



One Earth Solar Farm

Volume 6.0 Environmental Statement [EN010159]

Volume 3: Technical Appendices Supporting ES Volume 2

Appendix 11.2: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology

February 2025

Document Reference: EN010159/APP/6.21

Revision 01

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
- Reg 5 (2) (a)

Contents

A.11 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology	2
A.11.1 Introduction _____	2
A.11.2 Assessment methodology _____	3
A.11.3 Assessment of visual effects _____	12
A.11.4 Level of effect _____	17

A.11 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology

A.11.1 Introduction

A.11.1.1. This appendix sets out the methodology that has been applied in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) of the Proposed Development, undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects at Icen Projects.

Overview

A.11.1.2. The LVIA methodology involved the following stages:

- > A review of published landscape assessments, studies, relevant supporting evidence base documents, aerial photography, mapping, and field work to identify and define the landscape and visual baseline and receptors;
- > Iterative review of design development to embed mitigation measures into the Proposed Development;
- > Consideration of the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors, based on an assessment of their respective value and susceptibility to change;
- > Consideration of the magnitude of effect resulting from the Proposed Development. The consideration of magnitude of effect is based on the scale, duration, and reversibility of the effect; and,
- > Combination of the receptor's sensitivity and the magnitude of effect experienced to determine the resultant level of effect;

A.11.1.3. The assessment of the Proposed Development has been undertaken for:

- > Peak construction activity in winter (i.e. when deciduous vegetation is not in leaf);
- > Year 1 of operation, assuming the Proposed Development is built out and in winter;
- > Year 15 of the operation, assuming the proposed planting has established (i.e. is taller in height than at year 1), in winter. Where there is a difference in level of effect in summer conditions (i.e. when all deciduous vegetation is in leaf) then a separate summer scenario is assessed; and
- > Decommissioning in winter.

Guidance

- A.11.1.4. The LVIA is based on best practice and industry guidance set out in the following:
- > An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (2014), Natural England;
 - > Assessing landscape value outside national designations, Technical Guidance Note 02/21 (2021), Landscape Institute;
 - > Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd edition (2013), Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment;
 - > Notes and Clarifications on aspects of GLVIA 3, LI TGN-2024-01, Landscape Institute;
 - > Infrastructure, Technical Guidance Note 04/20 (2020), Landscape Institute;
 - > Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), Technical Guidance Note 02/19 (2019), Landscape Institute;
 - > Townscape Character Assessment, Technical Information Note 05/17 (2017), Landscape Institute;
 - > Tranquillity, Technical Information Note 01/17 (2017), Landscape Institute; and
 - > Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (2019), Landscape Institute.

A.11.2 Assessment methodology

Establishment of the study area

- A.11.2.1. With reference to GLVIA 3, the purpose of the study area is to identify a geographic area around the Site which is likely to experience significant landscape and visual effects and which is proportionate to the Proposed Development.
- A.11.2.2. To identify the study area, an initial area of search extended 5km from the Order Limits, with the distance based on experience from similar DCO solar schemes and professional judgement, that from beyond 5km significant adverse effects would not occur, due to distance and intervening features.
- A.11.2.3. A computer-generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was then prepared up to a 5km radius from the Order Limits to appraise the potential visibility of the solar arrays (up to 3.8m) and substation (up to 13.5m) within the Proposed Development. Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping and aerial photography was

used to identify potential receptors where the ZTV identified theoretical visibility.

- A.11.2.4. Fieldwork was then undertaken to verify the findings of the desk-based analysis. This involved visiting representative viewpoints (i.e. a publicly accessible location from which to take a representative photograph) of potential visual receptors ('people') to establish the nature of views and the likely extent to which they could be affected by the Proposed Development.
- A.11.2.5. Informed by the findings of the desk analysis and field survey, the 5km study area was reduced to a 2km radius of the Order Limits. This was due to existing woodland and tree belts around the edge of nearby settlements and along transport corridors as well as a scattered distribution of intervening built form negating any perception of the Site between the 2km and 5km distance and thereby negating the likelihood for significant effects arising from the Proposed Development.
- A.11.2.6. The 2km study area was kept under review during the design evolution and development of mitigation proposals and is assessed as remaining proportionate and representative to the assessment of the Proposed Development. Any perception of the Proposed Development from beyond the 2km study area is assessed as not resulting in significant effects due to the distance and intervening features.

Desk study

- A.11.2.7. The landscape and visual baseline has been informed by the relevant policy framework and guidance (refer to Appendix A). The desk study has also included a review of the following sources of information:
- > Natural England National Character Areas, which set out broad descriptions of the landscape character, key characteristics, and statements of environmental opportunity;
 - > The East Midlands, Greater Nottinghamshire, Newark and Sherwood, Bassetlaw, and West Lindsey Landscape Character Assessments, which define differing landscape character areas based upon a range of geographic scales, as well as guidance for the management of future change;
 - > OS Explorer 271: Newark-on-Trent, OS Landrangers 120 Mansfield & Workshop, no.270 Sherwood Forest and no.131: Lincoln & Newark-on-Trent, and aerial mapping;
 - > Magic interactive mapping which provides environmental, geographic and navigation information;
 - > Public Right of Way (PRoW) mapping for Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, which provides the alignment and naming of various routes;

- > Campaign for the Protection of Rural England tranquillity and night sky mapping, which illustrates the tranquillity and radiance of the night skies; and
- > Historic England on-line mapping for listed buildings and scheduled monuments.

Field survey

- A.11.2.8. Field surveys were undertaken in winter conditions between November 2023 and March 2024 to review and record the landscape and visual amenity baseline within the study area. Summer field surveys were also conducted between July 2023 and September 2024 to gain an understanding of the seasonal differences of existing vegetation.
- A.11.2.9. The field surveys involved the analysis of the defining landscape attributes and features across the Order Limits and study area. Consideration was also given to the boundaries and key characteristics of the local village character areas, based upon observations on Site.
- A.11.2.10. The field survey also informed the scope of the final visual receptors and representative viewpoints.

Consultation

- A.11.2.11. Consultation was undertaken to agree the proposed assessment methodology, scope of receptors and viewpoints, as well as the mitigation design. Consultees included:

- > Natural England
- > Bassetlaw District Council
- > Newark and Sherwood District Council
- > West Lindsey District Council
- > Nottinghamshire County Council
- > Lincolnshire County Council
- > Canal and River Trust

Assessment of landscape effects

Landscape baseline and receptors

- A.11.2.12. Landscape is defined by the European Landscape Convention as *“an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”*.

- A.11.2.13. GLVIA3 defines landscape receptors as *“aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal”*.
- A.11.2.14. Landscape receptors have been identified via a review of published landscape character assessments, maps and aerial photography, relevant planning policy and fieldwork surveys.
- A.11.2.15. Landscape character is defined by GLVIA3 as *“a distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse”*.
- A.11.2.16. Published landscape character assessments at the national, regional and district level have been reviewed to identify Landscape Character Types (LCT) and Landscape Character Areas (LCA) or Policy Zones (PZ), and to ensure any related landscape strategies are captured to inform the development of the masterplan and landscape design.
- A.11.2.17. Paragraph 5.14 of GLVIA3 states *“broad-scale assessments at national or regional level can be helpful in setting the landscape context, but are unlikely to be helpful on their own as the basis for LVIA”*. However, this is largely dependent on the scale of the proposals relative to the receptors being assessed, and district landscape character assessments may provide the required granularity of assessment to sufficiently report on likely effects, particularly given the often small scale of the Policy Zones. Where this is not the case, Local Village Character Areas (LVCA) have been classified by the LVIA Assessors within the project study area and a finer scale, project-specific assessment of their landscape character has been undertaken.

Landscape sensitivity

- A.11.2.18. Paragraph 5.39 of GLVIA3 states that:

“Landscape receptors need to be assessed firstly in terms of their sensitivity, combining judgements of their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape”.

Landscape value

- A.11.2.19. Landscape value refers to the relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society.
- A.11.2.20. The assessment of the value of each landscape receptor has been informed by the information set out in the baseline, including landscape designations and factors set out in the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations. The range of factors that can be considered when identifying landscape value are:

- > Natural heritage: “Landscape with clear evidence of ecological, geological, geomorphological or physiographic interest which contribute positively to the landscape.”
- > Cultural heritage: Landscape with clear evidence of archaeological, historical or cultural interest which contribute positively to the landscape.
- > Landscape condition: Landscape which is in a good physical state both with regard to individual elements and overall landscape structure.
- > Associations: Landscape which is connected with notable people, events and the arts.
- > Distinctiveness: Landscape that has a strong sense of identity.
- > Recreational: Landscape offering recreational opportunities where experience of landscape is important.
- > Perceptual (scenic): Landscape that appeals to the senses, primarily the visual sense.
- > Perceptual (wildness and tranquillity): Landscape with a strong perceptual value notably wildness, tranquillity and/or dark skies.
- > Functional: Landscape which performs a clearly identifiable and valuable function, particularly in the healthy functioning of the landscape.

A.11.2.21. In accordance with TGN 02/21, the indicators of value are reviewed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account their positive or negative contribution to the specific landscape. Once the evidence for each factor has been collated and assessed, the overall ‘weight of evidence’ is considered in coming to an overall judgement on landscape value.

A.11.2.22. Table 1 sets out the criteria for assessing landscape value based upon the assessment of the above indicators of landscape value.

Table 1 Landscape value criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	A designated landscape with statutory status (National Park or National Landscape).
High	A landscape designated at a local level, or an undesignated landscape with abundant published evidence of indicator(s) of landscape value.
Medium	An undesignated landscape with some published evidence of indicator(s) of landscape value.
Low	An undesignated landscape with little published evidence of indicator(s) of landscape value.
Very Low	A degraded landscape with no published evidence of indicator(s) of landscape value.

Notes: Examples of indicators of value are provided within TGN 02/21.

Landscape susceptibility

A.11.2.23. GLVIA3 Paragraph 5.40 defines landscape susceptibility as:

“the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies”.

A.11.2.24. LI TGN-2024-01 clarifies that the reference to ‘proposed development’ in Paragraph 5.40 is intended to distinguish from the intrinsic sensitivity of a landscape receptor, and that if details on type and size are available then these can be used to inform judgements on the susceptibility of the site and surrounding landscape.

A.11.2.25. The features and characteristics of each landscape receptor that are considered to be more or less susceptible to the type and nature of development proposed within the Order Limits, that is a utility scale solar farm, have been identified in the assessment. Considerations for landscape susceptibility together with indicators of higher and lower susceptibility are set out for those landscape receptors in the Order Limits in Table 2:

Table 2 Landscape susceptibility criteria

Consideration	Indicators of higher susceptibility	Indicators of lower susceptibility
Field pattern, scale and enclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale fields • Irregular or complex field patterns • Low field boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale fields • Regular or simple field pattern • High field boundaries
Landform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irregular or complex landform • Steep topography • Narrow valleys and ridges • Distinctive landform features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uniform landform • Flat topography • Expansive lowland landscapes • No or minimal distinctive landform features
Landcover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural or semi-natural landcover • Large areas of woodland • Open pastures • Parkland landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale and/or intensively managed arable fields • Previously developed land
Human influences / tranquillity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of modern development • Sparsely settled or unpopulated areas • Presence of small scale, historic, vernacular buildings or structures • Physically or perceptually remote, peaceful or tranquil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes with obvious signs of human activity • Major infrastructure (transport / utilities / industrial) • Presence of urban or modern built form or structures • Physically or perceptually settled, noisy or unattractive
Historic features and cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic field patterns • Presence of features of historic and/or cultural interest • Strong association with historic and/or cultural features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern landscape • Limited or no features of historic and/or cultural interest • Limited association with historic and/or cultural features
Scenic quality and character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High scenic quality • Strong sense of place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low scenic quality • Weak sense of place
Intervisibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open or exposed landscapes with far-reaching views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confined or enclosed landscapes with mostly short distance views

Consideration	Indicators of higher susceptibility	Indicators of lower susceptibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sparse woodland and tree cover Fields bound by low and/or gappy field boundaries Intervisibility with sensitive landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High proportion of woodland blocks and tree belts Fields bound by high and/or intact hedgerows and/or with trees Limited intervisibility with sensitive landscapes

A.11.2.26. For non-host landscapes (i.e. those not within the Order Limits), consideration has been given to the susceptibility of their perceptual qualities to the type of development proposed within the Order Limits. This assessment is focused on the relative distance and the presence of intervening features between the Order Limits and the non-host landscape. This is on the basis that any development outside the host landscape is not able to change any of the physical landscape features or characteristics of non-host landscapes, such that any change to landscape character can only be on its perceptual qualities, which covers tranquillity, scenic quality and intervisibility.

A.11.2.27. Landscape susceptibility is assessed with reference to the criteria set out in Table 3.

Table 3 Landscape susceptibility criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	The Proposed Development is very likely to result in undue changes to the baseline. Landscape features, perceptual qualities and overall character may offer very limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development without being fundamentally altered.
High	The Proposed Development is likely to result in undue changes to the baseline. Landscape features, perceptual qualities and overall character may offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development without being fundamentally altered.
Medium	The Proposed Development may result in undue changes to the baseline. Landscape features, perceptual qualities and overall character may offer few opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development without being fundamentally altered.
Low	The Proposed Development is unlikely to result in undue changes to the baseline, or only very limited change. Landscape features, perceptual qualities and overall character may offer some opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development without being fundamentally altered.

Very Low	The Proposed Development is very unlikely to result in undue changes to the baseline. Landscape features, perceptual qualities and overall character many offer many opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development without being fundamentally altered.
----------	---

Overall landscape sensitivity

A.11.2.28. Landscape value and landscape susceptibility are assessed separately and then combined to define the sensitivity of the landscape receptor, with reference to the criteria set out in Table 4.

Table 4 Landscape sensitivity criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	Typically landscapes of very high value which have very limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development.
High	Typically landscapes of high value which have limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development.
Medium	Typically landscapes of medium value with few opportunities to accommodate the type of development which is proposed.
Low	Typically landscapes of low value which have some opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development.
Very Low	Typically landscapes of very low value which have many opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development.

Magnitude of landscape effects

A.11.2.29. GLVIA3 notes at Paragraph 3.28 that magnitude is informed by combining considerations of the scale, extent, and duration of an effect.

A.11.2.30. This assessment considers the duration of effects as:

- > Short term: 0–2 years;
- > Medium term: 2–5 years; and
- > Long term: over 5 years.

A.11.2.31. Table 5 sets out the criteria used to determine the magnitude of landscape effects.

Table 5 Landscape magnitude of effect criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	Extensive alteration to landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character across most of the area. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
High	Substantial alteration to landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character across large part of the area. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Medium	Partial alteration to some landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character across parts of the area. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Low	Subtle alteration to the landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character across a small area. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Very Low	Barely perceptible alteration to the landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character across a limited area. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
None	No change to the landscape features, perceptual qualities or overall character or perception.

A.11.3 Assessment of visual effects

Visual baseline and receptors

- A.11.3.1. A series of computer-generated ZTVs were prepared using the 'Viewshed' tool in QGIS GIS Software for the Proposed Development. This assumes a 3.5m or 3.8m height of solar arrays within the proposed solar panel areas, 13.5m height of built form within the proposed substation area, and an assumed viewing height of 1.6 m above ground level to simulate the eye level of a person in the surrounding landscape.
- A.11.3.2. The ZTVs have been modelled for individual and combined components of the Proposed Development and run across the 5km areas of search and the 2km study area.
- A.11.3.3. A bare earth ZTV was first prepared using Environment Agency LiDAR digital terrain model (DTM) data of 2m resolution to demonstrate the influence of landform alone on the potential intervisibility.

- A.11.3.4. A second ZTV was prepared using Environment Agency LiDAR digital surface model (DSM) of 2m resolution that accounts for natural and built features on the Earth's surface including the top of existing buildings and woodland.
- A.11.3.5. The ZTVs have been updated as the design of the Proposed Development has progressed and verified through fieldwork. The ZTV has been used for the following:
- > Identify the theoretical extents of the Proposed Development visibility i.e. the locations from which it could potentially appear in views;
 - > Assist in the identification of the study area;
 - > Identify visual receptors likely to be affected by the Proposed Development;
 - > Identify locations that are representative of the views experienced by visual receptors at different locations within the study area (representative viewpoints); and
 - > Inform the design, including the extent and type of proposed mitigation.
- A.11.3.6. Visual receptors are defined in GLVIA3 as *“individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal”*. For example, this could include residents, users of public rights of way (PRoW) and motorists.
- A.11.3.7. Visual receptors likely to experience change to their visual amenity due to construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of the Proposed Development have been identified through analysis of the ZTV and through field surveys. Visual receptors identified have been categorised into the following categories:
- > Residents;
 - > Recreational users of the PRoW network; and
 - > Users of the road network.
- A.11.3.8. Visual receptors who are likely to experience similar views have been grouped as a single receptor group.

Representative viewpoints

- A.11.3.9. In line with GLVIA3, viewpoints were selected to represent typical views experienced by visual receptors and illustrate the views from within the local landscape character areas. The representative viewpoints were identified using the following criteria:
- > Accessibility to the public;

- > Number and sensitivity of people who could be affected;
- > Viewing direction, distance, and elevation; and
- > Nature of the viewing experience.

A.11.3.10. Photographs have been captured from each representative viewpoint in line with the requirements as set out in the Landscape Institute's TGN 06/19.

A.11.3.11. TGN 06/19 also defines the following types of visualisations, each with their own specific technical requirements:

- > Type 1: annotated viewpoint photographs;
- > Type 2: 3D wireline / model;
- > Type 3: photomontage / photowire;
- > Type 4: photomontage / photowire (survey / scale verifiable).

A.11.3.12. Type 3 photomontages have been produced for 18 representative viewpoints to demonstrate a variety of views and receptors. Where applicable, photomontages have been chosen to demonstrate the worst-case scenario for visual receptors. Type 3 photomontages have been produced at Year 1 (winter) and Year 15 (winter and summer) to demonstrate the effects of mitigation planting.

Visual sensitivity

A.11.3.13. Paragraph 6.31 of GLVIA3 states that:

"Each visual receptor, meaning the particular person or group of people likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint should be assessed in terms of both their susceptibility to change in views and visual amenity and also the value attached to particular views."

Visual value

A.11.3.14. The value attached to views experienced has been considered in line with GLVIA3, Paragraph 6.37, which identifies the following indicators of value:

- > Views associated with heritage assets or planning designations;
- > Appearances in guidebooks or tourist maps or proximity to facilities such as parking or interpretive materials; and
- > References to views in literature or art.

A.11.3.15. Visual value has been assessed in line with the criteria set out in Table 6.

Table 6 Visual value criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	A view of a designated landscape with statutory status; and/or A specific view designated in national or regional policy; and/or A view with limited or no detracting features and abundant evidence of cultural associations.
High	A view of a landscape designated at a local level or other landscapes with abundant evidence of indicators of value; and/or A specific view identified at a local level or noted in heritage listings; and/or A view with few or no detracting features and some evidence of cultural associations.
Medium	A view of an undesignated landscape with some evidence of indicator(s) of value; and/or A view with some or few detracting features and evidence of cultural associations.
Low	A view of an undesignated landscape with little evidence of indicator(s) of value; and/or A view with some detracting features and little evidence of cultural associations.
Very Low	A view of a degraded landscape; and/or A view with notable detracting elements and no evidence of cultural associations.

Visual susceptibility

A.11.3.16. The susceptibility of visual receptors results from parameters, such as:

- > “The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and
- > The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focussed on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.”

A.11.3.17. GLVIA3 notes that visual receptors “*most susceptible to change*” include residents at home and visitors engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is likely to be focused on the landscape and particular views. Visitors to heritage assets where the view is important, and communities where views contribute to the landscape setting are also noted as indicators of susceptibility.

A.11.3.18. The criteria used to assess susceptibility of visual receptor is listed in Table 7.

Table 7 Visual susceptibility criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	Visitors to designated landscapes with statutory status, particularly at specific viewpoints or viewing places, where views of the landscape are fundamental to the experience. People engaged in specific activities for enjoyment of dark skies.
High	Residents at home. Visitors to tourist hotspots, heritage assets or other attractions outside of statutory designated landscapes, particularly at specific viewpoints or viewing places, where views of the landscape are important to the experience. People engaged in outdoor recreation where their attention or interest is likely to be focussed on the landscape, for example those using promoted walking and cycling routes.
Medium	People engaged in outdoor recreation or travelling along public rights of way or local roads, which are not promoted routes but where an appreciation of the surrounding landscape are relevant to the experience. People working outdoors.
Low	People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape. People travelling on major road, rail or other transport routes which are not recognised as scenic routes.
Very Low	People working indoors.

Overall visual sensitivity

A.11.3.19. The sensitivity of a visual receptor is derived from a combination of value and susceptibility. A description of sensitivity is provided in Table 8.

Table 8 Visual sensitivity criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	Typically people whose interest or appreciation of views is fundamental to their activity and experience views across designated landscapes with statutory status, and/or views with very limited detracting features, and/or views with abundant evidence of cultural associations
High	Typically people with a particular interest or appreciation of views, and experience views across landscapes with abundant evidence of indicators of value, and/or views with few or no detracting features and/or some evidence of cultural associations.

Medium	Typically people with a general interest or appreciation of views, and experience views across landscapes with some evidence of indicators of value, and/or views with some detracting features and/or evidence of cultural associations.
Low	Typically people whose interest or appreciation of views is secondary to the activity or short in duration, and experience views across landscapes with little evidence of indicators of value, and/or views with some detracting features and/or little evidence of cultural associations.
Very Low	Typically people whose interest or appreciation of views is inconsequential to their activity and experience views across degraded landscapes, and/or views with many detracting features, and/or views with no evidence of cultural associations

Magnitude of visual effects

A.11.3.20. Table 9 sets out the criteria used to determine the magnitude of visual effects and combines considerations of the scale (including angle of view), geographic extent, and duration of an effect.

Table 9 Visual magnitude of effect criteria

Classification	Criteria
Very High	Extensive change to the character and composition of the view. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
High	Substantial change to the character and composition of the view. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Medium	Partial change to the character and composition of the view. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Low	Subtle change to the character and composition of the view. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
Very Low	Barely perceptible change to the character and composition of the view. May be short to long term and may be reversible.
None	No change to the composition of the view.

A.11.4 Level of effect

A.11.4.1. The significance of landscape and visual effects has been determined by considering the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of effect. Table 10 provides a guide showing how these two elements are combined using the professional judgement of competent

experts. Where this judgement differs from the guide provided a reasoned explanation will be provided within the assessment.

Table 10 Level of effect guide

		Magnitude of effect				
Sensitivity		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
	Very High	Major	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate
	High	Major	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor
	Medium	Major or Moderate	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible
	Low	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible
	Very Low	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Notes: where the assessment concludes that there will be no impacts on a receptor, (e.g. not visible in the view) this will be reported as no effect.

- A.11.4.2. Following identification of the level of effect, an assessment of significance is provided. Major and moderate effects are considered to be significant in EIA terms. Minor, negligible, and no effects are considered not significant.
- A.11.4.3. Whether effects are adverse, neutral or beneficial has been determined by considering the contribution of the Proposed Development to the baseline.
- A.11.4.4. Residual effects are those which remain at each assessment scenario with embedded or primary mitigation factored in, and which cannot be further mitigated by design or other measures.



one earth
solar farm