MATTERS ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT

PROOF OF EVIDENCE Mr Christopher McDermott BSc BLD LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

Appeal against the refusal of planning application P24/S1498/FUL:

The development of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), comprising a 500 megawatt (MW) battery storage facility with associated infrastructure, access and landscaping, with a connection into the Culham Jet National Grid substation
Land to the north of the Culham Campus Thame Lane near Clifton Hampden, OX14 3GY

APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

The study assesses the significance of the impact of the visual changes arising from the Proposed Development, together with the changes to the character and quality of the landscape.

The existing landscape character and the visual environment have been separately surveyed and assessed. The landscape assessment identifies characteristics, features and elements which constitute a particular landscape and its character. The visual baseline identifies existing views to, across or from the application site, and identifies the visual receptors, such as nearby residents or users of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) who might be affected by the Proposed Development.

The assessment follows the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition', Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013 (GLVIA 3).

GLVIA3 states within paragraph 1.17 that when identifying landscape and visual effects there is a "need for an approach that is in proportion to the scale of the project that is being assessed and the nature of the likely effects. Judgement needs to be exercised at all stages in terms of the scale of investigation that is appropriate and proportional."

GLVIA3 recognises within paragraph 2.23 that "professional judgement is a very important part of LVIA. While there is some scope for quantitative measurement of some relatively objective matters much of the assessment must rely on qualitative judgements" undertaken by a landscape consultant or a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI).

A baseline study is undertaken to determine:

1) Relevant landscape designations on or near the Site;

2) Relevant planning designations and policies;

3) Landscape character;

4) The value of the landscape in terms of landscape features, cultural, historical and recreational values and its value to the community;

5) How susceptible is the landscape to the type of development proposed?

6) The contribution the Site makes to landscape character and its value;

7) How the landscape appears to people within the landscape (visual receptors), and

8) How does the Site fit in and contribute to these views?

The second part of the assessment examines the changes that would occur if the development were to be implemented. In terms of landscape, it describes the likely changes that would occur to landscape character, determines whether any landscape features would be lost or created and whether there would be any changes to community or cultural aspects. The significance of the effect of these is then determined. To determine the likely changes in visual amenity to people a series of viewpoints are selected from where the Proposed Development is likely to be visible. These are chosen to illustrate changes to views from a variety of sensitive views, such as those from PRoW, residential properties, roads etc. at a variety of distances, elevations and directions around the Site. They are presented as a series of photographs with a narrative describing the changes, and if required, the proposed mitigation and likely effectiveness.

Determination of the Study Area

Study areas are defined for landscape issues and visual issues. Sometimes these can be the same area but on occasion the landscape character area can be more extensive, particularly if two or more landscape character areas are close to the Site. The landscape character study area is determined following a review of published landscape character studies, topography and land cover.

The visual study area is determined by producing a Theoretical Zone of Visual Influence (TZVI). The TZVI is determined by running software (ESRI ArcGIS Viewshed run on 3 D LiDAR topographical map data) which calculates the potential visibility of the high point of the proposed development based on topography and certain elements within the landscape such as large blocks of woodland and large buildings. For extensive developments, such as BESS, height markers are positioned at several high points based on topography and geographical spread. LiDAR is a radar-based system which picks up forms within the landscape (and has a distance error of 0.5 – 2 m and a height error of 10 cm) but it may not record all potentially screening elements such as hedgerows, walls or even deciduous woodland if the LiDAR data was gathered in winter. The software creates a raster image that indicates the potential visibility of the proposed development, known as the Theoretical Zone of Visibility (TZVI).

The model takes into account the curvature of the earth and light refraction, with observer heights of 2m. The publicly accessible areas where visibility is indicated were visited to see if the mast is likely to be visible or whether views will be blocked by trees, hedges or buildings.

Assessing the impact on Landscape Character

Landscapes can vary in quality, their value to communities and their susceptibility and these factors can be used to determine the sensitivity of the landscape to the proposed development. The criteria for quantifying the degree of quality, value, susceptibility and sensitivity, are set out in Tables 1 – 5.

LANDSCAPE QUALITY

The criteria set out in Table 1A are used to determine Landscape Quality (or Condition) and Table 1B sets out the meaning attributed to the determination of Value.

Table 1A: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Quality

Level of quality	Criteria which may be present contributing to quality
High	• Generally 'Outstanding landscapes' • Internationally and / or nationally-designated landscapes e.g. World Heritage Sites, National Parks, AONBs • Presence of internationally and / or nationally-designated areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other importance e.g. SACs, SSSIs, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and / or II* listed buildings, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Local Geodiversity Sites • Significant wider landscape / visual function e.g. Green Belt, context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement of international or national importance • Landscapes in excellent condition and / or of very high quality as defined by appropriate criteria. • Significant cultural associations. • Exceptional representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and / or rare • Exceptional aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. significant scenic beauty, iconic views, very distinctive sense of place, very high degree of wildness /remoteness, tranquillity. • No or very few detractors present. • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are likely to be the primary purpose of the visit.

	• Significant contribution to wider public amenity, access and recreation e.g. national trails, Open Access Land. • Significant Green Infrastructure assets. • Regionally / locally-designated landscapes e.g. Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) which may be subject of strategy and / or guidance. • Presence of regionally / countywide-level designated areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other importance e.g. Country Parks, TPOs, National Forest Inventory, Priority Habitat Inventory sites, Local Wildlife Sites / Local Nature Reserves, Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, , SMR / HER. Also National Trust land • Important wider, or significant local, landscape / visual function e.g. context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement of regional importance, green gap, buffer zone etc. • Landscapes in very good condition and / or of high quality as defined by appropriate criteria. • Important cultural associations. • Very good representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and / or uncommon • Very good aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. high degree of scenic beauty, fine / key views, distinctive sense of place, high degree of wildness /remoteness, tranquillity. • Negligible / few detractors present. • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are likely to be one of the main reasons for the visit. • Important contribution to wider public amenity, access and recreation e.g. long-distance / themed trails, well-used public rights of way, Heritage Coast, Public Open Space / Local Green Space. May be protected by / subject of planning policy. • Important wider, or significant local Green Infrastructure assets. • Very high level of management, or care, or pristine natural / semi-natural environment
Medium	• 'Everyday' landscapes. • Undesignated landscapes although may be subject of strategy and / or guidance • Presence of undesignated, 'informally' designated and / or locally-important areas /features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and /or other interest. • Important local landscape / visual function e.g. context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement, green gap, buffer zone etc. • Landscapes in good to fair condition and / or of moderate quality as defined by appropriate criteria but good potential for improvement. • Important local cultural associations. • Good to fair representation of landscape area / type / characteristics but common • Good to fair aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. moderate degree of scenic beauty, local key views, moderate sense of place, moderate degree of wildness / remoteness, tranquillity. • Some detractors present. • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are unlikely to be one of the main reasons for the visit, but make a positive contribution to the experience • Important contribution to local public amenity, access and recreation e.g. well-used public rights of way, green open spaces, common land. • Good local Green Infrastructure assets. • Good to fair level of management, environment in good to fair form and health.
Low	• Landscapes between 'Everyday' to 'Degraded'. • Undesignated landscapes unlikely to be subject of strategy and / or guidance (unless for restoration). • Few if any areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other interest. • Little or no local landscape / visual function. • Landscapes in fair to poor condition and / or of low quality as defined by appropriate criteria but some potential for improvement.

	• Few if any cultural associations. • Fair to poor representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and common • Few if any aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities: little sense of place, little or no sense of wildness / remoteness, tranquillity. • Several detractors present. • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are unlikely to be a reason for visiting. • Little or no contribution to public amenity, access and recreation. • Few Green Infrastructure assets. • Limited management, or care, environment in fair to poor form and health.

LANDSCAPE VALUE

Table 1B: Criteria attributed to the assessment of Landscape Value (see also Table 1 in the PoE).

Landscape Value **Magnitude**	**Meaning**	**Typical Scale**
High	High importance (or quality) and rarity. No (or limited potential) for substitution. Strategy: Preserve.	International National
Medium	Medium importance (or quality) and rarity. Some potential for substitution/enhancement. Strategy: Preserve positive aspects which confer value but seek opportunities to enhance value.	Regional
Low	Low importance (or quality) or rarity. Can be substituted or significantly changed. Strategy: Seek opportunities to enhance value.	Local

LANDSCAPE SUSCEPTIBILITY

Susceptibility looks at how well suited the landscape is to absorb the type of development proposed without the likelihood of significant harm. Typically, urban areas have a Low susceptibility to absorbing more urban development but open wilderness has potentially a High susceptibility. Some areas may be less susceptible due to high levels of enclosure from topography, woodland or the proximity to urban areas. The criteria for determining susceptibility are set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Susceptibility

Level of susceptibility	Definition
High	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc. Nature of land use – landscapes with no or little existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (e.g. ancient woodland, mature trees, historic parkland, etc). Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features, major infrastructure or industry is not present or where present has a limited influence on landscape character.
Medium	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a medium capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc. Nature of land use – landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted. Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features, major infrastructure or industry is present and has a noticeable influence on landscape character.
Low	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a high capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc. Nature of land use – landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a dominating influence on the landscape.

LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY

To calculate landscape sensitivity Landscape Quality is then combined with Susceptibility to ascertain the degree of sensitivity the landscape has to the type of development proposed as set out in Table 3.

Table 3: Criteria for assessing Landscape Sensitivity

Landscape Susceptibility Magnitude	Quality		
	High	**Medium**	**Low**
High	High Sensitivity	Medium – High Sensitivity	Medium sensitivity
Medium	Medium – High sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Low – Medium sensitivity
Low	Medium sensitivity	Low – Medium sensitivity	Negligible

MAGNITUDE OF CHANGE TO LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Table 4: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of change in relation to Landscape Character

Level of Magnitude	Definition
High adverse	• Noticeable alteration to, or significant loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a negative feature which is absent from the landscape. • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered large due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components. • Effects likely to be experienced at a large scale, influencing the character area and / or type within which the change is proposed. • Noticeable alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of uncharacteristic, conspicuous elements, features and / activities, would result in noticeable alteration to, or loss of, aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities. • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent and would be very difficult to reverse in practical terms.
Medium adverse	• Partial alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a negative feature which is uncommon within the landscape. • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered medium due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components. • Effects likely to be experienced at a moderate scale, influencing the character type within which the change is proposed but at a local level. • Partial alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of elements, features and / activities which are not uncharacteristic in the area, would result in partial alteration to, or loss of, aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities. • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent but is potentially reversible.
Low adverse	• Minor or barely discernible alteration to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a negative feature which is commonplace within the landscape. • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered small due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components. • Effects likely to be experienced at a small scale, influencing the landscape within which the change is proposed at a local level. • Minor alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of elements, features and / activities which are characteristic in the area, would result in minor alteration to aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities. • The duration of effect may be considered long-term / permanent but is easily reversible; or, the duration may be medium-term
Neutral	Beneficial effects counterbalance adverse effects.
Low beneficial	• Small but noticeable improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a feature which makes a positive contribution to landscape character but is not particularly noticeable. • Removal of negative landscape elements but not particularly noticeable

	• The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered small due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components. • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a small scale, influencing the local landscape. • Small but noticeable improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in discernible improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Improvements are medium- to long-term.
Medium beneficial	• Noticeable improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a feature which makes a positive contribution to landscape character and is noticeable. • Noticeable removal of negative elements(s) within the landscape. • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered medium due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components. • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a moderate scale, influencing the character type within which the change is proposed but at a local level. • Noticeable improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in noticeable improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities. • Improvements are long-term / permanent.
High beneficial	• Major improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition. • Insertion of a positive element within the landscape which is an obvious improvement. • Obvious removal of a negative element(s) within the landscape. • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered large due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components. • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a large scale, influencing the character area and / or type within which the change is proposed. • Major improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in considerable improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities. • Improvements are long-term / permanent.

DETERMINING THE EFFECT ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

To determine the effect of a Proposed Development on Landscape Character the Magnitude of Change is combined with the degree of Landscape Sensitivity, as set out in Table 5.

Table 5: Matrix for determining the level of effect on landscape character

Magnitude of change	**Landscape sensitivity**		
	High	**Medium**	**Low**
High	**Major**	**Moderate-Major**	**Moderate**
Medium	**Moderate-Major**	**Moderate**	**Minor**
Low	**Moderate**	**Minor**	**Negligible**

DETERMINING VISUAL EFFECTS

Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Visual receptors are people who potentially would have a view of the proposed development. The sensitivity of a visual receptor depends on the susceptibility of the visual receptor to change and the value of the view.

Susceptibility to Change

The susceptibility of visual receptors to a potential change in the view is a function of their occupation and activity and the extent to which their attention is focused on the views. The land use planning system considers that public views are of greater value than views from private property because an individual has no 'right to a view'. Typically views from residential properties are considered to be of High sensitivity because the view from a dwelling is permanent but lower storey views from residential properties are generally considered to be of greater susceptibility to change than upper storey views, as these are the rooms in which residents spend more time experiencing the view. There are exceptions to this as some residences have living rooms on upper storeys and this has been taken into consideration if evident. If a scheme is deemed to have a potentially significant adverse visual effect on residents, then a more in depth assessment is undertaken, a Residential Amenity assessment based on LI guidelines.

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE VALUE OF A VIEW

Table 6: Criteria for Judging the Value of a View

Level of value	Definition
High	• Views with high scenic value within designated landscapes including but not limited to World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, etc. Likely to include key viewpoints on OS maps or reference within guidebooks, provision of facilities, presence of interpretation boards, etc. with few detracting features, of high scenic value.
Medium	• Views with moderate scenic value within undesignated landscape including urban fringe and rural countryside.
Low	• Views with unremarkable scenic value within undesignated landscape with partly degraded visual quality and detractors.

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE SENSITIVITY OF THE VIEWER

Table 7: Criteria for Judging Levels of Receptor Susceptibility

Level of value	Definition
High	• Receptors (tourists / visitors) within, or looking towards, internationally- or nationally- designated landscapes, areas and features such as World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Grade I and II* listed buildings and other places where the landscape / feature is the main reason for the visit. • People using popular and well used national trails and other designated routes where the view is likely to be the focus of attention. • People living in residential properties. • Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area.

	• People travelling through the landscape on roads, rail or other routes on recognised scenic routes or where there is a distinct awareness of views of their surroundings and their visual amenity. • People walking on national long distant trails or promoted walks, motorists on designated scenic routes, people walking in nationally designated landscapes
Medium	• Receptors within, or looking towards, undesignated landscapes, areas and features of local importance, and in places where the landscape / feature is not necessarily part of the reason for the visit. • People engaged in outdoor recreation (such as walking local rural footpaths) whose attention is likely to be focused on the landscape and / or particular views, not on national trails or within designated landscapes. • People staying in hotels and healthcare institutions who are likely to appreciate and / or benefit from views of their surroundings. • Travellers on roads which have an attractive setting or scenic quality (rural or urban). • People working in premises where the views are likely to make an important contribution to the setting, and / or to the quality of working life.
Low	• Receptors in commercial and industrial premises, schools, playing fields etc. where the view is not central to the use. • People using main roads, infrequently used / inaccessible public rights of way and likely to be travelling for a purpose other than to enjoy the view • People moving past the view often at high speed (e.g. main roads, motorways and main line railways) and with little or no focus on or interest in the landscape through which they are travelling and significant roadside highway infrastructure (barriers, signs etc.).

Table 8: Criteria for Judging the Visual Sensitivity

Visual Susceptibility	**View Value**		
	High	**Medium**	**Low**
High	High Sensitivity	Medium – High Sensitivity	Medium sensitivity
Medium	Medium – High sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Low – Medium sensitivity
Low	Medium sensitivity	Low – Medium sensitivity	Negligible

Magnitude of Effect

The magnitude of effect evaluates the visual effects identified in terms of the size or scale of a development; the geographical extent of the area influenced; the nature of the effect (adverse or beneficial); and its duration and reversibility. More weight is usually given to effects that are greater in scale and long-term in duration. In assessing the duration of the effect, consideration is given to the effectiveness of mitigation, particularly where planting is proposed as part of the works which would change the scale of visual effect. The following aspects have been taken into consideration in determining the magnitude of visual effects on a receptor.

Size or Scale

The relative size or scale of the development within the view varies and reflects:

Scale of Change

The scale of change from the present views experienced has been considered with respect to the loss or addition of features in the view and changes in its composition, including the proportion of view occupied by the

proposed development. For example the introduction of a development into a view where similar developments or features are already present is more likely to result in a lower scale of change than the introduction of a new development into a view where there is no or little development present.

Consideration of how the proposed development affects the main focus of the existing view is also important.

Nature of the View

The relative amount of time over which views of the proposed development would be experienced on each occasion, for example along a short length of a PRoW, and whether views would be full, partial or glimpsed. Any filtering or screening of a view by vegetation, landform or built form as the filtering or screening of even part of a development can reduce the scale of change on the view. Consideration has also been given to the extent of filtering in 'full leaf' and during winter.

Geographical Extent

The geographical extent of visual effects varies with different viewpoints and reflects:

Angle of View

The angle of view has been considered with changes to direct views generally considered to be of greater importance than changes in oblique or indirect views.

Distance between the Receptor and the Proposed Development

The distance between the receptor and the proposed development is important with the magnitude generally decreasing with distance.

Proportion of View Affected

The proportion of view affected is an important consideration, with a change to a large proportion generally having a greater effect than a change to a small proportion.

Topography and Landform

Consideration has been given to whether the proposed development would be looked down to, looked up to or whether it would be viewed on a level. Views up to a development are generally considered to be of greater magnitude due to the enhanced verticality of the structures than views down to a development where the apparent height appears reduced.

Table 9: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect

Level of magnitude	Definition
High	• Substantial, obvious, loss or addition of features in the view. • Major change in the composition of the view • A major proportion of the view may be either blocked or occupied by the proposed development. • The development introduces colours or forms which draw the eye and are not commonplace in the view. • Views may be short-distance and direct. • Prominent position within the landscape, such as on the skyline or open hillside or open floodplain or plateau • Changes in the view may be visible over a large proportion of the view. The proposed development is permanent and irreversible. **Typically this would be where a development would be obvious to the casual viewer, seen in close proximity with a large proportion of the view**

	affected with little or no filtering or backgrounding and there would be a great scale of change from the present situation for the long or medium-term.
Medium	• Readily noticeable loss or addition of features in the view. • Partial alteration to the existing view and/or the introduction of readily noticeable elements in the view. • There is some screening or backgrounding by landform, woodland, and or built form • The colours and forms are largely in keeping with the colours and forms within the surrounding landscape • Views may be middle-distance, direct or oblique. Views may be filtered by vegetation. • Partial loss of, or change to, sites visual function / contribution • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent but is potentially reversible **Typically this would be where a development would be seen in views for the long or medium-term where a moderate proportion of the views is affected. There may be some screening or backgrounding which minimise the scale of change from the present situation.**
Low	• The change in the view would not be readily noticeable. • Development would form a minor constituent of the view, being partially-visible, or at a sufficient distance to be a limited component of a view • The duration of effect may be considered long-term / permanent but is easily reversible; or, the duration may be medium-term • A significant part of the development is screened • It does not lie within a particularly prominent location within the landscape • Introduction of features which may already be present in views. **Typically this would be where a moderate or low proportion of the view would be affected for the short-term or the development would be visible for the long-term in distant views; where only a small proportion of the view is affected in the medium-term or long-term; where the medium-term or long-term effect is reduced due to a high degree of filtering, screening or backgrounding or where there is a low scale of change from the existing view.**
Negligible	The change would be barely perceptible.

DETERMINING THE LEVEL OF VISUAL EFFECT

The magnitude and sensitivity are combined in the matrix Table 10, to determine the level of effect (whether beneficial or adverse) ranging from Major to Negligible.

Table 10: Matrix to determine the level of impact on visual amenity

Magnitude of change	Receptor sensitivity		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Major	Moderate-Major	Moderate
Medium	Moderate-Major	Moderate	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible

Duration and Reversibility of Visual Effects

These are separate but linked considerations.

Duration has been judged on a scale of:

- short-term: 0 to 5 years including the construction period and on completion;
- medium-term: 5 to 20 years including the establishment of replacement and proposed mitigation planting.
- long-term/permanent: 20 years onwards for the life of the proposed development.

Reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and the practicality of the visual effects being reversed. For example, while some forms of development can be considered permanent, others such as underground cable installation can be considered as reversible since the land will be reinstated. Reversibility is particularly relevant to construction effects as works will cease and land and most landscape features will be reinstated in the short-term.

Geographical extent of the effects

Effects can be experienced over different areas. For example, a tall structure could be visible at local, borough and district level. An impact on a nationally important feature would have an effect at National Level, and effect on a World Heritage Site would have an effect on International Level. Grade I and Grade II* listed structures are considered to be of national importance and so an effect on the setting of such structures would be on a National Level. The greater the extent of the effect greater weighting should be given to it.

- Local level: relating to the site and the immediate surroundings (ward);
- Borough level: relating to impacts within Borough/Local Authority/parish;
- District level: relating to the wider county area;
- Regional level: relating to the Region e.g. south east;
- National level: relating to England and Wales; and
- International: relating to Europe and beyond.

Viewing distances

Short distance – within 100m

Middle distance – 100 – 1000 m

Long distance – Over kilometre

Table 11: Recommended weight to be given to the magnitude of effect in decision making.

Level of magnitude	Definition in relation to decision making
Major adverse	The Proposed Development will cause and obvious substantial degradation of the landscape character/landscape features/existing views. These adverse effects are key factors in the decision-making process. These effects are generally, but not exclusively, associated with sites or features of international, national or regional importance that are likely to suffer a most damaging impact and loss of resource integrity. However, a major change in a site or feature of local importance may also enter this category.
Moderate to Major adverse	The Proposed Development will cause an easily noticeable degradation of the landscape character/elements/existing views. These adverse effects may be important and may be key decision-making factors (particularly if there are multiple Moderate to Major adverse effects). The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall adverse effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Moderate adverse	The Proposed Development will cause noticeable degradation of the landscape character/elements/existing views. These adverse effects may be important but are not likely to be key decision-making factors. The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall adverse effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Minor adverse	The Proposed Development will cause small but not readily perceived degradation of the landscape character elements/existing views. These adverse effects may be raised as local factors. They are unlikely to be critical in the decision-making process but are important in enhancing the subsequent design of the project.
Negligible	A barely perceptible effect. Such effects should not affect influence the decision-making process.
Neutral	Beneficial effects of a similar nature, on the same receptor, balance against adverse effects of a similar nature and so should not influence the decision-making process.
Minor beneficial	The Proposed Development will cause small improvement of the landscape character elements/existing views. These adverse effects may be raised as local factors. They are unlikely to be critical in the decision-making process but are important in enhancing the subsequent design of the project.
Moderate beneficial	The Proposed Development will cause noticeable, but not readily perceived, improvement of the landscape character/elements/existing views. These beneficial effects may be important, but are not likely to be key decision-making factors. The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall beneficial effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Moderate – Major beneficial	The Proposed Development will cause and easily noticeable improvement of the landscape character/elements/existing views. These beneficial effects may be important and may be key decision-making factors (particularly if there are multiple Moderate to Major effects). The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall beneficial effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Major beneficial	The Proposed Development will cause and obvious substantial improvement of the landscape character/landscape features/existing views. These beneficial effects are key factors in the decision-making process and should be balanced against any adverse effects.