and susceptibility to change differ (e.g. value may be high, with a medium susceptibility to change) professional judgement will be used to determine the overall sensitivity.

2.6. Magnitude of visual effect

The magnitude of the visual effect of the proposals needs to be established. This is dependent on:

- **Size or scale**: this should take into consideration the scale of change in the view with respect to loss or addition of features in the view and changes to its composition (including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development and the degree of contrast or integration of the proposed development with the existing landscape elements and characteristics) and the nature of the view in terms of duration and degree of visibility.
- **Extent**: this will vary with different viewpoints and is likely to reflect the angle of view in relation to the main activity of the receptor and the distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development.
- **Duration**: long, medium or short term.
- **Reversibility**: this is a judgement on the reversibility of a proposal in, say, a generation.

The magnitude of the visual effect can be **high, medium, low or nil** and can be either **adverse or beneficial**. This is defined more fully below:

Adverse	High	- Major change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. - Direct angle of viewing in relation to main activity of the receptor. - Close-range view. - Prolonged exposure to view. - Long-term and irreversible effect.
	Medium	- Moderate change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. - Indirect angle of viewing in relation to main activity of the receptor. - Mid-range view. - Moderate exposure to view. - Medium-term and irreversible effect.
	Low	- Minor change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. - Peripheral view in relation to main activity of the receptor. - Distant view. - Brief exposure to view. - Short-term and irreversible effect.
Neutral	Nil	No perceptible change to the composition of the view.
Beneficial	Low	Minor beneficial change to the composition of the view.
	Medium	Moderate beneficial change to the composition of the view.
	High	Major beneficial change to the composition of the view.

2.7. Significance of visual effect

The significance of the visual effect is a combination of the level of sensitivity of the visual receptor and the magnitude of the visual effect, which can be adverse, beneficial or neutral.

		Sensitivity of Receptor		
		High	Medium	Low
Magnitude of visual effect	High adverse	Major adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
	Medium adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse
	Low adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse	Minor adverse
	Nil	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
	Low beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial
	High beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial

2.8. Definition of significance

Significance may vary with location and context and with the type of proposal, but typically effects are assessed to be significant where they typically are major or major/moderate adverse (indicated by shading illustrated in the table above).

A scale of significance can be reasonably described as follows:

- *Major changes on an extensive scale introducing new, non-characteristic, intrusive or discordant effects into the view of highest sensitivity receptors* are defined to be effects of key importance for consideration in the decision making process and / or of national importance and therefore significant.
- *Major/Moderate changes on a large scale introducing new, non-characteristic, intrusive or discordant effects into the view of higher sensitivity receptors* are defined to be effects of key consideration in the decision making process and / or of regional or district importance and therefore significant.
- *Moderate changes introducing effects into the view of moderately sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects likely to be a lesser consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance but not generally significant. Where seen in combination in cumulative assessments, moderate effects could become significant.
- *Moderate/minor changes introducing small effects into the view of moderately sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance and therefore not significant.
- *Minor changes introducing small effects into the view of low sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of very local importance and therefore not significant.

2.9. Mitigation and residual effects

Where adverse visual effects are judged to be significant, mitigation proposals are described where possible. Any significant residual visual effects remaining after mitigation are then summarised.

3. APPROPRIATENESS OF ZONE OF THEORETICAL VISIBILITY (ZTV) ANALYSES

It should be noted that the establishment of a ZTV is a potentially misleading exercise, showing an indiscriminate level of visibility using a 'bare earth' scenario, without consideration for vegetation and built form that may often prevent views, and takes no account of the extent of accessible viewpoints.

It is a desktop exercise, a tool to inform the scope of fieldwork that has then to be tested in the field to check the reality of the situation.

A LVIA should be proportional to the nature of the proposals to which it relates and there may be no need to carry out a ZTV exercise. This should be judged on a project by project basis, in consultation with the Local Planning Authority if necessary, when agreeing the scope of the study.

