Technical Appendix 6.2
EDP LVIA Methodology

Introduction

A6.2.1 This section provides a methodology for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as used by EDP.

Methodology

A6.2.2 The assessment methodology for assessing landscape and visual effects prepared by EDP is based on the following best practice guidance:

- *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition* (LI/IEMA, 2013);
- *Using LANDMAP in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments Guidance Note (GN) 46* – Natural Resources Wales (2013); and
- Landscape Institute *Technical Guidance Note (TNG) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals* (17 September 2019).

A6.2.3 Other reference documents used to understand the baseline position in landscape terms comprise published Landscape Character Assessments appropriate to the site's location and the nature of the proposed development.

A6.2.4 The nature of landscape and visual assessment requires both objective analysis and subjective professional judgement. Accordingly, the following assessment is based on the best practice guidance listed above, information and data analysis techniques. It uses quantifiable factors wherever possible and subjective professional judgement where necessary, and is based on clearly defined terms.

Landscape Assessment

A6.2.5 Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape fabric that may give rise to changes in its character and how this is experienced. These effects need to be considered in line with changes already occurring within the landscape and which help to define the character of it.

A6.2.6 Effects upon the wider landscape resource, i.e. the landscape surrounding the development, requires an assessment of visibility of the proposals from adjacent Landscape Character Areas, but remains an assessment of landscape character and not visual amenity.

Visual Assessment

A6.2.7 The assessment of effects on visual amenity draws on the predicted effects of the development, the landscape and visual context, and the visibility and viewpoint analyses, and considers the significance of the overall effects of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the main visual receptor types in the study area.

Identifying Landscape and Visual Receptors

A6.2.8 This assessment has sought to identify the key landscape and visual receptors that may be affected by the changes proposed.

A6.2.9 The assessment of effects on landscape, as a resource in its own right, draws on the description of the development, the landscape context and the visibility and viewpoint analysis to identify receptors, which, for the proposed development may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- The landscape fabric of the development site;
- The key landscape characteristics of the local context;
- The 'host' Landscape Character Area that contains the proposed development;
- The 'non-host' Landscape Character Areas surrounding the host character area that may be affected by the proposals (where relevant); and
- Landscape designations on a national, regional or local level (where relevant).

A6.2.10 The locations and types of visual receptors within the defined study areas are identified from Ordnance Survey maps and other published information (such as walking guides), from fieldwork observations and from local knowledge provided during the consultation process. Examples of visual receptors may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Settlements and private residences;
- Users of National Cycle Routes and National Trails;
- Users of local/regional cycle and walking routes;
- Those using local rights of way – walkers, horse riders, cyclists;
- Users of open spaces with public access;
- People using major (motorways, A and B) roads;
- People using minor roads; and

- People using railways.

Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects

A6.2.11 The assessment of effects on the landscape resource includes consideration of the potential changes to those key elements and components that contribute towards recognised landscape character or the quality of designated landscape areas; these features are termed landscape receptors. The assessment of visual amenity requires the identification of potential visual receptors that may be affected by the development. As noted, following the identification of each of these various landscape and visual receptors, the effect of the development on each of them is assessed through consideration of a combination of:

- Their overall sensitivity to the proposed form of development, which includes the susceptibility of the receptor to the change proposed and the value attached to the receptor; and

- The overall magnitude of change that will occur - based on the size and scale of the change, its duration and reversibility.

Defining Receptor Sensitivity

A6.2.12 A number of factors influence professional judgement when assessing the degree to which a particular landscape or visual receptor can accommodate change arising from a particular development. Sensitivity is made up of judgements about the 'value' attached to the receptor, which is determined at baseline stage, and the 'susceptibility' of the receptor, which is determined at the assessment stage when the nature of the proposals, and therefore the susceptibility of the landscape and visual resource to change, is better understood.

A6.2.13 Susceptibility indicates *"the ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences"*[1]. Susceptibility of visual receptors is primarily a function of the expectations and occupation or activity of the receptor. A degree of professional judgement applies in arriving at the susceptibility for both landscape and visual receptors and this is clearly set out in the technical appendices to this assessment.

A6.2.14 A location may have different levels of sensitivity according to the types of visual receptors at that location, and any one receptor type may be accorded different levels of sensitivity at different locations.

A6.2.15 With reference to Box 5.1 within GLVIA3 (Page 84), **Table EDP A6.2.1** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall value of a landscape receptor may be judged. Within the assessment, further reference to the Landscape Institute's *TGN 02-21: Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations* may be applied where

[1] Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013). *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition*. Page 158.

appropriate. **Table EDP A6.2.2** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall susceptibility of the landscape is assessed, in relation to the type of development proposed.

Table EDP A6.2.1: Assessment of Landscape Value

Landscape Character Area Value				
Very Low	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**	**Very High**
Undesignated countryside and landscape features; absence of distinctive landscape characteristics; despoiled/-degraded by the presence of many landscape detractors.	Undesignated countryside and landscape features; few distinctive landscape characteristics; presence of landscape detractors.	Undesignated countryside and landscape features; some distinctive landscape characteristics; few landscape detractors.	Locally designated/valued countryside (e.g. Areas of High Landscape Value, Regional Scenic Areas) and landscape features; many distinctive landscape characteristics; very few landscape detractors.	Nationally/internationally designated/valued countryside and landscape features; strong/distinctive landscape characteristics; absence of landscape detractors.
Consideration of Other Value Criteria				
Condition/Quality				
A landscape with no or few areas intact and/or in poor condition.	A landscape with few areas that are intact and/or in a reasonable condition.	A landscape with some areas that are intact and/or in reasonable condition.	A landscape with many areas that are intact and/or in a reasonable condition.	A landscape with most areas intact and/or in good condition.
Scenic Quality				
A landscape of little or no aesthetic appeal.	A landscape of low aesthetic appeal.	A landscape of some aesthetic appeal.	A landscape of high aesthetic appeal.	A landscape of very high aesthetic appeal.
Rarity and Representativeness				
A landscape that does not contain rare landscape types or features.	A landscape that contains few distinct landscape types or features.	A landscape that contains distinct but not rare landscape types or features.	A landscape that contains one or more rare landscape types or features.	A landscape that is abundant in rare landscape types or features.
Conservation Interests				
A landscape with no or very limited cultural, geological and/or nature conservation content.	A landscape with limited cultural, geological and/or nature conservation content.	A landscape with some cultural, geological and/or nature conservation content.	A landscape with rich cultural, geological and/or nature conservation content.	A landscape with abundant cultural, geological and/or nature conservation content.
Recreation Value				
A landscape with no or very limited contribution to recreational experience.	A landscape with no or limited contribution to recreational experience.	A landscape that provides some contribution to recreational experience.	A landscape that provides a good contribution to recreational experience.	A distinct landscape that forms a strong contribution to recreational experience.

Landscape Character Area Value				
Perceptual Aspects				
A landscape with prominent detractors, probably part of the key characteristics.	A landscape with landscape detractors, and is not particularly wild, tranquil or unspoilt.	A landscape with few detractors that also retains some perceptual values.	A landscape with very few detractors that has a relatively wild, tranquil or unspoilt landscape.	A wild, tranquil or unspoilt landscape without noticeable detractors.
Cultural Associations				
A landscape without recorded associations.	A landscape with few recorded associations.	A landscape with some and/or moderately valued associations.	A landscape with numerous and/or highly valued associations.	A landscape of rich and/or very highly valued associations.
Overall Judgement of Landscape Value				
Very Low value – receptor largely reflects very low value criteria above.	**Low value** – receptor largely reflects low value criteria above.	**Medium value** – receptor largely reflects medium value criteria above.	**High value** – receptor largely reflects high value criteria above.	**Very High value** – receptor largely reflects very high value criteria above.

Table EDP A6.2.2: Assessment of Landscape Susceptibility

Very Low Susceptibility to Change	**Low Susceptibility to Change**	**Medium Susceptibility to Change**	**High Susceptibility to Change**	**Very High Susceptibility to Change**
Pattern, Complexity and Physical Susceptibility to Change to the Proposed Development				
A simple, monotonous and/or degraded landscape with common/indistinct features and minimal variation in landscape pattern.	A landscape with an occasionally intact pattern and/or with a low degree of complexity and with few features in reasonable condition.	A landscape with some intact pattern and/or with a degree of complexity and with features mostly in reasonable condition.	A landscape with mostly patterned/textured or a simple but distinctive landscape and/or with high value features and essentially intact.	A strongly patterned/-textured or a simple but distinctive landscape and/or with high value features intact.

Very Low Susceptibility to Change	Low Susceptibility to Change	Medium Susceptibility to Change	High Susceptibility to Change	Very High Susceptibility to Change
Visual Susceptibility to Change to the Proposed Development				
A very enclosed landscape that contains or strongly filters views, with an absence of visual landmarks and a lack of intervisibility with designated landscapes.	A predominantly enclosed landscape that contains or filters most views, with very few views of visual landmarks or intervisibility with designated landscapes.	A partially enclosed landscape with some visual containment and filtering, possible limited intervisibility with visual landmarks and designated landscapes.	An open landscape with intervisibility and limited visual filtering or enclosure. Prominent visual landmarks may be present, and/or intervisibility with designated landscapes may occur.	An open or exposed landscape with extensive intervisibility and no or very limited visual filtering or enclosure. Prominent visual landmarks are present, and/or intervisibility with designated landscapes occurs.
Experiential Susceptibility to Change to the Proposed Development				
A landscape with prominent visual and/or aural intrusion and close relationship with large-scale built development/-infrastructure. A landscape that contains many light sources and essentially suffers from widespread light pollution.	A busy landscape with frequent visual and/or aural intrusion and nearby relationship with large-scale built development/-infrastructure. A landscape that contains frequent light sources and suffers from light pollution.	A partially tranquil landscape with limited visual and/or aural intrusion, some relationship with built development/-infrastructure may be present. A landscape that contains some light sources.	A tranquil landscape with limited visual and/or aural intrusion, some relationship with built development/-infrastructure may be present. A landscape that contains few light sources.	A very tranquil, wild or remote landscape with little or no sense of visual or aural intrusion. A landscape that contains very few light sources and provides dark skies.
Overall Judgement of Susceptibility to Change to the Proposed Development				
Very Low Susceptibility – receptor largely reflects very low value criteria above.	**Low Susceptibility** – receptor largely reflects low value criteria above.	**Medium Susceptibility** – receptor largely reflects medium value criteria above.	**High Susceptibility** – receptor largely reflects high value criteria above.	**Very High Susceptibility** – receptor largely reflects very high value criteria above.

A6.2.16 **Table EDP A6.2.3** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of the landscape resource is judged within this assessment, and considers both value and susceptibility independently.

Table EDP A6.2.3: Assessment of Landscape Sensitivity

		Susceptibility of Landscape Receptor				
		Very High	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Very Low**
Receptor Value	**Very High**	Very High	Very High/High	High	High/Medium	Medium
	High	Very High/High	High	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low
	Medium	High	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low	Low
	Low	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low	Low	Low/Very Low
	Very Low	Medium	Medium/Low	Low	Low/Very Low	Very Low

A6.2.17 For visual receptors, judgements of susceptibility and value are closely interlinked considerations. For example, the most valued views are those that people go and visit because of the available view, and it is at those viewpoints that their expectations will be highest and thus most susceptible to change.

A6.2.18 **Table EDP A6.2.4** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a visual receptor is judged within this assessment, and considers both value and susceptibility independently.

Table EDP A6.2.4: Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Category	Visual Receptor Criteria
Very High	Designed view (which may be to or from a recognised heritage asset or other important viewpoint), or where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience. Key promoted viewpoint, e.g., interpretative signs. References in literature and art and/or guidebooks, tourist maps. Protected view recognised in planning policy designation. Visual receptors with a very high susceptibility to change, may include those with views from residential properties, especially from rooms normally occupied in waking or daylight hours; national public rights of way, e.g., National Trails and nationally designated countryside/landscape features with public access, which people might visit purely to experience the view; and visitors to heritage assets of national importance.
High	View of clear value but may not be formally recognised, e.g. framed view of high scenic value, or destination hill summits. It may also be inferred that the view is likely to have value, e.g. to local residents. Visual receptors with a high susceptibility to change are considered to be those whose attention or interest is focused on their surroundings and may include those with views from recreational receptors where there is some appreciation of the landscape, e.g., golf and fishing; local public rights of way, access land and National Trust land, also panoramic viewpoints marked on maps; road routes promoted in tourist guides for their scenic value.

Category	Visual Receptor Criteria
Medium	View is not promoted or recorded in any published sources and may be typical of the views experienced from a given receptor. Visual receptors with a medium susceptibility to change may include people engaged in outdoor sport other than appreciation of the landscape, e.g. football and rugby, or road users on minor routes passing through rural or scenic areas.
Low	View of clearly lesser value than similar views experienced from nearby visual receptors that may be more accessible. Visual receptors with a low susceptibility to change may include road users on main road routes (motorways/A roads) and users of rail routes or people at their place of work (where the place of work may be in a sensitive location). Also views from commercial buildings where views of the surrounding landscape may have some limited importance.
Very Low	View affected by many landscape detractors and unlikely to be valued. Visual receptors with a very low susceptibility to change may include people at their place of work, indoor recreational or leisure facilities or other locations where views of the wider landscape have little or no importance.

A6.2.19 The tables above offer a template for assessing overall sensitivity of any landscape or visual receptor, as determined by combining judgements of their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape, as set out at paragraph 5.39 of GLVIA3. However, the narrative in this report may demonstrate that assessment of overall sensitivity can change on a case-by-case basis.

A6.2.20 For example, a high susceptibility to change and a low value may result in a medium overall sensitivity, unless it can be demonstrated that the receptor is unusually susceptible or is, in some particular way, more valuable. A degree of professional judgement applies in arriving at the overall sensitivity for both landscape and visual receptors.

Magnitude of Change

A6.2.21 The magnitude of any landscape or visual change is determined through a range of considerations particular to each receptor. As set out within GLVIA3 (Page 39), the following steps are considered in defining the magnitude of change:



Figure EDP A6.2.1: Assessing the Magnitude of Change

A6.2.22 Receptor locations from which views of the proposed development are not likely to occur will receive no change and therefore no effect. With reference to the ZTV and site survey, the magnitude of change is defined for receptor locations from where visibility of the proposed development is predicted to occur.

A6.2.23 **Table EDP A6.2.5** provides an indication of the criteria by which the size/scale of change at a landscape or visual receptor is judged within this assessment.

Table EDP A6.2.5: Landscape and Visual Receptor Size/Scale of Change Criteria

Category	Landscape Receptor Criteria	Visual Receptor Criteria
Large Scale ↕ **Small Scale**	Total loss of or major alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements which strongly conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	There would be a substantial change to the baseline, with the proposed development creating a new focus and having a defining influence on the view.
	Notable loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that are prominent and may conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	The proposed development will be clearly noticeable, and the view would be fundamentally altered by its presence.
	Partial loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that may be evident but do not necessarily conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	The proposed development will form a new and recognisable element within the view which is likely to be recognised by the receptor.
	Minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements that may not be uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.	The proposed development will form a minor constituent of the view, being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a small component.
	Barely discernible loss or alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements not uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.	The proposed development will form a barely noticeable component of the view, and the view, whilst slightly altered, would be similar to the baseline situation.

A6.2.24 **Table EDP A6.2.6** provides an indication of the criteria by which the geographical extent of the area affected is judged within this assessment.

Table EDP A6.2.6: Geographical Extent Criteria

	Landscape Receptors	**Visual Receptor Criteria**
Largest ↕ **Smallest**	Large scale effects influencing several landscape types or character areas.	Direct views at close range, with changes over a wide horizontal and vertical extent.
	Effects at the scale of the landscape type or character areas within which the proposal lies.	Direct or oblique views at close range, with changes over a notable horizontal and/or vertical extent.
	Effects within the immediate landscape setting of the site.	Direct or oblique views at medium range, with a moderate horizontal and/or vertical extent of the view affected.
	Effects at the site level (within the development site itself).	Oblique views at medium or long range, with a small horizontal/vertical extent of the view affected.
	Effects only experienced on parts of the site at a very localised level.	Long range views with a negligible part of the view affected.

A6.2.25 The third, and final, factor, in determining the predicted magnitude of change is duration and reversibility. Duration and reversibility are separate but linked considerations. Duration is judged according to the defined terms set out below, whereas reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of the particular effect being reversed in, for example, a generation. The categories used in this assessment are set out below.

Duration

- Long-term (15 years+);
- Medium to long-term (10 to 15 years);
- Medium-term (5 to 10 years);
- Short-term (1 year to 5 years); or
- Temporary (less than 12 months).

Reversibility

- Permanent with unlikely restoration to original state, e.g. major road corridor, power station, urban extension, etc.;
- Permanent with possible conversion to original state, e.g. agricultural buildings, retail units;
- Partially reversible to a different state, e.g. mineral workings;

- Reversible after decommissioning to a similar original state, e.g. wind energy development; or

- Quickly reversible, e.g. temporary structures.

A6.2.26 With consideration of the judgements set out above, **Table EDP A6.2.7** combines these judgements to provide the overall criteria by which the magnitude of change may be judged. While not all of the criteria may apply, the size/scale, geographical extent criteria and the duration/reversibility of effects on receptors are taken together, to form a reasoned assessment of the magnitude of change. The overall magnitude of change is derived using professional judgement.

Table EDP A6.2.7: The Assessment of the Overall Magnitude of Change

Category	Receptor Criteria
Very High	Total loss of, or major alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements which strongly conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape. The proposed development would create a new focus and have a defining influence on the view. Landscape and visual effects are typically large in scale, resulting in a permanent and irreversible change, influencing several landscape types or character areas. Visual changes would be experienced in direct, close ranging views, with changes over a wide horizontal and vertical extent.
High	Notable loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that are prominent and may conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape. The proposed development would be clearly noticeable, and the view would be fundamentally altered by its presence. Direct or oblique views at close range, with changes over a notable horizontal and/or vertical extent. Notable landscape and visual effects may be experienced in the medium to long-term, with possible conversion to original state, at the scale of the landscape type or character area/s within which the proposal lies.
Medium	Partial loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that may be evident but do not necessarily conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape within the immediate setting of the site. The proposed development would form a new and recognisable element within the view which is likely to be recognised by the receptor. Visual change would be experienced in direct or oblique views at medium range, with a moderate horizontal and/or vertical extent of the view affected. Effects may be partially reversible to a different state, being experienced in the medium term.
Low	Minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements, largely at the site level, that may not be uncharacteristic within the existing landscape. The proposed development would form a minor constituent of an oblique view, being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a small component at medium or long range, and with a small horizontal/vertical extent of the view affected. The duration of the change may be short-term, being reversible to a similar original state.

Category	Receptor Criteria
Very Low	Barely discernible loss or alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements, experienced on parts of the site at a very localised level, not uncharacteristic within the existing landscape. The proposed development would form a barely noticeable component of the view, often being seen as a small component in a long-range view where, although slightly altered, the change would be similar to the baseline situation. Effects may be temporary and quickly reversible to the original state of the baseline context.

Significance of Effect

A6.2.27 The purpose of the EIA process is to identify the significant environmental effects (both beneficial and adverse) of development proposals. Schedule 4 to the *EIA Regulations* specifies the information to be included in all environmental statements, which should include a description of:

"The description of the likely significant effects …should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, transboundary, short-term, medium-term and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development."

A6.2.28 In order to consider the likely significance of any effect, the sensitivity of each receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to determine the significance of effect, with reference also made to the geographical extent, duration and reversibility of the effect within the assessment. Having taken such a wide range of factors into account when assessing sensitivity and magnitude at each receptor, the significance of effect can be derived by combining the sensitivity and magnitude in accordance with the matrix in **Table EDP A6.2.8**.

Table EDP A6.2.8: Level of Effects Matrix

Overall Sensitivity	Overall Magnitude of Change				
	Very High	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Very Low**
Very High	**Substantial**	**Major**	**Major/-Moderate**	**Moderate**	**Moderate/-Minor**
High	**Major**	**Major/-Moderate**	**Moderate**	Moderate/-Minor	Minor
Medium	**Major/-Moderate**	**Moderate**	Moderate/-Minor	Minor	Minor/-Negligible
Low	**Moderate**	Moderate/-Minor	Minor	Minor/-Negligible	Negligible
Very Low	**Moderate/-Minor**	Minor	Minor/-Negligible	Negligible	Negligible/-None

A6.2.29 In certain cases, where additional factors may arise, a further degree of professional judgement may be applied when determining whether the overall change in the view will be significant or not. For example, in cases where a moderate/minor effect is experienced by a high or very high sensitivity receptor, this may be considered to be significant. Similarly, where a moderate/minor effect is experienced by a very low sensitivity receptor, this may not be considered significant. Where this occurs, further explanation is given within the assessment.

Definition of Effects

A6.2.30 Taking into account the levels of effect described above, and with regard to effects being either adverse or beneficial, the following table represents a description of the range of effects likely at any one receptor.

Table EDP A6.2.9: Definition of Effect

Category	Definition of Adverse Effects	Definition of Beneficial Effects
Very Substantial	Typically, the landscape or visual receptor is very highly sensitive, with the proposals representing a very high adverse magnitude of change. The changes would be at complete variance with the landscape character and would permanently diminish the integrity of a valued landscape or view.	The removal of substantial existing incongruous landscape or visual elements and the introduction or restoration of highly valued landscape elements or built form, which would reinforce local landscape character and substantially improve landscape condition and visual amenity.
Substantial	Typically, the landscape or visual receptor has a very high to high sensitivity, with the proposals representing a very high to high adverse magnitude of change to the view or landscape resource. Changes would result in a fundamental change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.	The removal of existing incongruous landscape/visual elements and the introduction or restoration of some valued landscape or visual elements would complement landscape character and improve landscape condition and the local visual amenity.
Major	Typically, the landscape or visual receptor has a high to medium sensitivity, with the proposals representing a high to medium magnitude of change. The proposals would represent a material but non-fundamental change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.	The removal of some existing incongruous landscape elements and/or the introduction or restoration of some potentially valued landscape elements which reflect landscape character and result in some improvements to landscape condition and/or visual amenity.
Moderate	Typically, the landscape or visual receptor has a medium sensitivity, with the proposals representing a medium magnitude of change. The proposals would result in a slight but non-material change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.	Some potential removal of incongruous landscape features or visual amenity, although more likely the existing landscape and/or resource is complemented by new landscape features or built features compliant with the local landscape and published Landscape Character Assessments.

Category	Definition of Adverse Effects	Definition of Beneficial Effects
Minor	Typically, the landscape or visual receptor has a low sensitivity, with the proposals representing a low magnitude of change. There would be a detectable but non-material change to the landscape resource of visual amenity.	The proposals would result in minimal positive change to the landscape or visual resource, either through perceptual or physical change, and any change would not be readily apparent but would be coherent with ongoing change and process, and coherent with published Landscape Character Assessments.
Negligible	Typically, the landscape receptor has a very low sensitivity, with the proposals resulting in very limited loss or alteration to the landscape resource or change to the view. There would be a barely perceptible change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.	There would be a barely perceptible positive or negative change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.

A6.2.31 Effects can be adverse (negative), beneficial (positive) or neutral. The landscape effects will be considered against the landscape baseline, which includes published landscape strategies or policies if they exist. Changes involving the addition of large-scale, man-made objects are typically considered to be adverse as they are not usually actively promoted as part of published landscape strategies. Accordingly, the assessment of landscape effects as a result of these aspects of the proposed development will be assumed to be adverse, unless otherwise stated within the assessment.

A6.2.32 Visual effects are more subjective as people's perception of development varies through the spectrum of negative, neutral and positive attitudes. In the assessment of visual effects, the assessor will exercise objective professional judgement in assessing the level of effects and, unless otherwise stated, will assume that all effects are adverse, thus representing the worst-case scenario.