

4. Appraisal of Effects of the Proposals

Introduction

4.1 This section considers how the Proposals illustrated in the accompanying planning application documents will affect the townscape and visual receptors identified in the baseline study.

4.2 For each townscape character and representative view, the magnitude of impact which will be experienced is described. The magnitude of impact considers the effects in terms of duration, reversibility, geographical extent and size or scale. The Proposals are considered to be long term and permanent and therefore, to avoid unnecessary duplication, duration and reversibility are not discussed further.

The Proposals

4.3 The Proposals are for 10 residential units across an additional 1.5 storeys at Ascot House.

4.4 The supporting Design and Access Statement, prepared by the project architects, illustrates how the massing and scale of the Proposals has been carefully considered and designed in response to the Site’s opportunities and constraints and its context. Throughout the design development, consultation has been undertaken with WBC.

- 4.5 The development of the Proposals has been guided by a set of key principles to ensure they can be successfully integrated into the receiving townscape:
- Extend an existing building in a sensitive way;
 - Create a building of architectural merit;
 - Respect local form and character through an appropriate choice of form and materiality.
 - Integrate an upward extension which is subservient to the existing building;
 - Contribute to a sense of arrival into the town centre without creating a landmark;
 - Incorporate roof profiles which contribute to the existing varied town centre roofscape;
 - Respect the townscape hierarchy established by the Premier Inn; and
 - Retain the green character of Finchampstead Road, identified by WBC as a Green Route Enhancement Area.

Townscape Effects

4.6 The trees on the Finchampstead Road frontage are to be retained and they will not experience any effects as a result of the Proposals.

4.7 The Site falls within TCA 1 Elm Fields.

4.8 The height and form of the Proposals respond sensitively to the context, providing a transition between the larger scale, non-residential uses present within the TCA and the finer residential grain of the adjacent townscape character area to the east, TCA 3 Langborough Residential. This is demonstrated in the Context Elevations (Figures 4.1 and 4.2) and the representative views (Appendix B of this report).

4.9 The Proposals retain the green frontage and the proposed extension to Ascot House will not appear overly dominant. The massing of Ascot House provides a gradual increase in scale from the lower rise residential form to the east whilst remaining subservient to the larger scale built form to the west, such as the Premier Inn.

4.10 The pitched roof profile complements the existing varied town centre roofscape and the materials palettes complements the materiality and form of the context.

4.11 It is considered that the Proposals will result in a low magnitude of impact on TCA 1 and the effect would be minor and neutral.

4.12 Limited partial to glimpsed short to medium distance views of the roof line of the Proposals may be possible from limited locations to the east in TCA 3 Langborough Residential. Where the Proposals are visible, the additional variation in the proposed buildings massing will be imperceptible in the context of the existing skyline. Overall, it is considered that the Proposals will have a low magnitude of impact on TCA 3 and the effect will be minor and neutral.

4.13 It is considered that intervening built form, transport infrastructure and tree cover will prevent views of the Proposals from TCA 2 Wokingham Town Centre and TCA 4 Wokingham South.

4.14 It is therefore predicted that the Proposals will have no impact on TCAs 2 and 4 and that there will therefore be no effects on their character.

4.15 The conclusions on townscape effects are summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 – Summary of Townscape Effects

Townscape Character Area	Sensitivity	Description of change	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
TCA 1 Elm Fields	Low	Additional height to existing building - no increase in footprint	Low	Minor and neutral
TCA 2 Wokingham Town Centre	Low	None	None	None
TCA 3 Langborough Residential	Low	Minor change to the roofline discernible from limited locations	Low	Minor and neutral
TCA 4 Wokingham South	Low	None	None	None



Figures 4.1 & 4.2 - Context Elevations looking south and looking north

Visual Effects

4.16 On completion of the Proposals, visibility of Ascot House would increase from some locations due to the proposed increase in height.

4.17 In near views, the Proposals will be visible in linear views from roads orientated towards it such as Kendrick Close, Finchampstead Road and Wellington Road (representative views 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7) and from neighbouring properties which have windows or gardens orientated towards it, such as on Kendrick Close.

4.18 From further afield, views will be obscured by intervening visual barriers, principally built form (representative views 4 and 6). The Proposals will not be visible from the Conservation Area, from public footpaths or from areas of open space.

4.19 In summary, whilst the Proposals will be visible from certain vantage points, built form, in some cases of a large scale, is already a feature in the views. The proposed extension to Ascot House will not appear out of scale or introduce disproportionate form or overly intrusive elements to the roofline.

4.20 Where effects on the visual receptor representative views resulting from the Proposals have been identified, these will be direct, permanent and long term.

4.21 A full description of the magnitude of impact and effect on each representative view is provided in Appendix B and summarised in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 – Summary of visual effects

Representative View	Sensitivity	Description of change in view	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
1) Kendrick Close	Low	Additional height to existing building - no increase in footprint	High	Moderate and neutral
2) Finchampstead Road	Low	Glimpses of additional built form, screened by trees	Negligible	None
3) Wellington Road - entrance to Holiday Inn	Low	Additional height to existing building, partially screened by trees	Medium	Moderate and neutral
4) Denmark Street (Wokingham Town Centre Conservation Area)	Medium	None	None	None
5) Wellington Road - junction with Earle Crescent	Low	Additional height to existing building, partially screened by trees	Low	Minor and neutral
6) Denmark Street Car Park (Wokingham Town Centre Conservation Area)	Medium	None	None	None
7) Junction of Wellington Road/access to Superbowl	Low	Additional height to existing building, partially screened by trees	Medium	Moderate and neutral



5. Summary and Conclusions

5 Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

5.1 This TVIA has been founded on a thorough study of the Site and its townscape setting, and has been carried out in accordance with an assessment methodology based on Landscape Institute guidance (GLVIA3).

5.2 The Proposals are for the extension of an existing building to create ten additional residential units. The Proposals involve a 1.5 storey extension, with three additional units on the existing first floor and seven units on the proposed second floor. The Proposals do not extend the footprint of the existing building.

5.3 The design proposals reference local architectural detailing, style and character and have evolved in consultation with WBC. They have been informed by the following design objectives:

- Extend an existing building in a sensitive way;
- Create a building of architectural merit;
- Respect local form and character through an appropriate choice of form and materiality.
- Integrate an upward extension which is subservient to the existing building;
- Contribute to a sense of arrival into the town centre without creating a landmark;
- Incorporate roof profiles which contribute to the existing varied town centre roofscape;
- Respect the townscape hierarchy established by the Premier Inn; and
- Retain the green character of Finchampstead Road, identified by WBC as a Green Route Enhancement Area.

Baseline situation

5.4 The Site is bounded by roads and residential development. It contains a single two storey building in residential use with associated hard standing - Ascot House. There are mature trees on the Finchampstead Road frontage which are a landscape feature and are to be retained.

5.5 The baseline appraisal has established that the Site is not covered by any designation which would denote townscape value at the national, regional or local level and there are no heritage assets within its boundaries.

5.6 Four townscape character areas (TCAs) which could experience indirect effects as a result of the Proposals have been identified; the sensitivity of the reciving townscape is assessed as low to medium.

5.7 The field studies identified that due to the topography within the study area and the quantum of intervening visual barriers - predominantly built form - the Site has a small visual envelope.

5.8 Where there are existing views of Ascot House, these are limited to short distance views from Kendrick Close and other adjoining roads, and assumed views from some neighbouring properties. No views of Ascot House were identified from the Wokingham Conservation Area to the north of the Site, public footpaths or areas of public open space.

5.9 Seven representative views were identified as an appropriate selection to demonstrate the visibility of the Site and therefore the potential visibility of the Proposals and to inform the assessment of townscape and visual effects.

Townscape Character Effects

5.10 Following completion of the Proposals, there will be minor and neutral effects on the receiving townscape and no effects on the Wokingham Conservation Area.

5.11 The Proposals retain the green frontage to Finchampstead Road and the proposed extension to Ascot House will not appear overly dominant. The massing of Ascot House provides a gradual increase in scale from the lower rise residential form to the east whilst remaining subservient to the larger scale built form to the west, such as the Premier Inn.

5.12 The pitched roof profile complements the existing varied town centre roofscape and the materials palettes complements the materiality and form of the context.

Viusal Effects

5.13 The Proposals will be visible in some local views, albeit often screened by intervening tree cover. The proposed extension to Ascot House will be experienced in the context of existing built form. Visual effects will range from moderate and neutral for users of local roads and premises to none.

5.14 Ascot House will not be visible from the Conservation Area.

GLOSSARY

Accurate Visual Representation (AVR) A visualisation which superimposes an image of a proposed development upon a photograph or series of photographs.

Feature Components of site or its setting such as the public realm, building form and mass, vegetation, topography or land use, OR a particular aspect of the project proposal.

Heritage The historic environment and especially valued assets and qualities such as historic buildings and cultural traditions.

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.

Key characteristics Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the townscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place.

Land use What land is used for based on broad categories of functional land cover, such as urban and industrial use.

Landform The shape and form of the land surface which has resulted from combinations of geology, geomorphology, slope, elevation and physical processes.

Landscape An area, as perceived by people, the character of which is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.

Magnitude (of impact) 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.

Receptors See Townscape receptors and Visual receptors.

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.

Susceptibility The ability of a defined townscape or visual receptor to accommodate the type of change proposed without undue negative consequences.

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.

Townscape character A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the townscape that makes one townscape different from another, rather than better or worse.

Townscape Character Areas (TCAs) These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular townscape type.

Townscape effects Effects on the townscape as a resource in its own right.

Townscape quality (condition) A measure of the physical state of the townscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the townscape and the condition of individual elements.

Townscape receptors Defined aspects of the townscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.

Townscape value The relative value that is attached to different townscapes.

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.

APPENDIX A - APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

Baseline townscape assessment

A.1 The baseline assessment of townscape receptors includes a mixture of desk study and field work to identify and record the character of the townscape. This includes a summary of associated elements, features and aesthetic and perceptual factors which contribute to the townscape. Once these factors are established the townscape receptors and its associated key characteristics are identified.

A.2 Defining distinct character areas which share common features and characteristics has been informed by gaining an understanding of the characteristics of the existing townscape situation (such as land form, land use, movement and urban grain). These areas have recognisable patterns of elements, which together create the particular sense of place for the site and the surrounding townscape.

Townscape Value

A.3 The value attached to these townscape receptors is then considered and assessed using the criteria set out in Table A.1. This is based on and takes into account whether the area in question is covered by a townscape designation at a national, regional or local level. Good practice guidance states that undesignated landscapes and townscapes can, under certain circumstances, have value and should be judged drawing upon the following list:

- Landscape, or townscape, quality and scenic quality;
- Rarity and representativeness – presence of a rare or important element or feature;
- Conservation interest – presence of wildlife, earth science or archaeology or historical and cultural interest;
- Recreational value;
- Perceptual aspects – notably wildness and/or tranquillity; and
- Associations - with people or events that contribute to perceptions of natural beauty.

Baseline Visual assessment

A.4 The baseline assessment of visual effects establishes the area from which the Site and the Proposals may be visible; the different groups of people who may experience the views of the Proposals; and the areas where views can or are likely to be possible; and the nature of these views.

A.5 Based on desktop study of mapping information and fieldwork to interpret views towards the Site, the groups of people who are likely to experience views towards the Site have been identified and their associated viewing points have been referred to within the assessment as visual receptors. These are typically locations such as employment areas, public highways, public rights of way, areas of open space, residential properties and formally identified viewpoints.

Table A.1 – Criteria for assessing Townscape Value

Value	Typical criteria	Typical scale of importance/rarity	Typical examples
Exceptional	A townscape in excellent condition; of high importance, rarity and high scenic quality. No potential for substitution	International	World Heritage Site
High	A townscape in very good condition; of high importance with good scenic quality and rarity. Limited potential for substitution	National, Regional, Local	National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and/or typically an area containing a number of listed buildings that included grade I or II*, and/or Registered Park and Gardens
Medium	A townscape in generally good condition; with moderate importance and scenic quality. Limited potential for substitution.	Regional, Local	Undesignated but value perhaps expressed through non-official publications and/or demonstrable use and/or local listing
Low	A townscape in poor condition or with low scenic quality and importance. Considerable potential for substitution.	Local	Areas identified as having some redeeming feature or features and possibly identified for improvement
Poor	A degraded townscape in poor condition and no scenic quality and low importance	Local	Areas identified for improvement/recovery

A.6 Seven representative views have been identified and they have been used to support this assessment’s findings.

A.7 The locations of the representative viewpoints take into account the following characteristics:

- Public viewpoints;
- Public highways;
- Townscape or transport nodes;
- Heritage features;
- Open spaces;
- Where the proposed development might be prominent, or visible from concentrations of residential properties;
- Places where people work; and
- Any other sensitive receptors.

A.8 The evaluation of the representative viewpoints has taken into account the following:

Table A.2 – Criteria for assessing Value of the Representative View

Value	Typical Criteria
Exceptional	The view from the representative viewpoint is: of a highly exceptional nature, identified with a designated heritage asset, or a planning policy designation; and/or mentioned in a number of guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature.
High	Where the views have a generally high scenic value. The view may be within, from or towards a designated heritage asset, or a planning policy designation; and/or mentioned in a number of guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature but there may be some incongruous features or elements within the view.
Medium	The view from the representative viewpoint has a view of scenic value, with moderate local importance and scenic quality: it is typically related to a non-designated heritage asset; and/or of local visual amenity importance. Limited potential for substitution of some elements within the view
Low	The view from the representative viewpoint is not related to a designated, or non-designated, heritage asset, or a planning designation; and/or mentioned in a guidebook or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature; and/or of little visual amenity importance. Considerable potential for substitution of some elements in the view.
Poor	The view from the representative viewpoint is unsightly and of low importance. Considerable potential for substitution of some or all elements in the view.

- Type and relative numbers of people, and their occupation or activity;
- Location, nature and characteristics;
- Nature, composition and characteristics of the views (including directions); and
- Elements which may interrupt, filter or otherwise influence the views.

A.9 The distance from the Site was also considered within the following definitions: adjacent; short being 1-to 500 m; medium being 500 m to 1 km; and long being 1km plus.

A.10 The extent of visibility of the Site from the identified visual receptor representative viewpoints is considered in light of the following criteria that seek to identify the proportion of the site visible from each viewpoint.

- No View - The Site is not visible (or difficult to perceive)
- Glimpse - The Site, or proposed development, has an obscured (e.g. by intervening vegetation or built form) view or distant view of part of the context in the wider view
- Partial - A clear view of part of the Site, or proposed development; a partial view of most of it; or a distant view in which it forms a major proportion of a wider view
- Open - A panoramic view of most of the Site, or proposed development, occupying most of the field of vision.

Table A.3 – Criteria for Townscape Receptor Susceptibility to Change

Susceptibility to change	Criteria
High	An area possessing particularly distinctive townscape elements, characteristics or sense of place, and few townscape detractors. A townscape with limited tolerance to change of the type proposed OR where the proposed development would be in direct conflict with specific townscape management or planning policies.
Medium	An area with some distinctive townscape elements, characteristics, or clearly defined sense of place, but with some townscape detractors. A townscape which is partially tolerant to change of the type proposed.
Low	An area with recognisable townscape character, but few distinctive townscape elements, characteristics, and some, or a number of townscape detractors. The townscape is tolerant of some change of the type proposed OR where the character area is separated by distance or features so as to have little or no direct relationship with the site/and or proposed development.
Very Low	An area with limited or no distinctive townscape elements, characteristics, or weak sense of place, and many townscape detractors. An area that is tolerant of substantial change of the type proposed OR where the character area is separated by distance or features so as to have no direct relationship with the site/and or proposed development.

Table A.4 – Criteria for Representative View Susceptibility to Change

Susceptibility to the proposed change	Indicative Visual Receptor Activity / Location Criteria
High	Where the receptor is engaged in outdoor recreation including public rights of way and their attention is likely to be focused on the townscape or on particular views. Visitors to heritage assets or visitor attractions where the views to the townscape or surroundings are an important part of the experience. Residents at home where views make a positive contribution to the setting of a residential area.
Medium	People walking around a residential area or visiting retail outlets or other destinations as a leisure activity, or at a place of work, where the views to the townscape or surroundings are make a positive contribution to the experience OR where the receptor, normally categorised as High, is located in an area of poor scenic value where the views to the surrounding area are unlikely to be the main focus of attention (eg walking routes to work).
Low	People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation that does not depend on an appreciation of the view. People travelling by road or rail (unless the route is specifically identified for its views). People at work or in a workplace or a place of education where the views to the townscape or surroundings are not important

Value attached to the representative view

- A.11 The value attached to each visual receptors' representative view is based upon the criteria set out in Table A.2. This takes into account:
- Existing recognition of the value of the view (through identification under a designated heritage asset, or through planning policy); and
 - Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors (through identification in guidebooks or on tourist maps, and reference in literature and art).

Identification of Receptor Sensitivity

- A.12 To identify the sensitivity of the townscape receptors and visual receptors' representative views, the following factors are considered:
- Value (as set out in Tables A.1 and A.2); and
 - Susceptibility to the type of change proposed (as set out in Tables A.3 and A.4)
- A.13 The assessment of the townscape is concerned with establishing whether or not the townscape, be it a particular character area, townscape type or element, can accommodate the proposed development without unacceptable negative consequences. The levels of susceptibility are assessed using the criteria set out in Table A.3.

A.14 The assessment of visual receptors' representative view susceptibility is concerned with establishing to what extent the representative view can accommodate the change in the nature of the view resulting from the type of change proposed. In establishing susceptibility, the circumstances in which the representative view is experienced e.g. does it form part of the reason for being in a particular location (visiting a local landmark) or is it secondary to the reason for the person being in a particular location (e.g. a daily commute to work by car) are considered. The levels of susceptibility are assessed using the criteria set out in Table A.4.

A.15 It should be noted that the susceptibility of the visual receptors' representative view may be reduced if the view is of lower quality.

Table A.5 – Matrix for determining Sensitivity of Townscape Receptors and Visual Receptors' Representative Views

Value	Sensitivity		
Exceptional/ High	High	High	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Low	Low
	High	Medium	Low/Very Low
	Susceptibility to Change		

A.16 The matrix shown in Table A.5 broadly demonstrates how sensitivity is determined through combining the receptors' value with their susceptibility to change. It is important to note that GLVIA3 recommends avoiding over-reliance on a solely quantitative approach; the assessment should be linked back to evidence gathered at the baseline stage. GLVIA3 states that “*there should be more emphasis on narrative text describing the landscape and visual effects and the judgements made about their significance*” and that “*Tables and matrices should be used to support and summarise description text, not replace it*”.

Identifying Likely Effects

- A.17 The ‘Townscape effects’ and ‘Visual effects’ are defined as follows:
- Townscape effects: These consist of direct and indirect effects or changes in the fabric, character, individual features or elements and condition, (quality) of the townscape i.e. townscape receptors within the site or surrounding area; and
 - Visual effects: These are the predicted effects on views available to the public from publicly accessible areas and residential dwellings i.e. visual receptors. Specific effects result from changing the consistent elements within an existing view. This may be caused by construction of a new feature/element, or the obstruction or modification of an existing view.

A.18 In considering the effects of the Proposals upon the identified townscape and visual receptors' representative views, the assessment has been based on the drawings that comprise the application and are submitted for approval. Consideration is also given to the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and the Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) which have been prepared for each representative view. The latter are contained within Appendix B of this report. This approach allows for a balanced assessment that considers all the relevant material and allows for judgements to be made on design quality and associated mitigating effects.

Magnitude of Impact

- A.19 The magnitude of impact considers the size or scale of the Proposals, along with the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration.
- Size and scale is defined as the loss and/or addition of features being major, moderate, minor or none. This relates to the loss or addition of particular elements; the degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the townscape are altered; and the change to the key characteristics.
 - Geographical extent is the area over which the effect will be felt and ranges from site level, to character area, and onto a larger scale.
 - Duration, for the purpose of this assessment, relates to temporary (during construction) and permanent (once the proposed development is complete)
 - Nature of effect (whether direct or indirect, reversible or irreversible).

Table A.6 – Magnitude of Townscape and Visual Impact Descriptors

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
High	Where the proposed development (or works to facilitate it) would result in the total loss or major alteration of the elements that make up the character of the baseline townscape or make up the view from a particular location. Where the introduction of elements is considered to be wholly uncharacteristic in the particular setting. Where the effects of the proposed development would be experienced over a large scale and/or influence more than one townscape type/character area or would be visible over a large scale and / or at close range.
Medium	Where the proposed development (or works to facilitate it) would result in the partial loss or alteration of one or more of the key elements that make up the character of the baseline townscape or make up the view from a particular location. Where the introduction of new features may be prominent but not necessarily wholly uncharacteristic in the particular setting. Where the effects of the proposed development would be largely experienced within the townscape type/character area within which they are located. Where the effects of the proposed development would be largely seen from further afield or as only part of a view.
Low	Where the proposed development (or works to facilitate it) would result in minor loss or alteration of one or more of the key elements that make up the character of the baseline townscape or make up the view from a particular location. Where the introduction of elements would not generally be considered uncharacteristic in the particular setting and/or Where the proposed development is located within other character areas or types and by virtue of distance will have limited or no effect on the baseline character area or view.
Negligible / None	Where the proposed development (or works to facilitate it) would result in a very minor loss or alteration of one or more of the key elements that make up the character of the baseline townscape or view from a particular location. The introduction of elements that may not be uncharacteristic in the particular setting Where the proposed development occurs within other character areas or types and their introduction by virtue of distance will have limited or no effect on the baseline character area. Where the effects of the proposed development would only be seen from a distance and be imperceptible within the context of the wider view.

A.20 The overall magnitude of impact of the Proposals on the identified townscape receptors and visual receptor representative views is defined as being either high, medium, low, negligible or none and the criteria are set out in Table A.6. These judgements take into account whether the Proposals:

- conform with the pattern, scale, mass, grain and historic features of the identified townscape character;
- create a loss or restoration of key townscape features;
- contribute to the identified townscape character;
- affect identified townscape receptors and representative viewpoints; and
- accord with national, regional and local planning policy and guidelines.

A.21 For each of the seven representative views, existing photography and AVRs are provided. The AVRs have been prepared through overlaying the photographs taken from the agreed viewpoints with a representative model of the proposed development. They show the massing and appearance of the proposed development, taken from the plans and elevations submitted for approval. The methodology for preparing the AVRs, which is provided at Appendix C, aligns with the guidance provided in ‘Visual Representation of Development Proposals – Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19’.

A.22 The matrix at Table A.7 illustrates how the magnitude of impact and sensitivity of the townscape receptors and visual receptors' representative views are combined to identify the likely effects. In order to appreciate the effect of the proposed development on the identified townscape receptors and visual receptors' representative views, a supporting narrative has been provided to ensure that the resultant effects are clearly explained within the assessment.

Table A.7: Townscape Character and Representative Viewpoint Effect Matrix

Sensitivity	Overall Assessment of Townscape Effects			
High	Major	Major /to moderate	Moderate	Minor to/ Negligible
Medium	Major /to moderate	Moderate	Moderate to / minor	None
Low	Moderate	Moderate to / minor	Minor	None
	High	Medium	Low/Very Low	Negligible/None
Magnitude of impact				

Table A.8 – Type of Effect

Positive Criteria – Where the Proposals
Fit comfortably within the characteristics of the townscape or visual receptors' view. Increases characteristic features or enhances the contribution to the wider context. Improve the view or an element within the visual receptors view. Do not result in an incongruous feature within the prevailing pattern of townscape. Do not obstruct views towards a high quality or scenic townscape. Do not obstruct views or detracts from the visual amenity of a view towards a heritage asset. Provide ability to include adequate or appropriate mitigation. Complement local/national planning policies or guidance to protect townscape character or visual amenity or specific views.
Negative Criteria – Where the Proposals
Result in a change that is out of scale with surrounding townscape / landform and/or pattern of the townscape. Result in a loss of positive townscape feature or characteristics, including within a visual receptors' view. Introduce incongruous features within the prevailing pattern of townscape. Obstruct a view towards a high quality or scenic townscape. Obstruct views or detracts from the visual amenity of a view towards a heritage asset. Lack potential to include adequate or appropriate mitigation. Conflict with local/national planning policies or guidance to protect /manage townscape character or visual amenity or specific views.
Neutral Criteria – Where the Proposals
Will have an indiscernible effect on the townscape character or characteristics of an area, or the view or existing visual amenity of a view. Replace one element with another, resulting in an effect that is on balance is neither positive or negative.

APPENDIX B - REPRESENTATIVE VIEW APPRAISAL

Introduction

B.1 Seven representative views have been identified to inform the assessment of the likely effects of the Proposals on the character of the townscape and visual receptors. The viewpoint locations are shown in Figure B.1. Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) have been prepared for each of these representative views; the methodology for how these have been produced is provided in Appendix C.

B.2 In order to assess the likely effects of the Proposals on the representative views, two different types of AVRs have been prepared:

- Wireline AVRs – images which illustrate the location, scale and degree of visibility from a viewpoint (representative views 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7); and
- Rendered AVRs – images which illustrate the location, scale, degree of visibility, visual description of architectural form and use of materials at Year 1 (representative views 1 and 3).

B.3 The AVRs provide two-dimensional representations of a complex scenic experience and are indicative. They are intended to inform an understanding of where the Proposals are located in the field of vision and to what extent they would be visible from each viewpoint. The viewing experience is kinetic and variable in nature when experienced within the townscape.

B.4 The imagery is no substitute for the actual visual experience from each location. It is essential that the viewing experience at each location is taken into account, considering factors such as traffic noise, weather, surrounding buildings, levels of activity and any other similar matters. It is therefore recommended that this document is taken on site to fully appreciate the nature of the viewing experience in each representative view location.



Figure B.1 - Location of Representative Views

— Application Site Location of Representative View

Representative View 1 – Kendrick Close



Baseline conditions

- B.5 The foreground of the view is dominated by Kendrick Close, a residential no-through road located off the roundabout.
- B.6 Ascot House is prominent in the view, beyond garden boundaries associated with no. 7 Kendrick Close. Canopies of the trees on the boundary with Finchampstead Road can be glimpsed beyond Ascot House. The Carnival Hub can be seen beyond Ascot House and the roundabout.
- B.7 The representative view is assessed as having a low value.



Representative View 1 - Existing view