The Drax Power (Generating Stations) Order

Land at, and in the vicinity of, Drax Power Station, near Selby, North Yorkshire

Environmental Statement
Appendix 10.3 – LVIA Methodology

The Planning Act 2008
The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(a)

Drax Power Limited

Drax Repower Project

Applicant: DRAX POWER LIMITED
Date: May 2018
Document Ref: 6.2.10.3
PINS Ref: EN010091

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

1 LVIA METHODOLOGY

1.1 Guidance

1.1.1. The assessment methodology follows the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' Third Edition (GLVIA3)[1] . As recommended by GLVIA3, this is not a generic LVIA methodology, but has been tailored to be proportionate to the nature and location of the Proposed Scheme. The methodology also considers guidance within 'An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment' (Natural England, 2014)[2].

1.2 Terminology

1.2.1. A description of the terms used in this LVIA is provided below:

1.2.2. Sensitivity of Receptor

This is established by considering the value of the receptor and its susceptibility to change. Both these two aspects inform the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors as set out in Tables below. For the purposes of this LVIA, receptor sensitivity is classified on a four-point scale of: negligible, low, medium, and high.

Resource / Receptor Value

1.2.3. For the landscape resource this is related to the value that is attached to different landscapes by society. A landscape may be valued by different people for different reasons. For visual receptors this relates to the recognition attached to a particular view (for example in relation to heritage assets or through planning designations) and indicators of value attached to views by visitors (for example through appearances in guidebooks or on tourist maps and the provision of facilities such as car parking and interpretation). For the purposes of the LVIA a receptor value is classified on a four-point scale of: negligible, low, medium, and high refer to Table 10.3.1 and 10.3.2.

Susceptibility to Change

1.2.4. For landscape receptors this means the ability to accommodate a proposed scheme without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies as set out in Table 10.3.2.

1.2.5. For visual receptors this is a product of the occupation or activity of people experiencing the view and the extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and visual amenity they experience as set out in Table 10.3.4. For the purposes of this LVIA, susceptibility to change is classified on a three-point scale of: low, medium, and high.

Magnitude of Change Predicted

1.2.6. This is gauged by assessing the type and amount of change predicted to occur in relation to the landscape or visual receptor. Factors influencing the magnitude of change include: size,

[1] Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment, 2013, Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' Third Edition
[2] Natural England, 2014, An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment.

scale and nature of change; geographical extent; and duration and reversibility of effect. For the purposes of the LVIA, magnitude of change is classified on a four-point scale of: negligible, small, medium, and large.

Level of Effect

1.2.7. The level of landscape and visual effect is gauged by considering the magnitude of change along with the sensitivity of the receptor using professional judgement, as set out in Table C6 below. For the purposes of the LVIA, level of effect is classified on a six-point scale of: negligible, minor, minor to moderate, moderate, moderate to major and major.

1.2.8. In line with best practice guidance set out in GLVIA3, in addition to assessing level, effects are classified as: positive, negative or neutral as well as direct and indirect. An effect is understood to be neutral when the predicted residual change would, on balance, result in neither an improvement, nor a deterioration of the landscape and visual resource compared with the existing situation.

1.3 Effect Significance

1.3.1. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 require that a judgement is made on whether an environmental effect is 'significant' or not.

1.3.2. Landscape and visual effects found to be moderate or moderate to major are considered to be significant. Effects which are minor to moderate or moderate may or may not be significant depending on the context and the specific landscape resource or visual receptor in question. Effects of minor significance or lower will not be significant.

1.4 Assessment of effects

1.4.1. In accordance with GLVIA3 the assessment of landscape and visual effects are separate but linked procedures; the landscape is assessed as an environmental resource in its own right, whereas visual effects are assessed on views and visual amenity experienced by people.

1.4.2. Both landscape and visual effects have been assessed at construction stage, Year 1, and Year 15 from completion, allowing for the establishment of any landscape mitigation measures, if proposed.

Landscape Assessment

1.4.3. Landscape is characterised by dividing the study area into geographical areas which have readily identifiable characteristics in common. Landscape takes its character from a combination of elements, including: topography/landform, watercourses, patterns of land use; land cover / vegetation, open space, cultural influences, urban grain and building form. Where there are major elements of infrastructure, such as roads and railways, these often serve to divide one area from another. Character is not just about the physical elements and features of the landscape, but also embraces aesthetic, perceptual and experiential aspects.

1.4.4. Landscape effects can be defined as the changes in the fabric, character and quality of the landscape as a result of a development, through:

- Direct effects upon the landscape fabric (specific features and elements that make up the landscape).
- Indirect effects on the overall patterns of elements and on the perceptual and aesthetic aspects that give rise to landscape character and regional and local distinctiveness.
- Effects upon valued landscapes such as public open space, statutorily designated heritage assets and designated nature conservation sites with public access.

1.4.5. The landscape receptors identified within the assessment, including the LCA's. The sensitivity of these receptors has been arrived at by considering the landscape receptor value and the landscape susceptibility of the receptor to the change proposed, in accordance with Table 10.3.1 and 10.3.2 below. Whilst the tables below are a useful guide, professional judgement has been used as far as possible to give an objective evaluation of sensitivity.

Table 10.3.1 - Landscape Receptor Value

Value	Recognition	Features / Quality	Condition
High	Typically a landscape / feature of international or national recognition e.g.: World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Scheduled Monuments and Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Registered	A strong sense of place with landscape / features worthy of conservation; Absence of detracting features.	A very high quality landscape / feature; attractive landscape / feature; exceptional
Medium	Regional recognition e.g.: Conservation Areas; Grade II Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Important Landscape Areas	A number of distinguishing features worthy of conservation; evidence of some degradation and occasional detracting features.	Ordinary to good quality landscape / feature with some potential for substitution; a reasonably attractive landscape / feature.
Low	Undesignated, but locally valued landscape / features	Few landscape features worthy of conservation; evidence of degradation with some detracting features.	Ordinary landscape / feature with high potential for substitution; quality that is fairly commonplace.
Negligible	Typically an undesignated landscape / feature.	No landscape features worthy of conservation; evidence of degradation with many detracting features.	Low quality landscape / feature with very high potential for substitution; limited variety or distinctiveness; commonplace.

Table 10.3. 2 - Susceptibility to Change

Susceptibility to Change	
High	Low ability to accommodate the specific proposed change; undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (receptor value) and/or achievement of relevant planning policies / strategies.
Medium	Moderate ability to accommodate the specific proposed change; some undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (receptor value) and/or achievement of relevant planning policies / strategies.
Low	High ability to accommodate the specific proposed change; little or no undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (receptor value) and/or achievement of relevant planning policies / strategies.
Negligible	Very high ability to accommodate the specific proposed change; no undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (receptor value) and/or achievement of relevant planning policies / strategies.

Landscape Sensitivity

1.4.6. GLVIA3 indicates that combining susceptibility and value can be achieved in a number of ways and needs to include professional judgement. However it is generally accepted that a combination of high susceptibility and high value is likely to result in the highest sensitivity, whereas a low susceptibility and low value is likely to resulting in the lowest level of sensitivity. A summary of the likely characteristics of the different levels of sensitivity is described below in Table 10.3.3. It should be noted that the levels are indicative and in practice there is not a clear distinction between criteria levels.

Table 10.3.3 - Landscape Sensitivity

Landscape Resource Sensitivity	Characteristics
High	Areas of landscape character that are highly valued for their scenic quality (including most statutorily designated landscapes); Elements/features that could be described as unique or are nationally scarce; Mature vegetation with provenance such as ancient woodland or mature parkland trees; and/or Mature landscape features which are characteristic of and contribute to a sense of place and illustrates time-depth in a landscape and if replaceable, could not be replaced other than in the long term. No or limited scope for substitution or positive enhancement.
Medium	Areas that have a positive landscape character but include some areas of alteration/degradation/or erosion of features; Perceptual/aesthetic aspects has some vulnerability to unsympathetic development; and/or features/elements that are locally commonplace;

Landscape Resource Sensitivity	Characteristics
	unusual locally but in moderate/poor condition; or mature vegetation that is in moderate/poor condition or readily replicated. Some scope for substitution or positive enhancement
Low	Damaged or substantially modified landscapes with few characteristic features of value, Capable of absorbing major change; and Landscape elements/features that might be considered to detract from landscape character such as obtrusive man-made artefacts (e.g. power lines, large scale developments, etc.). Scope for substitution or positive enhancement
Negligible	Areas that are relatively bland or neutral in character with few/no notable features; A landscape that includes areas of alteration/degradation or erosion of features; and/or Landscape elements/features that are common place or make little contribution to local distinctiveness. Opportunities for the restoration of landscape through mitigation measures associated with the proposal.

Visual Assessment

1.4.7. The visual assessment aims to determine from which points the Proposed Scheme can be seen in the surrounding landscape; this is known as the visual envelope. Once determined, a series of key representative viewpoints are chosen (i.e. areas within the visual envelope from where it may be possible to see the proposed development from publicly accessible viewpoints), such as residential areas, public open spaces, PRoW / public footpaths and roads.

1.4.8. Visual effects relate to changes in available views of the landscape and the effect of those changes on people, including:

- The direct effects of the Proposed Scheme on the content and character of views through the intrusion or obstruction and/or the change or loss of existing elements.
- The overall effect on visual amenity, be it degradation or enhancement.

1.4.9. In predicting the effects of the proposed scheme on the visual receptors from specific viewpoints being assessed, GLVIA3 (para 6.27) states that it is helpful to consider (but not restricted to) the following issues:

- Nature of the view (full, partial or glimpsed).
- Proportion of the proposed development visible (full, most, part or none).
- Distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development and whether it would be the focus of the view or only a small element.

- Whether the view is stationary, transient or sequential.
- The nature of the changes to the view.

1.4.10. Additionally, the seasonal effects of vegetation are to be considered, in particular the varying degree of screening and filtering of views.

1.4.11. To determine visual effects both the sensitivity of the visual receptor and the magnitude of change must be considered. Determining visual sensitivity is the combination of susceptibility to change and value of a view. It is considered that a combination of high susceptibility to change and high value is likely to result in the highest sensitivity, whereas a low susceptibility and value is likely to result in the lowest level. The value, susceptibility to change and resultant sensitivity of a visual receptor are broadly categorised based on the following Tables 10.3.4 to 10.3.6 below. It should be noted that the levels are indicative and in practice there is not a clear distinction between criteria levels.

1.4.12. The susceptibility of visual receptors to changes in the view and visual amenity is related to activity they are engaged in and the extent to which their attention is focussed on the views and visual amenity at that location. As such those receptors most sensitive to change are likely to include people engaged in outdoor activities where an appreciation of the landscape is the focus or residents in areas where the landscape setting contribute to the setting of the properties.

1.4.13. Conversely, those considered least sensitive to change include (but are not restricted to) people engaged in outdoor sports or recreation where there is no focus on the surrounding landscape/views and people at their place of work where the focus is on the work activity. See Table 10.3.4 below for a full description of the criteria used to assess the susceptibility of viewpoints.

Table 10.3.4 - Susceptibility to Change

Susceptibility to Change	
High	o Residents at home. o Views from well used public rights of way including long distance trails and cycle routes (where the attractive nature of the countryside is a significant factor in the enjoyment of the walk). o Visitors along scenic routes and to recognised viewpoints. o Visitors to protected landscapes or heritage assets where views of the surroundings is an important contributor to the experience.
Medium	o Views experienced from boats, public rights of way / footpaths / disused airfields used locally and passing through the landscape and well used footpaths within settlements. o Views from places of worship and associated grounds, schools, country parks and golf clubs. o Views experienced by users of local roads where there are clear / open views across the landscape and low levels of traffic.
Low	o Views experienced from places of work where workers and

	visitors are concentrating on their day to day activities. o Views experienced by on near to motorways, major roads o Views experienced by users of the rail network and main roads travelling at speed or local roads where the focus is upon the road ahead owing to traffic conditions and the context / composition of the view. o Views experienced from less well used public rights of way which pass through less attractive landscapes or townscapes and are not used for enjoyment of the scenery. o Views experienced by those playing or spectating at outdoor sports or utilising outdoor sports facilities.

1.4.14. In making judgements about the value of each view, the assessment should take into account the following:

- Recognition of the value to a particular view, e.g. in relation to heritage assets or planning designations.
- Indicators of the value attached to views by others, e.g., in guide books, tourist maps, literary references, painting etc.

1.4.15. Table 10.3.5 below shows a full description of the criteria used to assess the value of the view.

Table 10.3.5 - Value of view criteria

Value of View Criteria	
High	o Views from designated landscapes (National Parks, AONBs, important Local Landscape Areas, Parks / Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. o Recognised /important views including from tourist destinations and marked on maps.
Medium	o Views from within medium quality non-designated but locally valued landscapes which has no strong cultural associations.
Low	o Views from within unattractive non-designated landscapes of local importance and unlikely to be visited specifically to experience the view available.

1.4.16. In combining susceptibility to change and value visual sensitivity criteria are summarised in the Table 10.3.6 below.

Table 10.3.6 - Visual Sensitivity Criteria

Visual Sensitivity	
High	o A well balanced view containing attractive features and notable for its scenic quality. o A view which is an important reason for receptors being there. o A view which is experienced by a large number of people and/ or recognised for its qualities.

Medium	o An otherwise attractive view that includes some attractive or discordant features or visual detractors. o A view which plays a small part in the reason why a receptor would be there. o A view which is locally recognised.
Low	o A view that is unattractive, discordant and/or contains many visual detractors. o A view which is unlikely to be part of the receptor's experience.

Magnitude of Change

1.4.17. The magnitude of landscape and visual change depends upon a combination of factors including the size, scale and nature of change in relation to the context; the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and reversibility, as summarised in Table 10.3.7 below.

Table 10.3.7 - Magnitude of Landscape and Visual Change

Magnitude	Size, scale and nature	Geographical extent	Duration and Reversibility
Large	Occupies an extensive proportion of the view and may even obstruct a significant portion of the view. Views may become the dominant feature. Considerable change to the majority / many existing landscape elements and/or landscape character; fundamental changes the surroundings and baseline to a large extent; very noticeable	Ranging from notable change over extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area.	Long term; permanent / non- reversible or partially reversible.
Medium	Occupies much of the view but would not fundamentally change its characteristics. Changes would be immediately visible but not a key feature of the view. Some change to existing landscape elements and /or landscape character; discernible changes the surroundings of a receptor, such that its baseline is partly altered; readily noticeable.	Moderate changes in a localised area.	Medium term; semi-permanent or partially reversible.
Small	Occupies a small portion of the view and therefore would not result in a change to the view's composition. Small change to existing landscape elements and/or landscape character; slight, but detectable impacts that do	Minor changes in a localised area.	Short term / temporary; partially reversible or reversible.

	not alter the baseline of the receptor materially not readily noticeable.		
Negligible /No change	Occupies little or no portion of the view. Little or limited /no change in existing landscape elements and/or landscape character, barely distinguishable change from baseline conditions; not noticeable.	No change discernible.	Short term / temporary

Significance of Effect and Criteria

1.4.18. The level of landscape and visual effect and whether it is significant or not has been assessed based on the sensitivity of the affected resource / receptor, and the magnitude of change caused by the Proposed Scheme, as set out for each above in the preceding Tables.

1.4.19. The combined sensitivity and magnitude used to determine the level of effect and whether significant or not is summarised within Table 10.3.8 below. Note that effects can be either positive or negative and in some cases neutral (neither positive, nor negative).

Table 10.3.8 - Matrix for Determining Significance of Effect

		Sensitivity (value / importance)			
		High	**Medium**	**Low**	**Negligible**
Magnitude of change	**Large**	Major	Moderate – Major	Minor – Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate – Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor – Moderate	Minor	Negligible – Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

1.4.20. The dark grey shaded cells are generally considered to be significant in the context of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017. The light grey shaded cells denote effects which may be significant, or not significant, depending on the factors relating to the context and the specific landscape or visual receptor in question.

1.4.21. Unshaded cells denote effects that would be 'not significant' and therefore ones which are generally considered to be not material to the planning decision.

1.4.22. It should be noted that the above matrix is intended as a framework for assessment only and that the level of effect (significance) will vary depending on the circumstances, the type and scale of development proposed, the baseline context and other factors. The gradations of magnitude of change and level of effect used in the assessment represent a continuum;

the assessor has used professional judgement when gauging the level of effect and determining whether or not an effect should be considered significant. The table 10.3.9 below provides a more detailed summary of the categories of effect.

Table 10.3.9 - Categories of Landscape and Visual Effect

Level of Effect	Description of Landscape Effect	Description of Visual Effect
Major	Considerable change over an extensive area of a highly sensitive landscape, fundamentally affecting the key characteristics and the overall impression of its character.	The development would become a prominent feature and would result in a very noticeable change to an existing highly sensitive and well composed view.
Moderate	Small or noticeable change to a highly sensitive landscape or more intensive change to a landscape of medium or low sensitivity, affecting some key characteristics and the overall impression of its character.	The development would introduce some enhancing or detracting features to an existing highly sensitive and well composed view, or would be prominent within a less well composed and less sensitivity view, resulting in a noticeable improvement or deterioration of the existing view.
Minor	Small change to a limited area of landscape of high or medium sensitivity or a more widespread area of a less sensitive landscape, affecting few characteristics without altering the overall impression of its character.	Where the proposed development would form a perceptible but not enhancing or detracting feature within a view of high or medium sensitivity or would be a more prominent feature within a poorly composed view of low sensitivity, resulting in a small improvement or deterioration of the existing view.
Negligible	No discernible improvement or deterioration to the existing landscape character.	No discernible improvement or deterioration in the existing view.
No Effect	The development would not affect the landscape receptor.	The development would not affect the view

1.5 Cumulative Assessment

1.5.1. The methodology for cumulative assessment follows that contained within GLVIA3. GVLIA3 (para 7.8) requires that the baseline includes additional changes to the baseline landscapes or visual resources as a result of other development.

1.5.2. Existing similar types of developments are therefore included within the baseline description, and cumulative effects of consented and proposed development are considered separately.

1.5.3. Cumulative effects will be considered within a 10 km Study Area as previously defined however the “area of development” when undertaking a cumulative effect will extend to a 15 km radius.

Magnitude of Cumulative Change

1.5.4. Cumulative landscape and visual effects may result from additional changes to the baseline landscape or visual resources, as a result of the Proposed Scheme, in conjunction with other developments.

1.5.5. The principle of magnitude of cumulative change thus makes it possible for the Proposed Scheme to have a major effect on a particular receptor, while having only a minor cumulative effect in conjunction with other existing developments.

1.5.6. The cumulative landscape and visual magnitude of change are determined with reference to the criteria set out above and the following considerations:

- The number of visible existing and/or potentially visible proposed developments.
- The distance to existing and/or proposed developments.

Significance of Cumulative Effects

1.5.7. Determination of the significance of cumulative landscape and visual effects has been undertaken by employing professional judgement to combine and analyse the cumulative magnitude of change against the identified sensitivity to change. It should be noted that the cumulative assessment is the result of the addition of the Proposed Scheme to the identified cumulative baseline scenario.

1.6 Accurate Visual Representations

1.6.1. Field verified visualisations \ photomontages \ Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) were prepared for five agreed viewpoints to illustrate the likely visual effects of the Proposed Scheme based on Stage 3 refer to Figures 10.11.3c and d, Figures 10.11.5c and d, Figures 10.11.6c and d, Figures 10.11.11c and d and Figures 10.11.15c and d.

1.6.2. The field verified photomontages (AVRs) demonstrate the existing view and view following completion of the Proposed Scheme based on Stage 3 the operation of both Unit X and Y. The AVRS were Level 3 detailing the location and size of the proposal as well as the degree of visibility of the proposal, the architectural form and use of lighting.

1.6.3. The methodology used and outlined in further detail below was compliant with relevant sections of:

- 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' Third Edition, Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment, 2013 (GLVIA3).
- Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment' Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11, 2011.
- Visual representation of development proposals | Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/17 (31 March 2017)

1.6.4. The outputs of the images is an A3 PDF document with a location plan and before and after images.

Photographic Survey

1.6.5. All photography was carried out by WSP visualisation team photographer under the supervision of a chartered landscape architect. Field verified views were taken using a

Nikon D3200 SLR Camera with a Nikon DX AF-S NIKKOR 35mm 1:1.8G lens, a Manafrotto 190go tripod and MHXPRO-3W X-PRO 3-way head with a Trimble Juno Series GPS Reader. The camera viewpoint position was at a height of 1.6 m and stabilised using the tripod with 3 axis levelling bubbles. Camera settings were locked to ensure aperture and sheeter speed were consistent in each batch of photographs.

1.6.6. A log was kept of the time, date and weather conditions that the photographs were taken so that lighting conditions could be recreated in the visualisers software 3DS Max. A GPS reading was taken to mark the position of the camera and these were then converted into National Grid co-ordinates.

Creating 3D Ground Model

- All necessary information regarding the Proposed Scheme was supplied to WSP visualisation team.
- All of the supplied information was modelled in an appropriate professional modelling software.

Preparing Photography

- All baseline images were reviewed by the WSP visualisation team and the chartered landscape architect prior to the start of production. Both cameras produce a raw file and jpeg format.
- In AVR's, having the camera pointing 'horizontally' (parallel with the ground) is desirable to ensure that vertical elements of the photographed scene remain perpendicular to the horizon. In reality, the eye and brain compensate for non-perpendicular verticals and it is desirable to replicate this with photography. The tripod used by WSP's visualisation team photographers has a 3 way head with built-in spirit level 'bubbles' to assist the photographer in keeping the vertical building elements 'vertical'.

Camera Matching – 3D Visual Alignment

1.6.7. For each viewpoint position, a physical camera within the software was set up in 3DS Max using the six figure national grid reference coordinates of each viewpoint position. The physical camera (model as described in Table 10.3.10) was then set up to match the camera's sensor width, focal length and the dimensions of the photograph.

Table 10.3.10 - Camera Model

Model	Sensor Size	Image Size (width x height)	
Nikon D3200	23.2 x 15.4	6016	4000

1.6.8. The following information was then used for the camera alignment process:

- Specific details of the camera and lens used to take the photograph.
- OS mapping and survey data from our database for lining up*.
- The GPS co-ordinates (x,y,z values) of the camera position.
- The GPS co-ordinates (x,y,z values) of the proposed scheme.
- OS Terrain data.
- A 3D model of the proposed scheme.

- Site Layout plan of the proposed scheme.

Note: Some small movements of the camera in the x, y and z planes are required to get a more accurate match, it is accepted that OS data and GPS coordinates have certain tolerances to which the visualiser work within.

Image Post Production

- Post production was undertaken in Adobe Photoshop Creative Cloud. The rendered image of the Proposed Scheme combined with the original baseline photograph to create the final image.
- For Level 1 2 or 3 AVR's, the render layer is placed in the scene, to make it appear behind those items in the photograph which would partially or wholly obscure it in reality. The process of bringing certain elements in the photograph to the foreground and allowing others to be obscured by the development in the background is known as 'masking'.
- For Level 3 AVR's the lighting and materials may require some minor adjustments to blend the new render elements into the photograph. This is open to some artistic interpretation.

Real Scale Viewing

- As should be treated as an aid to visual assessment and are not a substitute to site based assessment of an individual scene.
- When assessing a development using AVRs the scale of the development in the scene should be taken into account together with what the human eye would experience at the scene.
- The aim of AVRs is to represent the landscape or townscape context or proposed development that is under consideration as accurately as is practically possible.
- The AVRs produced by WSP visualisation team were produced in accordance with Landscape Institute Guidelines Advice Note 01/2011, based on the following criteria that the images should:
    - Be reproduced at a size and level of geometric accuracy to permit impact assessment, which must include inspection at the location where the photograph was taken.
    - Be based on a replicable, transparent and structured process, so that the accuracy of the representation can be verified, and trust established.
    - Use techniques with appropriate explanation, that in the opinion of the landscape professional best represent the scheme under consideration and it's proposed environment as accurately as possible.
    - Be easily understood, and usable by members of the public and those with a non-technical background.
    - Be based on a good quality photographic image taken in representative weather conditions.
    - In order to assess the images at a size and resolution suitable for use in assessment work in the field, the images were prepared with a field of view and viewing distance that accurately reconstructs the perspective and scale of elements experienced at the scene.

- As advised by the Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/2011 the method for determining the viewing distance was calculated using Scottish Natural Heritage's Good Practice Guide for the representation of windfarms SNH 2006, para 126.