



**Land South of
St Weonards,
Herefordshire**

**Landscape and
Visual Appraisal**

Prepared by:
**The Environmental
Dimension
Partnership Ltd**

On behalf of:
Duchy of Cornwall

March 2021
Report Reference
edp3231_r004c

Contents

Non-technical Summary

Section 1	Introduction, Purpose and Methodology.....	1
Section 2	Landscape Planning Policy and Designations.....	3
Section 3	Baseline Conditions: Landscape Resource	7
Section 4	Baseline Conditions: Visual Amenity	13
Section 5	The Proposed Development and Mitigation	19
Section 6	Assessment of Effects.....	23
Section 7	Discussion and Conclusions.....	29

Appendices

Appendix EDP 1	Proposed Site Layout (Drawing No. 2368-050 Revision C)
Appendix EDP 2	Relevant Local Plan Policies
Appendix EDP 3	Methodology
Appendix EDP 4	Table of Effects: Landscape Character
Appendix EDP 5	Table of Effects: Visual Amenity
Appendix EDP 6	Photoviewpoints (edp3231_d005g 17 March 2021 GY/VP)

Plans

Plan EDP 1	Site Location Plan (edp3231_d006d 03 December 2020 LH/RMC)
Plan EDP 2	Landscape Character and Context (edo3231_d021c 04 December 2020 LB/RMC)
Plan EDP 3	Relevant Policy Landscape and Heritage Designations (edp3231_d007d 03 December 2020 LH/RG)

- Plan EDP 4** Findings of Visual Appraisal
(edp3231_d003g 08 December 2020 LH/WG)
- Plan EDP 5** Village Landscape Strategy
(edp3231_d023f 16 March 2021 VP/RB)
- Plan EDP 6** Site Landscape Masterplan
(edp3231_d022e 16 March 2021 VP/RB)

This version is intended for electronic viewing only

	Report Ref: edp3231			
	Author	Formatted	Peer Review	Proofed by/Date
004_DRAFT	RC	AV	CJM	
004a	RC	AV	CJM	JM 260417
004b	VP	-	BR	FD 170321
004c	VP	-	-	-

This page has been left blank intentionally

Non-technical Summary

- S1 This Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) has been prepared by the Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd (EDP) on behalf of Duchy of Cornwall ('the Duchy'), for Land South of St Weonards, Hertfordshire (hereafter to referred to as 'the site').
- S2 The site is located on the southern edge of St Weonards. Chartered Landscape Architects (CMLI) at EDP have assessed the landscape and visual effects of the proposals in line with the national guidance comprising the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition (LI/IEMA, 2013)' (GLVIA3). Professional judgement has been used to form a professional opinion, which has been informed by a review of policy and published documents relating to local landscape character, as well as desktop analysis and field work.
- S3 The landform in the study area is undulating. The site is situated on falling land just below and to the south of the small, nucleated hilltop settlement of St Weonards. The village lies adjacent to the A466 and is clearly identified by the tower of St Weonards church. The fabric of the site itself is very simple, comprising part of a larger field that is subject to intensive modern agricultural practices.
- S4 Given the exposed location of the site, EDP's Landscape Architects have been involved in the consultation and design process from the outset. This has ensured that matters of landscape character and visual amenity have influenced the design outcomes. Although the site is not protected by any form of national or local landscape designation, Herefordshire Council (HC) and the Parish Council have been explicit in demanding that the proposals are sensitive to the intrinsic character of the landscape, and historic qualities of the village.
- S5 The site itself, albeit of low intrinsic landscape value, has a greater value as it forms part of the setting of this clustered, hill-top village, particularly when viewed from the south along the A466. The intervisibility of the site within the wider landscape is reasonably extensive due to topography, but there is a low density of visual receptors. Primary intervisibility is from the east and south and within 1km of the site. Because St Weonards is a distinctive landmark settlement along the main A466, it is deemed that users traveling north would have a medium to high sensitivity to change, and protecting visual amenity from this receptor has been a key driver of the design.
- S6 Principles that have strongly influenced the design include:
- Maintaining the prominence and dominance of the church tower;
 - Maintaining St Weonards as a clustered hill-top settlement;
 - Creating a form and scale of development that relates well to the existing settlement pattern and fabric, and not appearing as a discrete 'add-on';

- Creating a coherent southern edge that runs with the pattern and grain of the topography;
 - Creating an organic form that does not appear as a single, unbroken mass of residential development;
 - Strengthening the existing (poor) landscape fabric and create new and legible fabric, with enhanced biodiversity value where possible; and
 - Creating new public open spaces and circulation that tie into the existing green space fabric of the village, that would be of benefit to existing residents as well as new ones.
- S7 The Proposed Site Layout Plan (**Appendix EDP 1**) is the result of the iterative design process and working closely with HC officers. The effects of evolving proposals have been a key priority in this iterative design and a 3D model has been used to test the visual effects
- S8 The Landscape Masterplan provided as **Plan EDP 6** demonstrates how the existing and proposed green spaces have been treated as a single entity/resource. The aim has been to integrate the landscape proposals into an overall Green Infrastructure (GI) network for the village. Each proposed green space is linked to another and designed to be multi-functional, including: circular walks; ecological connectivity via a new, mixed native hedgerow and scrub; a village green; and green verges with street trees.
- S9 For the site itself, there would be *no* substantial or major adverse level of effect on its landscape character. There would be a **moderate** effect on perceptual and sensory elements – largely due to the loss of ‘openness’, which is an unavoidable consequence of any ‘greenfield’ development. Crucially, the proposed development would not alter the principles that define the setting of St Weonards, or its perception as a relatively small village, situated on the upper slopes of the local ridgeline/hilltop, and surrounded by an agricultural landscape and rectilinear field pattern. The site level effects are partially mitigated by creating new landscape fabric and public open green space.
- S10 At the wider scale, the site forms a very small proportion of the Archenfield Sub-regional Character Area and the type of change being proposed would not conflict with the prevailing trend towards more clustered settlements, which lie principally on elevated ground on the valley sides and tops. For these reasons, the level of effect is **moderate-minor** and **neutral**.
- S11 The effect of the proposed development on visual amenity ranges from **negligible** to **moderate**. No effect on visual amenity is assessed as substantial or major. Any effect of moderate or greater would normally attract significant weight in landscape policy terms; it is therefore noteworthy that this threshold is not crossed in the majority of instances. The receptors likely to experience the greatest level of effect would be users of PRoW SW11 (footpath to the immediate east of St Weonards church). The notable receptor experiencing the next greatest effect would be northbound users of A466.
- S12 The LVA finds that the proposals constitute a low-density, small scale residential development, reflecting the best qualities of the settlement and responds to its relationship

with adjoining farmland. As well as being guided by design principles above, the details in the accompanying Design and Access Statement (DAS) reflect the exceptionally high design standards and ethos of the Duchy's aspirations for this development within its surroundings

S13 For all the reasons above, it is concluded that the proposed development on this land south of St Weonards would not have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the local landscape. It is considered that the site has the capacity for this small scale development, which is sympathetic to the scale and pattern of the village of St Weonards. The following conclusions can be drawn from this comprehensive LVA:

- i) The proposed development complies with national policies and with policies in the adopted local plan;
- ii) No effect has been assessed as being substantial or major, although the site itself will experience a **moderate** effect, which is an unavoidable consequence of 'greenfield' development;
- iii) More widely, the proposed development is not considered to result in a material level of effect upon any landscape receptor that would be to the detriment of the Archenfield Sub-Regional Character Area;
- iv) Although 'greenfield' development, by definition, would result in a loss of 'openness' within the site, this LVA has demonstrated that the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond sensitively to the village of St Weonards within its hilltop setting; and
- v) The assessment has found that in no instance are the effects upon those identified landscape and visual receptors of such a magnitude to render the development unacceptable in landscape character or visual amenity terms.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Section 1

Introduction, Purpose and Methodology

Introduction

- 1.1 The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd (EDP) has been commissioned to undertake a landscape and visual appraisal for the proposal for a residential scheme on Land South of St Weonards in Herefordshire ('the site'), on behalf of Duchy of Cornwall ('the Duchy') to accompany an application for full planning permission.
- 1.2 EDP is an independent environmental planning consultancy with offices in Cirencester, Cheltenham and Cardiff. The practice provides advice to private and public sector clients throughout the UK in the fields of landscape, ecology, archaeology, cultural heritage, arboriculture, rights of way and masterplanning. Details of the practice can be obtained at our website (www.edp-uk.co.uk).
- 1.3 The location of the site on the southern edge of St Weonards is shown in **Plan EDP 1**, as is the 2km detailed study area. The site comprises the northern part of an arable field, which is contiguous with the edge of the village.

Purpose

- 1.4 The purpose of this LVA is to identify the baseline conditions of the site and its surrounding area; to inform the design, layout and appearance; and provide an assessment of the effects predicted to arise from the development on the landscape and visual baseline conditions.
- 1.5 In compiling the assessment, EDP has undertaken the following key tasks:
 - Reviewed the planning policy context for the site;
 - Undertaken a desktop study and web search of relevant background documents and maps. EDP's study included reviews of aerial photographs, web searches, Local Planning Authority (LPA) publications and landscape character assessments. EDP has also obtained, where possible, information about relevant landscape and other designations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), conservation areas and gardens and parks listed on Historic England's 'Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England';
 - Undertaken a field assessment of local site circumstances, including a photographic survey of the character and fabric of the site and its surroundings, using photography from a number of representative viewpoints. The field assessment was undertaken by a qualified and experienced landscape architect; and

- Provided an analysis of the likely landscape and visual effects of the proposed scheme, which is determined by combining the magnitude of the predicted change with the assessed sensitivity of the identified receptors. The nature of any predicted effects is also identified (i.e. positive/negative, permanent/reversible).

Methodology Adopted for the Assessment

- 1.6 This LVA has been undertaken in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition (LI/IEMA, 2013)' (GLVIA3) insofar as it is relevant to non-EIA schemes. The criteria referred to, but not defined within the guidelines, have been defined by EDP as set out in **Appendix EDP 3**.

Study Area

- 1.7 To establish the baseline and potential limit of material effects, the study area has been considered at two geographical scales.
- 1.8 A broad study area was considered, enabling the geographical scope of the assessment to be defined and provided the wider geographical context of the study. The search focussed on the local planning policy context, on identifying national and local landscape and other associated designations (e.g. AONB, historic parks and gardens) and providing a general geographical understanding of the site and its broader context (for example, in relation to landform, transport routes and the distribution and nature of settlement).
- 1.9 Following initial analysis and subsequent field work, and having an appreciation of the development proposed, a refinement of the study area has been undertaken, which focusses on those areas and features that are likely to be affected by the proposals. The extent of this detailed study area is 2km from the site boundary, although occasional reference may be made to features beyond this area where appropriate. This detailed study area is illustrated on **Plan EDP 1**.

Section 2

Landscape Planning Policy and Designations

- 2.1 An appreciation of the ‘weight’ to be attributed to any landscape or visual effects arising from development starts with an understanding of the planning context within which any such development is to be tested for its acceptability. The site’s relevant planning context is illustrated on **Plan EDP 2** and summarised below.

Landscape Designations

- 2.2 The surrounding landscape is protected neither by national nor local landscape designation.

Other Relevant Considerations

Heritage Matters

- 2.3 A separate Heritage Statement considers the historic character and setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets within the study area. While these are not landscape designations, they do on occasion serve to influence the value of the landscape, which is a consideration within this report. Where this is the case, it is noted in the relevant assessment.
- 2.4 There are no registered parks and gardens (RPGs) or conservation area (CA) within the detailed 2km search area. The site contains no trees with tree preservation orders (TPO) nor do the proposals affect any such trees.
- 2.5 A scheduled monument – St Weonard’s Tump – is located in the village centre, but the site is not visible from the scheduled monument.
- 2.6 There are 27 listed buildings located within the detailed search area – most being within the village – including the Grade I listed Church of St Weonard. The accompanying heritage report assesses that the site’s contribution to the significance of the church is ‘neutral’. In landscape terms, it is important that any development would not obscure or reduce the dominance of the church tower in the landscape from publicly available views (especially from the A466 to the south). As the site lies on lower land falling away from the church, such a risk is negligible.

Public Rights of Way

- 2.7 There are no Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the site and very few PRoW within the 2km detailed study area, the closest being the footpath that runs east from St Weonards church yard.

National Planning Policy

- 2.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), revised in July 2018 and updated in June 2019, includes planning policies and guidance requiring developers to respond to the natural environment and landscape character, integrating the development into its local surroundings.
- 2.9 A corner-stone of the NPPF¹ remains the achievement of sustainable development. In broad terms, the NPPF requires that development proposals that accord with adopted policy should be approved without delay, and where no policy exists or is out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of the proposal would significantly outweigh the benefits, subject to specific policies within the NPPF that restrict development (e.g. natural heritage and landscape designations). The principles of achievement of sustainable development should also be carried forward into planning policy at a local level so that it is clear what constitutes acceptable development under the new guidance.
- 2.10 In relation to development and landscape, section 12 seeks to achieve well designed places, whilst paragraph 127 specifically states that development “*will function well and add to the overall quality of the area ...*” and “*are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting*”.

Local Planning Policy

Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031

- 2.11 The statutory development plan relevant to the site comprises the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031, adopted on 16 October 2015. A review of the local planning policy circumstances, including relevant supplementary planning documents, evidence base documents and associated guidelines relevant to this assessment is contained below. A detailed review of planning policy is undertaken within the Planning Statement accompanying this application.
- 2.12 The following policies in the adopted local plan are considered relevant for this LVA, with extracts saved in **Appendix EDP 2**.
- Policy SS2 - Delivering new homes: In the wider rural areas new housing needs to “*recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*”;
 - Policy SS6 - Environmental quality and local distinctiveness: Development proposals should conserve and enhance those environmental assets that contribute towards the county’s distinctiveness, in particular its “*settlement pattern*” and “*landscape*”; and

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government (February 2019) National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, London.

- Policy LD1 - Landscape and townscape: Development proposals should demonstrate that character of the landscape has “*positively influenced the design, scale, nature and site selection*” and protection and enhancement of the setting of the settlement. Proposals should incorporate new landscape schemes to ensure development integrates appropriately into its surroundings.

Emerging Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.13 Herefordshire Council approved an application from St Weonards Parish Council on 10 June 2014 to be the designated body to produce a neighbourhood development plan. St Weonards Parish Council have taken the decision not to proceed with setting up a Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group or to write a Neighbourhood Development Plan at this time.

Interim Conclusions

- 2.14 The site is not constrained by any designation. However, a review of the site’s planning context has found that the proposed development would need to:
- Recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (Policy SS2);
 - Conserve and enhance those environmental assets that contribute towards the county’s distinctiveness, in particular the settlement pattern and landscape (Policy SS6);
 - Demonstrate it has been positively influenced (design, scale and nature) by the landscape and that it has enhanced of the setting of the settlement (Policy LD1);
 - Incorporate new landscape schemes to ensure it integrates appropriately into its surroundings (Policy LD1); and
 - Not obscure or reduce the dominance of the church tower in the landscape from publicly available views (especially from the A466 to the south).

This page has been left blank intentionally

Section 3

Baseline Conditions: Landscape Resource

- 3.1 EDP has undertaken a review of local landscape character, which included a site visit by an experienced, chartered landscape architect on 30 November 2020. The visit was undertaken in clear, dry conditions and included an extensive walkover of the entire site, an investigation of views available from adjacent areas and an investigation of views available from the wider landscape. Where necessary, relevance to published landscape character assessments is commented on below. Extracts of key characteristics, to assist with understanding the Council's accepted baseline position, are contained in **Appendix EDP 5**.

National Character Assessment

- 3.2 At the national level, the site lies in the South Herefordshire and Over Severn National Character Area (NCA) 104. While the description is broadly representative of the wider landscape, it is too generic to provide specific characterisation of the site. This is unsurprising as the national characterisation provides a broad framework for more detailed landscape character assessments.
- 3.3 For the scale of the development proposed, it is considered that the description of landscape character undertaken at the sub-regional level is more relevant in establishing the landscape resource baseline. Accordingly, while NCA 104 has been used to inform this LVA, it will not be carried forward to detailed assessment of effects, with the focus being on local landscape character areas.

Regional Character Assessment

- 3.4 A more detailed (and meaningful) assessment is found in Herefordshire Council's SPD 'The Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Guidance (2009)'.
- 3.5 The site lies within the Archenfield Sub-Regional Character Area, which is wholly of the Sandstone Farmlands landscape type. This is an agricultural landscape with a moderate to gently undulating landform and medium to large, regularly shaped fields separated by straight hedges. Tree cover is limited, being restricted to sparsely scattered hedgerow trees, some remnants of linear woodland running along the bottom of the steeper stream valleys and groups of trees around farms. Regarding change, intensive agriculture has led to a decline in hedgerows and, similarly, the hedgerow trees and fragments of woodland are gradually disappearing, leading to a more featureless landscape character in places. The inherent dispersed settlement pattern is changing in places as a result of new housing which tends to have a clustered pattern (possibly driven by modern planning controls).

3.6 EDP would concur with this published landscape character and would apply a high value to the Sub-Regional Character Area, even though it is not a designated landscape. However, EDP would emphasise that that:

- St Weonards is a low-density and clustered settlement, contained upon a low hill-top around the landmark church tower;
- The character of St Weonards (when viewed from the south along the A466) is influenced by modern development including a large, visually prominent school building and the rear curtilages of 1970s/80s dwellings plus some mature non-native, ornamental, evergreen trees;
- The site is generally featureless with intensely and often poorly managed hedgerows containing very few hedgerow trees; and
- The existing southern settlement edge is currently disjointed and there is an opportunity to create a more attractive and coherent edge when viewed from the south.

EDP Site Assessment

3.7 The site is located on the southern edge of St Weonards on falling land just below and to the south of the small, nucleated hilltop settlement of St Weonards. The site lies adjacent to the A466 and is dominated by the landmark St Weonards church tower. The fabric of the site is very simple, comprising part of a featureless arable field, which is subject to intensive modern agricultural practices. The site is shown in the aerial photograph provided as **Plan EDP 2**. **Image EDP 3.1** shows the site in its current form.



Image EDP 3.1: The site in its current form.

3.8 Recognising that 'landscape' is a multi-dimensional concept embracing 'what we see', its time-depth and physical attributes, this report reviews and assesses change to landscape character in terms of:

- Physical landscape (topography and hydrology);
- Landscape fabric and habitats (referencing ecological aspects as set out in the accompanying updated ecology note 2020 (Ref. edp3231_r006) accompanying this application);
- Cultural and historic dimensions (reference heritage and archaeological aspects as set out in the heritage assessment (Ref. edp3231_r003) accompanying this application);
- Perceptual and sensory character; and
- Landscape designations (if relevant).

The Physical Landscape

Topography and Hydrology

3.9 St Weonards lies, distinctively, on an elongated, low hill within an undulating landscape. This hill tapers to the south and the site lies adjacent to the southern settlement edge on land falling and draining south-eastwards. The highest point of the site (110m above

Ordnance Datum (aOD)) is in the north-west corner falling to the lowest point in the south-eastern corner (93m aOD). The falling topography is important as it means that the site is subservient to the existing historic settlement in terms of elevation and helps the village to be read as a hill-top settlement.

Landscape Fabric and Habitats

- 3.10 This is a rural, agricultural landscape with a moderate to gently undulating landform and limited tree cover. St Weonards is a low-density settlement clustered around the landmark church tower and containing modern development. The site is located at the urban fringe with the existing and adjacent southern settlement edge being quite disjointed with some landscape detractors (including the facades and retaining features of properties on Mount Way, and the Primary School).
- 3.11 The site is generally featureless with intensely cut hedgerows containing very few hedgerow trees. The landscape fabric is very simple: the site comprises the north-western corner of a medium-scale, open arable field, which extends further to the south and east. The site lies within an intensive agricultural landscape and comprises the northern circa 2 hectare (ha) of the field. The interior of the site is featureless and the site is subject to farming practices common in the area.
- 3.12 Regarding boundaries:
- The northern site boundary forms the southern settlement edge of St Weonards. It is linear, but quite disjointed, comprising stretches of species-poor hedge, fencing and retaining walls. Beyond this lie: the school playing field; a grassed area with a foul pumping station and overhead cables; and the Mount Way cul-de-sac of 1970s or early 1980s dwellings;
 - The western boundary is formed by a species-rich hedgerow along the A466. Domestic curtilage forms an indent in the north-west corner.
 - The northern section of the eastern field boundary is a species-rich hedgerow; and
 - The southern section, along with the entire southern boundary, represents the red line boundary which shows some sympathy to the rectilinear geometry of the neighbouring fields.
- 3.13 For the reason above, the value of the landscape fabric and habitats is assessed as low. There exists an opportunity to create a more attractive and coherent settlement edge when viewed from the south, especially from the approach along the A466.

Cultural Associations, Recreation and Historic Landscape

- 3.14 The prominent mediaeval St Weonards church tower occupies the highest point (circa 115m aOD), and lies in close proximity to a pre-historic earthwork/mediaeval motte.

The village contains a number of buildings that historically served the rural hinterland (forge/-smithy, old school, church/vicarage and a large dispersed farmstead) in addition to a number of 20th century additions – including Mount Way and St Weonards Primary School. Some of these more modern additions have not been sympathetic to the historic core and detract from the amenity of the settlement and, as a result, the cultural and historic value of the site is medium.

Perceptual and Sensory Character

- 3.15 Visually, St Weonards occupies a low hill-top location and is visible in the landscape with the church tower being a noticeable landmark feature up to 2km distant. There are few visual detractors at distance, but at closer range, the Mount Way development is out of keeping with the qualities and appearance of the older parts of the village and the large, white school building draws the eye.
- 3.16 The site is moderately tranquil. Views out of the site are of open countryside and perceived as 'still' but with some noise impact from the adjacent A466. There are no PRoW crossing the site and very few within 2km of the site itself. There is no public access land near the site.
- 3.17 For the reasons above, the perceptual and sensory elements of the site are assessed to be of medium value.

Interim Summary

- 3.18 In summary, EDP assess that the site itself, albeit of low intrinsic landscape value, has a greater value as it forms part of the landscape setting of this nucleated, hill-top village, particularly when viewed from the south. It was recognised at an early stage that any proposed development would need to be 'landscape-led' and of a high design standard to ensure that it doesn't appear as an incongruous or prominent new element detracting from the overall village character, when viewed from both nearby and further afield.
- 3.19 Design principles that should strongly influence the nature of any proposed development and keep it sympathetic to the local landscape character include:
- Maintaining the prominence and dominance of the church tower;
 - Maintaining St Weonards as a clustered hill-top settlement;
 - Creating a form and scale of development that relates well to the existing settlement pattern and fabric, and not appearing as a discrete 'add-on';
 - Creating a coherent southern edge that runs with the pattern and grain of the topography;

- Creating an organic form that does not appear as a single, unbroken mass of residential development;
- Strengthening the existing (poor) landscape fabric and create new and legible fabric, with enhanced biodiversity value where possible; and
- Creating new public open spaces and circulation that tie into the existing green space fabric of the village; that would be of benefit to existing residents as well as new ones.

3.20 Further residential development on the site would leave the historic core relatively unaffected in views from the north, east and west – and would appear to be the logical area to extend the village further. Further, this location also has the potential to provide good connectivity to the amenities within the existing village such as the church, post office shop, village hall and school. Development could also provide a more congruous settlement edge – itself mitigating views of 20th century development at Mount Way and the primary school.

Section 4

Baseline Conditions: Visual Amenity

- 4.1 This section identifies those visual receptors that may be affected by development on the application site: their distribution; character; and sensitivity to change.
- 4.2 Using landform data within a Geographical Information System (GIS), EDP has prepared a broad Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The ZTV is generated using landform height data only and therefore it does not account for the screening effects of intervening buildings, structures or vegetation. The ZTV was then reviewed by walking and driving (as appropriate) local roads, rights of way and other publicly accessible viewpoints. Through this exercise the main visual receptors predicted to have actual visibility to the site were identified and the Zone of Primary Visibility (ZPV) was established.

Zone of Primary Visibility

- 4.3 The ZPV is the area where the proposed development would be visible to the casual observer on foot, cycling or driving. These views would normally be close-ranging and open, and the proposal would be an obvious element of the view. Beyond this area, there is a zone of visibility that is less open, being either partly-screened or filtered. Views from within this zone would include the proposal – it may not be immediately noticeable, but once recognised would be a perceptible addition to the view. The extent of the proposal within such views would vary and in some cases it would be almost indistinguishable as a consequence of both increasing distance and intervening visual screening.
- 4.4 The visual appraisal (**Plan EDP 4**) illustrates the main determinants of visibility to the site:
- From the north, views of the site are blocked by topography and the existing settlement of St Weonards;
 - From the east there are open views of the site from public footpaths (**Photoviewpoints EDP 3 and 4**) and from minor roads (**Photoviewpoints EDP 5, 6, 8 and 9**);
 - From the south, the site is prominent in views from the A466 (**Photoviewpoints EDP 1 and 7**) where it forms an apron in front of the village. **Photoviewpoint EDP 10** is a more distant view (2.58km) from a minor road and demonstrates how small the site is from these distances and what a small proportion of these views the site occupies; and
 - From the west (**Photoviewpoints EDP 2, 11, 12 and 13**), there are no available close range and open views: the closer views are blocked by topography or obscured by vegetation; whereas the longer distance views demonstrate that the site is not an obvious feature in the landscape.

- 4.5 In summary, the visual receptors and photoviewpoints are illustrated in **Appendix EDP 5** and on **Plan EDP 4** and demonstrate that the greatest design care is required when considering how the proposals will be viewed from: the A466 (**Photoviewpoints EDP 1** and **7**); and from vantages in the east **Photoviewpoint EDP 3** (public footpath) and **Photoviewpoint EDP 6** (minor road).

Representative Viewpoints

- 4.6 The main receptor groups have been identified and described below and are represented by the photoviewpoints (PVP) presented in **Table EDP 4.1**. Based on the examination of the ZTV and a desk based analysis, EDP initially proposed eight photoviewpoints (**Photoviewpoints EDP 1 to 8**) with the site photography being conducted on 30 November 2020.
- 4.7 A full list of photoviewpoints were agreed with the LPA (Roland Close and Liz Duberley) via e-mail in August 2016. Following a meeting with the LPA in April 2016, the LPA requested additional photography and EDP took five additional photoviewpoints (**Photoviewpoints EDP 9 to 13**) during May 2016, some beyond the 2km detailed study area. These agreed Photoviewpoints have been re-taken in November 2020 to represent the current baseline.

Table EDP 4.1: Summary of Representative Photoviewpoints.

PVP No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance and Direction of View to Site	Reason(s) for Selection and Sensitivity of Receptor
1	Junction of A466 and Unclassified Road	349643, 223749	250m looking north	Users of major road, low
2	Unclassified Road West of St Weonards	349310, 224026	210m, looking east	Users of local road, medium
3	Local PRoW no. SW11 to the immediate east of St Weonards	349766, 224318	275m, looking south-west	Users of PRoW, high
4	Local PRoW no. SW11 to the immediate east of St Weonards	350331, 224134	825m, looking west	Users of PRoW, high
5	Unclassified Road adjacent to Trelasdee Farm	356392, 223793	670m, looking north-west	Users of local road (and residents), medium (high)
6	Unclassified Road south east of St Weonards	350300, 223422	850m, looking north-west	Users of local road, medium

PVP No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance and Direction of View to Site	Reason(s) for Selection and Sensitivity of Receptor
7	Layby along A466 north of Ark Cottages	349807, 223385	630m, looking north	Users of major road and residents, low
8	Unclassified Road East of St Weonards	351866, 224609	2.1km, looking west	Users of local road, medium
9	A4137 to the north of St Owen's Cross	353566, 225227	4km, looking east	Users of local road, medium
10	Unclassified road west of St Weonards	348805, 221502	2.58km looking north-east	Users of local road, medium
11	Route with permitted access north of Scotsbrook	349124, 222708	1.34km, looking north-east	Users of footpath, high
12	Unclassified road west of St Weonards	348216, 223572	1.43 km, looking north-east	Users of local road, medium
13	Junction of unclassified road and footpath 336/SW5 to the west of Northgate Farm	345981, 224511	3.69 km, looking east	Users of local road and PRoW, high

Visual Receptors

- 4.8 The main receptors identified as likely to experience a material effect as a result of the proposals are listed below.

Public Rights of Way

- 4.9 In accordance with the methodology, the overall sensitivity of this type of receptor is generally high; where a lower sensitivity is appropriate this is noted.

PRoW SW11

- 4.10 This footpath heads roughly eastwards from the church grounds. It is the only footpath within the detailed study area with open views of the site. **Photoviewpoints EDP 3 and 4** represent the varied views from it: the former is a closer-range view, partially filtered by field boundary vegetation, but which demonstrates how the site forms an extended settlement edge along the upper reaches of the hill; the latter is a longer-range and more open view, again showing how the site extends the existing settlement along the top of the hill.

PRoW SW5

- 4.11 This footpath lies almost 3.7km to the west of the site. **Photoviewpoint EDP 13** demonstrates how the site, along with the village of St Weonards, is barely perceptible at this distance and simply blends into the surrounding landscape.

Route with Permitted Access

- 4.12 This un-made route with permitted access lies 1.34km to the south-west of the site and is bounded on both sides by hedgerows. **Photoviewpoint EDP 11** demonstrates how the site, along with the village of St Weonards, is often obscured by vegetation and that the site is subservient to the elevation and prominence of the church tower.

Minor Roads

- 4.13 Users of minor roads within a rural setting have a generally medium sensitivity to change.
- 4.14 The rural nature of this landscape means that this type of receptor offers the most common opportunity to view the site, as demonstrated by **Photoviewpoints EDP 2, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 12**. Many of these views are short-duration glimpses of the site through field entrances and other breaks in the roadside vegetation. Of these vantages, the site is most noticeable from the minor roads in the western quarter, namely from **Photoviewpoints EDP 5, 6 and 8**. The first two of these offer closer-range views and show how the site: forms an extension of the village along the hill top; forms an apron of slightly lower ground in front of the village; and is visually subservient to the existing settlement – on the highest ground – including the visually dominant church tower. Generally, development would not create a new skyline, except the southernmost part of the site when viewed from **Photoviewpoint EDP 5**.

Main Roads

A466

- 4.15 In accordance with the methodology, users of major roads generally have a low sensitivity to change. However, the most open views of the site are available from the A466 from the south. For this reason, it is deemed that users of this receptor would have an increased – i.e. medium to high – sensitivity to change in this context.
- 4.16 Users – travelling northwards from the south – mount a crest near Ark Cottages from where the uninterrupted views commence – (**Photoviewpoint EDP 7**) – right up to the approach into the existing settlement – (**Photoviewpoint EDP 1**). From the former, the site forms an apron on lower ground in front of the existing settlement. Development would change the appearance of the existing settlement edge, whilst not obscuring views nor reducing the dominance of the church tower. From **Photoviewpoint EDP 1**, the nature of the existing settlement edge becomes clearer: the school building is quite large and visually prominent (as a white building) below the church tower, whilst the village edge falls to the south-west (right), comprising skyline development of the single and double storey dwellings on Mount Way, along with their fragmented domestic boundary treatments.

A4137

- 4.17 Due to distance (4km) and a backdrop of distant hills, users travelling along the A4137 will barely notice the village of St Weonards – on a lower hill in the middle distance – nor the site in these expansive yet oblique views above the field hedges, as demonstrated by **Photoviewpoint EDP 9**.

Residential Receptors

- 4.18 This appraisal has focused on the assessment of views from publicly accessible locations. Views from private residential properties, although likely to be of high to very high sensitivity to changes, are not protected by national planning guidance or local planning policy. Good site masterplanning of the development site, however, has considered the visual amenity of domestic dwellings in close proximity to the proposals.
- 4.19 Based on the site visit, analysis of photographs looking out from the site and from aerial imagery, there are a number of properties that will have some view into the site, including isolated dwellings to the east, such as Tresladee Cottages and Tresladee Farm.
- 4.20 The most substantial change would be experienced by those properties immediately adjacent to the site boundary, most notably dwellings at the southern end of Mount Way (no's 5 and 6) and two dwellings immediately to the north-west including The Tythe Barn. The dwellings on Mount Way and The Tythe Barn have been visited by a landscape architect (at the owners' request) in 2020. These dwellings experience close and open views into the site from the rears of the properties.
- 4.21 Residential receptors are regarded as highly sensitive in the GLVIA. However, private views from residential receptors are not generally afforded protection in planning policy. Instead, what is critical is whether residential amenity (through issues such as privacy, noise, loss of light etc.) is affected unacceptably. Nevertheless, any development on the site would need to respect the residential amenity of these dwellings

Interim Summary of Findings

- 4.22 In general, the intervisibility of the site with the wider landscape is reasonably extensive due to topography. However, this landscape context does not have a high density of publicly accessible receptors (nor dwellings). Detailed site surveys have demonstrated that the site is only readily discernible within 1km of the site. Beyond this distance – in longer-range views – the site is barely discernible, forming a very small part of some panoramic views where it forms a logical part of the existing settlement on the low hill. Most intervisibility is to the east and south of the site.
- 4.23 Because the clustered village of St Weonards is a distinctive landmark along the route of the relatively well-frequented A466, it is deemed that users of this main road traveling north would have a medium to high sensitivity to change. Respecting the visual amenity of viewpoints such as **Photoviewpoint EDP 7** has been a key driver of the design. Fortunately,

the site forms an apron of land lower than the land near the church and so development would not obscure views of the historic village nor reduce the dominance of the church tower in these views. Further, the existing settlement edge in these views has some detracting elements and development offers an opportunity to improve the landscape character and visual amenity of that edge.

Section 5

The Proposed Development and Mitigation

The Proposed Development

- 5.1 The Duchy is proposing a residential development of up to 24 dwellings, access, associated infrastructure and a structural landscape.
- 5.2 It is common ground with the LPA that, sequentially, the site forms the most logical location for the new housing required in the parish of St Weonards, with reference to the proposed layout (see **Appendix EDP 1**) and the Site Landscape Masterplan (see **Plan EDP 6**). In this regard the site:
- Would be sustainably connected to St Weonards, lying on the same side of the A466 as the historic village core;
 - A new agricultural access point exists on the site's western boundary which will be utilised as the proposed vehicular access point into the site. This has been sensitively sited near to the main village and settlement edge to ensure that vehicular movement is contained to the core of the village;
 - Facilitate a scale and pattern of development that would respond well to the prevailing clustered settlement pattern in this part of Herefordshire and the character of St Weonards in particular;
 - Not compete with the dominance of the landmark church tower as a result of local topography; and
 - Ensures development could not 'spill down' the hill so harming the hill-top nature of the village.
- 5.3 The Proposed Site Layout Plan (**Appendix EDP 1**) has evolved over time with considerable input from HC officers and from EDP's landscape architects, who have aimed to ensure that the proposals would be readily integrated into the settlement form and pattern, and easily assimilated into the landscape. To this end, the Illustrative Masterplan has been 'landscape-led'. It has also incorporated ecological, arboricultural, heritage and drainage considerations to avoid or minimise potential effects, which are detailed in the findings of each field assessment, including this assessment.
- 5.4 A key pillar of the landscape strategy has been to treat the publicly accessible existing and proposed green spaces as a single entity/resource. The landscape proposals are integrated into an overall GI network for the village (refer to **Plan EDP 5**). Each proposed green space is linked to another.

5.5 Each proposed green space, listed below, is designed to be multi-functional:

- Circular walks: An indicative footpath is proposed to link the proposed development to the village hall, post office and school. A number of pedestrian routes within the proposed development would also connect properties to each of the green spaces within the site. Provision of strong connections and circular routes around the village are a stated desire for many of the existing villagers;
- Village Green: A generous open green space is located within the centre of the proposed development, overlooked on all sides by dwellings. It would form part of the wider circulation, but also provide a flexible open space, large enough to accommodate larger feature trees such as walnut;
- Ecological connectivity: A new, mixed native hedgerow would be planted along the southern and western boundaries. This would include standard native trees to soften the southern edge. The hedgerow would provide a coherent boundary treatment as well as ecological connectivity for protected bat species; and
- Green verges and street trees: Wide grass verges would be included to reinforce the village character of the proposed development. The verges would be deep enough to accommodate informal pedestrian activity as well as small street trees.

Embedded Mitigation

5.6 This process has embedded mitigation measures into the design to reduce residual effects and, specifically, to further improve the appearance of the existing southern and western settlement edges. With considerable thought given to views into and out of the site, the following principles have been followed:

- Deliver a high-quality, low-density residential scheme;
- Develop with sympathy to the topographical contours;
- Obscure the slightly incongruous linear geometry of the red line boundary, by use of structural planting and by creating indents in the built form, which will also strengthen the rural form and appearance; and
- Use vernacular style form and materials to create a more coherent and sympathetic feel to the edge of settlement.

5.7 Further detail on the proposed building style and materials is provided in the accompanying DAS, but would be in keeping with the vernacular of St Weonards and other local villages.

5.8 Prior to adopting the above mitigation measures, measures to protect retained landscape features and habitats (i.e. the retained hedges) during construction will be in place and would continue to be protected in accordance with a long term management plan, which will maintain and enhance biodiversity and landscape value.

- 5.9 In adopting the above mitigation measures, the proposed scheme design serves to reduce the magnitude of potential landscape and visual effects on the identified baseline receptors. These proposals, however, go further: they contribute to the restoration and management of landscape features that contribute to the character/visual and wildlife amenity of the area.
- 5.10 **Section 6** of this report describes the *residual* landscape and visual effects, which would arise as a result of the implementation of the proposals described above.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Section 6 Assessment of Effects

Introduction

- 6.1 Predicted effects on receptors are assessed at Year 15, when the embedded mitigation measures, such as structural tree planting, have had time to mature. Where effects would be greater in the interim period, the assessment text describes those effects. The detailed assessment of effects, in tabular form, is provided at **Appendices EDP 4** and **5**.

Effects upon the Landscape Resource

- 6.2 For the proposed development at the site, it is considered that there is potential for effects on the landscape receptors listed below:
- Landscape character of the site itself: topography and hydrology, cultural and historical landscape, landscape fabric and habitats and, perceptual and sensory character; and
 - The landscape character of the 'Archenfield' Sub-Regional Character Area.
- 6.3 Effects on the wider (national) landscape character resource will diminish with distance and this, together with the limited geographical extent of NCA 104 covered by the ZPV and the scale of the proposals, means that it is highly unlikely that effects on this resource will be a material consideration and further assessment of this receptor has been scoped out. Where material effects are likely in the wider area, these are assessed.
- 6.4 The assessment of the identified landscape receptors is provided as **Appendix EDP 4**, whilst a summary of effects on landscape receptors is provided in **Table EDP 6.1**.

Table EDP 6.1: Summary of Landscape Effects on the Site Itself.

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect at Year 15	Nature of Effect
Cultural/Historical Landscape	Low-medium	Medium	Minor/ Moderate-minor	Beneficial
Topography and Hydrology	High	Low	Moderate/minor	Adverse
Landscape Fabric/Habitats	Low	Low	Minor/negligible	Beneficial
Perceptual and Sensory	High	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
Archenfield Sub-regional Character Area	High	Low	Moderate/minor	Neutral

Summary of Effects on Landscape Resource

- 6.5 In accordance with the methodology, there would be *no* 'substantial' or 'major' level of effect on the character of the site itself.
- 6.6 At the site level, there would be a **moderate** effect on perceptual and sensory elements. This is due to the loss of 'openness', which is an unavoidable consequence of any 'greenfield' development. The effect is no greater than moderate because the development would be perceived as a logical extension of St Weonards – in terms of mass, form and scale. Crucially, the proposed development would not alter the perception of St Weonards as a relatively small village, clustered onto the upper reaches of the low hilltop and surrounded by an agricultural landscape. The siting of the vehicular access has been located near to the village edge and utilises an existing agricultural field access point. The proposals would not alter the way in which the topography of the site contributes to local character.
- 6.7 All other site level landscape character effects are at a moderate-minor level, or below. Regarding cultural and historical elements, the site is relatively small and the form, scale and massing of the proposed development would not fundamentally alter the historic character of St Weonards, nor would it be likely to reduce the dominance of the church tower in the landscape.
- 6.8 At the wider landscape scale, the site forms a very small proportion of the Archenfield Sub-regional Character Area and the type of change being proposed would not conflict with the prevailing modern local trend towards more clustered settlements, which lie principally on elevated ground on the valley sides and tops. For these reasons, the level of effect is considered to be **moderate-minor** on the Archenfield Sub-regional Character Area, and **neutral** in nature.
- 6.9 The site level effects are partially mitigated by creating and strengthening the landscape fabric, such as replacement hedgerows and new trees. A new area of species rich grassland in the south-eastern corner would also result in ecological benefits. By Year 15, the structural tree planting would have effectively assimilated the scheme into the village setting and would partly mitigate any additional night time effect of new lighting. To further counterbalance the effects of the new development, the design and materials palette (as described in the DAS) would respond sensitively to and respect the positive attributes of the existing village. Finally, connected areas of public open space (both hard and soft landscaping) are integrated within the proposed development thus creating an opportunity for healthy living and opportunities to enjoy extensive views out to the south and east.

Effects on Visual Amenity

- 6.10 Visual effects relate to changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people's responses to those changes, and to the overall effects with respect to visual amenity. Effects upon these receptors are derived through the changes to the views experienced and the change to the overall visual amenity of the

detailed study area. An assessment of the effects at each of the thirteen approved viewpoints has been undertaken, and the results of this appraisal are provided in **Appendix EDP 4** with the summary contained in **Table EDP 6.2**.

Table EDP 6.2: Summary of Visual Effects.

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Overall Effect at Year 15	Nature of Effect
Photoviewpoint EDP 1	Medium	Medium	Moderate/minor	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 2	Medium	Medium	Minor	Adverse
Photoviewpoint EDP 3	High	Low	Moderate	Adverse
Photoviewpoint EDP 4	High	Low	Moderate/minor	Adverse
Photoviewpoint EDP 5	Medium	Low	Minor	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 6	Medium	Low	Minor	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 7	Medium-high	Low	Moderate/minor, Minor	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 8	Medium	Very Low	Minor/negligible	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 9	Low	Very Low	Negligible	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 10	Medium	Very Low	Minor/negligible	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 11	High	Very Low	Minor	Adverse
Photoviewpoint EDP 12	Medium	Very Low	Minor/negligible	Neutral
Photoviewpoint EDP 13	Medium	Very Low	Minor/negligible	Neutral

Summary of Effects on Visual Amenity

- 6.11 Out of the thirteen photoviewpoints, *none* is considered to have either a ‘substantial’ or ‘major’ level of effect overall.
- 6.12 One photoviewpoint is assessed as having a **moderate** level of effect at Year 15², this being **Photoviewpoint EDP 4**, meaning that the vast majority (twelve) of the thirteen photoviewpoints have a level of effect of **moderate/minor** or below and once the scheme has matured³. These moderate levels of effect would be experienced by users of PRoW SW11, because – although the magnitude of change to these close-ranging and open views from the east is low – users have a high sensitivity to change.

Public Rights of Way

SW11 to the Immediate East of St Weonards

- 6.13 Users of this footpath would experience different aspects of the proposed development, with views of the site opening up the further east the viewer moves away from the church. For example, very little of the proposed development would be visible from

² A ‘moderate’ effect would be deemed a ‘significant’ level of effect if the proposed development was subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

³ A level of effect below ‘moderate’ would be deemed ‘not significant’ if the proposed development was subject to EIA.

Photoviewpoint EDP 3, but most of the proposed development would open up to the viewer at **Photoviewpoint EDP 4**. From here, proposals would form skyline development, but this would be of the similar character as the existing village. Proposed boundary vegetation would contain the built development and structural planting would both soften and break up the built form as well as creating part of the skyline over time. In short, the landscape proposals would assimilate the buildings into this settled landscape in a character similar to the baseline and so the level of effect is limited to **moderate** by Year 15. Clearly, the level of effect would be greater than this in the early years when materials have not yet weathered and before tree and hedgerow planting has not started to mature.

Other Public Rights of Way

- 6.14 From other more distant PRoW, the level of effect would be **minor** or lower. From the route with permitted access north of Scotsbrook (**Photoviewpoint EDP 11**), it is highly unlikely that anything other than a couple of house ridgelines would be visible – due to the site lying on falling ground on the opposite face of the hill – and these would form a small component of the view and appear well-related to the existing village. From footpath 336/SW5 to the west of Northgate Farm (**Photoviewpoint EDP 11**), at this distance and elevation, the development proposals would be barely noticeable in the landscape.

Minor Roads

- 6.15 The level of effect on views from minor roads is at most **minor** and often **minor/negligible**. The minor effects are from **Photoviewpoints EDP 2, 5 and 6**. The proposed development would be clearly noticeable but would form a small horizontal and vertical extent of skyline. However, the built form has an organic, varied form and orientation and would not appear as a continuous mass of development. This would be further softened and broken up by structural planting by Year 15. The design intent has been to improve the character of the southern settlement edge and the proposals do contain beneficial elements that are more typical of a rural, farmland village character, such as the continuous native hedgerow with native standard trees.

Main Roads

- 6.16 The level of effect is on users of the A466 and this effect is assessed as **moderate/minor** at most. Most importantly, the proposed development would not reduce the dominance of the church tower in this landscape and would not alter the hill-top nature of the settlement. The proposals have been designed to improve the visual amenity of the southern settlement edge. For example, the varied scale, mass, form and orientation of the buildings has been designed to have a more rural, organic and non-housing estate character. The visual prominence of the school would be reduced significantly, as would the 1970s dwellings at Mount Way. The location of the vehicular access has been kept close to the village edge, appearing as a logical part of the settlement on the approach and meaning views of this are not overly prominent in the wider landscape.

Residential Receptors

- 6.17 The most substantial change would be experienced by those properties immediately adjacent to the site boundary, most notably dwellings at the southern end of Mount Way and two dwellings immediately to the north-west including The Tythe Barn. This is not untypical for settlement-edge locations, and the Proposed Site Layout Plan (contained at **Appendix EDP 1**) demonstrates how offsets to proposed buildings have been designed into the masterplan to maintain the residential amenity of these existing dwellings. Importantly, the dwellings on Mount Way would still enjoy panoramic views out from the north-east to the south-east. The primary amenity aspects of The Tythe Barn are towards the east. Although some open views would be lost to the east and south-east (from the vegetable garden), care has been taken not to introduce overbearing elements.

Summary of Effects on the Visual Amenity

- 6.18 The effect of the proposed development on visual amenity has been a key priority in the iterative design process.
- 6.19 The effect of the proposed development on visual amenity ranges from **negligible** to **moderate**. No effect on visual amenity is assessed as 'substantial' or 'major'. Any effect of moderate or greater would attract some weight in landscape policy terms, but it is worth noting that the proposed development would have a less than moderate effect on the majority of the receptors assessed.
- 6.20 The receptor that would experience the greatest (**moderate**) level of effect would be users of PRoW SW11 approaching St Weonards from the east. The notable receptor experiencing the next greatest effect (**moderate/minor**) would be northbound users of A466.
- 6.21 EDP's landscape architects have provided a set of objectives that the masterplan was required to achieve to minimise any adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity. As a result, this assessment has demonstrated that, in visual terms, the proposed development:
- Does not reduce the dominance of the church tower in publicly available views;
 - Creates a southern edge that does not appear as an abrupt and incongruous boundary, but is sympathetic to the sloping nature of the topography;
 - Visually ties into the existing settlement pattern and fabric and does not appear as a discrete 'bolt on'; and
 - Does not appear to spill, in an uncontained manner, down the hillside, but maintains the perception of St Weonards as a nucleated or clustered 'hill-top' settlement.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Section 7

Discussion and Conclusions

- 7.1 EDP has been commissioned by the applicant to take part in the design and consultation process resulting in these development proposals. As part of this iterative exercise, EDP has undertaken this LVA to accompany an application for full planning permission. The proposed development would contribute towards meeting the objectives of published landscape character assessment guidelines and local planning policy. Each of these are addressed below.

Consideration of Policy Tests

- 7.2 Assessing the site against pertinent adopted local plan policies, this LVA has demonstrated that proposals have responded sensitively to the intrinsic character and beauty of the local countryside, and are thus consistent with Policy SS2.
- 7.3 The clustered settlement pattern and landscape setting of St Weonards – that contribute to Herefordshire’s distinctiveness – have been protected and enhanced by the proposals in line with Policy SS6.
- 7.4 The landscape design has taken a ‘whole village’ approach in that proposed green spaces are integrated appropriately into their surroundings and with the existing village green spaces, which is in the spirit of the guidance set out in Policy LD1.

Discussion: Effects on Landscape Character

- 7.5 At the wider landscape scale, the site forms a very small proportion of the Archenfield Sub-regional Character Area and the type of change being proposed would not conflict with the prevailing modern local trend towards more clustered settlements, which lie principally on elevated ground on the valley sides and tops. For these reasons, the level of effect is **moderate-minor** and **neutral**.
- 7.6 At the site level, there would be a **moderate** effect on perceptual and sensory elements, largely due to the loss of ‘openness’, which is an unavoidable consequence of any ‘greenfield’ development. The effect is no greater than moderate due to the development being perceived as a logical extension of St Weonards, which would thus retain its character as a small, rural and nucleated hilltop village dominated by the church tower.
- 7.7 Any adverse effects are mitigated by creating and strengthening the landscape fabric (which is currently limited and of limited value), such as replacement hedgerows and new trees. This new habitat, in addition to an area of species rich grassland, would also result in ecological benefits. By Year 15, the structural tree planting would have assimilated the scheme into the village setting. To further help further counterbalance the weight of adverse effects, an network of connected areas of public open space run through the

proposed development, thus promoting an opportunities for walking/recreation, as well as opportunities to enjoy extensive views out towards the south and east.

Discussion: Effects on Visual Amenity

- 7.8 The effect of the proposed development on visual amenity ranges from **negligible** to **moderate**. A **moderate** level of effect would be experienced by users of PRoW SW11 and **moderate/minor** effect would be experienced by northbound users of A466.
- 7.9 The iterative nature of the LVA process has helped to ensure that visual objectives have been met, in particular: maintaining the dominance of the church tower in publicly available views; creating a new coherent southern settlement edge sympathetic to the site contours; containing development on the hilltop; and assimilating the built form into the landscape through proposed tree planting.

Conclusions

- 7.10 The following conclusions can be drawn from this comprehensive LVA process:
- The proposed development complies with national policies and with the relevant policies in the adopted local plan;
 - No effect has been assessed as being ‘substantial’ or ‘major’, although the site itself will experience a **moderate** effect, which is an unavoidable consequence of ‘greenfield’ development;
 - More widely, the proposed development is not considered to result in a material level of effect upon any landscape receptor that would be to the detriment of the Archenfield Sub-Regional Character Area;
 - Although ‘greenfield’ development, by definition, would result in a loss of ‘openness’ within the site, this LVA has demonstrated that the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond sensitively to the village of St Weonards within its hilltop setting; and
 - The assessment has found that in no instance are the effects upon those identified landscape and visual receptors of such a magnitude to render the development unacceptable in landscape character or visual amenity terms.
- 7.11 To counterbalance any residual adverse effects, weight should be given to the new fabric (hedgerow, trees and grassland) and public open spaces that are being proposed (e.g. village green and circular walks with publicly available vistas) that would be to the benefit and general well-being of existing village residents as well as the potential new residents.

- 7.12 For the reasons outlined within the report, the proposed residential development represents an appropriately-scaled and relatively discrete visual feature, which is designed to be in keeping with the local landscape character and village setting. It would result in a very limited number of material landscape or visual effects and it would not result in any policy contraventions.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Appendix EDP 1
Proposed Site Layout (Drawing No. 2368-050 Revision C)

This page has been left blank intentionally



- General Notes:**
1. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with other consultants drawings
 2. Check site conditions prior to commencement of work
 3. Discrepancies must be reported directly to the Architect
 4. Do not scale off drawing, use figured dimensions only
 5. This drawing may be issued in colour, and may be a non-standard paper size

- KEY:**
- Site Boundary
 - Proposed House Types

- PLOT SCHEDULE:**
- House Type A1 - Plot 06
 - House Type A2 - Plot 01
 - House Type B1 - Plot 18 & 24
 - House Type B3 - Plot 07 & 19
 - House Type B4 - Plot 02
 - House Type C1 - Plot 04, 05, 15, 16 & 17
 - House Type C2 - Plot 08, 09, 20 & 21
 - House Type D1 - Plot 14
 - House Type D2 - Plot 03
 - House Type E1 - Plot 22 & 23
 - House Type F1 - Plot 10, 11, 12 & 13

House Type	Bedrooms	Unit GIA (m²)
House Type A1	3 Bed	160
House Type A2	3 Bed	160
House Type B1	3 Bed	100
House Type B3	3 Bed	103
House Type B4	3 Bed	100
House Type C1	2 Bed	83
House Type C2	2 Bed	83
House Type D1	4 Bed	115
House Type D2	4 Bed	115
House Type E1	2 Bed	91
House Type F1	3 Bed	100

C	24.02.21	Planning Issue	AG
Rev	Date	Notes	Drawn
Scale			
1 : 500 @ A2			
0 10 20m			
0 50ft			

QA Serial Number

YIANGOU
YIANGOU ARCHITECTS

Dyer House, 3 Dyer Street
Cirencester, Glouce, GL7 2PP
t 01295 868 150
e architecture@yiangou.com
w www.yiangou.com

Project Address	Land South of St.Weonards, Herefordshire		
Project Description	New Housing Development		
Drawing Title	Proposed Site Plan		
Drawing No.	2368-050	Rev.	C

Appendix EDP 2

Relevant Local Plan Policies

Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 - 2031

Policy SS2 – Delivering New Homes

- A2.1 *“In the **rural** areas new housing development will be acceptable where it helps to meet housing needs and requirements, supports the rural economy and local services and facilities and is responsive to the needs of its community. In the wider rural areas new housing will be carefully controlled reflecting the need to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.”*

Policy SS6 - Environmental quality and local distinctiveness

- A2.2 *“Development proposals should conserve and enhance those environmental assets that contribute towards the county’s distinctiveness, in particular its settlement pattern, landscape, biodiversity and heritage assets and especially those with specific environmental designations ...:*

- landscape, townscape and local distinctiveness, especially in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;*
- the network of green infrastructure; and*
- local amenity, including light pollution, air quality and tranquillity.*

...Furthermore assessments of local features, areas and sites, defining local distinctiveness in other development plan documents, Neighbourhood Development Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents should inform decisions upon proposals.”

Policy LD1 – Landscape and townscape

- A2.3 *“Development proposals should:*
- Demonstrate that character of the landscape and townscape has positively influenced the design, scale, nature and site selection, protection and enhancement of the setting of settlements and designated areas;*
 - Conserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic beauty of important landscapes and features, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, nationally and locally designated parks and gardens and conservation areas; through the protection of the area’s character and by enabling appropriate uses, design and management;*

- *Incorporate new landscape schemes and their management to ensure development integrates appropriately into its surroundings; and*
- *Maintain and extend tree cover where important to amenity, through the retention of important trees, appropriate replacement of trees lost through development and new planting to support green infrastructure.”*

Policy LD3 – Green infrastructure

A2.4 *“Development proposals should protect, manage and plan for the preservation of existing and delivery of new green infrastructure, and should achieve the following objectives:*

1. *Identification and retention of existing green infrastructure corridors and linkages; including the protection of valued landscapes, trees, hedgerows, woodlands, water courses and adjoining flood plain;*
2. *Provision of on-site green infrastructure; in particular proposals will be supported where this enhances the network; and*
3. *Integration with, and connection to, the surrounding green infrastructure network.”*

Appendix EDP 3 Methodology

Recording the Baseline

Landscape Resource

- A3.1 The landscape resource section provides a description of the baseline character and condition of the different landscape receptors (topography and hydrology; landscape fabric and habitats; cultural and historic landscape; perceptual and sensory) with comparison against adopted character assessment, other published characterisations or, in the absence of these, EDP's own landscape characterisation. Considerations on the value of the landscape are drawn from GLVIA V3 Box 5.1.

Visual Amenity

- A3.2 Visual receptors are identified through theoretical visibility testing, followed by site-based recording of actual views and visual amenity. Visual amenity is described from specific locations that may also be represented by photoviewpoints. Visual amenity may also be described for part or all of a route with reference made to viewpoints that do not have views.

The Proposed Development

- A3.3 Description of the proposed development including – but not limited to – its scale, siting, layout and characteristics. This description also includes landscape mitigation measures, derived from published landscape character guidelines and if available as an illustrated plan.

Mitigation

- A3.4 Mitigation measures will be described, where relevant, to demonstrate how adverse effects can be prevented/avoided, offset or remedied. These may be primary i.e. embedded into the design; part of construction and/or long term operational management practices, and/or secondary measures.

EDP Assessment of Effects

Landscape

- A3.5 The landscape section provides a description of the interactions likely to be experienced by the individual dimensions of landscape character and how this affects overall landscape character.

Visual

- A3.6 This section provides a description of the interactions likely to be experienced by visual receptors at a specific point and/or in the broader context or along a route.

Table EDP A3.1: Definition of Effects.

Substantial	Changes resulting in a complete variance with the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Major	Changes resulting in a fundamental change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Moderate	A material but non-fundamental change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Minor	A slight but non-material change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Negligible	A detectable but non-material change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
None	No detectable change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Consequence	Effects can be positive, adverse or neutral i.e. if no change arises
Duration	Long term (20+ years); Medium-long term (10-20 years); Medium term (5-10 years); Short term (1 – 5 years); Temporary (>12 months); Construction.

Table EDP A3.2: EDP Assessment Terminology and Definitions.

Landscape Baseline - Overall Sensitivity	
Very High	<p>Value: Nationally/internationally designated/valued countryside and landscape features; strong/distinctive landscape characteristics; absence of landscape detractors.</p> <p>Susceptibility: Strong/distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; absence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in excellent condition. Landscapes with clear and widely recognised cultural value. Landscapes with a high level of tranquillity.</p>
High	<p>Value: Locally designated/valued countryside (e.g. Areas of High Landscape Value, Regional Scenic Areas) and landscape features; many distinctive landscape characteristics; very few landscape detractors.</p> <p>Susceptibility: Many distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; very few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in good condition. The landscape has a low capacity for change as a result of potential changes to defining character.</p>
Medium	<p>Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; some distinctive landscape characteristics; few landscape detractors.</p> <p>Susceptibility: Some distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in fair condition. Landscape is able to accommodate some change as a result.</p>
Low	<p>Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; few distinctive landscape characteristics; presence of landscape detractors.</p>

Landscape Baseline - Overall Sensitivity	
	Susceptibility: Few distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; presence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in poor condition. Landscape is able to accommodate large amounts of change without changing these characteristics fundamentally.
Very Low	Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; absence of distinctive landscape characteristics; despoiled/degraded by the presence of many landscape detractors.
	Susceptibility: Absence of distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/-perceptual aspects; presence of many landscape detractors; landscape receptors in very poor condition. As such landscape is able to accommodate considerable change.

Table EDP A3.3: Visual Baseline – Overall Sensitivity.

Very High	Value/Susceptibility: View is designed/has intentional association with surroundings; is recorded in published material; is from a publicly accessible heritage asset/designated/promoted viewpoint; national/internationally designated right of way; protected/recognised in planning policy designation.
	Examples: May include views from residential properties, National Trails; promoted holiday road routes; designated countryside/landscape features with public access; visitors to heritage assets of national importance; Open Access Land.
High	Value/Susceptibility: View of clear value but may not be formally recognised e.g. framed view of scenic value or destination/summit views; inferred that it may have value for local residents; locally promoted route or PRoW.
	Examples: May include from recreational locations where there is some appreciation of the visual context/landscape e.g. golf, fishing; themed rights of way with a local association; National Trust land; panoramic viewpoints marked on OS maps; road routes promoted in tourist guides and/or for their scenic value.
Medium	Value/Susceptibility: View is not widely promoted or recorded in published sources; may be typical of those experienced by an identified receptor; minor road routes through rural/scenic areas.
	Examples: May include people engaged in outdoor sport not especially influenced by an appreciation of the wider landscape e.g. pitch sports; views from minor road routes passing through rural or scenic areas.
Low	Value/Susceptibility: View of clearly lesser value than similar views from nearby visual receptors that may be more accessible.
	Examples: May include major road routes; rail routes; receptor is at a place of work but visual surroundings have limited relevance.
Very Low	Value/Susceptibility: View may be affected by many landscape detractors and unlikely to be valued.
	Examples: May include people at their place of work, indoor recreational or leisure facilities or other locations where views of the wider landscape have little of no importance.

Table EDP A3.4: Magnitude of Change.

(Considers Scale of Proposal/Geographical Extent/Duration and Reversibility/Proportion)	
Very High	<p>Landscape: Total loss/major alteration to key receptors/characteristics of the baseline; addition of elements that strongly conflict or integrate with the baseline.</p> <p>Visual: Substantial change to the baseline, forming a new, defining focus and having a defining influence on the view.</p>
High	<p>Landscape: Notable loss/alteration/addition to one or more key receptors/characteristics of the baseline; or, addition of prominent conflicting elements.</p> <p>Visual: Additions are clearly noticeable and part of the view would be fundamentally altered.</p>
Medium	<p>Landscape: Partial loss/alteration to one or more key receptors/characteristics; Addition of elements that are evident but do not necessarily conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.</p> <p>Visual: The proposed development will form a new and recognisable element within the view which is likely to be recognised by the receptor.</p>
Low	<p>Landscape: Minor loss or alteration to one or more key landscape receptors/characteristics; Additional elements may not be uncharacteristic within existing landscape.</p> <p>Visual: Proposed development will form a minor constituent of the view being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a small component.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape: Barely discernible loss or alteration to key components; addition of elements not uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.</p> <p>Visual: Proposed development will form a barely noticeable component of the view, and the view whilst slightly altered would be similar to the baseline.</p>
Imperceptible	In some circumstances, changes at representative viewpoints or receptors will be lower than 'Very Low' and changes will be described as 'Imperceptible'. This will lead to negligible effects.

Effects Matrix

- A3.7 Based on the judgements above and the description of mitigation, the level of effect is assessed at Year 15 when landscape proposals function more effectively. This accepts that effects may be higher during construction and early years before materials have weathered and before structural planting has begun to mature. Effects of moderate or higher may be a material consideration.

Table EDP A3.5: EDP Assessment Terminology and Definitions.

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

This page has been left blank intentionally

Appendix EDP 4

Table of Effects: Landscape Character

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (> Year 15)	Effect
<p>Site - Topography and Hydrology</p> <p><u>Sensitivity:</u> The hill-top nature of the village means that the sloping topography is highly sensitive to change.</p> <p><u>Magnitude of Change:</u> Construction activities would not fundamentally alter the aspect of the site and, although there would need to be some 'cut and fill' works to deal with the topography, these would not be readily noticed within the overall context of the settlement. There are no water bodies on site and the surface water attenuation area has been proposed to be underground in the lower part of the site. Most importantly, development would not alter the way in which the topography of the site contributes to local character. For these reasons, the magnitude of change to the site's topography and hydrology would be low.</p>	High	Low	Moderate/ Minor, adverse
<p>Site - Cultural, Recreation and Historical Landscape</p> <p><u>Sensitivity:</u> The accompanying Archaeological and Heritage assessment concludes that development on the site would have no effect on the setting of the tump. It concludes that the tower is readily visible from the surrounding countryside and from within the site, so in principle, the site comprises part of the listed building's wider setting. However, as the site is assessed not to contribute to the significance of the church, the sensitivity of these elements is assessed as low.</p> <p>From a landscape perspective, the site forms an apron of open land just below the historic village. However, the sensitivity of the site is lowered by the existing detractors associated with later developments (Mount Way and the school) and development would be extremely unlikely to reduce the dominance of the church tower. For these reasons, the cultural and historical sensitivity of the site – in landscape terms – is medium.</p> <p><u>Magnitude of Change:</u> The site is relatively small and the form, scale and massing of the proposed development would not fundamentally alter the character of St Weonards from a historic, small, clustered, hill-top settlement. For these reasons, the magnitude of change is assessed as medium and an improved settlement edge would be beneficial.</p>	Low-medium	Medium	Minor/ Moderate-minor beneficial

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (> Year 15)	Effect
<p>Site - Landscape Fabric and Habitat</p> <p><u>Sensitivity:</u> The existing fabric is simple and low value and the sensitivity to change is correspondingly low.</p> <p><u>Magnitude of Change:</u> Only a relatively small portion of the arable field would be converted to residential use. The species-rich hedgerows at the eastern field boundary would be retained and protected. Although the species-rich hedgerow along the western boundary with the A466 would be removed (in order to create a strong and positive relationship between the proposed village extension and the road, as witnessed further north along this road), this would be more than offset by the planting and management of new mixed-native hedgerow along the southern and western boundaries, which would also connect better with the existing hedgerow network further east. For these reasons, the magnitude of change is assessed as low and beneficial.</p>	Low	Low	Minor/ Negligible, beneficial
<p>Site - Perceptual and Sensory Character</p> <p><u>Sensitivity:</u> The site is small, but is clearly discernible in open views from the east and south situated just below the settled hill-top. The landscape is highly tranquil, albeit influenced by the adjacent settlement edge and the A466. For these reasons, the sensitivity of these elements is assessed as high.</p> <p><u>Magnitude of Change:</u> The proposed development lies immediately adjacent to the existing southern settlement edge and would be perceived as a logical extension of St Weonards in terms of mass, form and scale. The additional car journeys would not materially affect ambient noise levels on surrounding, but despite the commitment to a sensitive lighting scheme, additional dwellings would extend light glow, although this would only be perceived by night-time users of the A466 and by a handful of residential dwellings to the east. This would be mitigated somewhat by the proposed structural planting.</p> <p>Crucially, the proposed development would not alter the perception of St Weonards as a relatively small village, huddled on the upper reaches of the low hilltop and surrounded by an agricultural landscape. The proposals have been designed so as not be perceived to spill in an uncontrolled manner down the hillside. For these reasons the magnitude of change to these elements is assessed as medium.</p>	High	Medium	Moderate, adverse

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (> Year 15)	Effect
<p>'Archenfield' Sub-Regional Character Area</p> <p><u>Sensitivity:</u> EDP assess the sensitivity of this Character Area as high.</p> <p><u>Magnitude of Change:</u> The site forms a very small proportion of the overall Character Area and so the scale of change is minor or even negligible. This type of proposed change would not conflict with the prevailing modern character, which is trending towards more clustered settlements, which lie principally on elevated ground on the valley sides and tops. For these reasons, the magnitude of change is assessed as low.</p>	High	Low	Moderate/ Minor, neutral

This page has been left blank intentionally

No.	Viewpoint Name	Grid Ref.	Distance and direction to Site	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (>Year 15)	Effect
PVP 1	Junction of A466 and Unclassified Road	349643, 223749	250m looking north	Users of major road	Medium	Medium	Moderate/ Minor, neutral
<p>Baseline View: Users of the A466 experience a clear and open view towards the site, with the existing settlement forming the backdrop. This baseline view demonstrates the dominance of the church tower and that the site forms an apron on lower ground in front of the existing settlement, which is clustered on the highest ground. The existing linear settlement edge has some detracting features: the school building is quite large and visually prominent (white) below the church tower and the disjointed and incoherent boundary treatment with the site is clear. To the right (south-west) the single- and double-storey dwellings on Mount Way form sky-line development.</p> <p>Magnitude of Change Predicted: Although the development would change the appearance of the existing settlement edge, the church tower would retain its dominance from this vantage. The proposed boundary would be more coherent, being formed of a mixed-native hedgerow, including native standard trees and would contain the extent of the village from migration down the hill. Buildings on Mount Way would be obscured by buildings more sympathetic – in terms of the variety of form, mass and materials (as set out in the accompanying DAS) – to the historic character. For these reasons the magnitude of change is assessed as medium with some improving, beneficial elements.</p>							
PVP 2	Unclassified Road West of St Weonards	349310, 224026	210m, looking east	Users of local road	Medium	Low	Minor, adverse
<p>Baseline View: Users of this minor road would experience a short-duration and oblique view of the site through a field entrance. The view of the site is heavily filtered by trees in the outgrown hedge in the foreground. The intact hedgerow in the background forms the site's western boundary. The view is also characterised by existing residential development, ornamental planting and by farmyard building.</p> <p>Magnitude of Change Predicted: A short stretch of visible, intact hedgerow would be replaced with two new roadside dwellings within their curtilage. This proposed development would be noticeable, although obscured, through the intervening vegetation. These two new dwellings would be consistent in character with existing roadside development further north (left) in this view. For these reasons, the magnitude of change would be low, and adverse in the sense that some 'open' aspect of this view would be developed.</p>							

No.	Viewpoint Name	Grid Ref.	Distance and direction to Site	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (>Year 15)	Effect
PVP 3	Local PRoW no. SW11 to the immediate east of St Weonards	349766, 224318	275m, looking south-west	Users of PRoW	High	Low	Moderate, adverse

Baseline View: Users of this footpath, just east of the church, would have an open, close-range view of the site, only partially filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation. The view shows the site forming an extension to the settlement edge along the upper reaches of the hill. It can be argued that the 1970s character of dwellings along Mount Way are a detracting element from the attractiveness of this view.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: Very little of the proposed development would be visible. Due to the fall of the site's topography, buildings would not obscure the view towards the far distance as so some element of openness would be maintained. The proposed hedgerow trees to the south (left) would form a 'full stop' to contain built form on the upper reaches of the hill. For these reasons the magnitude of change is assessed as low, with some beneficial elements.

PVP 4	Local PRoW no. SW11 to the immediate east of St Weonards	350331, 224134	825m, looking west	Users of PRoW	High	Low	Moderate, adverse
-------	--	----------------	--------------------	---------------	------	-----	--------------------------

Baseline View: Users of this footpath, further east from **Photoviewpoint EDP 3**, would experience an open, but longer-range view of the site, unfiltered by vegetation. The view shows the site forming an extension to the settlement edge along the upper reaches of the hill. The church tower is the dominant landscape feature. The 1970s character of dwellings along Mount Way extends the village from its highest point near the church to the south (left) and the site forms an extension to it.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: The proposed development would be clearly noticeable from this viewpoint, and would form skyline development in the same manner as the existing village. The proposed boundary vegetation would contain the built development as an extension to the existing hedge that contains Mount Way along the eastern settlement edge. The proposed structural planting would soften and break up the built form – and form part of the skyline in time – and help assimilate the buildings into this settled landscape. Because the change is noticeable, but similar to the baseline character, the magnitude of change is assessed as low.

No.	Viewpoint Name	Grid Ref.	Distance and direction to Site	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (>Year 15)	Effect
PVP 5	Unclassified Road adjacent to Treلاسdee Farm	356392, 223793	670m, looking north-west	Users of local road and residents	Medium	Low	Minor

Baseline View: Users of this minor road would experience an open view of the site, unfiltered by roadside vegetation, which appears to have been grubbed up along this section. The site forms an extension to the settlement edge along the upper reaches of the hill, where the church tower is the dominant landscape feature. Apart from the tower, most of the skyline is formed of tree canopies. At this distance, the detracting character of 1970s dwellings along Mount Way is still noticeable and the amount and extent of domestic ornamental evergreen planting is readily apparent.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: The proposed development would be clearly noticeable from this viewpoint, above the roadside bank, and would create a short extent of skyline development. However, over time the structural tree planting would mature to soften that skyline in a manner similar to the baseline condition. The proposed native boundary vegetation would contain the built development to the south and east. The native tree planting would soften and break up the built form. Maturing trees would also help assimilate the buildings into this settled, but apparently well-treed hill top. Because the nature of the change is noticeable, but similar to the baseline character, the magnitude of change is assessed as low. There would be beneficial elements to the change, because the balance of tree species would swing towards native, deciduous species.

PVP 6	Unclassified Road south east of St Weonards	350300, 223422	850m, looking north-west	Users of local road	Medium	Low	Minor
-------	--	----------------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------	-----	--------------

Baseline View: Users of this minor road would experience a short-duration glimpse of the site through a field gate. The glimpse is an open, but medium-range view of the site, unfiltered by vegetation. The site forms an apron just beneath the southern settlement edge, below the peak of the hill, where the church tower is the dominant element. At this distance, the detracting character of 1970s dwellings along Mount Way is less noticeable and the line of the southern settlement boundary is difficult to discern.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: The proposed development would be clearly noticeable from this viewpoint, but would form a small amount of skyline. Instead, the proposals would create a new and more well-defined southern edge to the village. The proposed structural planting would soften and break up the built form, which – also due to its varied form and orientation – would not appear as a solid continuous mass of development. Because the change is noticeable, but similar to the baseline character, the magnitude of change is assessed as low.

PVP 7	Layby along A466 north of Ark Cottages	349807, 223385	630m, looking north	Users of major road and residents	Medium-High	Low	Minor/Moderate-minor, some beneficial elements
-------	--	----------------	---------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------	-----	---

Baseline View: Users of this main road will enjoy a straight-on, long-duration view of the site. The site forms an apron on lower ground just in front of the existing settlement and development of the site would not form a new skyline. The nature of the existing settlement edge is unclear from this distance, but it has a strong, linear appearance. The school building appears quite large and visually prominent (white) below the church tower.

[illegible]

No.	Viewpoint Name	Grid Ref.	Distance and direction to Site	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude (>Year 15)	Effect
PVP 11	Route with permitted access north of Scotsbrook	349124, 222708	1.34km, looking north-east	Users of footpath	High	Very Low	Minor

Baseline View: This green footpath lies 1.3km to the south-west of the site and is bounded on both sides by hedgerows. From this viewpoint, the site, along with the village of St Weonards, is often obscured by vegetation, but where it is visible, the site is subservient to the elevation and prominence of the church tower.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: It is unlikely that the extent of development proposals would be visible. It is highly unlikely that anything other than a couple of house ridges would be visible, because the site lies on falling ground on the other side of the hill that faces the viewer. The magnitude of change is assessed as very low.

PVP 12	Unclassified road west of St Weonards	348216, 223572	1.4km, looking north-east	Users of local road	Medium	Very Low	Minor/Negligible
--------	---------------------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	---------------------	--------	----------	------------------

Baseline View: This is a longer-distance view of the site, which is heavily filtered behind intervening vegetation over a hedge. The site forms a small and barely noticeable portion of this view.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: Although a tiny amount of building ridge might be technically visible, the development proposals would form a barely noticeable element in the landscape across a very small portion of this view, especially when proposed tree planting starts to mature. For these reasons the magnitude of change is assessed as very low.

PVP 13	Junction of unclassified road and footpath 336/SW5 to the west of Northgate Farm	345981, 224511	3.7km, looking east	Users of local road and PRow	Medium	Very Low	Minor/Negligible
--------	--	----------------	---------------------	------------------------------	--------	----------	------------------

Baseline View: This is a long-distance view of the site, which forms a small and barely noticeable portion of this view.

Magnitude of Change Predicted: The development proposals would form a barely noticeable element in the landscape across a very small portion of this view and for these reasons, the magnitude of change is assessed as very low.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Appendix EDP 6
Photoviewpoints
(edp3231_d005g 17 March 2021 GY/VP)

This page has been left blank intentionally





To be viewed at comfortable arm's length



Approximate extent of site still occupies upper reaches of landscape ridge

Settlement edge is of
1970's development

To be viewed at comfortable arm's length



To be viewed at comfortable arm's length



To be viewed at comfortable arm's length