

CITY AND COUNTRY GROUP EPS

LAND EAST OF TROWES LANE, SWALLOWFIELD

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

ISSUE: MONDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER 2025

CLIENT: City and Country Group EPS

PROJECT: Land East of Trowes Lane, Swallowfield

REPORT TITLE: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

DJA Reference: 3430-4-4-4-LV-0001-S4-P2 Swallowfield LVIA

Report Number: LV-0001

Revision: P2

Issue Date: Monday, 29 September 2025

REPORT REVISIONS

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Approved
P1	15/09/2025	First issue	GR	PG
P2	29/09/2025	Amended following Client comments	GR	PG

CONTENTS:

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. PLANNING POLICY.....	4
3. LANDSCAPE BASELINE	7
4. VISUAL BASELINE	17
5. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES	23
6. PREDICTED LANDSCAPE EFFECTS	24
7. PREDICTED EFFECTS ON VISUAL AMENITY	30
8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37

Figures:

1. Site Location
2. Landscape Character
3. Landscape Value
4. Public Rights of Way
5. Topographical Relief
6. Zone of Theoretical Visibility
7. Representative Viewpoint Locations

Appendices:

1. Methodology and Glossary of Terms
2. Photographic Field Survey Record
3. Wokingham Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment (2019) (extracts)
4. Illustrative Photomontages

1. INTRODUCTION

Name and Qualification

- 1.1 David Jarvis Associates Limited (DJA) has been instructed by City and Country Group EPSGroup Executive Pension Scheme to produce this Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('LVIA') in support of an outline planning application at the Site known as Land East of Trowes Lane, Swallowfield.
- 1.2 This report has been prepared by George Richardson, Senior Landscape Architect MA Dip. Hort. (RHS) CMLI of David Jarvis Associates Limited.
- 1.3 DJA is an environmental, planning and design consultancy experienced in the design and assessment of development across the planning spectrum. DJA is a Registered Practice of the Landscape Institute.

Scope

- 1.4 The landscape and visual assessment considers landscape and visual matters as separate issues. Visual impacts relate to changes in views, whereas landscape impacts relate to physical changes to the landscape, that is, changes to landscape character, the historic landscape and landscape components such as trees, landform and water courses.
- 1.5 Short and medium terms effects are those that are likely to arise during the construction of the proposed development, long term effects are those that are likely to occur post-completion of the proposal. In general terms it is envisaged that short and medium term effects could arise from the commencement of the construction phase to development's completion whilst construction is anticipated to be ongoing, and long terms effects could arise upon the completion of the development.
- 1.6 Impacts have been considered in the summer of Year 15 after completion to assess the effect of mitigation.
- 1.7 The assessment of effects is confined to a Study Area, which has been informed by field surveys and is defined as the area within 1km of the Site boundary.

2. PLANNING POLICY

2.1 The section below provides a summary of policy relevant to the consideration of landscape and visual matters.

2.2 This report does not seek to demonstrate compliance with relevant policy as this will be addressed in the planning statement accompanying the application.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), December 2024

2.3 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The natural and local environment is addressed under Section 15 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'.

2.4 Paragraph 187¹ states that the overarching objective of planning policies and decisions is that they

"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*
- c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;*
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;*
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and*
- f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.*

Local Plan

2.5 The Site falls within the area covered by 'Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Development Plan' adopted in 2010.

2.6 The Site falls outside of the settlement boundary for Swallowfield as defined by policy CP11. The weight given to this policy is set out in the Planning Statement.

2.7 Wokingham Borough Council's HELAA² published in September 2024 assesses that *"the site could form a logical extension to the settlement area"* and that proposed development on the site *"would not lead to the physical or perceived coalescence of settlements"*.

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2024) 'National Planning Policy Framework'

² Wokingham Borough Council: Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (September 2024)

2.8 On this basis, the site assessment in WBC's HELAA concludes that "*the context of the site provides an opportunity for development which broadly conforms to the existing settlement form, with sensitive design able to reflect the edge of village environment and landscape character*".

Relevant Cases

2.9 The field directly opposite the Site across Trowes Lane has consent for 81 residential dwellings, granted at appeal in July 2024 (ref. APP/X0360/W/24/3340006):

"The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 81 dwellings (including 40% affordable homes), open space, sustainable drainage system, landscaping, biodiversity enhancement, new vehicular access off Trowes Lane, pedestrian and cycle links, and associated infrastructure on land west of Trowes Lane and north of Charlton Lane, Swallowfield RG7 1RT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 230422 and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule."

2.10 Landscape was one of the main considerations with the following section on landscape given in the Appeal Decision notice. That which is of particular relevance to the Site is underlined below:

Landscape

14. The site falls within the I2: Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland landscape character area as described in the Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment 2019. The landscape is characterised by arable farming in large open fields bounded by hedgerows. Rural lanes are often narrow and lined with verges containing ditches and mature trees. There are occasional small blocks of woodland.

15. The settlement pattern consists of nucleated villages with a scatter of farmsteads. Swallowfield originated as a rural village centred on the crossing of The Street and Swallowfield Street. It expanded mainly during the 20th century to the west and south forming a compact settlement. The village is set back from the B3349 Basingstoke Road, surrounded by farm and park land.

16. Although the countryside around Swallowfield is not a 'valued' landscape in the sense used in paragraph 180 of the Framework, it retains a largely rural character and is recognised in the landscape character assessment as having valuable landscape attributes.

17. The appeal site exhibits many of the landscape features described in the landscape character appraisal. It currently forms an arable field on the southern edge of Swallowfield, surrounded by trees and woodland. Trowes Lane running along its eastern boundary is characteristic of the lanes in the area being narrow with verges and ditches either side, and lined with hedgerows containing mature trees. To the south a block of plantation woodland screens the arable field from Charlton Lane, other than for a limited view through a field access. Houses along its northern boundary, including a small estate currently under construction, form a boundary between the village and the countryside.

18. Development of the site with a housing estate would inevitably harm its contribution to the landscape by introducing built development on what is currently open agricultural land. The widening of the northern end of Trowes Lane and provision of footpaths to form the main access to the site would also erode its rural character. Some mitigation would be provided by setting the houses back from the eastern boundary with Trowes Lane, and tree planting and landscaping within the site, along the Trowes Lane boundary and around the Charlton Lane pedestrian access. Nevertheless, the presence of residential buildings would be apparent in views from Trowes Lane and from the permissive paths in the woodland, as would be the domestic activities and movement of vehicles that are inherent in a residential setting. The development would have the effect of extending the built form of the village further south into the countryside, and eroding the rural setting of Trowes Lane as it approaches the village.

19. Having said that, the effect on the landscape would be largely confined to the site itself and the section of Trowes Lane along its eastern boundary. The containment provided by the trees and hedges around the boundaries, and the block of woodland in the southern part of the site, would largely screen the development in views from the wider landscape. This includes views from Charlton Lane, where the view through the field access would be stopped by additional landscaping. The impact on the character and appearance of the countryside outside the immediate southern environs of the village would therefore be minimal.

20. The evidence presented to me on landscape impact was consistent in its assessment of character and visual effects, albeit with varying degrees of judgement on the scale of that impact. Once planting has matured, I consider that the effect of the development on the landscape would be moderately adverse in terms of its local impact, and at most slightly adverse in terms of its wider impact on the landscape. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the landscape and would therefore conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Local Plan, which seek to retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape, but only to the limited extent outlined above.

21. The Council's reason for refusal on the issue of landscaping includes further policies. While Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC01 and CC02 of the Local Plan do obliquely refer to countryside and landscape, their primary roles relate to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the location of development outside settlement boundaries, which I address elsewhere in my decision. I consider they are of secondary importance to the issue of landscape.

2.11 Cumulative effects of the approved scheme are considered in this LVIA.

3. LANDSCAPE BASELINE

Description of the Application Site

- 3.1 The Site is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) SU 72562 64423 and is approximately 5.74Ha.
- 3.2 The site is located on the southern edge of Swallowfield, east of Trowes Lane.
- 3.3 It is bounded to the north by the rear gardens of Foxborough.
- 3.4 To the east, the site is bounded by trees, a watercourse, and the rear gardens of houses on Part Lane.
- 3.5 It is bounded by woodland and fields to the south.
- 3.6 Immediately to the west of Trowes Lane is the Croudace site, which has planning permission for the erection of 81 dwellings.
- 3.7 The Site is approximately 47m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and exhibits a gentle slope down towards the east.
- 3.8 The majority of the Site is rough grazing land with approximately 1.5Ha of mature woodland in the south of the Site.
- 3.9 Internally, the Site has no notable or rare features.
- 3.10 The Site is privately owned, contains no public rights of way (PRoW) and is not publicly accessible.

Description of the Surrounding Area

- 3.11 The site lies on the southern edge of Swallowfield, to the east of Trowes Lane.
- 3.12 It is situated within the lowland Blackwater valley, enclosed by higher ground to the west at Farley and to the east around Riseley and Heckfield Heath.
- 3.13 Surrounding fields are medium in scale, bounded by mixed hedgerows with scattered mature trees providing intermittent enclosure.
- 3.14 The estate landscape of Swallowfield Park lies to the north-east of Swallowfield and is generally more open.
- 3.15 The historic core of Swallowfield is centred around The Street and Swallowfield Street. Subsequent growth through the 20th century has seen suburban edge development extending largely southwards.
- 3.16 The southern edge of the village is varied, with cul-de-sac housing, gardens, and small paddocks defining the transition to open countryside.
- 3.17 Trowes Lane is a narrow rural lane, partially enclosed by hedgerows and mature trees, lightly trafficked and typical of the local network.
- 3.18 The wider area retains a quiet and rural character, with agricultural activity and scattered farmsteads contributing to sense of place.
- 3.19 Public rights of way in the vicinity provide views of the settlement edge and surrounding countryside, though these are often filtered by vegetation.

Published Landscape Character

3.20 Hierarchically, the Site is located in:

- National Character Area (NCA) 129: 'Thames Basin Heaths' (Natural England)
- Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland'

3.21 The Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment is the most recent and detailed in relation to the Site and is therefore used for the purposes of this assessment. Key characteristics of Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland' are as follows, and those that are of particular relevance to the Site are shown underlined:

Key Characteristics

- *Gently shelving landform from 45m to 65m AOD, underlain by London Clay bounded by alluvium from the river valleys to the north and river terrace gravels to the south east.*
- *Historic deep water filled ditches due to the water-logged soils often lined with pollarded willows.*
- *Limited woodland with only small blocks of BAP priority habitat lowland mixed deciduous woodland east of Charlton/Trowes Lane and a small area of BAP priority habitat wet woodland (The Marshes, Riseley LWS and LNR).*
- *Arable farming in large irregular fields dominates, with open pasture and horse and pony paddocks on settlement edges. Fields are bound by gappy overgrown hawthorn hedgerows with veteran trees, often oaks, with some post and rail and post and wire fencing.*
- *The GHQ Stop Line (General Headquarters Line), a defensive zone built during the summer of 1940 to contain the threatened German invasion ran east from Bristol to the Thames Estuary.*
- *Small scale settlement concentrated in the villages of Riseley and outskirts of Swallowfield. Elsewhere scattered farmsteads, some Grade II listed, are linked by rural lanes.*
- *Victorian and modern buildings have a predominately polychromatic Reading brick character, with occasional traditional timber framing and traditional barge board detailing.*
- *Rural lanes bounded by wide grassy verges, banks with wildflowers and overgrown mixed hedgerows. The busy A33 cuts through the northwest of the area, bringing noise and movement to the area.*
- *Lack of woodland and hedgerows results in an open landscape where there are views across the flat fields to distant wooded horizons. Pylons and wires, large agricultural buildings and shelter belts are visually dominant within the character area.*
- *Simple and unvaried agricultural landscape, with an isolated character due to its location between the Loddon and Broadwater valleys, and relative inaccessibility by public rights of way, which results in a strong sense of tranquility and an experience of 'dark skies'.*

3.22 Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area 'A2: Loddon River Valley' covers a small part of the Study Area to the West. Key characteristics are as follows, and those that are of particular relevance to the site are shown underlined:

Key Characteristics

- *A broad, flat alluvial floodplain around 40-45m AOD underlain by riverine alluvium and river terrace deposits. The alluvial soils are affected by high groundwater levels, while*

the loamy soils on the low ridges of the river terrace gravels are better drained and in use as arable fields.

- *The River Loddon follows a meandering course within braided channels. There are a system of sluices and weirs along the course of the river, at Arborfield, Sheep Bridge and Stanford End. Streams and tributary rivers join the Loddon including the rivers Broadwater and Blackwater in the southeast of the area. There are ponds, oxbow lakes and pools of standing water on the valley floor.*
- *A wooded backdrop is provided by scattered blocks of deciduous woodland and copses, interlinked woodland belts and scattered mature trees and scrub. The semi-natural woodlands include frequent areas of Ancient Woodland, all of which are designated as LWSs.*
- *Pasture and arable farmland in medium and large irregular geometric fields, divided by post and wire fencing, post and rail fencing, gappy hedgerows and drainage ditches. The areas closest to the river are affected by flooding and are characterised by pasture and wet meadow.*
- *Wetland character, including BAP priority habitats of floodplain grazing marsh, wet woodland, lowland fen and lowland meadows which contain characteristic features such as willow pollards. Six areas with wetland character are designated as LWS. South of Sheepbridge an area of waterlogged hay meadow is designated as the Stanford End Mill and River Loddon SSSI, which supports nationally important populations of fritillary (*Fritillary meleagris*) and the Loddon pondweed (*Potamogeton nodosus*), while the full length of river north of Sheepbridge is an LWS.*
- *Important historic riverside features include traditional brick humpback bridges and water mills e.g. Sindlesham Mill and Sindlesham Bridge and the Mill at Swallowfield (all Grade II listed). Moated sites are present at Beaumy's Castle and Sheepbridge Court and designated as Scheduled Monuments.*
- *Extensive designed parkland landscape at Swallowfield Park (designated as a Registered Park and Garden) which leads down to the River Loddon with grassland and mature oaks and specimen trees including cedars of Lebanon, and a Grade II listed 18th century bridge.*
- *The GHQ Stop Line (General Headquarters Line), a defensive zone built during the summer of 1940 to contain the threatened German invasion ran east from Bristol to the Thames Estuary and included a section along the Foudry Brook, the Loddon, the Broadwater and the Blackwater.*
- *Low-density scattered settlement pattern of villages and farmsteads characterised by traditional warm red brick and timber framed vernacular evident in cluster of listed buildings in Swallowfield village Conservation Area.*
- *Tranquil and rural character away from river crossings and visual influence of large scale settlement in adjacent areas. The south of the area is also a resource of 'dark skies'. Little public access to the floodplain except for the Blackwater Valley Path which runs south and east of Swallowfield. Busy roads cross the flood plain, including the A33, M4 and Winnersh and Shinfield Eastern Relief Roads, and create physical and visual severance along the floodplain.*
- *Pylons, residential and commercial development are distinctive visual features in this open and flat landscape, with development very visible along the edges of this character area. The new landmark Science and Innovation Park building at Shinfield is a notable feature in the landscape.*

3.23 Extracts of the relevant landscape character assessments are provided at **Appendix 4**.

3.24 Field survey in April 2025 confirms that current landscape character is broadly consistent with the published character descriptions.

3.25 The above character assessment does not ascribe values for sensitivity to the character areas.

3.26 Area I2 is a largely intensive agricultural landscape and whilst there are some longer distance views it is not notably scenic. As such it is considered to have a **Medium/ Low** value. The presence of unsympathetic large agricultural buildings, and highly variable scattered post-war development results in a **Medium/ Low** susceptibility to the type of change proposed and consequently a **Medium/ Low** sensitivity.

3.27 Area A2 has a number of more valued landscape elements, some recognised at a national level. It is not covered by wider landscape designations such as National Landscape or National Park. As such it is considered to be of **Medium/ High** value. Although the character is more tranquil and rural, there is still influence from post-war development and consequently it is assessed as having a **Medium/ High** susceptibility to the type of change proposed and therefore a **Medium/ High** sensitivity.

3.28 The character of the Site reflects its location on the southern edge of Swallowfield, forming part of the transition between the settlement edge and the surrounding rural landscape.

3.29 The majority of the Site is a singular rough grazing field of a medium scale, consistent with the general field pattern of the surrounding study area.

3.30 The woodland block in the south of the forms part of a larger wooded area – the only such feature within the Study Area.

3.31 The Site is highly enclosed by boundary vegetation, the woodland block and the settlement edge, restricting views in and out of the Site with no significant long-distance intervisibility.

3.32 The adjacent modern residential development introduces an urbanising influence that is atypical of the wider rural character of the study area.

3.33 The Site has no known cultural or recreational value, makes little contribution to the wider landscape, and does not provide valued views. It is not subject to any landscape designations. Accordingly, the value of the Site's landscape character is assessed as **Low**. The influence of adjacent modern development reduces the Site's susceptibility to further change of the type proposed, assessed as **Medium/ Low**. Overall, the Site is therefore assessed as having **Low** sensitivity to development of this nature.

Landscape Elements and Features

3.34 The Site contains no notable or rare landscape elements or features.

Landscape Value

3.35 Landscape value relates to the value or importance society attaches to a landscape or view, which expresses national or local consensus and because of its quality, special qualities, cultural associations or ecological status. IEMA/LI guidance identifies a number of reasons why a landscape may be valued:

landscape condition: a measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements;

scenic quality: the term used to describe landscapes that appeal primarily to the visual senses;

rarity: the presence of rare features or elements in the landscape, or the presence of a rare landscape character type;

representativeness: whether the landscape contains a particular character and/or features or elements which are considered particularly important examples;

conservation interests: the presence of features of particular wildlife, earth science or archaeological, historical and cultural interest can add to the value of a landscape as well as having value in their own right;

recreation value: evidence that the landscape is valued for recreational activity where experience of the landscape is important;

perceptual aspects: a landscape may be valued for its perceptual qualities, notably wildness and/or tranquillity.

associations: some landscapes are associated with particular people, such as artists or writers, or events in history that contribute to perceptions of the natural beauty of the area.

3.36 Assessment of landscape value has been based on consideration of:

- landscape designation i.e. Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- nature conservation designation i.e. Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- published literature relating to local cultural heritage, recreation and tourism;
- published landscape assessment;
- the inter-relationship of the above.

Scenic Quality within the Study Area

3.37 The Study Area predominantly comprises medium scale, intensively farmed fields medium in scale, bounded by mixed hedgerows with scattered mature trees providing intermittent enclosure.

3.38 Scattered farmsteads with modern agricultural buildings detract from views.

3.39 Within the Site and immediately adjacent to it, woodland restricts views.

3.40 The rural qualities of the landscape and some wider views suggest some susceptibility to change. However, the scattered housing and farmsteads and filtering vegetation reduce susceptibility to development of the type proposed. Overall susceptibility is assessed as **Medium/ Low**. While the Study Area is predominantly rural, it is not subject to landscape designations and its scenic qualities are lacks any distinctive attractive features. Value is therefore assessed as **Medium/ Low**. Consequently, the sensitivity for the Study Area is **Medium/ Low**.

Tranquillity within the Study Area

3.41 The Study Area is generally tranquil, however, it is impacted by noise from the B3349 and A33.

3.42 Consequently, the tranquillity is assessed as **Medium/ High** value.

3.43 The type of development proposed is both pre-existing and less noticeable than detracting elements present and therefore susceptibility is assessed as **Low** resulting in a **Medium** sensitivity.

Site Condition

3.44 The condition of the Site is generally poor comprising predominantly rough grassland with no rare features or elements.

3.45 Mature boundary vegetation and woodland the south contribute positively but also restrict views to/from the Site.

3.46 The Site has no public access and is not prominent in local views reducing the importance of its condition.

3.47 The enclosure and settlement edge character are atypical of the character area.

3.48 The Site is therefore assessed as being **Low** value.

3.49 The Site is overlooked by existing residential development resulting in a **Low** susceptibility to the type of development proposed. The sensitivity is assessed as **Low**.

Landscape Designations

3.50 There are no landscape designations within the Site.

3.51 There are no further landscape designations within the Study Area.

Nature Conservation

3.52 There are no designated nature conservation assets within the Site.

3.53 Within the Study Area there is one designated nature conservation assets:

- An unamend Ancient & Semi Natural Woodland approximately 90m from the Site
- Swallowfield Meadow, Local Wildlife Site

3.54 They are separated from the Site through a combination of topography, vegetation and built-form. They are therefore excluded from further assessment.

Cultural Heritage

3.55 There are no cultural heritage assets by designation within the Site.

3.56 Within the Study Area there are following designated cultural heritage assets:

- 10 grade II listed buildings

3.57 These assets are separated from the Site through a combination of topography, vegetation and built-form with the result that none of these lie within the Zone of Significant Visibility. They are therefore excluded from further assessment.

3.58 There are no further cultural heritage designations within the Study Area.

Leisure and Tourism

3.59 There are no PRoW within the Site and the Site is not publicly accessible. Consequently, the Site has **Low** leisure and amenity value. As rural landscapes generally have limited formal play provision typical of residential development, it considered to have **High** susceptibility to the type of change proposed. This results in a **Medium** sensitivity.

3.60 There are 2 Public Rights of Way within the Study Area:

- Wokingham Borough Council public footpath SWAL FP16
- Wokingham Borough Council public footpath SWAL FP17

3.61 They would not experience direct affects as a result of the proposed development. They do not intersect with the ZSV and therefore would not experience significant indirect effects as a result of the proposed development. They are therefore excluded from further assessment.

3.62 Blackwater Valley Path long distance footpath follows Church Road which clips northern-eastern corner of the Study Area. It is separate from the Site through a combination of topography, vegetation and built-form does not fall within the Zone of Significant Visibility. It is therefore excluded from further assessment.

Landscape Receptors

3.63 The area is perceived as both a living and working landscape comprising agricultural farmland traversed by major and minor transport corridors and PRoW.

3.64 For the purposes of assessing landscape receptor sensitivity, a judgement needs to be made on the relative value or importance to society of its various aspects or components. This is a complex task as the landscape is valuable to people in different ways hence only broad judgements can be made. Identified sensitive receptors described above are summarised in Table 3.1 together with an assessment of value, susceptibility, sensitivity and rationale for the judgement.

Valued Landscape

3.65 The Site is not considered to be a valued landscape as protected by §187a of the NPPF³ based upon the guidance given in Box 5.1 of GLVIA3⁴ and the Landscape Institute's TGN 02/21⁵.

3.66 This is confirmed by the Wokingham Borough Council (2024) 'Value Landscapes Assessment'.

³ Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government (2024) National Planning Policy Framework

⁴ IEMA & Landscape institute (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3)

⁵ Landscape Institute (2021) TGN 02/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations

Table 3.1 Landscape Receptor Sensitivity

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
PREDICTED LANDSCAPE EFFECTS				
<i>Landscape Character</i>				
Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gently shelving landform. - Historic water-filled ditches with pollarded willows. - Limited woodland. - Predominantly arable farmland in large irregular fields; pastures and pony paddocks near settlement edges. - Boundaries are gappy hawthorn hedgerows with veteran oaks, alongside fencing. - Settlement is small-scale, centred on Riseley and Swallowfield's edge, with scattered farmsteads. - Open, simple agricultural landscape with distant wooded horizons, pylons, and large farm buildings. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Largely intensive agricultural landscape - Some longer distance views it is not notably scenic. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally rural landscape setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Unsympathetic large agricultural buildings. - Highly variable scattered post-war development. 	Medium/ Low
Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area 'A2: Loddon River Valley'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flat alluvial floodplain supporting arable uses on drier river terrace gravels and wet meadows near the river. - River Loddon meanders through braided channels with sluices, weirs, tributaries, ponds, and oxbow lakes. - Woodland backdrop of copse and tree belts, ancient Woodland and scattered trees. - Medium-large arable and pasture fields divided by hedgerows, ditches, and fencing. - Historic features include mills, bridges, moated sites, and Swallowfield Park RPG. - Settlement is scattered, with traditional brick and timber vernacular. 	Medium/High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some more highly valued elements, including some with national recognition such as Swallowfield Park Registered and Garden and SSSIs. - Landscape not covered by wider national designations such as National Park or National Landscape. 	Medium/ High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally rural landscape setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Some influence from post-war development. 	Medium/ High

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
Site Landscape Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Atypical of character area. - Predominantly rough grazing field of a medium scale. - The woodland block in the south of the forms part of a larger wooded area – the only such feature within the Study Area. - Highly enclosed. - Overlooked by adjacent modern residential development. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No known cultural or recreational value. - Little contribution to the wider landscape. - Not subject to any landscape designations. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural character influenced by adjacent modern development. 	Low
<i>Local Landscape Quality</i>				
Scenic Quality within Study Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Predominantly medium scale, intensively farmed fields medium in scale, bounded by mixed hedgerows with scattered mature trees providing intermittent enclosure. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scattered farmsteads with modern agricultural buildings detract from views. - Within the Site and immediately adjacent to it, woodland restricts views. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural character with some wider views susceptible to urbanising influences. - Scattered housing and farmsteads and filtering vegetation reduce susceptibility 	Medium/ Low
Tranquillity within Study Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally tranquil, rural landscape - Impacted by noise from the B3349 and A33 	Medium/ High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Village, farmland and parkland tranquil. - Major roads intrusive in some areas. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type of development proposed is both pre-existing and less noticeable than detracting elements already present 	Medium
Site Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rough grazing field with woodland block to south. - Mature boundary vegetation. - Overlooked by properties on Foxborough. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no valued features within the Site. - The Site atypical of the local character area. - The Site has no public access and is not prominent in local views reducing the value of its condition. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Enclosure enables it to accommodate development without affecting its value in wider landscape. - Residential elements already present in view. 	Low
<i>Landscape Designations - None</i>				
<i>Nature Conservation - None</i>				
<i>Cultural Heritage - None</i>				
<i>Leisure & Amenity</i>				
Site Amenity & Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no public access to the Site. - Limited visual amenity. 	Low	High	Medium

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Site currently provides no direct amenity value and does not form a valued part of views.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Footpaths are a common feature with rural landscapes.- Play areas within rural landscapes are uncommon	

4. VISUAL BASELINE

Visual Receptors

4.1 Three categories of Visual Receptor have been identified within the existing and predicted ZSV. These are:

1. Occupiers of Residential properties.
2. Users of roads.
3. Users of Public Rights of Way.

4.2 People occupied at their place of work are considered to be least likely to be affected by development and have not been included.

4.3 Where there is more than one category of potential receptor for a viewpoint, the higher sensitivity receptor has been selected.

4.4 Locations of sensitive receptor viewpoints are shown on **Figure 7**. These represent all of the receptor categories and at locations where it anticipated effects would be greatest. A photographic record of the broad extents of visibility is provided at **Appendix 3**.

4.5 Receptor sensitivity is described in **Table 4.1**. The sensitivity of visual receptors varies according to category and the context of the view as described above.

Consultation

4.6 Locations for representative viewpoints were agreed in April 2025 with Carol Newell, Landscape Officer, Central Bedfordshire Council. Refer to **Table 4.1**.

Field Assessment

4.7 A visual assessment of the Site and its surroundings was carried out in April 2025. The visual assessment was initially based on a desktop analysis of Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping of the application site and the surrounding area.

4.8 This analysis was subsequently reviewed and refined during the field survey where views were captured from publicly accessible locations.

4.9 The agreed locations were used as representative viewpoints. These were points both within the site and the surrounding landscape with potential views identified by the initial ZTV study. They represent a range of potential visual receptors.

Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

4.10 ZTV studies were carried out to assess the broad theoretical extents of visibility of the Proposed Development.

4.11 An initial ZTV was produced testing the developable parameter parcels of the application Site at 11m above existing ground level. This was used to identify representative viewpoints (in conjunction with desktop study of the local PROW network and other potentially sensitive receptors) to be agreed with the local planning authority. The result of this study is shown at **Figure 6**.

4.12 The ZTV tests were run using QGIS software to determine the approximate extents and levels of visibility. The models used consider the screening effect of surface features and provides a measure of where the Site is likely to be visible.

Visual Value

4.13 In order to determine the sensitivity of representative viewpoints the value of each view should be established. Viewpoints are valued in different ways depending upon the expectations of the viewer. The LI/IEMA guidelines currently provide examples of broad categories including recreation, residence, employment or passing through on roads or other modes of transport. The guidelines stress that these are only examples and that every project will require its own set of criteria and thresholds.

4.14 Visual receptor value criteria are set out in the Methodology in **Appendix 1**.

Visual Susceptibility

4.15 The degree by which a visual receptor is judged to be sensitive however also depends on the actual quality of the existing view and its susceptibility to change. Accordingly, when the sensitivity to the change actually being proposed is assessed, matters such as the context and extent of existing view as well as the proximity of the receptor to the proposed development need to be considered.

4.16 An example could be provided by two identical residential properties. The occupier of property A could have open views across a National Park while B may overlook heavy industrial areas on the urban fringe. Whilst both parties could be regarded as inherently highly sensitive to visual change the actual situation would be that the occupier of property A would be regarded as highly sensitive to change relative to built development in the context of the view, whilst the party at property B as of medium or low sensitivity.

4.17 Visual receptor susceptibility criteria are set out in the Methodology in **Appendix 1**.

Visual Sensitivity

4.18 To determine the sensitivity of the representative visual receptors the value of each should be considered in relation to its susceptibility. The sensitivity matrix and criteria are set out in the Methodology in Appendix 1. The sensitivity of each representative viewpoint is explained in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Selected Representative Visual Receptors

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
PREDICTED VISUAL EFFECTS				
Viewpoint 1 View from public bridleway SWAL BW 23 (Taylors Lane) Easting: 471631 Northing: 163879 Distance: 919m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - View along well-used rural route. - Highly enclosed by mature vegetation. - No wider views. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pleasant rural route, locally valued but with no notable features and no wider views. 	Medium/ Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site 	Medium/
Viewpoint 2 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) Easting: 471970 Northing: 164391 Distance: 478m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - View across arable field from footway through field gate alongside busy road. - View restricted by woodland. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semi-Open view with tranquillity disrupted by busy road. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential elements already present. - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available. 	Low
Viewpoint 3 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) Easting: 472036 Northing: 164132 Distance: 444m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - View across grazing field from footway over hedge alongside busy road. - View restricted by woodland and hedges. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semi-Open view with tranquillity disrupted by busy road. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential elements already present. - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available. 	Low
Viewpoint 4 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) near public bridleway SWAL BW 23 (Taylors Lane) Easting: 472046 Northing: 163728 Distance: 702m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - View across grazing field from footway through gap in hedge alongside busy road. - View restricted by woodland and hedges. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semi-Open view with tranquillity disrupted by busy road. 	Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential elements already present. - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available. 	Low

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
Viewpoint 5 View from Charlton Lane Easting: 472231 Northing: 164451 Distance: 234m	- View from rural lane through blocked gateway into Croudace development Site (currently grazing land).	Medium/ Low - Pleasant rural lane, locally valued but with no notable features and no wider views.	Medium/ Low - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available.	Medium/ Low
Viewpoint 6 View from Trowes Lane Easting: 472484 Northing: 164528 Distance: 0m	- View from rural lane through field gate into Site. - View restricted by trees. - Powerlines detract from Site.	Medium/ Low - Pleasant rural lane, locally valued but with no notable features and no wider views.	Medium/ Low - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available.	Medium
Viewpoint 7 View from Trowes Lane Easting: 472442 Northing: 164364 Distance: 7m	- View from rural lane. - View restricted by trees.	Medium/ Low - Pleasant rural lane, locally valued but with no notable features and no wider views.	Medium/ Low - Users generally looking along line of road but likely to turn to wider views where available.	Medium
Viewpoint 8 View from public footpath SWAL FP 16 Easting: 472510 Northing: 164268 Distance: 4m	- View along rural route. - Highly enclosed by mature vegetation. - No wider views.	Medium - Rural route, locally valued but with no notable features and no wider views. - Gate detracts/	Medium/ Low - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site	Medium/ Low
Viewpoint 9 View from public footpath SWAL FP 17 Easting: 472642 Northing: 163963 Distance: 336m	- View from rural footpath across fallow field. - View restricted by woodland.	Medium - Semi-open view - Generally pleasant rural landscape.	Medium - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences.	Medium
Viewpoint 10 View from Blackwater Valley Long Distance Footpath on Church Road Easting: 472910 Northing: 164826 Distance: 351m	- View from footway alongside rural road, partially restricted by vegetation.	Medium - View from promoted route - Semi-open view over generally pleasant rural landscape.	Medium/ Low - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site (views are more open to the north-east)	Medium

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
Viewpoint 11 View from Part Lane Easting: 472799 Northing: 164624 Distance: 133m	- View from footway alongside rural road, restricted by vegetation.	Medium/ Low - Partially restricted view along tranquil lane. - Entrance to field detracts.	Medium/ Low - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site	Medium/ Low
Viewpoint 12 View from Part Lane Easting: 472854 Northing: 164411 Distance: 118m	- View from footway alongside rural road, restricted by vegetation.	Medium/ Low - Partially restricted view along tranquil lane. - Entrance to field and shipping container detract.	Medium/ Low - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site	Medium/ Low
Viewpoint 13 View from churchyard of All Saints Church, Swallowfield Easting: 473178 Northing: 164783 Distance: 543m	- View from churchyard of grade I listed church	Medium/ High - Well-vegetated with a number of substantial trees. - Tranquil setting. - Views restricted by vegetation.	Medium/ High - Rural elements susceptible to urbanising influences.	Medium/ High
Viewpoint 14 View from public footpath SWAL FP 15 Easting: 473227 Northing: 164481 Distance: 495m	- View from rural footpath across floodplain field. - View restricted by woodland.	Medium - Semi-open view - Generally pleasant rural landscape.	Medium - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences.	Medium
Viewpoint 15 View from public footpath SWAL FP 15 Easting: 473145 Northing: 164285 Distance: 429m	- View from arable field. - Maize crop restricts views in places, view would otherwise be semi-open being limited by mature vegetation around field boundaries	Medium - Semi-open view - Generally pleasant rural landscape.	Medium - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences.	Medium
Viewpoint 16 View from Nutbean Lane Cemetery near Blackwater Valley Long Distance Footpath Easting: 473614 Northing: 164272 Distance: 891m	- View from cemetery through gap in boundary vegetation.	Medium/ Low - View restricted by existing vegetation. - View open beyond cemetery.	Low - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users not generally looking in direction of Site	Low

Receptor	Baseline	Value	Susceptibility to type of Change	Sensitivity
Viewpoint 17 View from public bridleway SWAL BW 29 Easting: 474494 Northing: 164986 Distance: 1847m	- View along rural route. - Highly enclosed by mature vegetation. - No wider views.	Medium/ Low - Pleasant rural route, locally valued but with no notable features and limited glimpses of wider views.	Medium - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Users generally looking along line of bridleway but likely to turn to wider views where available.	Medium/ Low
Viewpoint 18 View from public footpath SHIN FP 22 Easting: 472494 Northing: 166108 Distance: 1558m	- Open view across fields. - Solar farm and trees in distance - Residential buildings on the edge of Spencers Wood are visible	Medium - Open view across largely rural landscape. - Well-vegetated in distance. - Solar farm detracts.	Medium - Rural setting susceptible to urbanising influences. - Some built form already present.	Medium

5. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Description

5.1 This report accompanies an Outline Planning Application for the construction of up to 79 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), together with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure, with all matters reserved except access Landscape Strategy – Recommended Mitigation Measures and Enhancements

5.2 The key landscape features of the proposals are as follows:

- Existing vegetation to be retained save for small sections removed to create the new access.
- Lengths of proposed hedgerow and areas of new tree planting
- Species-rich grassland habitat to enhance biodiversity net gain

Table 5.1 Landscape Strategy

Mitigation	Purpose
Primary Mitigation (Inherent)	
Built form is of a scale and height that can be contained within the surrounding vegetation structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To limit visibility within wider views.
The woodland, mature trees and hedgerows of the Site are retained except for access.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maintain visual screening of the Site from the surrounding area. • To maintain the landscape character and biodiversity of the site
Secondary Mitigation (Foreseeable)	
Native tree and scrub planting are proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce the visual impact of the development and enhance the biodiversity value of the site. • To improve habitat connectivity, soften and integrate the development into its surroundings.
Carefully designed lighting restricted to the minimum with limited operating in hours of darkness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce or prevent light spillage onto adjacent areas and limit the night time effect on the open landscape
Enhancements	
Integrated internal tree planting, wildflower grassland and soft landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To contribute to the assimilation of the proposed development into the landscape • To provide ecological enhancement and visual interest.
Informal walking routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance the leisure and amenity value of the Site.
Play area and informal open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance the leisure and amenity value of the Site.

6. PREDICTED LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

Construction – Assessment of Effects

Generally

- 6.1 This has been assessed as year 1 from commencement of construction. It is anticipated that the construction period would be relatively short in duration and therefore it is assumed that infrastructure, including roads and drainage, and built form will be complete.
- 6.2 With the exception of receptors within the site, impacts are indirect and relate to views from these receptors. These effects diminish rapidly with distance and are significant effects are constrained to within the ZSV.
- 6.3 The predicted effects are shown in **Table 6.1** with a more detail provided in **Appendix 2**.

Mitigation Measures

- 6.4 Planting, ecological enhancements and recreational provision are assumed not to be present at this assessment point. Therefore, the predicted effects are greater than those predicted during operation.

Landscape Character

- 6.5 Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland' would only experience direct effects within the Site itself. The Site is atypical of the character area and the proposals do not introduce elements that are not already widely present in the locality. Indirect effects upon the character area are restricted to the ZSV which is also predominantly atypical of the character area with very limited visibility in wider landscape. This is therefore a **Negligible** change.
- 6.6 Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area 'A2: Loddon River Valley' would experience no direct effects as a result of the proposals. Indirect effects upon the character area are restricted to the ZSV which is also predominantly atypical of the character area with very limited visibility in wider landscape. This is therefore a **Negligible** change.
- 6.7 The Site landscape character would experience a change of the grassland field to construction Site: topsoil stripped from areas to be developed, tree and hedge removal associated with Site access, and the introduction of roads and housing. This is a **High** magnitude of change and therefore an adverse effect of **Moderate** significance.

Scenic Quality

- 6.8 The partially completed Proposed Development results in a very localised change, introducing additional residential development into some views. Significant effects would be restricted to the ZSV and would not introduce elements not already present in the landscape. The magnitude of change is therefore considered **Low** resulting in an adverse effect of **Minor** significance.

Tranquillity

- 6.9 There would be a very localised reduction in tranquillity due to construction activity constrained to the Site and its immediate vicinity. The magnitude of change is therefore considered **Low** resulting in an adverse effect of **Minor** significance.

Site Condition

6.10 The Proposed Development would result in a change of the grassland area to an active construction Site. Topsoil would be stripped from areas to be developed and there would be tree and hedge removal to create accesses. The Proposed Development would see the introduction of roads and housing into the Site. This is a **High** magnitude of change resulting in an adverse effect of **Moderate** significance.

Leisure and Tourism

6.11 There would be public access to completed areas of the Site only. This is a change of **Low** magnitude and therefore **Minor** significance.

Operation – Assessment of Effects

6.12 This has been assessed as at the completion of construction + 15 years, to assess the effect of proposed planting.

6.13 Effects are generally as assessed during construction.

6.14 Public access to the site and play provision will have a beneficial effect on Leisure and Tourism.

6.15 The predicted effects are shown in **Table 6.1** with a more detail provided in **Appendix 2**.

Duration and Reversibility

6.16 The proposed development represents a permanent and irreversible change to the Site.

Cumulative Landscape Effects

6.17 The consented Croudace development immediately opposite the Site across Trowes Lane will result in 81 dwellings on that site.

6.18 The Croudace site is almost identical to the Site in terms of its landscape character and context: both are presently medium sized, rough grazing fields with woodland to the South and modern development on the edge of Swallowfield and are highly enclosed within the landscape with limited influence on the surrounding landscape.

6.19 Consequently, the impacts of the Croudace development are highly limited and would have no impact upon the landscape receptors beyond that associated with the proposed development.

Table 6.1: Predicted Landscape Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
PREDICTED LANDSCAPE EFFECTS						
<i> </i> Landscape Character						
Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland'	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) - Direct effects constrained to Site which is atypical of character area and does not introduce elements that are not already present within character area. - Indirect effects restricted to ZSV which is also atypical of character area with very limited visibility in wider landscape.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, temporary	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction with the addition of: - Proposed Development now complete. - Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, permanent	Not Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per Operation with the addition of: - Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, permanent	Not Significant
Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area 'A2: Loddon River Valley'	Medium/ High	Construction (Year 1) - No direct effects. - Indirect effects restricted to ZSV which is also atypical of character area with very limited visibility in wider landscape.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, temporary	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, permanent	Not Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per Operation with the addition of: - Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, permanent	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
Site Landscape Character	Low	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change from agricultural use to construction Site. - Topsoil stripped from areas to be developed. - Tree and hedge removal associated with Site access. - Introduction of roads and housing. 	High	Moderate	Adverse, Temporary	Significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction activity now ceased. - Proposed Development complete. - Planting softening and integrating Proposed Development with surroundings and creates a high-quality streetscape. 	High	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As per operation. 	High	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
<i>Local Landscape Quality</i>						
Scenic Quality within Study Area	Medium/Low	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visibility of partially completed Proposed Development confined to a few locations. - Some possibility of ridgelines of proposed development to just break skyline behind existing built form in some but unlikely to be noticeable to the casual observer in the wider landscape. - Change does not introduce elements not already present in the landscape. 	Low	Minor	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As per construction with the addition of: - Proposed Development now complete. - Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development. 	Low	Minor	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per Operation with the addition of:- Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	Low	Minor	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
Tranquillity within Study Area	Medium	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Very localised reduction in tranquillity due to construction activity.	Low	Minor	Adverse, Temporary	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Construction activity now ceased.- Change in tranquillity due to residential activity not likely to noticeable above baseline levels.- Mitigation planting reduces above effects.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per Operation with the addition of:- Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
Site Condition	Low	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Change from agricultural use to construction Site.- Topsoil stripped from areas to be developed.- Tree and hedge removal associated with Site accesses.- Introduction of roads and housing.	High	Moderate	Adverse, Temporary	Significant
		Operation (Year 15) Construction activity now ceased. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Proposed Development complete.- Planting softening and integrating Proposed Development with surroundings and creates a high-quality streetscape.	High	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	High	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
Landscape Designations - None						
Nature Conservation - None						
Cultural Heritage - None						
Leisure & Amenity						
Site Amenity & Leisure	Medium	Construction (Year 1) - Public access to completed areas only.	Low	Minor	Beneficial, Temporary	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) - Proposed Development now complete. - Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development in views from the receptor. - Full access to public open space, woodland area and play features enhances amenity value of Site.	High	Moderate	Beneficial, Permanent	Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.				

7. PREDICTED EFFECTS ON VISUAL AMENITY

Zone of Significant Visibility

7.1 The ZTV results for the Proposed Development were assessed during field surveys to better define the actual extents of significant visibility, based upon consideration of whether the development would likely draw the eye of the casual observer. The ZSV could then take into account the screening effects of vegetation and structures not included on the computer model, as well as the scale and nature of Proposed Development in the local context.

7.2 The ZSV for the Proposed Development is shown on **Figures 5 and 6**. It is defined as the area in which significant visual impacts occur. It is highly constrained by vegetation and built form and covers an area of approximately 10 hectares.

Construction – Assessment of Effects

7.3 The predicted effects are shown in **Table 7.1** with a more detail provided in **Appendix 2**.

7.4 Only viewpoints 6 and 7 would experience significant visual effects. These viewpoints are located close to the Site boundary.

7.5 The partially completed development would be prominent in the foreground for viewpoint 6, resulting in a **High** magnitude of change and adverse effect of **Major** significance.

7.6 Viewpoint 7 has a filtered view of the Site due to existing vegetation resulting in a **Medium** magnitude of change and adverse effect of **Moderate** significance.

7.7 The remaining viewpoints lie outside of the ZSV.

Operation – Assessment of Effects

7.8 This has been assessed as at the completion of construction + 15 years, so as to assess the effect of proposed planting.

7.9 Effects are generally as assessed during construction – mitigation planting not having a significant change upon those receptors with significant effects during construction.

7.10 The predicted effects are shown in **Table 7.1** with a more detail provided in **Appendix 2**.

Illustrative Photomontages

7.11 Illustrative photomontages for Viewpoints 4, 6 and 12 are provided in Appendix 5. These viewpoints have been selected as they represent viewpoints close to the site, to the east and to the south-west where visual effects might be expected.

Predicted Potential Effects on Artificial Lighting

7.12 Lighting will be carefully designed at the detailed design (Reserved Matters) stage and restricted to the minimum in order to reduce or prevent light spillage onto adjacent areas and limit the night time effect on the open landscape.

7.13 A suitable planning condition can be imposed to ensure that external lighting associated with the proposals would be consistent to that of the existing settlement and to ensure it would not be readily discernible at night from that of the existing settlement at moderate distances.

Duration and Reversibility

7.14 The proposed development represents a permanent and irreversible change to the Site.

Cumulative Visual Effects

7.15 The only cumulative visual effects anticipated are those associated with the Croudace development described in 6.17.

7.16 Only viewpoint 5 would experience a change in significance resulting from the Croudace development: with a **High** magnitude of change exclusively from the Croudace development resulting in a **Major** adverse impact.

Table 7.1 - Predicted Effects on Visual Amenity during Development

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
PREDICTED VISUAL EFFECTS						
Viewpoint 1 View from public bridleway SWAL BW 23 (Taylors Lane) Easting: 471631 Northing: 163879 Distance: 919m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 2 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) Easting: 471970 Northing: 164391 Distance: 478m	Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 3 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) Easting: 472036 Northing: 164132 Distance: 444m	Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 4 View from Basingstoke Road (B3349) near public bridleway SWAL BW 23 (Taylors Lane) Easting: 472046 Northing: 163728 Distance: 702m	Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
Viewpoint 5 View from Charlton Lane Easting: 472231 Northing: 164451 Distance: 234m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Potential for ridgelines of proposed development to just break skyline behind existing built form but unlikely to be noticeable to the casual observer.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per Operation with the addition of:- Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes Lane.	High	Major	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
Viewpoint 6 View from Trowes Lane Easting: 472484 Northing: 164528 Distance: 0m	Medium	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- View of partially constructed development in foreground.	High	Major	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction with the addition of:- Proposed Development now complete.- Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development.	High	Major	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per Operation with the addition of:- Development of Croudace site introduces residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	High	Major	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
Viewpoint 7 View from Trowes Lane	Medium	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- View of partially constructed development in foreground.	Medium	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
Easting: 472442 Northing: 164364 Distance: 7m		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction with the addition of:- Proposed Development now complete.- Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development.	Medium	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per Operation with the addition of:- Development of Croudace site introduces glimpsed residential elements to other side of Trowes lane.	Medium	Moderate	Adverse, Permanent	Significant
Viewpoint 8 View from public footpath SWAL FP 16 Easting: 472510 Northing: 164268 Distance: 4m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 9 View from public footpath SWAL FP 17 Easting: 472642 Northing: 163963 Distance: 336m	Medium	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 10 View from Blackwater Valley Long Distance Footpath on Church Road	Medium	Construction (Year 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Glimpsed views of ridgelines possible	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
		Operation (Year 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As per construction.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
Easting: 472910 Northing: 164826 Distance: 351m		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
Viewpoint 11 View from Part Lane Easting: 472799 Northing: 164624 Distance: 133m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) - Glimpsed views of ridgelines possible	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
Viewpoint 12 View from Part Lane Easting: 472854 Northing: 164411 Distance: 118m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) - Glimpsed views of ridgelines possible	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse, Permanent	Not significant
Viewpoint 13 View from churchyard of All Saints Church, Swallowfield Easting: 473178 Northing: 164783 Distance: 543m	Medium/ High	Construction (Year 1) - View of partially constructed development in foreground.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction with the addition of: - Proposed Development now complete. - Mitigation planting softening the appearance of the Proposed Development.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 14 View from public footpath SWAL FP 15 Easting: 473227 Northing: 164481 Distance: 495m	Medium	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect

Receptor	Sensitivity	Change	Magnitude of change	Effect	Nature	Significance
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 15 View from public footpath SWAL FP 15 Easting: 473145 Northing: 164285 Distance: 429m	Medium	Construction (Year 1) Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 16 View from Nutbean Lane Cemetery near Blackwater Valley Long Distance Footpath Easting: 473614 Northing: 164272 Distance: 891m	Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 17 View from public bridleway SWAL BW 29 Easting: 474494 Northing: 164986 Distance: 1847m	Medium/ Low	Construction (Year 1) - Proposed development not visible to casual observer due to existing vegetation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Viewpoint 18 View from public footpath SHIN FP 22 Easting: 472494 Northing: 166108 Distance: 1558m	Medium	Construction (Year 1) - Site distant and obscured by vegetation, topography and built form.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Operation (Year 15) - As per construction.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
		Cumulative (Year 15) - As per operation.	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 This report accompanies an Outline Planning Application for the construction of up to 79 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), together with associated infrastructure and landscaping (includes access proposals, with all other matters to be reserved for later approval).

8.2 The site is located on the southern edge of Swallowfield, east of Trowes Lane and is approximately 5.7ha. The majority of the Site is rough grazing land with approximately 1.5Ha of mature woodland in the south of the Site.

8.3 Internally, the Site has no notable or rare features.

8.4 The Site is privately owned, contains no public rights of way (PRoW) and is not publicly accessible.

8.5 The Site is not considered to be a valued landscape as protected by §187a of the NPPF based upon the guidance given in Box 5.1 of GLVIA3 and the Landscape Institute's TGN 02/21. Internally, the Site has no notable or rare features.

8.6 The Site is located within Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2019) Character Area I2: 'Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland'. The Site is atypical of the character area.

8.7 The landscape strategy includes retaining and enhancing existing vegetation, introducing new planting, improving biodiversity, and integration with the wider landscape through tree and scrub planting.

8.8 The introduction of public open space, informal walking routes around the site including through the southern woodland and opportunities for play provides a significant benefit to leisure and amenity upon completion.

8.9 Significant landscape effects during construction are confined to the ZSV and reflect the transition from grassland field to residential use. The only significantly adversely affected landscape receptors are the Site Condition and Site Landscape Character.

8.10 There are no significant effects upon the Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment character areas.

8.11 Visibility is highly restricted by existing built-form, hedgerows, woodland and trees. The Zone of Significant Visibility (ZSV) extends approximately 10ha. Two visual receptors that lie on the or near the Site boundary would experience significant adverse effects during construction. Beyond these viewpoints no visual effects of any consequence are predicted.

8.12 Effects during operation remain broadly similar to those during construction, although maturing vegetation will aid integration into the surroundings.

8.13 The predicted visual effects would be limited, localised and experienced over a limited geographical area.

8.14 The consented Croudace development immediately opposite the Site across Trowes Lane will result in 81 dwellings on that site.

8.15 The Croudace site is almost identical to the Site in terms of its landscape character and context: both are presently medium sized, rough grazing fields with woodland to the South and modern development on the edge of Swallowfield and are highly enclosed within the landscape with limited influence on the surrounding landscape.

8.16 The Appeal Inspector concluded on Landscape, at paragraph 20 of the appeal decision,

"Once planting has matured, I consider that the effect of the development on the landscape would be moderately adverse in terms of its local impact, and at most slightly adverse in terms of its wider impact on the landscape. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the landscape and would therefore conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Local Plan, which seek to retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape, but only to the limited extent outlined above."

8.17 The same conclusions on impact and limited impact on local plan policy should therefore be applied to this Site.

Table 8.1 - Summary of Residual Landscape and Visual Effects

Description of Impact/Effect	Geographical Level of Importance of Issue*					Impact	Nature	Significance
	I	N	R	D	L			
Construction Stage								
Site Landscape Character				•		Negative	Temporary	Significant
Local Landscape Character			•	•		Negligible	Temporary	Negligible
Scenic Quality				•		Negative	Temporary	Not Significant
Tranquillity				•		Negative	Temporary	Not Significant
Site Condition				•		Negative	Temporary	Significant
Landscape Designations	•		•	•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Nature Conservation	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Cultural Heritage	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Leisure and Tourism				•		Beneficial	Temporary	Not Significant
Visual Effects				•		Negative	Temporary	Not Significant
Operational/Completed Development								
Site Landscape Character				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Local Landscape Character			•	•		Negligible	Permanent, Irreversible	Negligible
Scenic Quality				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Not Significant
Tranquillity				•		Negligible	Permanent, Irreversible	Negligible
Site Condition				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Landscape Designations	•		•	•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Nature Conservation	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Cultural Heritage	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Leisure and Tourism				•		Beneficial	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Visual Effects				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Not Significant
Cumulative Effects								
Site Landscape Character				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Local Landscape Character			•	•		Negligible	Permanent, Irreversible	Negligible
Scenic Quality				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Not Significant
Tranquillity				•		Negligible	Permanent, Irreversible	Negligible
Site Condition				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Landscape Designations	•		•	•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Nature Conservation	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Cultural Heritage	•			•		No Effect	No Effect	No Effect
Leisure and Tourism				•		Beneficial	Permanent, Irreversible	Significant
Visual Effects				•		Negative	Permanent, Irreversible	Not Significant

*International, National, Regional, District, Local

Appendix 1

Methodology and Glossary of Terms

1. Methodology

1.1 The following section provides a description of the survey and assessment methods used within this LVIA.

Assessment Terminology

1.2 Whilst the process of assessment is referred to as landscape and visual impact it is important to note the difference between 'impact' and 'effect'. The impact is what will happen i.e. the permanent loss of trees and hedgerows. The effect is the result of the impact i.e. opening of new views or a change in the perception of the local landscape character.

1.3 The term 'Study Area' relates to the area of land that has been described and assessed as part of this LVIA. The term 'Development' or 'Proposals' refer to all the elements of the proposed development. The term 'Site' refers to the area that contains the existing elements such as hedgerows, fields etc. within the planning application boundary. A full glossary of the terms used in this assessment is provided at the end of this appendix.

Guidance and Approach

1.4 This assessment has been prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition)⁶ and other guidance produced by the Countryside Agency⁷ and the former Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR)⁸. Guidance emphasises the responsibility of the landscape professional carrying out the assessment to ensure that the approach and methodology adopted is appropriate for the particular development to be assessed.

Overview of the Assessment Process

1.5 Professional judgement is a very important part of the LVIA process at every stage of assessment. That said, it is also important that professional judgement is exercised within an overall assessment framework which transparently sets out the steps in the assessment process which have resulted in the final assessment of the level of effects.

1.6 In accordance with the above guidance, the preparation of this assessment involved the following key stages:

- **Establishment of the landscape baseline** - through identification of the physical and perceptual landscape characteristics within the site and surrounding study area (in the form of landscape character assessment) and the relative value that is attached to the landscape by way of detailed desk-based study (to identify relevant landscape designations and related planning policy) and site field work.

⁶ Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and the Landscape Institute – 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' Third Edition 2013.

⁷ Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage – 'Landscape Character Assessment' 2002.

⁸ Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions- 'Lighting in the Countryside: Towards Good Practice'.

- **Establishment of the visual baseline** – through identification and analysis of the existing visual resource that may be affected including the extent and nature of principal views to the proposed development from visual receptors in the study area.
- **Identification of Potential effects** - The broad design parameters of the project were established at the time of commission in terms of the nature of the development. This provided sufficient information to identify the likely scale and nature of the changes to landscape characteristics and value as well as changes affecting visual amenity.
- **Identification of landscape and visual receptors** – These are assessed and assigned their sensitivity to change. The sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors is determined by a combination of their value, and their susceptibility to change. (i.e. their ability to accommodate the proposed change without resulting in overly negative effects).
- **Identification of mitigating measures** – Iterative development of the proposals and/ or mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or offset identified adverse effects. Mitigation measures have been considered in relation to 'Primary' measures (inherent) which form part of the design process and 'Secondary' measures (foreseeable) designed to address any residual adverse effects of development.
- **Assessment of the final scheme design** – Assessment of the magnitude and significance of the effects of the proposals during the construction stage, during operations and completion (restoration).

Extent of Study Area

1.7 The definition of a Study Area is an important part of a landscape and visual impact assessment as it describes the predicted maximum geographical extents within which potential environmental effects may occur and which are assessed for their significance.

1.8 The Study Area is determined by a two-stage process: a desk study to identify any relevant landscape designations and sensitive receptors in the landscape surrounding the Site and a field survey to assess the limits of potential significant visibility. The latter is informed by a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) study in which views of the proposals would be confined.

1.9 Following field surveys it was apparent that the visibility of the proposals in the wider landscape is highly limited and to limit the Study Area to the ZSV would limit the ability of the assessment to consider non-visual affects of the proposed development. As such the Study Area was defined as the area enclosed by The Street, Part Lane and Basingstoke Road/B3349. Field surveys identified that beyond this distance no significant effects would be experienced.

Site Surveys

1.10 The Site and surrounding area was visited on 25th August 2025 in order to inform the LVIA and gather photography. The survey was undertaken during summer and therefore do not represent a 'worst case' scenario of the Site to be taken.

1.11 A total of 18 locations were selected and used as representative viewpoints. These were points both within the site and the surrounding landscape with potential views. They represent a range of potential visual receptors.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assessment of Landscape Effects

Landscape Baseline

- 1.12 The landscape baseline is the description of the existing environmental qualities of the landscape receptors and the landscape as a whole against which any future changes can be measured or landscape effects predicted and assessed.
- 1.13 The landscape baseline is established by considering both a desk study of existing sources and field work to identify and record the character of the landscape and the existing elements and features as well as the perceptual and aesthetic factors which contribute to it.
- 1.14 Landscape character and value are separately identified. This is done in order to distinguish between the ability of a landscape to physically accommodate a development in terms of landform, landcover and land use, as opposed to consideration of effects on valued aspects of the landscape which are more subjective in nature.

Landscape Character

- 1.15 Existing Landscape Character Assessments are critically judged for their applicability to the application site and wider study area.
- 1.16 Typically, the landscape baseline will identify and describe the elements that make up the landscape in the study area, namely:
 - **Physical Influences:** Geology, Landform/ Topography, Soils, Drainage.
 - **Land Cover:** Vegetation, Tree Cover, Built Form.
 - **Human Influences:** Land use and Management, Field Pattern, Method of Enclosure, Settlement Character, Building Character.

Landscape Value

- 1.17 As part of describing the landscape baseline the value of the potentially affected landscape is established. This is done on an element by element basis within the assessment.
- 1.18 Existing landscape designations are an indication of higher landscape value and are identified through desk study. It should be noted that a lack of formal designation does not immediately make the value of a landscape of low importance.
- 1.19 The value for both designated and undesignated landscapes is assessed during the field work stage. Box 5.1 of GLVIA3 guidance is used as the basis of the assessment of landscape value.
- 1.20 Value is presented on a three-point scale of High, Medium, and Low. Split grades may be possible where resulting value falls between two grade levels. Table APP 1.1 below gives an indication of the value assigned to various landscape designations.

Table APP 1.1 Landscape Receptor Value

Designations	Description	Value
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Landscape Designations • National Heritage Designations 	Areas by virtue of their attractive landscape have national importance and or national heritage assets that either themselves or via their setting have natural links to the landscape.	High – due to national importance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Landscape Designations • Regional Heritage Designations 	Areas designated at a county or local level on the basis of the quality of the landscape to the region and or the basis of the heritage importance including matters of setting and views.	High/Medium Due to regional/ local importance.
• Local Landscape Designations	Area designated at a local level to reflect the importance of a landscape and or area at a local level.	High/Medium/ Low Subject to their assessed importance within the locality.
• No Formal Designation	Local importance of undesignated land judged as part of assessment process.	High/ Medium/ Low subject to their assessed importance locally.

Landscape Susceptibility

1.21 Landscape Susceptibility is the ability of an identified landscape receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences on the baseline conditions of that individual receptor.

1.22 Susceptibility of a landscape receptor to change is specific to the type of development being proposed in that particular area to ensure relevancy to the assessment. Where noted, the definition for the grades of susceptibility is described in Table APP 1.2 below.

Table APP 1.2 Landscape Receptor Susceptibility

Grade	Description
High	Little or no ability to accommodate the proposed development without adverse consequences on the retention of the existing landscape baseline.
Medium	Some ability to accommodate the proposed development without adverse consequences on the retention of the existing landscape baseline.
Low	An ability to accommodate the proposed development without adverse consequences on the retention of the existing landscape baseline.

1.23 It should be noted that the relationship between susceptibility to change and value can be complex and is not linear. For example, a highly valued landscape (such as an AONB) may have a low susceptibility to change due to both the characteristics of the landscape and/or the nature of the proposed change.

Landscape Sensitivity

1.24 Landscape sensitivity is derived from combining the judgements on landscape value and landscape susceptibility together. It is itself then carried forward to determine the significance of effect.

1.25 The assessment provides a clear rationale for both the landscape receptor's existing value and its susceptibility to change arising from the type of development proposed. The rationale is the record of why a receptor's sensitivity has been graded in a particular way.

1.26 The determination of sensitivity is based on professional judgement, however, high value/ high susceptibility receptors are likely to be highly sensitive to change, with lower value and/or low susceptibility receptors being likely to be of low sensitivity to change. A three-point scale is used to define landscape receptor sensitivity. Split grades are used when resulting sensitivity falls between two grades. Table APP 1.3 provides a description of the grades of sensitivity along with examples of typical indicators.

Table APP 1.3 Landscape Receptor Sensitivity

Grade	Description	Typical indicators
High	A landscape area with a particularly distinctive character and sense of place. Landscape characteristics that make a notable contribution to a landscape area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly valued for its scenic quality. • Highly valued for its landscape character. • Designed landscape of historical importance. • Strong heritage or cultural associations. • Appreciated as a recreational resource. • Landscape characteristics that cannot be readily replaced. • Landscape in good condition.
Medium	A landscape area with some distinctive sense of place and character but not nationally rare. Landscape characteristics that make a positive contribution to a landscape area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some scenic quality with some discordant scenic elements. • Recognisable landscape character that has value. • A recognisable area/ tract of designed landscape. • Some heritage and/or associations. • Some tolerance of the type of proposed development. • Some appreciation as a recreational recourse. • Landscape elements than could be replaced. • Landscape in reasonable conditions.
Low	A landscape area with no distinctive sense of place or notable character and not locally rare. Landscape characteristics that make a limited positive contribution to a landscape area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited or no scenic quality. • Landscape character is ordinary or weak. • Tolerance to the type of development. • Not a recognisable designed landscape. • No known heritage or cultural associations. • No obvious appreciation as recreational resource. • Landscape characteristics could be readily replaced. • Landscape in poor condition.

1.27 To allow easier inspection and review of the assessment process Table APP 1.4 below is used to aid consistency in the definition of sensitivity.

Table APP 1.4 Sensitivity Matrix

Category	Susceptibility				
	High	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium/ Low	Low

Value	High	High	High	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium
	Medium/ High	High	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium	Medium/ Low
	Medium	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium	Medium/ Low	Medium/ Low
	Medium/ Low	Medium	Medium	Medium/ Low	Medium/ Low	Low
	Low	Medium	Medium/ Low	Medium/ Low	Low	Low

Magnitude of Landscape Effects

1.28 The magnitude of effect on landscape receptors is assessed by considering a number of factors. The factors considered are listed below and include:

1. Size or scale of the proposed development;
2. Geographical extent of the effect;
3. Contrast or integration with the existing landscape character;
4. Duration of effects; and
5. Reversibility.

1.29 The size or scale of the magnitude of landscape effects relates to the loss or addition of features to the particular landscape receptor likely to be caused by the development. The assessment takes into account:

- The extent/proportion of the landscape element that is lost or added;
- The contribution of that element to the character of the landscape;
- The revised setting of the landscape or landscape element resulting from the development;
- The degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape receptor are altered; and
- Whether the effect changes the key characteristics of the landscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.

1.30 The geographical extent over which the landscape effects occur is distinct from the size or scale. For example, large scale effects may be limited to the immediate site area. The geographical extent, where noted, is defined as:

- Wide - Influencing several landscape character areas.
- Medium - Landscape character area in which the site lies.
- Local - The Site and immediate surrounds.
- Site - Site level of the development itself.

1.31 The duration of effects is classified as short, medium or long term. Unless otherwise stated the durations are defined as:

- Short term: 0-5 years
- Medium term: 5 – 15 years
- Long term: beyond 15 years

1.32 Reversibility is different from duration and passes a judgement about whether the landscape effect is reversible or not. It is judged on a scale of: reversible, partially reversible and permanent.

1.33 The above factors are considered together to derive an overall magnitude of change for each receptor, which is determined by the use of professional judgement. The magnitude of effect is presented on a three-point scale of High, Medium and Low. Split grades may be possible where resulting magnitude falls between two grade levels. A description of the magnitude categories is described below in Table APP 1.5.

Table APP 1.5 Magnitude of Change for Landscape Receptors

Grade	Description
High	The development would result in a substantial alteration to the key landscape character or characteristics of the receptors.
Medium	The development would result in a partial loss of or alteration to key landscape character or characteristics of the receptor
Low	The development would result in a minor alteration to landscape character or characteristics of the receptor.

Assessment of Visual Effects

Visual Baseline

1.34 The visual baseline is the description of the existing qualities of views and visual amenity for the individual visual receptors against which any future changes can be assessed or visual effects predicted and assessed.

1.35 The visual baseline is established by considering both a desk study of existing sources such as landscape character assessments and OS mapping to identify prominent or promoted views and field work to identify and record the character and extent of the views and the features and aesthetic and perceptual factors which contribute to the general visual amenity.

Value attached to views and visual amenity

1.36 The assessment considers the interest or reason a receptor has in experiencing a view and the value that they can reasonably attach to it.

1.37 The value attached to views is described as either High, Medium, or Low. Split grades may be possible where resulting value falls between two grade levels. Table APP 1.6 below gives an indication of the value assigned to views and visual amenity.

Table APP 1.6 Visual Receptor Value

Grade	Description
High	Views from and/or visual amenity associated with viewpoints of regional or national importance, popular visitor attractions where views and visual amenity form a key part of the attraction or route. Inclusion within guidebooks or cultural references.
Medium	Views from and/or the visual amenity associated with viewpoints of district or local importance, local visitor attractions or public open spaces and routes where views and visual amenity form an integral part of the attraction.
Low	Views from and/or visual amenity associated with every day locations or routes that do not benefit from any designation or cultural associations.

1.38 Existing landscape designations are a general indication of visual value but this cannot be assumed and must be confirmed by assessment. Likewise, the lack of an existing designation does not mean a view is without value. Value for designated and undesignated views is assessed during the field survey.

Susceptibility of visual receptor to change

1.39 Susceptibility of visual receptors to change in views and visual amenity is derived from the consideration of:

1. The occupation or reason why one is experiencing the view or area; and
2. The amount of interest or attention one may have in the view and appearance of the area.

1.40 Judgements on visual susceptibility are presented on a three-step scale of Low, Medium or High. Split grades may be possible where resulting value falls between two grade levels. A description and indication of typical receptors associated with the grades of visual susceptibility are described in Table APP 1.7 below.

Table APP 1.7 Visual Receptor Susceptibility

Scale	Description of susceptibility	Typical Receptors
High	Little or no ability to accommodate change caused by development without adverse consequences for the visual receptor group experiencing the view/ and or general visual amenity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential occupiers • People who are engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is on the view e.g. walkers, visitors to heritage attractions, public park users, travellers on recognised scenic routes. • Communities where setting of an area contributes to general visual amenity.
Medium	Some ability to accommodate change caused by development without adverse consequences for the visual receptor group experiencing the view/ and or general visual amenity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users of transport routes; and • People who are engaged in outdoor recreation where the view is not the primary focus of attention.
Low	An ability to accommodate change caused by development without adverse consequences for the visual receptor group experiencing the view/ and or general visual amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People at work; or • Going about business that is not focussing on the views or general visual amenity.

Visual Sensitivity

1.41 Visual Sensitivity is derived from combining the judgements of value of a view or visual amenity and susceptibility of the visual receptor together. It is itself carried forward to determine the significance of visual effect.

1.42 The assessment provides a clear rationale for both the existing value of the view or visual amenity and its susceptibility to change arising from the type of development proposed. The rationale is the record of why a visual receptor's sensitivity has been graded in a particular way.

1.43 Determination of sensitivity is based on professional judgement, however, high value/high susceptibility receptors are likely to be highly sensitive to change, with lower value and/or low susceptibility receptors being likely to be of low sensitivity to change. A three-point scale is used to define visual receptor sensitivity. Split grades are used when resulting sensitivity falls between two grades. As with the determination of landscape sensitivity, to allow easier inspection and review of the assessment process, the sensitivity matrix at **Table 2.4** is used to aid consistency in the definition of visual sensitivity. Table APP 1.8 below provides a description of the grades of visual sensitivity along with typical indicators.

Table APP 1.8 Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Grade	Description	Typical Indicator
High	A highly attractive view or area with an obvious attraction and lack of discordant features.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highly valued for its scenic quality• Low tolerance to the type of proposed development.• Designed landscape of historical importance.• Strong heritage /cultural associations.• Focus of a recreational resource.• Views and amenity that cannot be readily replaced.• Potentially benefiting from a national regional or local landscape designation.
Medium	An attractive view or area with some attraction and limited discordant features.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some scenic quality• Some tolerance to the type of proposed development.• A recognised area or piece of designed landscape.• Some heritage and/or cultural associations.• Some appreciation as a recreational resource.• Views and amenity can be recreated.• Potentially benefiting from regional or local landscape or heritage designation.
Low	An ordinary view with no distinguishing visual character or an area with a general lack of positive visual features.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited or no particular scenic quality or elements.• Tolerance to the type of proposed development.• Not a recognised designed landscape.• No known heritage or cultural associations.• No obvious appreciation as a recreational resource.• Views and amenity that can be readily replaced or recreated.• Unlikely to be subject to landscape or heritage designation.

Viewpoint Selection

1.44 Viewpoints are selected to illustrate the views and visual amenity experienced by the different visual receptors. In selecting the viewpoints, the following factors are taken into account:

- Viewing distance and direction – short, medium, long distance or oblique;
- The nature of the viewing experience – static views, views along a route;
- The type of view- glimpsed, panorama, screened, partial; and
- The potential for cumulative views in conjunction with other existing and proposed development.

Visual Presentation Methods

1.45 Presentation methods for the visual impact assessment comprise panoramic photography consisting of a series of stitched single shot photographs.

1.46 All photographs are taken using a 20-megapixel full-frame Canon EOS 6D with a fixed 50mm lens as recommended by Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 – ‘Visual Representation of Development Proposals’.

1.47 Photographs are taken in landscape format with sufficient overlap for stitching. Where it has been necessary to raise or lower the horizon line by cropping, this has been stated. A minimum of three clear reference points are included in each panoramic view to enable the accurate production of the photomontage. GPS co-ordinates for each photomontage viewpoint are taken.

1.48 Photographs are stitched in cylindrical projection. Once stitched the resulting panoramic image may be scaled down 50% before the preparation of the photomontage was started but only if the file size was unmanageable. The images have not been cropped. The 3D model used for the photomontage, whether produced in SketchUp or LSS, is output at a 50mm equivalent focal length. The 3D model includes a minimum of 3 clear reference points in the view to fix the position of the proposals. Vertical height data is based on OS data, which may include some inherent inaccuracies, or survey data. An eye height of 1.6m is used.

1.49 The final photomontage is produced in Photoshop. The resulting photomontage is then cropped to a 90-degree view angle, up to an ideal maximum of 120 degrees. This is a guide and the proposals, and its relevant landscape, will determine the horizontal field of view from any given viewpoint.

1.50 Photomontage sheets are produced in InDesign using a 400mm viewing distance at A1. Guidance allows between 300mm to 500mm but recommends all montages prepared for a given site should be represented using the same viewing distance, where this is possible.

1.51 Information listed on each sheet included:

- Camera, lens focal length and horizontal field of view;
- Date, time and direction of view;
- The viewpoint’s height above ground level and OS grid coordinates;
- Recommended Viewing Distance; and
- Viewpoint Co-ordinates e.g. Eastings and Northing.

Magnitude of Visual Effects

1.52 The magnitude of visual effect is assessed by considering a number of factors. These typically include:

- **Size and scale of the change in view** – considering the loss or addition of features, changes in composition and consideration of the proportion of view occupied by the proposed development
- **Geographical extent of the effect** - angle of view, distance of the receptor to the development and the extent over which the changes would be visible.
- **Contrast or integration with the existing visual character** – possible areas of consideration include form, scale and mass, skyline effects, height, colour and texture.
- **Duration of visual effects**- 0-5 years short term, 5-15 years medium term and 15 years onwards long term.
- Reversibility.

1.53 The above factors are considered together to derive an overall magnitude of change for each receptor, which is determined by the use of professional judgement. The magnitude of visual change is categorised as either High, Medium or Low. Split grades between these categories can be used where the magnitude fits neither category. A description of the visual magnitude categories is shown in Table APP 1.9 below.

Table APP 1.9. Magnitude of Change for Visual Receptors

Grade	Description
High	The development would result in a substantial alteration to the identified view or visual amenity of an area, largely affect key visual features in the view or introduce new prominent features within the scene or alter the general composition and character of the view.
Medium	The development would result in a partial alteration to the identified view or visual amenity of an area, moderately affect key visual features in the view or introduce new features within the scene or alter some part of the composition and character of the view.
Low	The development would result in a minor alteration to the identified view or visual amenity of an area, may affect key visual features in the view or introduce new prominent features within the scene or alter some small part of the composition and character of the view.

Significance and nature of Effect on Landscape and Visual Receptors

1.54 The assessment of the significance of effect is derived by combining the judgements of sensitivity and magnitude of effect for each landscape and visual receptor along with a clear narrative of the reasoning behind the assessment. The significance of an effect can be beneficial, adverse or neutral, permanent or temporary.

- **Adverse effects** are those that would be damaging to the key characteristics arising from either their loss, reduction or introduction of uncharacteristic elements so as to degrade the quality and integrity of the landscape and/or visual resource.
- **Beneficial effects** are those that would result in an improvement in the key characteristics arising from improvement or introduction of new positive elements so as to improve the quality and integrity of the landscape and/or visual resource.
- **Neutral effects** are those effects that would maintain, on balance, the key characteristics and existing levels of the quality and integrity of the landscape and/or visual resource.

1.55 To aid consistency and allow easier inspection and review of results checklists, tables and matrices have been employed. These include the use of matrices for the determination of significance thresholds, whereby the predicted magnitude of an effect is assessed against the sensitivity of a given receptor. This provides an indication of the level or significance of an effect (see Table APP 1.10 below).

1.56 It should be noted that the table is only used as a 'guide' and never used to replace professional judgement, particularly in instances when assessing the nature of an effect (i.e. adverse, neutral or beneficial). Its purpose is solely to ensure consistency of approach and results.

Table APP 1.10 Significance of Effects Matrix

Category		Receptor Sensitivity			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Magnitude of Effect	High	Substantial	Major	Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

1.57 The intermediary categories of Minor Negligible, Minor Moderate and Moderate Major will be used where the significance of effect falls between the broad definitions outlined in Table APP 1.11 below.

Table APP 1.11 Significance of Effect

Significance of effect	Landscape	Visual
Substantial	The proposals will result in a total change in the key characteristics of the receptor or alterations to the quality and integrity of the landscape receptor such that the proposals are the dominant element markedly altering the baseline landscape context.	The proposals will result in a total change in view or introduce/ alter elements, features or characteristics where the baseline visual context markedly alters with the proposals becoming the dominant visual element.
Major	The proposals will result in a prominent change in the key characteristics of the receptor or alterations to the quality and integrity of the landscape receptor such that the proposals are one of the principle elements altering the baseline landscape context.	The proposals will result in a large change in view or introduce/ alter elements, features or characteristics where the baseline visual context alters with the proposals being one of the principal visual elements.
Moderate	The proposals will result in a notable change in the key characteristics of the receptor or partial alterations to the quality and integrity of the landscape receptor but where the baseline landscape context remains.	The proposals will result in a noticeable change in view or introduce/ alter elements, features or characteristics but where the baseline visual context remains.
Minor	The proposals will result in a small change in character of the receptor that is discernible but does not alter its key characteristics or will alter the quality	The proposals will result in a small change in view/ areas of visual amenity or introduce/ alter elements, features or

Significance of effect	Landscape	Visual
	and integrity of the landscape receptor in a small way.	characteristics but where the change is not prominent.
Negligible	No discernible change in the key characteristics of the landscape or alterations to the quality and integrity of the landscape receptor.	The proposals will result in some very small change in view/ areas visual amenity or introduce/ alter elements, features or characteristics in a barely perceptible way.

Glossary of Terms

(Derived from current IEMA/LI Guidelines with additional glossary)

Access land	Land where the public have access either by legal right or by informal agreement.
Baseline studies	Work done to determine and describe the environmental conditions against which any future changes can be measured or predicted and assessed.
Characterisation	The process of identifying areas of similar landscape character, classifying and mapping them and describing their character.
Characteristics	Elements, or combinations of elements, which make a contribution to distinctive landscape character.
Compensation	Measures devised to offset or compensate for residual adverse effects which cannot be prevented/avoided or further reduced.
Competent authority	The authority which determines the application for consent, permission, licence or other authorisation to proceed with a proposal. It is the authority that must consider the environmental information before granting any kind of authorisation.
Consultation bodies	Any body specified in the relevant EIA Regulations which the competent authority must consult in respect of an EIA, and which also has a duty to provide a scoping opinion and information.
Designated landscape	Areas of landscape identified as being of importance at international, national or local levels, either defined by statute or identified in development plans or other documents.
Development	Any proposal that results in a change to the landscape and/or visual environment.
Direct effect	An effect that is directly attributable to the proposed development.
'Do nothing' situation	Continued change or evolution in the landscape in the absence of the proposed development.
Ecosystem services	The benefits provided by ecosystems that contribute to making human life both possible and worth living. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (www.unep.org/maweb/en/index.aspx) grouped ecosystem services into four broad categories: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. supporting services, such as nutrient cycling, oxygen production and soil formation – these underpin the provision of the other 'service' categories;2. provisioning services, such as food, fibre, fuel and water;3. regulating services, such as climate regulation, water purification and flood protection;4. cultural services, such as education, recreation and aesthetic value.
Elements	Individual parts which make up the landscape, such as, for example, trees, hedges and buildings.
Enhancement	Proposals that seek to improve the landscape resource and the visual amenity of the proposed development site and its wider setting, over and above its baseline condition.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	The process of gathering environmental information; describing a development; identifying and describing the likely significant environmental effects of the project; defining ways of preventing/avoiding, reducing, or offsetting or compensating for any adverse effects; consulting the general public and specific bodies with responsibilities for the environment; and presenting the results to the competent authority to inform the decision on whether the project should proceed.
Environmental Statement	A statement that includes the information that is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development and which the applicant can, having regard in particular to current knowledge and methods of assessment, reasonably be required to compile, but that includes at least the information referred to in the EIA Regulations.
Feature	Particularly prominent or eye-catching elements in the landscape, such as tree clumps, church towers or wooded skylines OR a particular aspect of the project proposals.

Geographical Information System (GIS)	A system that captures, stores, analyses, manages and presents data linked to location. It links spatial information to a digital database.
Green Infrastructure (GI)	Networks of green spaces and watercourses and water bodies that connect rural areas, villages, towns and cities.
Heritage	The historic environment and especially valued assets and qualities such as historic buildings and cultural traditions.
Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC and Historic Land-use Assessment (HLA)	Historic characterisation is the identification and interpretation of the historic dimension of the present-day landscape or townscape within a given area. HLC is the term used in England and Wales, HLA is the term used in Scotland.
Indirect effects	Effects that result indirectly from the proposed project as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects.
Iterative design process	The process by which project design is amended and improved by successive stages of refinement which respond to growing understanding of environmental issues.
Key characteristics	Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place.
Land cover	The surface cover of the land, usually expressed in terms of vegetation cover or lack of it. Related to but not the same as land use.
Land use	What land is used for, based on broad categories of functional land cover, such as urban and industrial use and the different types of agriculture and forestry.
Landform	The shape and form of the land surface which has resulted from combinations of geology, geomorphology, slope, elevation and physical processes.
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)	A tool used to identify and assess the likely significance of the effects of change resulting from development both on the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity.
Landscape capacity	The degree to which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate change without unacceptable adverse effects on its character. Capacity is likely to vary according to the type and nature of change being proposed.
Landscape character	A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.
Landscape Character Areas (LCAs)	These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular landscape type.
Landscape Character Assessment (LCA)	The process of identifying and describing variation of the character of the landscape and using this information to assist in managing change in the landscape. It seeks to identify and explain the unique combination of elements and features that make landscapes distinctive. The process results in the production of a Landscape Character Assessment.
Landscape Character Types (LCTs)	These are distinct types of landscape that are relatively homogeneous in character. They are generic in nature in that they may occur in different areas in different parts of the country, but wherever they occur they share broadly similar combinations of geology, topography, drainage patterns, vegetation and historical land use and settlement pattern, and perceptual and aesthetic attributes.
Landscape classification	A process of sorting the landscape into different types using selected criteria but without attaching relative values to different sorts of landscape.
Landscape effects	Effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right.

Landscape features	A prominent eye-catching element, e.g. wooded hill top and church spire.
Landscape quality (condition)	A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements.
Landscape receptors	Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Landscape strategy	The overall vision and objectives for what the landscape should be like in the future, and what is thought to be desirable for a particular landscape type or area as a whole, usually expressed in formally adopted plans and programmes or related documents.
Landscape value	The relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society. A landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons.
Magnitude (of effect)	A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration.
Parameter	A limit or boundary which defines the scope of a particular process or activity.
Perception	Combines the sensory (that we receive through our senses) with the cognitive (our knowledge and understanding gained from many sources and experiences).
Photomontage	A visualisation which superimposes an image of a proposed development upon a photograph or series of photographs.
Receptors	See Landscape receptors and Visual receptors.
Scoping	The process of identifying the issues to be addressed by an EIA. It is a method of ensuring that an EIA focuses on the important issues and avoids those that are considered to be less significant.
Seascape	Landscapes with views of the coast or seas, and coasts and adjacent marine environments with cultural, historical and archaeological links with each other.
Sensitivity	A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.
Significance	A measure of the importance or gravity of the environmental effect, defined by significance criteria specific to the environmental topic.
Stakeholders	The whole constituency of individuals and groups who have an interest in a subject or place.
Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	The process of considering the environmental effects of certain public plans, programmes or strategies at a strategic level.
Susceptibility	The ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences.
Time depth	Historical layering – the idea of landscape as a ‘palimpsest’, a much written-over manuscript.
Townscape	The character and composition of the built environment including the buildings and the relationships between them, the different types of urban open space, including green spaces, and the relationship between buildings and open spaces.
Tranquillity	A state of calm and quietude associated with peace, considered to be a significant asset of landscape.
Visual amenity	The overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of the people living, working, recreating, visiting or travelling through an area.

Visual effects	Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.
Visual receptors	Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Visualisation	A computer simulation, photomontage or other technique illustrating the predicted appearance of the development.
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)	A map, usually digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible.
Zone of Significant Visibility (ZSV)	Area within a ZTV from which a proposed development is likely to draw the eye of a casual observer, based on field observations.

Appendix 2
Photographic Field Survey Record

Appendix 3
Wokingham Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment (2019) (extracts)

Appendix 4
Illustrative Photomontages