



APPENDIX F: LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS

F1 INTRODUCTION

F1.1 Introduction

This Appendix presents the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the proposed Energy from Waste Facility (EWF) at Battlefield Industrial Estate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire. The details of the development assessed, as they relate to the LVIA, may be summarised as:

- the erection of an EWF facility on land adjacent to an Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWWMF) which includes a Waste Transfer station and an existing Household Recycling Centre (HRC). It should be noted that the development includes an extension to the HRC and this has been assessed within the LVIA, and reference to the EWF includes this ancillary development; and
- associated mitigation planting and landscape design.

The location of the site is shown on Figure F1.1. Photographs of the site are included on Figure F1.2.

The purpose of the assessment is to:

- define the existing or “baseline” landscape character and visual context of the site;
- assess the implications of the proposed development on landscape character and visual amenity;
- consider relevant mitigation; and
- provide a summary of the nature and significance of residual predicted effects. (i.e. those impacts which cannot practicably be further reduced through mitigation).

This assessment is structured as follows:

- explanation of the assessment methodology;
- description of the existing landscape and visual characteristics of the site and its context (the “baseline”);
- analysis of potential landscape and visual effects arising from the development;
- identification of appropriate mitigation through modification of the development proposals; and
- summary of residual effects taking mitigation into account.

The landscape and visual effects of the scheme have been assessed at the following stages of the development:

- in Year 1 i.e. upon completion of the built development; and
- 15 years after completion of the built development, taking the predicted growth of mitigation planting into effect.

F1.2 General Methodology

The format and content of this assessment is based on guidance from the Countryside Agency (now Natural England)/Scottish Natural Heritage and the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment given in:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Second Edition, IEMA/LI 2002 – hereafter referred to as the GLVIA;
- Landscape Assessment Guidance, 2002 (CA/SNH); and
- 'Topic Paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity' (Countryside Agency 2003).

These publications, supplemented by additional government guidance, form the standard reference for undertaking landscape character and visual assessment in the UK but are applicable to any landscape context or type and are accepted as fulfilling the requirements of EC directives on Environmental Assessment.

The guidance referred to above recommends a two stage approach to landscape and visual assessment comprising an initial desktop study and review of published information, including designations, followed by a site based visit.

In addition, due to the size of the proposed EWF building, the English Heritage/CABE "Guidance on Tall Buildings" (July 2007) guidance was consulted to verify that the approach and methodology within this assessment was appropriate. This guidance requires a character appraisal to be undertaken to identify the building context and significant views and assess the potential effect on the local environment. This has been undertaken for the proposed EWF and is provided in detail in the following pages.

F1.3 Terminology

For the purposes of the environmental assessment, a clear distinction is drawn between landscape and visual impacts as follows:

- **Landscape impacts:** relate to the impacts of the proposed Scheme's construction and operation, upon the physical characteristics or components of

that landscape. Together, these form the character of that landscape (e.g. landform, vegetation, and buildings); and

- **Visual impacts:** relate to the changes arising from development to individual 'receptors' views of that landscape (e.g. local residents or passing motorists).

A glossary of other terms relating to landscape and visual assessment is provided in Annex F1.

Baseline Conditions: the baseline landscape and visual conditions were assessed through both desktop and site appraisal during February 2008 (i.e. winter with deciduous vegetation not in leaf) and again in June 2008 (i.e. summer with deciduous vegetation in leaf).

As there is a permitted IWMF already operating on site, this assessment includes impacts/effects as part of the existing landscape and visual context. This context is taken as the baseline against which the extended Household Recycling Centre HRC and the proposed EWF facility i.e. "the development" is to be assessed.

Study Area: The Study Area for the assessment of the landscape and visual impacts is defined by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). This defines the extent of the landscape context within which views of the proposed EWF may be achieved (refer to Figures F4.1 and F4.2).

The ZTV has been established by initial analysis of topographic maps, 3D digital modelling and terrain analysis followed by field survey verification.

Following assessment of the baseline landscape and visual context of the development the LVIA assesses the:

- sensitivity of receptors, whether the landscape or viewers;
- magnitude of effects, whether adverse or beneficial; and
- significance of the effects based on a comparison of sensitivity of receptor to magnitude of effects.

F1.4 Consultations

Shropshire County Council (SCC) was consulted on the choice of viewpoints for the assessment and recommendations made during that consultation and other suggestions arising from the Community Liaison Group forum were considered and where appropriate included in the assessment.

In addition the Shropshire County Council and Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council (SABC) websites were consulted in order to establish whether any local/county level landscape character assessments have been prepared for the area of the application

site. It was established that the following character assessment, relevant to the context of the site, has been completed:

- The Shropshire Landscape Typology 2006; and
- Shrewsbury and Atcham Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study 2007.

In addition the following sources of information were consulted:

- Countryside Agency (now Natural England) – Joint Character Area 61, Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Plain.

Information derived from these sources has been incorporated into this assessment as appropriate.

F1.5 Technical Difficulties

Generally no technical difficulties or practical problems were encountered in carrying out the landscape and visual assessment presented in this document although, with the exception described below, private land outside of the control of the applicant was not accessed.

Access to Laura's Tower at Shrewsbury Castle was not available at the time of the winter photoviewpoint survey due to building works. In order to record the position of the crane within the panorama from the Castle, access was gained to the roof, an area not normally accessible to the public. Once Laura's Tower was re-opened a second photograph was taken to represent the summer view towards the EWF from the steps of the tower, the highest publicly available part of the castle. The winter photo was then used to position the proposed EWF within the panorama and indicate the extent of visibility at that location.

F2 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER BASELINE ASSESMENT

F2.1 General

The use of landscape characterisation as part of landscape assessment is a widely accepted tool. The Countryside Commission (1996) produced a 'Character of England' map in order to provide a national and regional framework for the more detailed assessment of character at county and local levels. The study led to the classification of distinct landscape character areas called Joint Character Areas (JCAs). The purpose was, in part, to assist those who make decisions about unitary development plans, structure and local plans to consider how best to enhance and respect local distinctiveness.

F2.2 National, County Council & Local Council Landscape Designations

The site lies within 14 kilometres of the Shropshire Hills AONB boundary and within 600m of the Chatwood (Harlescott) Village Conservation Area. The latter, whilst not a specific landscape designation reflects landscape and architectural quality.

The site itself is not located within any area designated as important in landscape or visual terms either on a local or regional level.

The extent of the Chatwood (Harlescott Grange) Conservation Area is shown on Figure F1.1 Site Location.

F2.3 Joint Character Areas/Local Landscape Assessments

The Joint Character Areas (JCAs) form the national level of landscape assessment within which other smaller scale assessments are undertaken, including those carried out by Local Authorities and site-specific assessments. This approach is now recognised in Government Policy (Planning Policy Guidance Note 7) and has become an important tool in the planning process.

The JCAs are used as a tool to define management objectives for the county that seek to strengthen landscape characteristics and retain diversity through the adoption of targeted strategies for landscape development.

- The application site falls within Natural England's Joint Character Area 61, Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Plain which is a large area stretching from Macclesfield and Northwich in the north to Shrewsbury in the south.
- Key Characteristics of JCA 61.

The key characteristics of JCA 61 reproduced from the written description, are:

- Extensive gently rolling plain interrupted by sandstone ridges, the most prominent being the Cheshire Sandstone Ridge.
- A unified rural landscape, with strong field patterns, dominated by dairying which merges with more mixed and arable farming to the north and south-east.
- Mosses, meres and small field ponds are scattered throughout. Subsidence flashes occur to the east of the Cheshire Plain.
- Boundaries are predominantly hedgerows, generally well-managed, with abundant hedgerow trees which are mostly oak. Metal railing fences occur locally on estates.
- Woodlands are few and are restricted to deciduous and mixed woods on the steeper slopes of sandstone ridges, and some of the wetter areas. There are also locally extensive tracts of coniferous woodland. The plentiful hedgerow trees, particularly in Cheshire, give the appearance of a well-wooded landscape.
- Large farmsteads regularly spaced throughout with dispersed hamlets and few market towns.
- Buildings are predominantly red brick with warm sandstone churches and, in the national park, occasional very distinctive black and white half timbered buildings.
- Extractive industries generally small-scale but widespread - sand, gravel, salt, sandstone, peat.

JCA 61 Landscape Change/Trends:

- Intensification of grassland management resulting in the loss of herb-rich hay meadows and pastures and wet grassland.
- The pastoral character has been reduced through the introduction of fodder crops such as maize to provide winter feed.
- The loss of field ponds, bogs, and mosses. Heathlands, once widely distributed, particularly in the south, are now limited to a few isolated fragments.
- The move to arable farming has led to an increase in field size coupled with either the loss of hedgerows and hedgerow trees or the mismanagement of remaining hedges.
- An increase in farm size, and diversification of farm activities.

- Woodlands have been felled locally and replaced with conifers or new conifer plantations have been planted. Many woodlands, and the majority of hedgerow trees, are mature or over-mature.
- Apart from Telford, on the fringe of the area, development has largely been confined to the few major towns and there have been a number of developments in the open countryside in response to the increase in tourism and the demand for recreational facilities.
- The proximity of large conurbations means that development pressures are likely to continue. The demand for infill sites for waste disposal from the conurbations is also an issue.

Shropshire Landscape Typology

The Shropshire Landscape Typology assesses the Shropshire landscape at the next level of detail to the description/analysis of JCA 61. It identifies 27 different landscape types within the County.

The application site is located within an area defined as urban on the border of the Principal Settled Farmlands. The site itself therefore falls into the urban category for which there is no written description, reflecting the landscape assessment's primary focus on rural landscapes, not townscape. The site specific landscape character assessment within this LVIA therefore provides an assessment of the local landscape context of the site. (Refer to Figure F2.2 Landscape Character)

Although the application site lies outside of the Principal Settled Farmlands, their proximity is such that they influence the site and vice versa. A description of the key characteristics of the Principal Settled Farmlands, taken from the Shropshire Landscape Typology, are given below:

- prevalent throughout northern Shropshire;
- settled lowland landscapes of small villages and hamlets, scattered farms and relict commons;
- mixed farming land use;
- varied pattern of sub-regular, hedged fields;
- lacks significant woodlands..... tree cover comprises scattered hedgerow and field trees (mainly oak and ash); and
- landscapes with predominantly filtered views.

Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment

In addition to the Shropshire Landscape Typology which is countywide, Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council appointed White Consultants in July 2006 to undertake a landscape sensitivity and capacity assessment for defined areas around the main settlements of the Borough, principally Shrewsbury.

The assessment “undertook analysis of sensitivity using a new method based on four aspects of inherent sensitivity- ecological, cultural, visibility and tranquillity.”

The assessment took into consideration Countryside Agency ‘Topic Paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity’. It divided the county landscape types into Land Development Units (LDUs) and then divided these into Land Cover Parcels (LCPs) – in other words looking at the next level of detail by carrying out site specific landscape sensitivity and capacity analysis.

The landscape sensitivity of individual LCPs was assessed along with their capacity, in this case primarily in their ability to accommodate housing and employment.

Table F2.1 defines the criteria for sensitivity and capacity used in the assessment. The site for the proposed Energy from Waste Facility (EWF) was one of those LCPs specifically assessed by the assessment.

The development site was classified as Shrewsbury LCP No 15 which had was assessed as having the following landscape sensitivity/capacity:

- Landscape sensitivity: Low
- Landscape Capacity for Housing: Medium/Low
- Landscape Capacity for Employment: High/Medium

The extent of Land Cover Parcel (LCP) 15 is shown on Figure F2.2 Landscape Character.

The land forming the proposed development site is therefore categorised as being of low landscape sensitivity and having a high/medium capacity for employment purposes which reflects both its position adjacent to existing industrial use and the land-use planning context within a clearly defined industrial/employment zone bounded by the Battlefield Link Road (A5124).

Table F2.1: Significance Criteria for Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity*

| | Sensitivity | Capacity |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Low | Key characteristics of landscape are robust and/or are of relatively low intrinsic value as a landscape resource. | thresholds for change are very low and the area is unable to accommodate development without significant adverse effects. |
| Medium-Low | key characteristics of landscape are resilient to change and/or are of limited intrinsic value as a landscape resource. | thresholds for change are low and development can be accommodated only in limited situations. |
| Medium | key characteristics of landscape are susceptible to change and have value as a landscape resource. | thresholds for change are intermediate with some ability to accommodate development in some parts. |
| High-Medium | key characteristics of landscape are vulnerable to change and/or have high value as a landscape resource. | thresholds for significant change are high and the area is able to accommodate a significant proportion for development. |
| High | key characteristics of landscape are very vulnerable to change and/or have significant value as a landscape resource. | thresholds for significant change are very high and much of the area can be developed. |

* based on White Consultants, 2007.

F3 SITE SPECIFIC BASELINE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

F3.1 Introduction

Landscape character assessment is a hierarchical process descending from the national to regional to local scale and ultimately to site-specific studies, such as that undertaken in this assessment. The regional and countywide landscape character assessments referred to in this assessment are at a scale further up the hierarchy and serve to provide an overview of landscape context in which to place site specific studies.

In addition to the White Consultants assessment of the site as part of a borough wide landscape assessment, a site-specific landscape assessment has been undertaken in order to identify the key characteristics of the landscape in accordance with current guidance and also to make an assessment of factors such as the landscape quality, sensitivity and capacity to absorb change or development. The site-specific assessment deals both with the application site and land in the immediate vicinity defined as the landscape context.

F3.2 Site Description

Site location & Features

Whilst the extension to the HRC will occupy land currently developed, the EWF proposal site, which extends to approximately 4.3 ha in area, is located on land adjacent to the IWMF and is allocated for industrial use on the fringe of the Shrewsbury urban area. It is essentially flat and comprises an area of rough grassland containing some soil storage heaps and excavations. The land is currently unused and woody vegetation cover is confined to the northern and eastern boundaries. (Refer to Figures F1.1 Site Location and F1.2 Site Photographs).

The western boundary and southern boundary of the site of the site are formed by existing large scale industrial/warehouse buildings, including the IWMF. The site is bounded to the north by a small stream, within a steep sided cutting, which is a tributary of the River Severn. A railway embankment runs to the east of the open land of the application site, elevated above the site at this point and acting as a partial visual barrier for locations to the east of the railway.

F3.3 Landscape Characteristics

Landscape characteristics include natural factors such as vegetation type, tree cover type and pattern, the extent and pattern of semi-natural habitat, landform and

drainage patterns. These are described in the paragraphs below for the landscape context of the application site.

Topography

The topography surrounding the application site is naturally relatively flat, varying either side of 70m AOD by just a couple of metres. To the east, approximately 3km from the application site the land rises sharply to form an elevated ridgeline between Haughmond Hill (153m AOD) and Ebury Hill (100m AOD). To the south of the application site the topography is again relatively flat at around 70m AOD until the change in geology in the vicinity of Bayston Hill (110m AOD), approximately 6km distant and Lyth Hill beyond (160m AOD). The broad valley of the River Severn marks another variation in topography, generally at approximately 60m AOD and therefore of a lower elevation than the broader landform through which it flows.

To the north the Shropshire Plain rises gradually, with minor undulations, from 70m AOD at the site to 77m AOD at Hadnall, approximately 3Km from the application site and onwards to an elevation of 192m AOD at Clive/Grinshill.

A graphic representation of the landform variation/topography is provided on Figure F2.1 Landform & Landscape Context.

Drainage

The drainage pattern is dominated by the River Severn into which a number of small brooks, including that to the northern boundary of the site, connect. Still water is not a characteristic feature of the landscape and, where found, is often man made.

Land use

The vicinity of the application site is characterised by urban fringe industrial development to the south, west and east and the Battlefield Link Road (A5124) to the north, separated from the site by an undeveloped industrial site. Open countryside, containing isolated hamlets and villages, such as Hadnall and Bomere Heath, lies beyond the Battlefield Link Road.

Land with the open countryside is both arable and pasture with the latter more prevalent. It includes, immediately to the north of the A5124, the site of the battle of Shrewsbury and the church which is believed to have been built on the battleground. No obvious landscape elements exist to indicate the presence of the battlefield.

Public Rights of Way

The site is not crossed by any Public Rights of Way. The closest, at approximately 320m from the application boundary, being the network of footpaths in the vicinity of Battlefield Church and the Battlefield site itself.

Vegetation

Land cover is dominated by improved or semi-improved pasture. Woodland is sparse but vegetation is present in the form of well managed, trimmed, hedges containing mature trees. Recent planting has taken place within the highway corridor of the Battlefield Link Road and associated with the Battlefield viewing mound.

Other vegetation in the vicinity of the site includes shrubby growth along the railway line and planting between the rear of the existing Waste Transfer Station and the Battlefield Link Road.

F3.4 Cultural Factors & Perception

Cultural factors reflect land use, settlement pattern, field boundaries, enclosure pattern and other elements described under landscape characteristics. It also includes the "time depth" apparent in the landscape and any noted literary or historical associations. These elements combine to shape perception of the landscape.

The site context is dominated by industrial use and within an area where, irrespective of the proposed development, further industrialisation is planned and will take place. To the south of the Battlefield Link Road the area has been developed such that few, if any, characteristic landscape elements now exist. To the north the most recent and prominent addition being a series of pylons which cut across the landscape.

However to the north of the Battlefield Link Road the landscape largely retains its characteristic elements, field pattern and vegetation cover. This area includes the area of the historic site of the Battle of Shrewsbury (1403) and attracts visitors wishing to see the site of a pivotal battle in English history. The battlefield is accessible from the car park and viewing mound adjacent to the Enterprise Roundabout on the Battlefield Link Road – from where the views are northwards across the battlefield towards Battlefield church and also from the north through the church grounds and from a series of footpaths across the battlefield. In April 2008 a battlefield exhibition centre was opened at Battlefield Farm to the north of Battlefield church. In addition to refreshment facilities and a farm shop this incorporates an exhibition and offers a panoramic view across the battlefield with interpretation.

No direct specific literary associations are known but Shakespeare draws on the circumstances of the battle of Shrewsbury in Henry IV Part II.

F3.5 Aesthetic Factors

Aesthetic factors relate to the appearance of the landscape derived from the assemblage of elements in it. These are summarised in Annex F5.

F3.6 Tranquillity

The application site and its immediate context are urban/urban fringe in nature and in close proximity to main roads (A49/A53) and rail links as well as traffic within the industrial estates and generally using the arterial routes into Shrewsbury. In addition helicopters from the nearby Shawbury airbase are a constant feature of the area. These factors combine to create an area of low and sometimes, locally, very low tranquillity.

An independent mapping of tranquillity in Shropshire has been undertaken by White Consultants for the Countryside Agency/Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council) as part of the Living Landscapes Project (March 2005). The report mapped areas of tranquillity on the basis of proximity to urban areas and main roads – land forming the application area and land adjacent was assessed as being of low/very low tranquillity.

F3.7 Landscape Capacity

The Countryside Agency (now Natural England)/Scottish Natural Heritage published Topic Paper 6 (2003) in relation to sensitivity and capacity to clarify the links between the two. The 2002 Landscape Assessment Guidance defined capacity as:

“the degree to which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate change without significant effects on its character, or overall change of landscape character type. Capacity is likely to vary according to the type and nature of change proposed.”

In this assessment a landscape of low capacity to accommodate a particular development would indicate a lower ability to accommodate change and as a result, depending on magnitude of impact, a potential impact of greater significance.

In the case of the proposed development at Battlefield, the landscape currently includes waste recycling and other industrial use. The site therefore has a **high** capacity to accommodate development such as the proposed Energy from Waste Facility (EWF) which reflects both its position adjacent to existing industrial use and the land-use planning context within a clearly defined industrial/employment zone bounded by the Battlefield Link Road.

F3.8 Landscape Sensitivity

Assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape resource is important to determine whether a landscape type or area can accommodate change arising from a development without detrimental effects. This capacity to accommodate change is identified in the GLVIA (para. 7.16) as being dependent on:

- existing land use;
- the pattern and scale of the landscape;
- visual enclosure/openness and distribution of visual receptors;
- scope for mitigation in character with the existing landscape; and
- the value placed on the landscape.

The Countryside Agency/Scottish Natural Heritage Topic Paper 6 drew a distinction between:

- overall landscape sensitivity – i.e. inherent sensitivity irrespective of the type of change proposed; and
- specific sensitivity to a particular type of change or development.

The former is relevant to strategic studies/zoning and is the basis for designations of quality whereas the latter is considered within a specific impact assessment.

The landscape of the application site currently includes established industrial and commercial activity within an industrial zone.

Landscape sensitivity to particular projects is based on judgments on natural factors, cultural factors, landscape quality/condition and aesthetic factors. In this case the proposed development would not entail the loss of significant areas of characteristic vegetation, change to tree cover/field patterns or a reduction in the integrity or intactness of the landscape or modification of the aesthetic factors.

The landscape context of the development site is therefore regarded as being of **low sensitivity** to the type of development proposed.

F3.9 Landscape Quality

Quality and condition is derived from the intactness of the landscape, the degree to which it is representative of a typical character type and the state of repair of characteristic landscape elements such as walling, hedgerows and agricultural use.

An assessment of the landscape quality for within the study area has been undertaken on the basis of overall condition and aesthetic appeal, relative to the landscape setting five-point scale in Annex F2.

The landscape context of the application site is twofold: the urban/urban fringe industrial area south of the Battlefield Link Road and the rural "principal settled farmlands" to the north of it.

Landscape quality within the industrial area is **low/very low** as a result of a mix of uses, building styles and the absence of a coherent landscape infrastructure along roads or within individual development plots. In addition the area is fragmented by rail and road corridors resulting in land severance. Vacant land awaiting development and a high incidence of pylons and telecommunication masts further reduces landscape quality.

To the north of the Battlefield Link Road a consistent balance of land use in a pattern which is locally consistent, relatively small scale, long established and defined by characteristic features such as hedges with hedgerow trees is still present. Elements such as the railway and road corridors do impact, in some cases significantly. Some degradation of landscape quality has occurred as a result of agricultural intensification, for example to the south of Albright Hussey/Albrighton where field sizes are larger and hedgerow trees more sparse. Similarly, power lines cutting across the rural landscape to the north of the application site detract from landscape quality. Overall, in the vicinity of the application site, outside of the urban/urban fringe the landscape is of **medium quality**.

F3.10 Summary of Landscape Baseline Assessment

The appraisal of the baseline landscape of the development identifies that the urban context within which the site is located may be described as:

- Northern Shrewsbury industrial/commercial/retail fringe comprising recent buildings of large size and varied architectural style that effectively form the industrial zone of an otherwise traditional historical market town;
- urban fringe land fragmentation exacerbated by rail and road corridors as well as severance and vacant land awaiting development;
- zone of active change and development including new large scale buildings.
- residential use extremely limited although older ribbon development has been and is being supplemented recently by infill;
- views significantly obstructed by large buildings within the flat landscape and other elements such as the railway on its embankment;
- visual discordance arising from varied building styles, pylons and telecommunication masts;

- it has no designation based on landscape quality;
- the application site contains no characteristic landscape elements that would be lost as a result of the proposed development and contains no elements which could not be replicated;
- the landscape has a **high** capacity to accommodate the proposed development;
- the study area is assessed, against the criteria given in Annex F2 and through professional judgment and consideration of the criteria in the GLVIA, as being of **low sensitivity** to the type of development proposed; and
- similarly the landscape of the application site is considered to be of **low/very low quality** whilst that of the rural land to the north is considered to be of **medium quality**.

F4 VISUAL BASELINE ASSESSMENT

F4.1 General Visibility & Methodology

The existing visibility of the application site was initially assessed by a desktop study of an Ordnance Survey Explorer Sheet (1:25,000) in order to identify potential viewpoints and the potential zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) of the application site. This was followed by in-situ analysis of views of the application site from the surrounding landscape in February 2008 and again in June 2008. The February assessment incorporated a crane survey as a means of locating a structure set at the predicted height and positioning of the proposed EWF chimney. The crane remained set at the chimney height for several hours and allowed an on the ground assessment and photographic record of its visibility from key locations. The purpose of this was twofold:

- The crane jib provided a reference point to determine actual visibility of the highest part of the proposed EWF on the day of the survey.
- The tip of the crane jib provides a known reference, in addition to other surveyed points within a panorama, which facilitates accurate photomontaging of the proposed EWF building into the panorama.
- Locations to be recorded as part of the assessment were agreed in advance with Shropshire County Council.

On the day of the crane survey the objective was to determine which locations offer the most representative views of the application site/proposed development for a range of receptors in locations which were publicly accessible at the time of the assessment. Photographs were taken from selected viewpoints during February 2008, representing the Winter period and again in June 2008 in order to record the Summer views, with vegetation in leaf. The location and direction of view was recorded on a plan (Refer to Figure F4.3, Photoviewpoint Locations and Visual Context).

Views from Locations to the South/West

Within the urban fringe area (incorporating the Battlefield industrial estate) the availability of views is heavily influenced by built development, in particular the large retail/commercial and industrial buildings (existing, under construction and planned) which are characteristic of the locality. As a result, views of the crane/existing Recycling Facility/development site from the south and west were extremely localised and variable depending on the scale and proximity of intervening features. Views are obtained from the vicinity of the roundabout at the junction of Brixton Way/Harlescott Lane. (Refer to Viewpoint 6) Views from residential areas including the Conservation Area of Harlescott Grange were extremely limited due to the

intervening screening effect of buildings within the Battlefield Enterprise Park. (Refer to Viewpoints 4 & 5).

In order to assess potential distant views from the town centre and other locations to the south, access was obtained to the roof area of Shrewsbury Castle and the view recorded at the time of the crane survey. (Refer to Viewpoint 12). In addition Lyth Hill and Bayston Hill to the south of Shrewsbury centre were visited but no views of the crane/development site were discernible.

Views from Locations to the North

Views from the north are obtained from the network of Public Rights of Way associated with the Battlefield and Battlefield Church, Battlefield Farm and Visitor Centre and from the A49, the Battlefield Link Road and adjoining roads. (Refer to Viewpoints 8, 9 & 17) The application site is viewed from the Battlefield viewing mound, although views of the Battlefield are in the opposite direction. (Refer to Viewpoint 1) More distant views from the north were obtained from the vicinity of Albrighton Church and the Albright Hussey Hotel. (Refer to Viewpoints 2 & 3) Views towards the site from Upper Battlefield are obstructed by the intervening railway embankment. (Refer to Viewpoint 15).

Views from Locations to the East

Views towards the site from the east are obtained from Battlefield Road, varying according to the extent of intervening buildings. These include views from the retail developments on Arlington Way and the recent residential development at Shillingstone Drive. (Refer to Viewpoints 7 & 10). Views are also obtained from the housing along Battlefield Road, including the new residential development at Mayfield. No views were obtained from residential areas of Harlescott in the vicinity of Featherbed Lane due to the intervening retail buildings (Refer to Viewpoint 16).

Further east the elevated ridgeline of Haughmond Hill and Ebury Hill offers a number of vantage points overlooking the whole of Shrewsbury and into Wales beyond. Haughmond Hill was visited at the time of the crane survey and the view recorded as Viewpoint 11. (Refer to Viewpoint 11). The whole of the Battlefield Enterprise Park, including the proposed development site is visible from Haughmond Hill and associated areas on the east of that ridge. The development site is also visible from Queen Eleanor's Bower and the Shropshire Way at Ebury Hill. These locations were visited as part of the summer view survey and the view recorded. (Refer to Viewpoints 13 & 14).

F4.2 Visual Envelope

Figures F4.1 and F4.2 illustrate the maximum theoretical extent of the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) of the proposed EWF building and chimney respectively. The ZTV has been generated by analysis of a 3D model of the proposed EWF within a digital terrain model (DTM) of the surrounding terrain taking intervening obstructive elements into account and determined by site survey. The output provides a graphical representation of the mathematical intervisibility between a viewer (at 1.7m height) and the development.

F4.3 Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoints

The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (paragraphs 7.31 to 7.35) note that sensitivity of receptors depends on a number of factors, which are listed for reference in Annex F3.

The assessment of visual impacts is structured by receptor group. The sensitivity of each receptor group can be categorised as being high, medium or low. Visual impacts result from change to the appearance of the landscape as a result of the development proposals either intruding into, or obstructing existing views, or by their overall impact on visual amenity and character. The sensitivity of receptors relates principally to three factors:

- receptor's function whilst exposed to view;
- degree of exposure to view; and
- period of exposure to view.

The criteria used to assess the magnitude of visual impacts are as follows:

- value of existing views;
- degree of change to existing views;
- the availability and amenity of the alternative views; and
- distance to receptor.

Impacts may be considered as beneficial (i.e. positive) as well as adverse.

The magnitude of a visual impact can be described as high, medium low or negligible. Whilst there is professional judgement inherent in determining the category of impact, the assessment process is both systematic and structured. The assessment of visual impacts is based upon views obtained at the time of assessment. Where significant differences in impact between summer and winter are apparent, these are identified.

The sensitivity of viewpoints is generally categorised as high, medium, low or negligible in accordance with the terminology adopted in the current guidance (GLVIA).

The sensitivity of visual receptors within this assessment is provided in Table F4.1 with an explanation of the reason for the categorisation (see Figure F4.3 for photoviewpoint locations)

The sensitivity of a receptor and the level of impact upon it can be combined to assess the significance of the resultant effects – refer to Table F.3.1 in Annex F3.

A summary of views experienced from various categories of viewpoint is provided below.

Views from Houses/Residential Locations

Residential locations which would offer a view of the proposed EWF include:

- properties along Battlefield Road (approx 350m distance from the application boundary at the closest);
- properties on the northern edge of Harlescott Grange (approx 415m distance from the application boundary at the closest) which would view the top section of the chimney but not the EWF;
- residential property at Battlefield Farm (approx 1075m distance from the application boundary at the closest) and Albright Hussey (1230m distance);
- distant locations including Albrighton. (approx 1895m distance) and individual properties in elevated locations such as those in the vicinity of Haughmond Hill; and
- generally, views from within the urban area of Shrewsbury would be extremely localised and limited to elevated locations e.g. upper storeys of taller buildings or a view of the upper section of the chimney. This reflects the presence of large scale retail/industrial buildings in between the main residential areas of Shrewsbury and the proposed EWF.

Table F4.1: Visual Receptors

| Photoviewpoint Reference | Location | Receptor Type | Sensitivity |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Battlefield Way/Enterprise Roundabout | Recreational | Medium |
| | | Vehicle users | Low |
| 2 | Albrighton Churchyard | Worshippers | Medium |
| 3 | Albright Hussey | Business/Leisure | Medium |
| | | Recreational | Medium* |
| 4 | Harlescott Lane/Derwent Avenue | Residential | High |
| | | Vehicle users | Low |
| 5 | Harlescott Lane/Harlescott Crescent | Residential | High |
| | | Vehicle users | Low |
| 6 | Harlescott Lane Brixton Way | Commercial | Low |
| | | Vehicle users | Low |
| 7 | Battlefield Road/Arlington Way | Vehicle users | Low |
| | | Commercial | Low |
| 8 | Battlefield Church/Public Right of Way | Recreational | High |
| 9 | A49 Battlefield Roundabout | Vehicle users | Low |
| 10 | Shillingstone Drive/Battlefield Road | Residential | High |
| | | Vehicle users | Low |
| 11 | Haughmond Abbey | Recreational | High |
| 12 | Shrewsbury Castle/Laura's Tower | Recreational | Medium* |
| 13 | Queen Eleanor's Bower/Haughmond Hill | Recreational | High |
| 14 | Shropshire Way/Ebury Hill | Recreational | High |
| 15 | A49 Upper Battlefield | Residential | High |
| 16 | Featherbed Lane | Residential | High |
| | | Commercial | Low |
| 17 | Battlefield Farm & Visitor Centre | Recreational | High |
| | | Residential | High |

* Distant residential/recreational locations have been categorized as medium sensitivity reflecting the fact that distance reduces sensitivity and influence. This accords with the GLVIA guidance that degree of exposure to the view influences sensitivity.

Views from Public Rights of Way

The proposed EWF would be visible from the network of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of Battlefield Church, and in the location of Haughmond Hill and Ebury Hill (including from the Shropshire Way – a long distance footpath). These are shown on Figure F4.3 Photo viewpoint Locations & Visual Context.

3D modelling of intervisibility between locations in the landscape (making no allowance for screening other than landform) indicates that there would be no views from the long distance Severn Way. (Refer to Figures F4.1 and F4.2 EWF Building & Chimney ZTV.)

Views from Roads

Views of the proposed EWF would be obtained from the A49 and the A53 in the vicinity of the Battlefield Roundabout. Views would also be obtained from the A5124 Battlefield Link Road to the north of the application site. Intermittent views, varying according to the effect of intervening buildings would be obtained from the A5112 Battlefield Road and from the network of roads within the Battlefield Enterprise Park.

Other Views

The most prominent views of the proposed EWF would be experienced from within the Battlefield Enterprise Park itself in close proximity to the site. Distant views would also be obtained from elevated locations such as Shrewsbury Castle, Haughmond Abbey and Queen Eleanor's Bower. These represent visitor or recreational locations which are visited in part due to the availability of wide panoramas over the town of Shrewsbury and surrounding countryside.

Figures F4.1 and F4.2 EWF Building & Chimney ZTV represent the maximum theoretical visibility of both the EWF building and the chimney, making allowance for intervening landform, main woodlands and main built development.

Screening/Obstructive Elements

Obstructive elements are identified on Figure F4.3 Photoviewpoint Locations and Visual Context.

The crane survey, undertaken in February 2008 allowed an accurate understanding of actual visibility of the proposed EWF, taking the screening effect of intervening elements into account. The principal screening elements are the existing large scale buildings in close proximity to the proposed EWF; occasional woodland blocks such as those associated with Haughmond Hill; and, locally, mature hedgerow trees or strips of trees which obstruct views. In addition the railway embankment in the vicinity of Upper Battlefield serves to obstruct views towards Battlefield.

Based on a combination of site survey and modelling of the intervening features within the 3D model the actual assessed ZTV is shown on Figures F4.1 and F4.2, EWF Building & Chimney ZTV.

Representative Viewpoints

In total 17 viewpoints have been chosen to record typical representative views in the vicinity of the site and from within the surrounding landscape.

In addition to representing locations agreed with Shropshire County Council, the representative photographs were taken at the time of the crane survey which allowed a definitive record of the visibility of the tallest element of the proposed development (i.e. the chimney). From this it has been possible, using additional surveyed reference points, to accurately represent the height, bulk and mass of the proposed EWF in winter and summer views thus providing an invaluable aid to assessment of the visual impact.

The viewpoints are listed in Table F4.1 and their locations identified on Figure F4.3 Photoviewpoint Locations and Visual Context.

F5 LANDSCAPE/VISUAL EFFECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

F5.1 Potential Landscape Effects of the Development

Development may have an adverse or beneficial effect on landscape character through removal of characteristic landscape elements such as hedges/walling/woodland or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements that contrast with the existing landscape character.

In this case the development would occur adjacent to an existing recycling facility on relatively featureless land which is within an industrial development area. No characteristic landscape features would be removed to accommodate the proposed EWF. At a site scale the development would therefore have negligible impact on existing landscape character. On a wider scale, beyond the application site boundary, the potential landscape effects arising from the proposed development include:

- Impact of further large scale industrial development on the predominantly rural landscape and historical Battlefield to the north of the A5124 Battlefield Link Road.
- Introduction of further woodland, included as partial mitigation of the proposed development, within the northern section of the Battlefield Enterprise Park. (Refer to Figure F5.1 Landscape Mitigation)

The actual extent, scale and impact of these landscape effects, taking mitigation into account, is described in the landscape assessment.

F5.2 Potential Visual Effects of the Development

Changes in views may give rise to adverse or beneficial visual effects through obstruction in views, alteration of the components of the view, particularly through the introduction of intrusive, non-characteristic elements and through the opening up of new views by the removal of screening.

In the case of the proposed EWF, potential visual effects would centre on visual impact arising from the height, scale and nature of the EWF building within views and the degree to which this would change the nature of the view.

The potential effect of lighting of the building has been considered and assessed in relation to three aspects:

- The chimney may have a red light permanently illuminated at its top in order to increase visibility for aircraft, particularly at night. Whilst this would increase visibility at night and mark the location of the chimney it would be represent a minor impact for locations on the ground.

- Whilst the proposed semi translucent upper section of the building has the potential to emit light from within the building, lighting within the building would be directional at a lower level within the building and designed to illuminate working areas only. As a consequence, light emitted from the upper section of the building will be minimised and viewed within the context of the lit environment of Battlefield Industrial Estate.
- Lighting around the building would be comparable with other similar buildings in close proximity and on the Battlefield Industrial Estate, including the existing IWMF, and would not add significantly to existing light in the vicinity.

Potential visual effects are described in detail, taking any mitigation into account, in relation to the representative viewpoints.

F5.3 Potential Indirect Effects of the Development

Traffic accessing and leaving the site may form an indirect landscape or visual effect from the proposed development. The volume and frequency of traffic is considered elsewhere in this Environmental Assessment but it is not considered to be of a magnitude/duration to be a significant indirect impact on the landscape or visual amenity.

A potential intermittent visual effect would arise from the plume which may arise from the chimney under certain atmospheric conditions, principally when the steam/hot air from the chimney enters cold, still air and leads to condensation and visibility as a plume. This is likely to be an early morning or winter phenomenon and would not be present frequently. Its presence would add to visual impact from the EWF through emphasis of its location, however it is not considered to be of a magnitude/duration to be a significant indirect impact on the landscape or visual amenity.

No other indirect impacts on landscape and visual amenity are anticipated.

F5.4 Timescales of Effects

Construction of the external shell/EWF building is likely to take 30 months followed by a period of commissioning.

Once complete the EWF building would have a minimum life of at least 27 years in line with the PFI contract with Shropshire County Council.

Planting implemented as mitigation of the proposed development would remain as a long term element of the landscape.

F6 MITIGATION OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL EFFECTS

Mitigation of the potential visual impact of the building has been considered through the design and colour scheme of the building and by careful consideration of architectural form and scale such that, within the constraints dictated by function the building is an attractive example of contemporary architecture.

Additional mitigation of potential landscape and visual effects of the development has been incorporated into the planning application and considered within the LVIA in the form of:

- A belt of woodland planting, located along the northern edge of the application site as mitigation of views of the base of the EWF building from locations to the north. (Refer to Figure F5.1 Landscape Mitigation). In the longer term this would create a woodland strip of trees capable of reaching a mature height in excess of 25m which approximates to the height of the building (minus chimney).
- A staggered row of semi-mature native broadleaf trees of approximately 8-10m in height would be located to the northern boundary of the application site. These would provide an immediate partial mitigation of views of the lower section of the building, in particular of benefit for Viewpoint 8 and Viewpoint 17. (Refer to Figure F5.1 Landscape Mitigation).
- Strategically placed rows of semi-mature trees (7 to 9m height) have been included within the landscape around the building to provide an immediate softening and screening from viewpoints to the north and east of the Site.
- Choice of an appropriate recessive colour scheme for the building cladding in order to reduce its prominence and the introduction of architectural features to break up the mass.
- The building design incorporates a green roof in a swooping curve as a means of softening the form of the structure and echoing the natural landforms of the Shropshire Hills.
- The building design incorporates a semi translucent upper section of the building as a means of reducing the mass and form.

The mitigation proposals are designed to minimise the effect of the proposed development on the landscape and visual context of the site, the degree to which they are adequate and the extent of residual landscape and visual impacts taking mitigation into account is considered in the remainder of the assessment.

Other important factors, outside of the control of the applicant, which would further mitigate visual impact of the proposed EWF include:

- The proposed development of further industrial units on land to the north of the brook which would become the edge of the industrial development and screen lower sections of the proposed EWF.

- Woodland planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road will continue to mature and provide a wooded edge to the Battlefield Enterprise Park and provide a buffer/visual barrier to the rural fringe and provide a clear limit to the urban area.

F7 RESIDUAL LANDSCAPE EFFECTS AND SIGNIFICANCE

F7.1 Introduction

The GLVIA (para. 7.18) suggest that the evaluation of landscape effects be graded from high to low in a minimum of four categories, including both adverse and beneficial effects. The guidelines acknowledge that there is no standard methodology for the quantification of the scale/magnitude of landscape effects but note that the following factors apply:

- the scale or degree of change to the landscape resource;
- the nature of the effect and its duration; and
- the permanence and reversibility of effects.

Each of these factors has been considered in this assessment along with other factors and criteria as given in Annex F2, such as the sensitivity of the landscape to change, landscape quality and in particular the type of change that would arise from the proposed development.

F7.2 Residual Landscape Effects

Residual landscape effects (i.e. effects on landscape character) are effects that remain after taking mitigation into account. Residual landscape effects from the development are assessed below.

- The proposed EWF would not result in a change in the pattern or scale of the landscape or removal of characteristic landscape elements.
- The proposed EWF would not introduce uncharacteristic elements into the landscape since the immediate context of the application site includes large industrial and retail buildings of a similar scale and appearance similar to that proposed. This context will be reinforced by further industrial and commercial development under construction and planned to the north and west of the development site. In addition the building has been designed to be aesthetically varied and pleasing in appearance, within the confines imposed by its function.
- The proposed EWF would have an indirect localised impact on the landscape character of the Principal Settled Farmlands landscape type to the north of the Battlefield Link Road, an effect which is currently experienced as a result of visibility of the existing light coloured buildings of the Battlefield Enterprise Park.
- The effect on landscape character elsewhere beyond the site would be extremely limited – the proposed EWF merging with the conglomeration of large scale buildings on the edge of the rural fringe to Shrewsbury.

- The openness/enclosure of the landscape and distribution of visual receptors will not change significantly as a result of the development and elements of existing landscape features (e.g. woodland) will be replicated as part of the mitigation.
- The height of the proposed chimney and to a lesser extent the building is such that mitigation planting will not fully screen the EWF.
- The landscape context of the proposed EWF has changed significantly with the development of the Battlefield Enterprise Park and the creation of the Battlefield Link Road and further change will occur. The Battlefield Enterprise Park now effectively marks the edge of development of the urban area of Shrewsbury. Further development is planned to occur between the proposed EWF and the Battlefield Link Road which will encroach towards the Battlefield and the rural landscape. The landscape impact of the proposed EWF will therefore be reduced as a result of intervening buildings.
- Infrastructure planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road is maturing and will within the next 10 years or so, combined with existing woodland planting associated with the current recycling centre and proposed woodland planting as part of the development proposals, contribute to create a wooded edge to the urban fringe. The woodland will soften the boundary and reduce linkage between the two areas.

The magnitude of impacts on landscape character, within the ZTV, has been assessed at three points in time, both for the site area and the wider landscape, as below:

- During the construction phase, allowing for the additional impact from machine and cranes required to construct the building: impact of **very low** adverse magnitude on the landscape character of the application site and impact of **low** adverse magnitude on the wider landscape.
- Year 1: landscape impact of **very low** adverse magnitude on the landscape character of the application site and impact of **low** adverse magnitude on the wider landscape.
- Year 15 i.e. once the mitigation planting has reached 15 years maturity and allowing for the continued maturity of off-site planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road: landscape impact of **very low** adverse magnitude on the landscape character of the application site and impact of **very low** adverse magnitude on the wider landscape.

F7.3 Significance of Landscape Effects

The significance of the proposed development on landscape character has been assessed by comparison of the sensitivity of the landscape with the magnitude of the predicted landscape effects at three points in time.

The predicted significance of landscape impacts is summarised in Table F7.1 and has been assessed in relation to a range of criteria given in Annex F2.

The significance of landscape impacts may be summarised as:

During the **Construction Period**:

- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape quality of the application site and **slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Insignificant adverse** effect on landscape tranquillity of the application site and **Negligible adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.

In **Year 1**:

- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape quality of the application site and **slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Insignificant adverse** effect on landscape tranquillity of the application site and **Insignificant adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **Slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.

At **15 years** on from the day of opening:

- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape quality of the application site and **Negligible adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Insignificant adverse** effect on landscape tranquillity of the application site and **Insignificant adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape.
- **Negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **Negligible adverse** effect on landscape character of the wider landscape

The definition of what these categories mean in terms of the degree of change to the landscape resource is provided in Annex F2.

Table F7.1 Summary of Landscape Assessment

| Landscape characteristics | Sensitivity/ ranking | Effect magnitude | | | Overall significance | | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|----------|-----------|----------------------|--------|-----------|
| | | Construction | Year 1 | At 15 yrs | Construction | Year 1 | At 15 yrs |
| Designations | | | | | | | |
| National designation | n/a | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Local designation | n/a | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other value Criteria | | | | | | | |
| Landscape Quality | M**/L* | L**/VL* | L**/VL* | VL**/VL* | S**/N* | S**/N* | N**/N* |
| Landscape Capacity | H | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cultural Associations | L | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tranquillity | L**/VL* | L**/VL* | VL**/VL* | VL**/VL* | N**/I* | I**/I* | I**/I* |
| Landscape Sensitivity | L | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mitigation Potential | | | | | | | |
| Replication of landscape elements | L | - | L | M | - | N | S |
| Achievement of landscape management objectives | VL | - | VL | VL | - | I | I |
| OVERALL LANDSCAPE CHARACTER | | L**/VL* | L**/VL* | VL**/VL* | S**/N* | S**/N* | N**/N* |

* Application Site

** Wider Landscape

Table F7.1 (cont'd)

| SIGNIFICANCE MATRIX | | SENSITIVITY | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low |
| MAGNITUDE | Very High Magnitude | Major | Very Severe | Severe | Substantial | Moderate |
| | High Magnitude | Very Severe | Severe | Substantial | Moderate | Slight |
| | Medium Magnitude | Severe | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Negligible |
| | Low Magnitude | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Negligible | Insignificant |
| | Very Low Magnitude | Moderate | Slight | Negligible | Insignificant | Insignificant |

F8 RESIDUAL VISUAL EFFECTS AND SIGNIFICANCE

F8.1 Introduction

The GLVIA identifies a number of criteria for evaluating visual effects. These are summarised in Annex F3 and have been used, along with professional judgment and any other relevant factors as the basis for the assessment relating to the representative photoviewpoints given below.

F8.2 Residual Visual Effects at Photoviewpoint locations

Visual impact has been assessed at each photo viewpoint location by analysis of the degree of visibility and magnitude of visual impact of the proposed EWF. In order to assist in the assessment process and for others to properly understand the potential impacts at the selected representative viewpoints a 3D visualisation of the proposed building has been generated for each of the 17 viewpoints. In most cases these include both a summer and winter view. The photomontages show the building scale and form positioned within the view by the use of reference points but do not illustrate the proposed colour scheme or rendering variations of the building.

Residual visual effects, grouped under descriptive categories of visual impacts are described below and summarised in Table F8.1.

Viewpoint 1: Battlefield Viewing Mound, Battlefield Way/Enterprise Roundabout

(Refer to Figure F8.1)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint:

Viewing platform and car park overlooking the Battle of Shrewsbury site. The view towards the proposed EWF is in the opposite direction to the battlefield panorama, looking back towards the car park. The proposed EWF would not therefore intrude into the view across the battlefield at this location. The users include people dog walking, road users stopping for a break and users visiting specifically to appreciate the battlefield context. The latter are regarded as users of high sensitivity but given that the building would not affect views of the battlefield, and views towards the proposed EWF already include industrial buildings as a significant component, the overall sensitivity of this location is assessed as medium.

The existing view includes the current IWMF in the middleground set amongst other industrial buildings and the ridgeline of Haughmond Hill in the distance. Vegetation comprising immature trees and shrubs partially screens the IWMF. Potential changes

to the existing view would also include further industrial type buildings between the EWF and the viewpoint, acting as a partial screen.

Construction

The construction of the EWF, including temporary cranes and scaffolding would be visible in the middleground, particularly in the winter view when intervening planting would have a reduced screening effect. The overall impact during this phase is likely to be periodically greater than the actual impact of the completed building at this location. Visual impact at this stage would be medium magnitude on the basis that the EWF structure would be clearly visible and represent a prominent element of the view.

Year 1 of Operation

Mitigation in the form of planting to the northern boundary of the application site would have no screening value at this stage but maturing planting in the foreground with a couple of years growth on that within the photopanorama would have a partial screening effect and reduce the magnitude of visual impact to medium magnitude. Long views towards Haughmond Hill would not be obstructed.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.1.

At 15 Years

Proposed mitigation planting and existing planting found to the rear of the existing IWMF would have matured sufficiently to provide a screen of the lower half of the EWF. Intervening planting, outside of the control of the applicant, associated with the Battlefield Link Road and the viewing mound would have matured sufficiently to effectively screen all elements of the EWF with the exception of the chimney which would protrude above it in the same way that lighting columns currently do.

The magnitude of visual impact at this stage would be very low.

Viewpoint 2 – Albrighton Churchyard

(Refer to Figure F8.2)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

An historic church and burial ground with users not primarily concerned with appreciation of the landscape but nevertheless of medium sensitivity to landscape and visual impact. The churchyard offers long views southwards, over a wooded rural pastoral landscape, towards the existing IWMF and Enterprise Park and beyond to Haughmond Hill and the Wrekin.

Construction

The construction of the building would be barely visible as a distinctive element of the view, particularly due to the screening effect of intervening mature trees and further planned development of the Enterprise Park. The EWF chimney would however punctuate the skyline in the same way that the pylons in close proximity to the site currently do. The chimney would be of a similar or lesser magnitude visual impact to the pylons currently in the view. The body of the EWF building would be partially visible but would not extend above the distant skyline, thereby reducing its impact. Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The most prominent visible element of the EWF would be the chimney but as a whole the EWF would form a distant and minor element of the view, reducing in significance as the proposed mitigation planting and planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road matures. Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.2.

At 15 Years

By year 15 intervening maturing planting and existing mature trees would restrict views of the proposed EWF to the upper section of the chimney, on the skyline. Visual impact at this stage would be of very low magnitude.

Viewpoint 3: Albright Hussey.

(Refer to Figure F8.3)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

This location represents both the view from the buildings at Albright Hussey, including a hotel and also for users of the Public Right of Way connecting Battlefield Church with Albrighton. The view from the PROW is somewhat truncated by an intervening shoulder of land within the arable field in the middle/foreground. However Haughmond Hill, the existing IWMF and Battlefield Enterprise Park are all background elements of the panorama. Views from the hotel buildings are likely to be more open as they are slightly elevated in comparison to the PROW. Views over the intervening landform subtend a very shallow angle i.e. occupy a narrow section of the panorama vertically. The location is regarded as being of medium sensitivity given the distance from the proposed EWF and the nature of the existing view towards it.

Construction

The view differs significantly between winter and summer. The relatively minor height increase of a growing crop in the intervening field is sufficient to eliminate direct views of the existing EWF and Battlefield Enterprise Park. In the winter the construction of the building would be visible as a clearly identifiable element of the view but occupying a relatively small element of the panorama. In the summer view (assuming a crop of similar height to the rapeseed present at the time of the photograph) the body of the EWF would be screened but the chimney would be visible on the skyline. Visual impact at this stage would be of medium magnitude in the winter and low magnitude in the summer.

Year 1 of Operation:

The EWF would form a relatively distant but prominent element of the winter view and a minor element of the summer view. The winter view would include other large scale industrial buildings and may, in the event that further buildings are erected on land to the north of the application site be further impacted by the proximity of the industrial fringe of Shrewsbury. For the more open winter view the majority of the building would lie below the distant skyline. Visual impact at this stage would be of medium magnitude in the winter and low magnitude in the summer.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.3.

At 15 Years

By year 15 intervening maturing planting as described previously would have some effect in obstructing intervening views of the lower part of the building, serving to break up its outline. However in the winter the upper section of the main building and the chimney would remain visible and of low magnitude impact. In the summer visual impact would be of very low magnitude.

Viewpoint 4: Harlescott Lane/Derwent Avenue

(Refer to Figure F8.4)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

A residential (high sensitivity) and highway location (low sensitivity) illustrating potential visibility from the edge of the Harlescott Grange residential area. The existing view along Harlescott Lane is framed by mature planting and buildings within the Battlefield Enterprise Park are of limited prominence and significance. In the summer the vegetation is sufficient to further reduce impacts from the large scale industrial buildings.

Construction

The crane survey has allowed an accurate understanding of the degree to which the intervening building and vegetation would obstruct views. The only visible element of the EWF at this location would be the chimney, rising above the intervening farm buildings. The chimney would form a minor and insignificant element of the view. Overall visual impact at this stage would be of very low magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The chimney would form a minor element of the winter view, on a par with the lamp-posts in the middleground which provide a vertical element to the view. Visual impact would be of very low magnitude in the winter and of lesser prominence in the summer.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.4.

At 15 Years

Mitigation planting would be of no significance or value at this location. The winter view of the EWF chimney would be similar to that at shown in the photomontage for Year 1 whilst in the summer the chimney is likely to be fully screened by the vegetation adjacent to the brick farm building complex in the middleground. Visual impact would vary between very low magnitude to zero magnitude.

Viewpoint 5: Harlescott Lane/Harlescott Crescent

(Refer to Figure F8.5)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

A residential and highway location illustrating potential visibility from the edge of Harlescott Grange conservation area regarded as high sensitivity. The existing view towards the proposed EWF is dominated by the business and industrial units in the fore/middleground which form the skyline and obstruct long views towards the application site.

Construction

As for Viewpoint 4 the crane survey has allowed an accurate understanding of the potential visibility of the proposed EWF above the intervening buildings. Only a minor part of the upper section of the crane was visible in the winter panorama, protruding above the roofline of the intervening office unit in the centre of the view. The chimney would form a minor and insignificant element of the view, resembling a chimney on the roof of the intervening building. Overall visual impact at this stage would be of very low/zero magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The chimney would form a minor element of the view. Visual impact would be of very low/zero magnitude in both winter and summer.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.5.

At 15 Years

Mitigation planting would be of no significance or value at this location. The winter view of the EWF chimney would be the same to that at shown in the photomontage for Year 1. Visual impact would be of very low/zero magnitude.

Viewpoint 6: Battlefield Road/Arlington Way.

(Refer to Figure F8.6)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

A wholly industrial and retail estate dominated view occurring within the context of large buildings and associated infrastructure. Receptors are people engaged in work activity, vehicle users or shoppers/visitors to the retail/industrial units including the existing IWMF. The existing view towards the proposed EWF is dominated by the business and industrial units in the fore/middleground which form the skyline. Receptors in this location are considered to be of low sensitivity.

Construction

The construction of the EWF would be clearly visible in the background of the view, partially screened by the intervening retail building but rising above and to the right hand side of it. At this distance detailed construction activity would be discernible along with the temporary cranes, lifting platforms and vehicles etc required to complete the building. The combined impact of the building and the ancillary means to construct it would periodically give rise to a greater temporary visual impact than the completed building. However the proposed EWF would be seen as another large building in the context of multiple large modern buildings and from this location appears to be of a similar style and scale and would not unduly dominate the panorama.

Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude given the context of the view, the degree of exposure to the view and the extent to which the view would be altered.

Year 1 of Operation

Activity associated with the operation of the EWF would not be visible from this location and it would appear as another building of an industrial nature. The building

would occupy a central element of the view but is of a similar scale to the buildings within the panorama and would not dominate or add an incongruous element to it. There would be little or no difference between the summer and winter views at this location due to the absence of infrastructure planting or existing trees within the panorama.

Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.6.

At 15 Years

Mitigation planting would have little effect at this location although planting to the application site frontage and the road frontage to the existing IWMF would potentially soften the lower section of the building by year 15 but this would be of little significance.

Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude.

Viewpoint 7: Battlefield Road/Arlington Way.

(Refer to Figure F8.7)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

View from the edge of the Harlescott Retail Park at a busy crossroads. The winter view is dominated by highway infrastructure and the rooflines of industrial buildings including the JCB dealership, although in summer tree planting along the highway has a significant beneficial effect in screening the buildings and softening the panorama. Views from the adjacent retail units and car parks of Homebase and MFI are at a lower level and would be much reduced. The panorama therefore represents the worst case view from the edge of the Sundorne Retail Park and would be experienced by people in vehicles and users of the retail park, also predominantly accessing the shops by vehicle. These categories of users are considered to be of low sensitivity.

Construction

There is a marked difference between the summer and winter views at this location. In the winter the proposed EWF would be visible to the rear of the JCB buildings partially screened by intervening signs, JCBs and other infrastructure. The EWF chimney would form the most prominent aspect but overall the effect of distance is such that the EWF building would represent a minor and inconsequential element of the panorama. Construction activity visible at this location would include cranes and other temporary structures but they would not form a significant element of the view and indeed are similar in nature to the structures/infrastructure already in the

panorama. In the summer visual impact would be confined to a view of the upper section of the chimney.

Visual impact arising from the construction phase of the EWF development would be of low magnitude in the winter and very low magnitude in the summer.

Year 1 of Operation

Generally as described for the construction phase – the winter view would include a substantially screened and filtered view of the EWF building and chimney within the context of visual clutter and industrial buildings. Summer views of the EWF would be limited to the upper section of the chimney.

Visual impact in the winter would be of low magnitude whilst visual impact in the summer would be of very low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.7.

At 15 Years

Tree planting in the middleground, which is relatively immature at present, is likely to gain sufficient height to fully screen the chimney in the summer period – the EWF would remain visible in the winter period but as a minor element of the view.

Visual impact in the summer would be very low to zero and that in the winter of low magnitude.

Viewpoint 8: Battlefield Church/Public Right of Way

(Refer to Figure F8.8)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

A network of Public Rights of Way extends to the South of Battlefield Church and are used both by visitors specifically accessing the area to appreciate the site of the battle and also by general walkers/dog walkers who find it a convenient location on the edge of urban Shrewsbury. The panorama currently includes views of the urban fringe industrial buildings, including the existing IWMF. The photoviewpoint chosen is representative of the first open views available by viewers coming from the Battlefield Church through the fishpond woodland area to look over the battlefield.

It represents one of the more open and significant viewpoints within the battlefield area – for example views from the church itself are heavily screened and obstructed by woodland. The view is likely to change further, irrespective of the proposed EWF development, as a result of the erection of buildings between the proposed EWF and the Battlefield Link Road. In addition planting along the Link Road is maturing and

will in time create a more wooded fringe to the edge of the Enterprise Park thereby changing the nature of the view.

On the basis that users of the footpath network are recreational viewers they are categorised as being of high sensitivity.

Construction

Maximum visual impact would occur towards the end of the construction period when the building form is supplemented by the infrastructure required to construct it. Activity at ground level (e.g. vehicles and people) would not be readily discernible due to the effect of distance. The building would form a central part of the view and locally form the skyline. As with other locations the position of the building has been fixed by the use of a series of reference points, including the use of the crane survey with the jib set at the top height/position of the chimney.

At this stage the proposed EWF would as a result of its scale, nature and location centrally within the view give rise to visual impact of medium magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The proposed EWF would be seen as a relatively distant but large scale, prominent building in the middleground but would not dominate the panorama, which includes other buildings as well as open arable land and the prominent pylons which cut across the view. The magnitude of impact would be influenced by both the presence of any intervening buildings as not yet constructed and by appropriate choice of cladding colours/materials. The photomontage representation shows the "worst case" panorama without any allowance for potential intervening buildings, mitigation planting or the effect of time during which the Battlefield Link Road planting would alter and filter available views from this location.

The proposed EWF adds a further large scale building into the view but does not significantly obstruct long views or restrict visibility of the battlefield. The winter view would be more open than the summer view at this stage but both would include clear visibility of the upper section of the building and chimney. For both summer and winter the proposed EWF would give rise to visual impact of medium magnitude at this location.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.8.

At 15 Years

The view is likely to change as a consequence of the growth of planting associated with the link road and also as a result of the proposed mitigation planting included on the northern edge of the application site as part of the development proposals. The combined effect would serve to soften the building and reduce its impact by reduction of the visible extent of the northern façade. Dense vegetation would also have a filtering effect in the winter, albeit lesser than summer, as a result of the mass of branches and twigs.

The magnitude of visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude during both summer and winter.

Viewpoint 9: A49 Battlefield Roundabout

(Refer to Figure F8.9)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

The viewpoint is on the edge of the service station and pub and also represents the view from vehicles travelling south on the A49 and a gateway into Shrewsbury from the A53 to the east and A49 to the north. It is predominantly a vehicle user viewpoint and is therefore of low sensitivity. Views from the pub are oblique and partially screened whilst the shop and service station is orientated away from the application site and accessed from the A53 rather than the A49.

The hedge along the western edge of the A49 has a beneficial screening value in summer but is of lesser value in the winter.

Construction

Aspects of the construction likely to be viewed over the intervening screening include cranes and scaffolding and other temporary structures associated with the completion of the upper sections of the EWF and chimney. Ground level operations would not be visible.

At this stage the EWF would give rise visual impact of low magnitude in the winter and very low magnitude visual impact in the summer.

Year 1 of Operation

In the winter period the end of the EWF building would be viewed along with the chimney. The Battlefield Link Road lies between the viewpoint and the application site but is in cutting at this point and not visible. The summer view would be much reduced as a result of the screening effect of the hawthorn hedge and vegetation in the middleground.

The magnitude of visual impact in the winter would be low whilst that in the summer would be very low, confined to the upper section of the chimney.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.9.

At 15 Years

Intervening woodland planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road and the mitigation planting proposed on the northern boundary of the application site will both have a beneficial effect in reducing visibility by year 15 at this location. The

EWF building is likely to be fully screened in both winter and summer with the exception of the upper section of the chimney.

In both summer and winter, visual impact is predicted to be of very low magnitude by year 15 as a result of the growth of intervening vegetation.

Viewpoint 10: Shillingstone Drive/Battlefield Road

(Refer to Figure F8.10)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

This location represents both a vehicle user's view from Battlefield Road and the view from the vicinity of properties on Shillingstone Drive. It is therefore both a view of low sensitivity (road users) and high sensitivity (residential). At present the view is dominated by the unkempt roadside hedge and powerlines as well as the vehicle yard and brick building in the background. The railway line north from the town centre lies in between the viewpoint and the application site but is not visible. The existing IWMF is not visible from this location.

Construction

Towards the end of the construction period the upper section of the EWF building and the chimney would be visible in the background of the view, rising above the roofline of the brick building in the middleground. The visual impact would be of similar magnitude between winter and summer although the nature of the wider view changes significantly between the two seasons as a result of the obstruction of views of the car park/vehicle yard. This reflects the fact that the EWF building would be seen above the intervening building. The EWF would not obstruct existing elements in the view but would appear as a backdrop to it.

Visual impact at this stage would be of low magnitude given the limited extent to which the building changes the view and its foreground context.

Year 1 of Operation

The proposed EWF building would occupy a central element of the panorama but would not be the dominant element. The building would be seen as a new addition to an otherwise unchanged panorama.

Visual impact would be of low magnitude – the building becoming an accepted part of a wider panorama. Winter and summer views would be largely comparable.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.10.

At 15 Years

Mitigation at this location would primarily be achieved through the design and colour of the building and its architectural merits. Although of a large scale this does not necessarily imply adverse visual impact. Other mitigation such as planting would have no discernible effect at this location but the hedge and vegetation in the foreground, subject to management may further reduce visibility albeit this is beyond the control of the applicant.

Visual impact would be of low magnitude at this stage.

Viewpoint 11: Haughmond Abbey

(Refer to Figure F8.11)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint:

Haughmond Abbey is located mid-way along the elevated ridgeline known as Haughmond Hill which is an area of upstanding hard-rock visited both as a viewpoint and recreational area but also because of the presence of Haughmond Abbey. Haughmond Abbey is a disused medieval abbey managed by English Heritage. The chosen viewpoint is close to the abbey and also forms part of a Public Right of Way. The primary purpose of visitors to this location would be to experience the view over the Shropshire Plain to the outlying Welsh mountains beyond and to explore and appreciate the abbey and its context.

Battlefield Enterprise Park and the Sundorne Retail Park currently form a clearly identifiable but distant element of the view, primarily as a result of the light colour of the buildings and their linear nature. The viewpoint is of high sensitivity reflecting the category and nature of users.

Construction

The viewpoint is relatively distant and on all but the clearest of days individual details of buildings and activity are barely discernible. During the latter stages of construction the form of the building would become apparent and the chimney would be viewed in the same way that the pylons cut across the existing view and are visible above the landscape.

Infrastructure required to construct the EWF would have minimal visual impact. The difference between summer and winter views would be negligible at this location – the key factor being haze and clarity of distant views.

The magnitude of visual impact would be very low given the distance of the view, the context of the EWF amongst other large scale buildings and the extent to which it would impinge upon or alter the nature of the view. The proposed EWF would be a visible but minor element of a varied panorama.

Year 1 of Operation

As outlined above the extent to which the EWF would impinge upon or alter the quality of the view at this location is negligible. Visual impact would be of very low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.11.

At 15 Years

As previously described- mitigation would have no material effect on the nature of the view at year 15.

Visual impact at this stage would be of very low magnitude.

Viewpoint 12: Shrewsbury Castle/Laura's Tower

(Refer to Figure F8.12)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

This location has been assessed in order to consider the potential visibility of the proposed EWF from elevated locations of tourism value within the town centre. At the time of the winter visit in February 2008 Laura's tower was not accessible to the public and permission was granted to record the view at the time of the crane survey from the roof of the castle itself. The winter view is not representative of the typical view from the Castle and was taken solely for future reference in the summer view once access to Laura's Tower (the main viewpoint in the Castle) was permitted following completion of building works. A subsequent visit to the most elevated generally accessible part of the Castle, Laura's Tower, was made in June 2008. Using the winter photograph the position and height of the proposed EWF in the panorama from Laura's Tower was then established.

The location is of high sensitivity as a result of its tourist status and the fact that it is a known viewpoint across the town of Shrewsbury. However for assessment purposes it has been amended to medium sensitivity due to the distance from the proposed EWF and the extent that it would impinge into the panorama. The viewer's experience at this location includes a plethora of buildings and features, amongst which the proposed EWF would be a very minor addition.

Construction

The winter and subsequent summer surveys indicated that given the distance of the view, the minimal extent to which the EWF would alter the panorama and the nature of other elements (including the existing Enterprise Park buildings) between the viewpoint the magnitude of impact at this stage would be very low.

Year 1 of Operation

For the reasons given above the impact of the proposed EWF on views from the castle would be of very low magnitude. In the case of the summer view from the top of the steps at Laura's tower, which offers a broad panorama over the town, the proposed EWF would be visible from some locations, including the top of the steps to the tower. For the majority of locations within the castle grounds the EWF would be not visible, as a result of the screening effect of intervening trees or buildings. Due to the distant nature of the view, the width of the panorama and the degree of variation of built form within it including visibility of the existing industrial/retail buildings at Harlescott, the magnitude of impact of the proposed EWF at this location would be very low/zero. The EWF would not materially alter the nature of the view or cause a noticeable deterioration in visual amenity.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.12.

At 15 Years

Impacts would be as described for Year 1 reflecting the fact that mitigation would have no significance at this location.

Visual impact of very low magnitude.

Viewpoint 13: Queen Eleanor's Bower/Haughmond Hill

(Refer to Figure F8.13)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

Queen Eleanor's Bower is a noted viewpoint offering a vantage point over the Shropshire Plain and the town of Shrewsbury as well as the focus for a number of footpaths on the Haughmond Hill ridgeline. The summer view was recorded as this location was added in discussion with Shropshire County Council but not visited at the time of the crane survey although a 3D generated view of the proposed EWF and existing IWMF from this locality was subsequently generated. The viewpoint is considered to be of medium sensitivity, reduced from high sensitivity as a result of distance and the fact that the view also encompasses the existing large scale developments to the north of Shrewsbury town centre which would appear in front of the proposed EWF.

Construction

Individual aspects of the construction would not be readily identifiable from this location due to distance. Visual impact arising from the EWF at the construction stage would be of very low magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The EWF would be viewed as an addition to the light coloured mass of buildings in the distant background of the panorama. It would lie below the skyline and within the complex of buildings making up the Sundorne Retail Park and the Battlefield Enterprise Centre. Visual impact from the EWF would be of very low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer context is provided on Figure F8.13.

At 15 Years

Individual planting within the Retail Park and Battlefield Enterprise Park may have a negligible beneficial impact in reducing the visibility of the EWF and the prominence of the cluster of large buildings in general but would make little difference to the magnitude of impact arising from the EWF, which would be very low.

Viewpoint 14: Shropshire Way/Ebury Hill

(Refer to Figure F8.14)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

Part of the long distance Shropshire Way footpath linking Ebury Hill and Haughmond Hill used by recreational users engaged in appreciation of the landscape and therefore of high sensitivity, modified to medium sensitivity given the nature of the view and the distance of the viewpoint from the proposed EWF. The viewpoint offers long views towards the Welsh Mountains and includes an existing distant view of the light coloured Battlefield Enterprise Park and Sundorne Retail Park buildings. Although these form a minor element of the panorama they are visible primarily as a result of their light colour.

Construction

The EWF would be visible towards the end of the construction period as the building rises and the chimney is erected. However the level of visual impact from construction specific activity would be of very low magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The proposed EWF would occupy a very limited and distant element of the view and be seen in the context of the existing industrial/retail developments in the north of Shrewsbury. Visual impact would be of very low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer context is provided on Figure F8.14.

At 15 Years

No anticipated change in the magnitude of visual impact which would remain at very low magnitude and barely impact upon the quality of the view or the experience of the viewer.

Viewpoint 15: A49 Upper Battlefield

(Refer to Figure F8.15)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

View available from the southern edge of the hamlet of Upper Battlefield and from the A49 southbound carriageway. The upper section of Battlefield Church Tower is just visible above the intervening landform and there are long views towards the Long Mynd. As a residential location this viewpoint is of high sensitivity.

Construction

The intervening embankment landform and bridge of the railway line serves to obstruct views of the existing IWMF and Battlefield Enterprise Park. Pylons within the panorama and 3D model of the proposed EWF have been used to position the building and this indicates that visibility of the proposed EWF at this location would be limited to the chimney. Temporary visibility of cranes may also occur during this period but overall visual impact would be of very low magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

The chimney would appear as a slender column on the skyline, similar in scale and appearance to the telegraph poles which are currently found in the view. The body of the building would not be visible and overall visual impact would be of very low magnitude.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer context is provided on Figure F8.15.

At 15 Years

In the absence of any changes outside of the application area the view would essentially be that experienced in Year 1 – that is the chimney would be visible but the magnitude of visual impact would be very low.

Viewpoint 16: Featherbed Lane

(Refer to Figure F8.16)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

Edge of Harlescott residential area and fringe of the retail park to the north of Featherbed Lane. The residential receptors are of high sensitivity. A record of the summer and winter context is provided on Figure F8.16.

Construction

The photograph and visual assessment taken on the day of the crane survey indicated that the crane and therefore the EWF chimney was not visible at this location. Visual impact would therefore be of zero magnitude.

Year 1 of Operation

Visual impact of zero magnitude.

At 15 Years

Visual impact of zero magnitude.

Viewpoint 17: Battlefield Farm & Visitor Centre

(Refer to Figure F8.17)

Nature & Sensitivity of Viewpoint

The viewpoint is part of a recently developed Battle of Shrewsbury exhibition centre and café/farm shop in the complex of traditional farm buildings at Battlefield Farm. The farm overlooks the battlefield and provides an elevated view towards the existing IWMF and the site of the proposed EWF as well as Battlefield Enterprise Park and Sundorne Retail Park in general. The visitor centre was not operational/publicly accessible at the time of the winter survey and the view is not therefore recorded. It is regarded as a location of high sensitivity, given its location on a vantage point overlooking the battlefield.

Construction

The viewpoint is sufficiently distant for the detail of the construction to be indistinct however the infrastructure such as cranes and other equipment periodically used would be visible in the centre of the view along with the form of the building as it rises towards completion. The EWF would occupy a central part of a wide panorama and with the exception of the chimney would not break the distant skyline.

Visual impact at this stage would be of maximum medium magnitude reflecting the fact that the proposed EWF would be clearly visible as a prominent element of the view but within a much wider panorama already containing industrial elements and would not obstruct close views or dominate the foreground.

Year 1 of Operation

As described above – the EWF would be clearly visible and is of a larger scale than the other industrial buildings in the panorama. At this stage the majority of the mitigation planting proposed as part of the development would have no beneficial effect – for this reason the mitigation design includes a line of semi-mature trees of 8-10m height is proposed to achieve a filtered screen of the lower part of the building form in Year 1. In addition the planting associated with the Battlefield Link Road which is well established and at the point of putting on substantial growth is likely to have an impact in reducing the visible extent of the northern façade of the building.

Visual impact would be of medium magnitude allowing for the beneficial screening effect of the larger scale mitigation planting and of high magnitude visual impact without.

A representation of the proposed EWF in Year 1 in the summer context, with and without mitigation planting is provided on Figure F8.17.

At 15 Years

Proposed mitigation planting would reduce the extent of the building visibility to the upper curved section and the chimney. In addition the existing planting to the rear of the EWF would be sufficiently mature to screen views of it and the planting along the Battlefield Link Road would effectively link the woodland to the left hand side of the proposed EWF with the mature trees in the right hand side of the view giving a wooded backdrop to the rear of the battlefield. Upper sections of the proposed EWF would however remain visible above the woodland fringe and give rise to visual impact of low magnitude.

F8.3 Significance of Visual Impacts

LVIA guidance recommends, as set out in Annex F3, that following assessment of sensitivity of the viewpoint and magnitude of the impact the significance of the predicted impact be assessed.

Table F8.1 summarises the sensitivity of each viewpoint, the magnitude of impact and the significance of the impact according to criteria/yardsticks given in Annex F3, which provides a scale against which the importance of the impact is assessed.

Table F8.1 Summary of Visual Assessment

| | VIEWPOINT REFERENCE | ELEVATION (m AOD) | DISTANCE (m)** | VIEWPOINT SENSITIVITY *maximum | EFFECT MAGNITUDE | | | OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE | | |
|------|--|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--------|---------|----------------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | | Construction | Year 1 | Year 15 | Construction | Year 1 | Year 15 |
| VP1 | Battlefield Way/Enterprise Roundabout | 80.8 | 405 | Medium | M | M | VL | M | M | S |
| VP2 | Albrighton Churchyard | 96.3 | 1893 | Medium | L | L | VL | S | S | N |
| VP3 | Albright Hussey: Winter | 83.9 | 1211 | Medium | M | M | L | M | M | S |
| VP3 | Albright Hussey: Summer | 80.3 | a/a | Medium | L | L | L | S | S | S |
| VP4 | Harlescott Lane/Derwent Avenue | 69.2 | 841 | High | VL | VL | VL | S | S | S |
| VP5 | Harlescott Lane/Harlescott Crescent | 66.5 | 410 | High | VL | VL | VL | S | S | S |
| VP6 | Harlescott Lane Brixton Way | 65.8 | 455 | Low | L | L | L | N | N | N |
| VP7 | Battlefield Road/Arlington Way: Winter | 75.2 | 471 | Low | L | L | L | N | N | N |
| VP7 | Battlefield Road/Arlington Way: Summer | 71.2 | a/a | Low | VL | VL | VL | I | I | I |
| VP8 | Battlefield Church/Public Right of Way | 67.9 | 701 | High | M | M | L | Sub | Sub | M |
| VP9 | A49 Battlefield Roundabout: Winter | 89.3 | 637 | Low | L | L | VL | N | N | I |
| VP9 | A49 Battlefield Roundabout: Summer | 92.0 | a/a | Low | VL | VL | VL | I | I | I |
| VP10 | Shillingstone Drive/Battlefield Road | 141.0 | 386 | High | L | L | L | M | M | M |
| VP11 | Haughmond Abbey | 105.0 | 3266 | High | VL | VL | VL | S | S | S |

Environmental Statement: Appendix F Landscape and Visual Impact

| | VIEWPOINT REFERENCE | ELEVATION (m AOD) | DISTANCE (m)** | VIEWPOINT SENSITIVITY *maximum | EFFECT MAGNITUDE | | | OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------|----------------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | | Construction | Year 1 | Year 15 | Construction | Year 1 | Year 15 |
| VP12 | Shrewsbury Castle/Laura's Tower | 83.2 | 3743 | Medium | VL | VL | VL | N | N | N |
| VP13 | Queen Eleanor's Bower/Haughmond Hill | 61.2 | 3569 | Medium | VL | VL | VL | N | N | N |
| VP14 | Shropshire Way/Ebury Hill | 87.3 | 3271 | Medium | VL | VL | VL | N | N | N |
| VP15 | A49 Upper Battlefield | 80.8 | 1178 | High | VL | VL | VL | S | S | S |
| VP16 | Featherbed Lane, Harlescott | 96.3 | 1046 | High | Z | Z | Z | Z | Z | Z |
| VP17 | Battlefield Farm & Visitor Centre | 83.9 | 1034 | High | M | M | L | Sub | Sub | M |
| SIGNIFICANCE MATRIX | | SENSITIVITY | | | | | | | | |
| | | Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low | | | | |
| MAGNITUDE | Very High Magnitude | Major (MJ) | Very Severe (VS) | Severe (Sev) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | | | | |
| | High Magnitude | Very Severe (VS) | Severe (Sev) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | | | | |
| | Medium Magnitude | Severe (Sev) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) | | | | |
| | Low Magnitude | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) | Insignificant (I) | | | | |
| | Very Low Magnitude | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) | Insignificant (I) | Very Insignificant (VI) | | | | |
| | Zero | Zero (Z) | Zero (Z) | Zero (Z) | Zero (Z) | Zero (Z) | | | | |

** Measured to Application Boundary

F9 CONCLUSIONS

The baseline landscape and visual context of the application site has been described by an appropriately qualified and experienced Landscape Architect in relation to a desktop study of published information and via a site survey in accordance with current guidance on landscape and visual assessment. Potential landscape and visual impacts, both adverse and beneficial where appropriate, of the development have been identified.

The assessment of the effects of the EWF development was supplemented and aided by the use of a crane survey and 3D computer modelling of the development proposals allowing an accurate understanding and photomontage representation of the proposed EWF (and ancillary developments) within existing views.

Both the landscape and visual assessments consider the potential effects of the proposed EWF at 3 points in time: during the construction period, in 1 year and at 15 years. This allows for change to visual amenity and landscape character to be assessed over time.

During the construction period it was assessed that the proposed EWF would have **negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape. On the day of opening effects were assessed as **negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **slight adverse** effect on the wider rural landscape. By year 15, taking mitigation and other factors, such as the likelihood of additional buildings being built and the development of planting elsewhere in the landscape, the proposed EWF would result in **negligible adverse** effect on the landscape character of the application site and **negligible adverse** effect on landscape character of the wider landscape. The definition of what these categories mean in terms of the degree of change to the landscape resource is provided in Annex F2.

The visual impact of the proposed EWF development have been described for a series of 17 representative viewpoints, chosen to illustrate the range of viewpoints within the zone of theoretical visibility of the application site. This includes record of locations with no view of the existing site or development. For each of the viewpoints where a view of the EWF would be obtained an indicative photomontage has been prepared to illustrate the appearance of the EWF at that location. The scale and positioning of the EWF within the views has been achieved through use of computer digital terrain models and a schematic model of the building itself designed to illustrate visibility and mass within a panorama. For most locations the proposed EWF would be viewed as an industrial building in an industrial context

The sensitivity of viewpoints ranged from high to low, whilst predicted magnitude of visual impact fell in the range medium to zero. Overall significance of visual impact varied from substantial to none with most locations experiencing maximum impacts during the construction period and particularly the latter stages of the construction period, with impacts declining over the 15 year period as mitigation planting takes effect. For the majority of locations visual impact would be of slight or negligible significance.

ANNEX F1: TERMINOLOGY/GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Landscape: comprises those physical components that together form the appearance of land, including its shapes, colours and textures. Landscape also reflects the way in which these various components combine to create distinctive landscape character, particular to specific localities.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV): the area within which views of the proposed scheme may be obtained, partly determining the extent of the study area. The extent of the ZTV is determined by many factors, including topography and intermediate visual intrusions such as hedges, buildings and blocks of woodland which that create areas of visual "dead ground."

Landscape Character Area (LCAs): Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) are areas of homogenous landscape character. Typical landscape components defining character include landform, land cover, vegetation, settlement pattern, remoteness and degree of tranquillity.

Visual Receptors: people who can achieve key viewpoints, which are within the ZTV and occur from publicly accessible roads, footpaths and other open spaces are identified. Individual visual receptors groups (e.g. local residents, walkers on public footpaths, business employees, passing motorists and train passengers) within the ZTV are also identified and categorised in terms of their sensitivity to visual change e.g. local residents, walkers on public footpaths, business employees, passing motorists and train passengers.

Baseline Conditions: the baseline landscape and visual conditions were assessed through both desk and site appraisal during 2006/2007.

The Study Area: The Study Area for the assessment of the landscape and visual impacts is defined by the ZTV. This defines the extent of the Scheme within which views of the landfill may be achieved.

ANNEX F2: LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Landscape Quality

The assessment of landscape quality within the Study Area has been undertaken on the basis of overall condition and aesthetic appeal, relative to the following landscape- setting five-point scale As follows:

- *Very High:* Areas and/or features which that have a particularly high value, by nature of their condition, high scenic qualities, strong characteristics (such as pattern and land cover), cultural associations, and/or relative position and amenity, including level of tranquillity. These are likely to be, but not necessarily, within a National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Registered Park and Garden or within a World Heritage Site;
- *High:* Areas and/or features that that are considered to be of high value by virtue of their positive characteristics, sense of place or local or cultural associations. These areas will be of regional or local importance and are likely to be, but not necessarily, designated by the planning authority as being of landscape value;
- *Moderate:* Landscapes and/or features which that retain a positive character and a sense of place and/or are of local interest or have local cultural associations. These areas are unlikely to be designated for their landscape value;
- *Low:* Landscapes in fair to poor condition which that have undergone change to the extent that they no longer have a distinctive local character, or particular aesthetic quality, or they lack cultural associations;
- *Very Low:* Degraded landscapes and/or features in poor condition whose distinctive character and aesthetic quality has been seriously damaged.

Guidance on landscape character assessment highlights consideration of landscape quality as an important consideration.

Locally distinctive features have also been appraised against the following indicators:

- *Scale:* the geographical scale at which the feature is important (local, national, international);
- *Importance:* the reason why the feature is important, such as reasons for designation; and
- *Rarity:* the relative abundance of the feature, or its trend in relation to a target level.

Landscape Sensitivity

The sensitivity of the landscape to change is the degree to which a particular LCA can accommodate changes or new features without unacceptable detrimental effects to its essential characteristics. Criteria used in this study to determine the sensitivity of landscape character include:

- the distinctiveness of character and quality of the existing landscape;
- the vulnerability of the key components determining character;
- the nature of predicted impacts, the degree of change that would result and the ability of the landscape to accommodate that change; and
- the significance of the landscape resource in a local, regional and national context.

Table F.2.1 summarises the classification of landscape sensitivity and the criteria used to define sensitivity to change, is as set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for Environmental Assessment (LI & IEMA, 2002).

Table F.2.1: Classification of Landscape Sensitivity

| Description | Sensitivity |
|---|-------------|
| For example, important components or landscape of particularly distinctive character susceptible to relatively small changes. | High |
| For example, a landscape of moderately valued characteristics Reasonably tolerant of change | Medium |
| For example, a relatively unimportant landscape, the nature of Which is potentially tolerant of substantial change | Low |

Magnitude of Landscape Impacts

The magnitude of a landscape impact relates to:

- the size, extent or degree of change to landscape character or individual landscape components;
- whether there is a direct impact resulting in the loss of landscape components, or change beyond the land take of the Scheme having an impact on the character of the area; and
- whether the impact is permanent or temporary.

Table F.2.2 presents the criteria used to define the magnitude of landscape impacts.

Table F.2.2: Classification of Magnitude of Landscape Impact

| Description | Magnitude |
|---|-----------|
| Permanent large scale significant change in landscape characteristics and change in landscape character. | Very High |
| Notable change in landscape characteristics over an extensive area ranging to very intensive change over a more limited area. | High |
| Moderate change to landscape elements in a localised area or minor change over a larger area. | Medium |
| Minor but noticeable changes over a localised area or moderate temporary changes over a short-term timescale. | Low |
| Virtually imperceptible change in any landscape component. | Very Low |

Significance of Landscape Effects

The significance of the effect of the Scheme on each LCA can be determined by combining the magnitude of the impact with the sensitivity of each area to change. Criteria used to derive significance are illustrated in Table F.2.3, which is based on the GLVIA.

Table F.2.3: Significance of Landscape Effects (Beneficial or Adverse)

| | | SENSITIVITY | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low |
| MAGNITUDE | Very High | Major | Very Large | Large | Substantial | Moderate |
| | High | Very Large | Large | Substantial | Moderate | Slight |
| | Medium | Large | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Negligible |
| | Low | Substantial | Moderate | Slight | Negligible | Insignificant |
| | Very Low | Moderate | Slight | Negligible | Insignificant | Insignificant |

Examples of what this means in terms of landscape change are provided in Table F.2.4 below:

Table F.2.4 Landscape Significance

| Significance | Comment |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Large beneficial (positive) effect | <p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ integrate very successfully with the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape; ▪ enable the complete restoration of sense of place and scale through well-designed planting and mitigation measures, (i.e. characteristic features are enhanced through the use of local materials and species to fit the proposal into the landscape); ▪ enable a high sense of quality to be restored or enhanced through beneficial landscaping and sensitive design in a landscape that is of a formally recognised quality; or ▪ complement government objectives to regenerate degraded countryside. |
| Moderate beneficial (positive) effect | <p>The proposals provide an opportunity to enhance the landscape because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ they fit very well with the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape; ▪ there is potential, through mitigation, to enable the restoration of characteristic features, partially lost or diminished as the result of changes resulting from intensive farming or inappropriate development; ▪ they will enable a sense of place and scale to be restored through well-designed planting and mitigation measures, (i.e. characteristic features are enhanced through the use of local materials and species to fit the proposal into the landscape); ▪ they enable some sense of quality to be restored or enhanced through beneficial landscaping and sensitive design in a landscape that is not of any formally recognised quality; ▪ they further government objectives to regenerate degraded countryside. |

| Significance | Comment |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Slight beneficial (positive) effect | <p>The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ fit well with the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape; or ▪ incorporate measures for mitigation to ensure they will blend in well with surrounding landscape; ▪ will enable some sense of place and scale to be restored through well-designed planting and mitigation measures; ▪ maintain or enhance existing landscape character in an area that is not a designated landscape, nor vulnerable to change; ▪ avoid conflict with government policy towards protection of the countryside. |
| Neutral effect | <p>The proposals are well designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ complement the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape; or ▪ incorporate measures for mitigation to ensure that the Scheme will blend in well with surrounding landscape features and landscape elements; ▪ avoid being visually intrusive nor have an adverse effect on the current level of tranquillity of the landscape through which the route passes; ▪ maintain existing landscape character in an area that is not a designated landscape, that is neither of national or local high quality nor vulnerable to change; ▪ avoid conflict with government policy towards protection of the countryside. |
| Slight adverse (negative) effect | <p>The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ do not quite fit the landform and scale of the landscape; or ▪ although not very visually intrusive, will impact on certain views into and across the area; ▪ cannot be completely mitigated for because of the nature of the proposal itself or the character of the landscape through which it passes; ▪ affect an area of recognised landscape quality; ▪ conflict with local authority policies for protecting the local character of the countryside. |

| Significance | Comment |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Moderate adverse (negative) effect | <p>The proposals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ out of scale with the landscape, or at odds with the local pattern and landform; ▪ are visually intrusive and will adversely impact on the landscape; ▪ not possible to fully mitigate for, that is, mitigation will not prevent the Scheme from scarring the landscape in the longer term, as some features of interest will be partly destroyed or their setting reduced or removed; ▪ will have an adverse impact on a landscape of recognised quality or on vulnerable and important characteristic features or elements; ▪ in conflict with local and national policies to protect open land and nationally recognised countryside as set out in Planning Policy Statement (PPS)7 and Planning Policy Guidance PPG2. |
| Large adverse (negative) effect | <p>The proposals are very damaging to the landscape in that they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ are at considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape; ▪ are visually intrusive and would disrupt fine and valued views of the area; ▪ are likely to degrade, diminish or even destroy the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements and their setting; or ▪ will be substantially damaging to a high-quality or highly vulnerable landscape, causing it to change and be considerably diminished in quality; ▪ cannot be adequately mitigated for; ▪ are in serious conflict with government policy for the protection of nationally recognised countryside as set out in PPS7. |
| Very large adverse (negative) effect | <p>The proposals would result in exceptionally severe adverse impacts on the landscape because they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ are at complete variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape; ▪ are highly visual and extremely intrusive, destroying fine and valued views both into and across the area; ▪ would irrevocably damage or degrade, badly diminish or even |

| Significance | Comment |
|--------------|--|
| | <p>destroy the integrity of characteristic features and elements and their setting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="647 501 1498 595">▪ would cause a very high-quality or highly vulnerable landscape to be irrevocably changed and its quality very considerably diminished;<li data-bbox="647 629 1498 723">▪ could not be mitigated for, that is, there are no measures that would protect or replace the loss of a nationally important landscape;<li data-bbox="647 757 1498 819">▪ cannot be reconciled with government policy for the protection of nationally recognised countryside as set out in PPS7. |

ANNEX F3: VISUAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Visual impacts result from change to the appearance of the landscape as a result of the development proposals either intruding into, or obstructing existing views, or by their overall impact on visual amenity and character. Where relevant, seasonal differences in impact are identified. The sensitivity of receptors relates principally to three factors as follows:

- receptor's function whilst exposed to view;
- Degree of exposure to view; and
- period of exposure to view.

Visual Receptors: Within the ZTV a number of visual receptor groups of differing sensitivity are identified as follows.

Very High Sensitivity

- Residential locations in an area of designated landscape quality;
- Users of public rights of way in an area of designated landscape quality;

High Sensitivity

- local residents although the context of the dwelling may influence sensitivity;
- users of public rights of way;
- equestrians on bridleways;

Medium Sensitivity

- Distant residential locations from which the site forms a minor part of the panorama.
- Users of distant public rights of way from which the site forms a minor part of the panorama.

Low Sensitivity

- Train passengers.
- Vehicle travellers on the road network;

Very Low Sensitivity

- Farm workers; and
- Employees of local businesses.

The criteria used to assess the magnitude of visual impacts are as follows:

- Value of existing views;
- Degree of change to existing views;
- the availability and amenity of the alternative views;
- distance to receptor;
- impacts may be considered as beneficial (i.e. positive) as well as adverse.

The magnitude of a visual impact can be described as high, medium low or negligible. Whilst there is professional judgement inherent in determining the category of impact, the assessment process is both systematic and structured. The assessment of visual impacts is based upon a comparative winter views. Where significant differences in impact between summer and winter are apparent, these are identified.

The sensitivity of a receptor and the level of impact upon it can be combined to assess the significance of the resultant effects – refer to Table F.3.1.

Table F.3.1: Significance Criteria for Visual Effects (Beneficial or Adverse)

| SIGNIFICANCE MATRIX | | SENSITIVITY | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low |
| MAGNITUDE | Very High Magnitude | Major (MJ) | Very Large (VL) | Large (L) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) |
| | High Magnitude | Very Large (VL) | Large (L) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) |
| | Medium Magnitude | Large (L) | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) |
| | Low Magnitude | Substantial (Sub) | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) | Insignificant (I) |
| | Very Low Magnitude | Moderate (M) | Slight (S) | Negligible (N) | Insignificant (I) | Very Insignificant (VI) |
| | Zero | Zero | Zero | Zero | Zero | Zero |

The criteria detailed in Table F.3.1 above can be described upon the basis of the following descriptions (based on DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 5, Chapter 4, Paragraph 4):

- **Major (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a major significant deterioration in the existing view;
- **Very Large (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a very large significant deterioration in the existing view;
- **Large (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a large significant deterioration in the existing view;
- **Substantial (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a significant deterioration in the existing view;
- **Moderate (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a noticeable deterioration in the existing view;
- **Slight (adverse):** where the scheme would cause a perceptible deterioration in the existing view;
- **Negligible (adverse):** where the Scheme would cause a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view;
- **No change:** where the Scheme would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in the existing view;
- **Negligible (beneficial):** where the Scheme would cause a barely perceptible improvement in the existing view;

- **Slight (beneficial):** where the Scheme would cause a perceptible improvement in the existing view;
- **Moderate (beneficial):** where the Scheme would cause a noticeable improvement in the existing view; and
- **Substantial (beneficial):** where the Scheme would cause a significant improvement in the existing view.

ANNEX F4: PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT OF RELEVANCE TO THE LVIA

- Regional Planning Guidance for the West Midlands North West (RPG11) (June 2004);
- Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Joint Structure Plan 1996-2011 (adopted in November 2002; and
- Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Local Plan (June 2001) (as partially amended in July 2005).

ANNEX F5: SUMMARY OF LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS

The proposed development straddles the rural urban fringe and therefore the key characteristics of each are described below:

Rural Context Key Aesthetics:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Scale | A medium scale landscape of regular field sizes, rarely intimate in scale. |
| Balance/ Unity | A well balanced rural landscape with an attractive combination of unified hedges, hedgerow trees and small woodlands. The urban fringe creates a discordant and incongruous boundary. |
| Enclosure | Variable, generally distant long views and relatively open middleground views. |
| Texture | Rural textures of crops and agriculture varying from season to season in conjunction with smooth landforms and pasture punctuated by varied texture of hedges and woodland. |
| Diversity | The rural landscape is relatively uniform being a combination of pasture and arable use in a well defined pattern. The rural urban fringe is more varied and includes recent large scale detracting elements such as industrial/retail buildings. |
| Form | Largely linear reflecting the field boundaries, powerlines and highway and rail corridors. |
| Movement | Locally important along the A49 and A53 but otherwise not a prominent aspect of the landscape. |
| Colour | Muted rural greens and browns, varying seasonally, dominate. |
| Other Comments | The rural/urban fringe transition is abrupt and not well integrated – allowing the urban development to impinge into the rural. |

Urban Fringe Context Key Aesthetics:

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Scale | A landscape of large scale buildings with little landscape infrastructure creating a poorly sub-divided mass of modern buildings of variable quality. |
| Balance/ Unity | A unified area of out of town retail and business use. Insufficient landscape infrastructure to separate the mass of buildings or define individual plots and create a sense of place. |
| Enclosure | Often well enclosed with views defined by the intervening buildings. |
| Texture | Little variation in texture apparent – unused areas of undeveloped land add some variation but are often poorly managed and act as a detractor. |
| Diversity | Uniformity of buildings and land use. |
| Form | Largely linear reflecting the layout of the access roads. |
| Movement | A prominent feature – the retail and industrial/commercial use ensures a consistent flow of traffic and movement. |
| Colour | Light colours dominate, forming a prominent contrast to the rural landscape with no seasonal variation. |
| Other Comments | The rural/urban fringe transition is abrupt and not well integrated – existing planting along the Battlefield Link Road will beneficially separate the two in due course. |



FIGURES