

8.0 Landscape and Visual

8.1 Introduction

This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant effects of the proposed development in terms of landscape and visual amenity and incorporates a summary of the landscape and visual baseline presented in full at *Appendix 8.1*. A detailed description of the site is contained in *Chapter 3* of this ES.

The chapter describes the assessment methodology, the baseline conditions at the site and surroundings, the likely significant landscape and visual effects, the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects and the likely residual effects after these measures have been employed. It has been written by the Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd (EDP).

The Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) an independent environmental planning consultancy and a Registered Practice of the Royal Chartered body for Landscape Architects and landscape professionals (LI). EDP landscape consultants and the authors of this ES Chapter are individually Chartered Members of the Landscape Institute (CMLI).

This chapter should be read in conjunction with the following appendices and figures:

Figures	
Figure 8.1	Site Location and Boundaries
Figure 8.2	Landscape Designations and Other Considerations
Figure 8.3	Site Character and Surrounding Landscape Context
Figure 8.4	Topographical Relief and Hydrological Features
Figure 8.5	Published Landscape Character Assessment
Figure 8.6	Site Photographs
Figure 8.7	Visual Appraisal
Figure 8.8	Viewpoints and Potential Visual Receptors
Figure 8.9	Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan
Figure 8.10	Representative Photoviewpoints
Appendices	
Appendix 8.1	Landscape and Visual Baseline (and associated annexes)
Appendix 8.2	Landscape and Visual Effects during Construction
Appendix 8.3	Landscape and Visual Effects during Occupation
Appendix 8.4	Arboricultural Impact Assessment

8.2 Scoping, Consultation and Overview of Potential Effects

Consultation with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) Coventry City Council (CCC) principally involved a pre-application meeting held on the 8 August 2018.

A draft photoviewpoint location plan was presented at the meeting with CCC for officer review, however, officers declined to comment in detail on the appropriateness of the proposed photoviewpoint locations. EDP therefore, proceeded with its selection of potential representative photoviewpoints (PVP).

Potential effects associated with the proposed development were anticipated to comprise:

- Potential effects upon people living local to the site, due to a change in existing views;
- Potential effects upon the landscape character¹ of the immediate locality, due to new development in the landscape;
- Potential effects upon people using local roads, rights of way and recreational facilities, where the change in general character will change the experience of receptors;
- Cumulative effects on the above receptors resulting from development of the wider Keresley SUE.

8.3 Assessment Methodology

A general EIA² methodology is presented in *Chapter 2*. Provided within this section is an abridged methodology for Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA). An unabridged version can be found at Annex EDP 2 of *Appendix 8.1*, with terms clearly defined within the Glossary at Annex EDP 3.

8.3.1 Guidance

The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition (LI/IEMA, 2013)' (GLVIA3³).

A three-stage assessment process has been adopted for the LVIA in accordance with best practice as set out in GLVIA3 comprising:

1. Description of the proposed development and the existing landscape and visual context in which it will be assessed (*Appendix 8.1*, Section 5, with reference to *ES Chapter 2*);
2. Prediction of the likely changes to the landscape and visual context resulting from the proposed development (*Appendix 8.2 and 8.3*); and
3. Assessment of the significance and nature (beneficial or adverse) of the effects resulting from the likely changes (*Appendix 8.2 and 8.3*).

The likely effects of the proposed development on the landscape resource and visual amenity were assessed through the combination of an assessment of a number of representative viewpoints and desk research and fieldwork, through which a more precise understanding of the study area was gained.

In order to assess the likely effects, the assessment evaluated the current environmental baseline to identify potential sensitive receptors. Details of the environmental baseline is set out in *Section 8.4*.

8.3.2 Receptor Sensitivity and Magnitude of Change

Assessment of the overall sensitivity of a landscape or visual receptor is determined by combining judgements of their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape or view, as set out at Paragraph 5.38 of GLVIA3.

¹ An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Natural England 2004);

² Town and Country Planning Regulations, 2017, "Environmental Impact Assessment";

³ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition (LI/IEMA, 2013)

However, overall sensitivity can change on a case-by-case basis, for example, a high susceptibility to change and a low receptor value may result in a medium overall sensitivity, unless it can be demonstrated that the receptor is unusually susceptible or is in some particular way more or less valuable.

A degree of professional judgement applies in arriving at the overall sensitivity for both landscape and visual receptors. While GLVIA3 provides an overall framework for the completion of an LVIA, it also makes clear that professional judgement is an essential component of the assessment process.

Table 8.1 provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a landscape receptor is judged within this assessment and considers both value and susceptibility independently.

Category	Landscape Receptor Value Criteria	Landscape Susceptibility to Change Criteria
Very High	Nationally/internationally designated/valued countryside and landscape features; strong/distinctive landscape characteristics; absence of landscape detractors.	Strong/distinctive landscape elements and aesthetic/perceptual aspects; absence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in excellent condition. Landscapes with clear and widely recognised cultural value. Landscapes with a high level of tranquillity.
High	Locally designated/valued countryside (e.g. Areas of High Landscape Value, Regional Scenic Areas) and landscape features; many distinctive landscape characteristics; very few landscape detractors.	Many distinctive landscape elements/- aesthetic/perceptual aspects; very few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in good condition. The landscape has a low capacity for change as a result of potential changes to defining character.
Medium	Undesignated countryside and landscape features; some distinctive landscape characteristics; few landscape detractors.	Some distinctive landscape elements/- aesthetic/perceptual aspects; few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in fair condition. Landscape is able to accommodate some change as a result.
Low	Undesignated countryside and landscape features; few distinctive landscape characteristics; presence of landscape detractors.	Few distinctive landscape elements/- aesthetic/perceptual aspects; presence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in poor condition. Landscape is able to accommodate large amounts of change without changing these characteristics fundamentally.
Very Low	Undesignated countryside and landscape features; absence of distinctive landscape characteristics; despoiled/- degraded by the presence of many landscape detractors.	Absence of distinctive landscape elements/- aesthetic/perceptual aspects; presence of many landscape detractors; landscape receptors in very poor condition. As such landscape is able to accommodate considerable change.

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

Table 8.2 provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a visual receptor is judged within the assessment and considers both value and susceptibility together.

Table 8.2: Visual Receptor Sensitivity Criteria	
Category	Visual Receptor Criteria
Very High	<p>Designed view (which may be to or from a recognised heritage asset or other important viewpoint), or where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience. Key promoted viewpoint e.g. interpretative signs. References in literature and art and/or guidebooks tourist maps. Protected view recognised in planning policy designation.</p> <p>Examples may include views from residential properties, especially from rooms normally occupied in waking or daylight hours; national PRow e.g National Trails and nationally designated countryside/landscape features with public access which people might visit purely to experience the view; and visitors to heritage assets of national importance.</p>
High	<p>View of clear value but may not be formally recognised e.g. framed view of high scenic value, or destination hill summits. It may also be inferred that the view is likely to have value e.g. to local residents.</p> <p>Examples may include views from recreational receptors where there is some appreciation of the landscape e.g. golf and fishing; local PRow, access land and National Trust land, also panoramic viewpoints marked on maps; road routes promoted in tourist guides for their scenic value.</p>
Medium	<p>View is not promoted or recorded in any published sources and may be typical of the views experienced from a given receptor.</p> <p>Examples may include people engaged in outdoor sport other than appreciation of the landscape e.g. football and rugby or road users on minor routes passing through rural or scenic areas.</p>
Low	<p>View of clearly lesser value than similar views experienced from nearby visual receptors that may be more accessible.</p> <p>Examples may include road users on main road routes (motorways/A roads) and users of rail routes or people at their place of work (where the place of work may be in a sensitive location). Also views from commercial buildings where views of the surrounding landscape may have some limited importance.</p>
Very Low	<p>View affected by many landscape detractors and unlikely to be valued.</p> <p>Examples may include people at their place of work, indoor recreational or leisure facilities or other locations where views of the wider landscape have little or no importance.</p>

Table 8.3 provides an indication of the criteria by which the size/scale of change at a landscape or visual receptor is judged within the assessment.

Category	Landscape Receptor Criteria	Visual Receptor Criteria
Very High	Total loss of or major alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements which strongly conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	There would be a substantial change to the baseline, with the proposed development creating a new focus and having a defining influence on the view.
High	Notable loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that are prominent and may conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	The proposed development would be clearly noticeable and the view would be fundamentally altered by its presence.
Medium	Partial loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline condition. Addition of elements that may be evident but do not necessarily conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.	The proposed development would form a new and recognisable element within the view which is likely to be recognised by the receptor.
Low	Minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements that may not be uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.	The proposed development would form a minor constituent of the view being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a small component.
Very Low	Barely discernible loss or alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline landscape. Addition of elements not uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.	The proposed development would form a barely noticeable component of the view, and the view whilst slightly altered would be similar to the baseline situation.
Negligible	No appreciable change	No appreciable change

Table 8.4 provides an indication of the criteria by which the geographical extent of the area affected is judged within the assessment.

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

8.3.3 Significance Criteria

The purpose of the EIA process is to identify the likely significant environmental effects (both beneficial and adverse) arising from the proposed development.

In order to consider the likely level of an effect, the sensitivity of each receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change (as set out above), with reference also made to the geographical extent, duration and reversibility of the effect within the assessment. The level of effect can be derived by combining the sensitivity and magnitude in accordance with the matrix in *Table 8.5*.

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

It should be noted that due to the number of levels in relation to sensitivity and magnitude of change, the additional term ‘major’ has been introduced to describe an effect of between moderate and substantial significance.

In certain cases, where additional factors may arise, a further degree of professional judgement may be applied when determining the level of overall change. Where this occurs, further explanation is given.

Effects will be described and evaluated during construction, at Year 1 (completion of construction activities) and Year 15 (following maturation of the landscape proposals).

8.3.4 Study Area

As a result of baseline analysis, together with an understanding of the nature and scale of the development and the likely extent and distribution of effects, the assessment defines the following study areas, as represented on *Figure 8.1*:

- General Study Area – set at 5km distance from the site (providing the broad geographical context); and
- Detailed study area – set at 2km from the site (the area within which significant effects are likely to occur).

8.3.5 *Field Surveys*

A field assessment of local site circumstances, including a photographic survey of the character and visual context of the site and its surroundings, and an analysis of existing Public Rights of Way (PROWs), have been undertaken between January and March 2018 in order to gather robust baseline information.

Photoviewpoints were selected from locations where visual receptors are most sensitive e.g. national long-distance routes, PROWs, local routes and specific, recorded view locations. These are derived from a number of sources, including examination of OS and online definitive maps.

A photographic field survey of the site and its surroundings was carried out by EDP on 21 February 2018 in order to gather robust baseline information. The field assessment was undertaken in winter conditions and has therefore, been undertaken, as far as is practicable, in accordance with best practice guidance which states that such assessments should be undertaken when the leaves are absent from the majority of trees/vegetation and visibility is at its greatest.

The LVIA has identified a total of 11 'representative viewpoints', illustrating the nature of views to the site and the wider Keresley SUE allocation site from surrounding publicly accessible locations.

8.3.6 *Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects generally occur where there may be combined or sequential visibility of two or more developments of the same type and scale, or where the consideration of other schemes would increase an effect identified. Where other schemes are relevant, these are considered in conjunction with the proposed development.

The assessment considers the potential significant cumulative effects of development of the wider Keresley Sustainable Urban Extension⁴ (SUE), including planning permission OUT/2014/2282, as described in *Chapter 4*.

8.3.7 *Assumptions and Limitations*

Baseline conditions have been established using existing assessments, available documentation and field assessment, however, it is important to note that this information may change before or during the construction and occupation of the proposed development.

The assessment is undertaken in consideration of the 'worst case' scenario for the proposed development, i.e. those potential outcomes, situations or locations which would result in the most profound effect on landscape and visual receptors, unless stated to the contrary. It therefore, identifies the greatest degree of change likely to accrue and may be subject to mitigating factors or alternative conditions which might reduce those effects. For example, visual effects are considered in both summer and winter contexts; although the level of effect is expressed for winter landscape conditions when trees are bare of leaf cover and the visibility

⁴ Coventry City Council Urban Extension Design Guidance Draft Supplementary Planning Document (August 2018) and Coventry City Council Urban Extension Design Guidance Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Appendix 1 Keresley (2018)

of development is at its greatest. Where this is the case, the assessment identifies alternative conditions or further mitigation which might result in impacts being less pronounced.

As defined above, the assessment of likely significant effects applies a pre-determined methodology to arrive at its conclusions. This procedure brings a degree of objective, procedural rigour into what otherwise might be judged to be 'personal opinion'. Certainly, professional judgement is still required, but the purpose of adopting a methodology is to make the process as clear and logical as possible.

This assessment has been undertaken with regard to the phases of development and assumed build rate therein, as presented in the Design and Access Statement (DAS). An Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan (*Figure 8.9*) shows indicative planting and soft treatment of other open areas and assumes that planting would be managed in line with an appropriate management plan, agreed with the LPA at reserved matters stage.

8.4 Baseline Conditions

Landscape and visual assessment is comprised of a study of two separate but inter-linked issues; landscape character and visual amenity. A detailed description of the landscape and visual baseline at and around the site is set out in *Appendix 8.1* with a summary provided below.

8.4.1 National Landscape Character

While the National Landscape Character⁵ (NCA) description is useful in that it provides a context for the site and a broad framework for more detailed landscape character assessments, it is too generic to provide specific site level characterisation and is not considered further here. For the scale of the development proposed, it is considered that the description of landscape character undertaken at the sub-regional level is more relevant in establishing the landscape resource baseline.

8.4.2 Local Landscape Character: Published Assessments

Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines

The published landscape character assessment relevant to the EIA area is the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines⁶ (WLG) produced in November 1993. The site is located within the Arden Regional Landscape Area (RLA) and the Ancient Arden Landscape Character Type (LCT), the location of which is illustrated on *Figure 8.5*. The overall character and qualities, characteristic features and management strategy of this LCT are noted in *Appendix 8.1*.

⁵ National Character Area profile 96 'Dunsmore and Feldon'
<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/1819400?category=587130> (accessed 06.02.18);

National Character Area profile 97 'Arden'
<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4878893332824064?category=587130> (accessed 06.02.18);

⁶ Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines (November 1993) <https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/landscapeguidelines> (accessed 20.04.18)

The Ancient Arden LCT is described as “A small scale farmed landscape with a varied, undulating topography, characterised by an irregular pattern of fields and narrow, winding lanes.”

Typical features which make up this landscape character area include the following:

- *“A varied and undulating topography;*
- *A network of winding lanes and trackways often confined by tall hedgerows;*
- *An irregular pattern of small to medium sized fields;*
- *Hedgerow and roadside oaks; and*
- *Field ponds associated with permanent pasture”.*

The site is typical of the host landscape area, with many of the above characteristic features present and intact. However, within the site’s locality on the north-western edge of Coventry and the immediate settled area, there are a number of non-typical elements and degraded features, most noticeably on the eastern side of Hall Brook. These elements include:

- Urban built form to the north-west of Coventry City Centre around Keresley and Holbrook represents an urban edge context;
- Industrial commercial built form of the Prologis Park and associated vehicular routes representing dominant features in the landscape;
- Background noise from the M6 Motorway which is approximately 2km north of the Site (at its closest point) which is an intrusive aspect of the environment;
- Overhead cables and pylons crossing the landscape immediately south of the Site; and
- Degraded and ‘gappy’ hedgerows to the east of the Site with a very limited number of scattered hedgerow trees, which is uncharacteristic of the host landscape area.

The combination of these factors diminishes the overall quality and condition of the host landscape area. Furthermore, the site lies on land directly adjacent to multiple neighbouring residential and urban curtilages with which there is inter-visibility. The presence of surrounding urban settlement and industrial commercial development particularly to the more open eastern aspect is evident from the site.

The effect is that the site is experienced on the edge of the urban setting, and consequently, whilst located within the Ancient Arden host LCT it is situated within a transitional area between the urban setting and the open countryside in the wider landscape. The site is perceived as having a strong affinity within the urban edge neighbouring the site.

The WLG continues to highlight the following pressures on the landscape from modern development: “... the gradual change of agricultural land to other uses, such as sport and leisure facilities. Such changes are imprinting a suburban character on the landscape”.

However, in this case, the site is perceived as being associated within this urban edge setting, and it is therefore, considered that the site is influenced by these landscape features resulting in a ‘moderate’ sensitivity to change in the landscape.

Under the heading of Management Strategy, the WLG makes the following prescription and highlights the following recommendations for future landscape management:

- *“Conserve and restore the ancient irregular landscape pattern;*

- *New hedge planting should reflect the irregular field pattern and include only mixed native species;*
- *Maintain and manage field ponds in areas of permanent pasture; and*
- *Encourage the natural regeneration of hedgerow oaks; enhance tree cover through small scale woodland planting”.*

Coventry Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (2013)

The Coventry Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (CHLC) has been used to define Coventry’s historic character as represented by character types which identify and define character areas. This publication represents the most recent assessment of the landscape and therefore has been used to supplement the descriptions of local landscape context that follow.

The site is located within Historic Landscape Character (HLC) Area 35 ‘Keresley Character Area’. The land parcel consists of small, irregular fields, often with banked hedges with sunken lanes and some woodland typical of the Ancient Arden LCT. The landscape character is described as predominately surrounded by rural areas with a small industrial area to the east and ribbon development along the arterial roads from the 1930s onwards.

To the north there is a strong sense of enclosure due to existing woodland blocks and the narrow topography of the Hall Brook. The Alders and Pikehorne Wood are ancient semi-natural woodlands and form part of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Fivefield road passes through the landscape and forms an example of a typical Arden landscape sunken lane. To the north-east there is a small plateau area characterised by horse grazing and remnant, unkempt hedgerows.

The study suggests that the condition of hedgerows and hedgerow trees are often fragmented, and generally field boundaries are in decline. There are some positive elements such as ancient woodland at Pikehorne Wood and the medieval fishponds to the northwest. Overall, the study considers that this land cover parcel has a varied landscape condition.

8.4.3 EDP Landscape Character Assessment

EDP conducted an assessment of the site’s characteristics on 21 February 2018, in dry clear weather conditions. The individual elements of the site were noted, as were the differences in the composition and the character of the site’s physical components to the published assessment and their value and ability to accommodate change.

The aerial photograph provided at *Figure 8.3* illustrates the character and features of the landscape across the site and near context while *Figure 8.4* illustrates the topographic character of the study area. The photographs taken from the photoviewpoint locations also illustrate the character of the landscape across the site and surrounding area (*Figure 8.10*, Photoviewpoints EDP 1 to 11).

The site consists of two parcels of land which are contained by a series of local road networks, Fivefield Road to the north and Bennetts Road to the east. The Tamworth Road (B4098) runs along the western site boundary upon which there are a number of residential dwellings and a care home (Keresley Wood). Queenswood Court, a small development of one storey dwellings, is situated off the Tamworth Road and is located between the two land parcels.

Beyond this there is a continual line of residential dwellings to the west of Tamworth Road, all of which are oriented north east towards the site.

The settlement of Keresley is located on the junction between Bennetts Road and Fivefields Road and consists of a number of two storey residential dwellings. Beyond Keresley, to the north-east is the Prologis Park development of Use Class B8 units with associated vehicular routes. The M6 Motorway is located circa 2km north east of the Site (at its closest point).

Adjoining the southern boundary of the larger of the site's two land parcels is a residential dwelling (Keresley Manor), which is enclosed quite extensively by mature tree groups. Beyond this there is a collection of urban / semi-urban land uses, including the Cardinal Newman Roman Catholic School, the Royal Court Hotel and Golf Driving Range, with residential dwellings on the southern edge of Keresley and associated urban road network i.e. B4098 Tamworth Road.

Within the smaller of the site's land parcels, which measures c.3ha, the paddocks are divided by post and rail fencing. Within the larger land parcel, which measures c.22ha the fields are divided by hedgerows and hedgerow trees that, to some limited degree, restrict views within and across the site from external locations.

Landscape Fabric and Biodiversity

The landscape fabric is illustrated on the aerial photograph at *Figure 8.3* and *Figure 8.6*. Additional information is provided within *ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity*, and within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment at *Appendix 8.5*. The landscape fabric is relatively impoverished as a result of several decades of intensive farming (refer to *Figure 8.6*). Whilst there are a number of mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees, neither the condition of the Site, nor its intrinsic qualities, are considered unique locally.

The Site comprises seventeen fields of varying sizes in use as grazing pasture, seasonally cut grassland or rough grassland. Several of the internal field boundaries along Tamworth Road consist of post and rail fence, though in the main, hedgerows are present on the majority internal field boundaries as well as the external boundaries. A number of mature trees are present within these hedgerows as well as scattered across the Site. Several of the Site boundaries are bound by woodland, namely 'The Alders' and 'Pikehorne Wood'.

The landscape fabric of the Site is broadly consistent with the published landscape character assessment, which describes the area as a well wooded landscape with a mixture of 'woodlands, hedgerow trees... and strongly wooded streamlines' and 'small scale farmed landscape... characterised by an irregular pattern of fields' (Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines (November 1993).

Topography

The site is set across a valley formed by the Hall Brook. *Figure 8.4* illustrates that, as described in the published landscape character assessments, the site has a "varied and undulating" topography. The highest point is on the western boundary on Tamworth Road, which follows the ridge line, at c.157m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). The lowest part is in the south-eastern corner by the Hall Brook at c.120m AOD. The eastern boundary, close to Keresley, is at c.140m AOD.

Hydrology

There are four ponds present within the boundaries of the site and a small stream, Hall Brook, which flows into the site from the north, south into a pond, then south-east along the southern boundary. There is also a wet ditch present along the south-eastern boundary which has no flow.

Hall Brook is a notable landscape feature which passes through the centre of the site. It flows through the landscape from Watery Lane to the east, generally following field boundaries until it arrives at Pikehorne Wood to the west.

8.4.4 *Perceptual and Sensory Characteristics*

The perception of the site is of a managed agricultural landscape. Tranquillity is affected by agricultural activity, movement and noise operating in and around the site from traffic along Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road. The road corridors, lighting and road signage are visual detractors, but these do not make it an unpleasant place to be. Existing woodland, hedgerows and trees, as well as the topographical relief assist greatly in breaking up intervisibility with the Site.

Due to the localised topography, and despite built form and mature landscape features enclosing the site to the north-west and south-west, long views across the agricultural landscape are possible in an easterly direction. However, from within the Site, the proximity of residential properties, and their varied boundary treatments also reduce the scenic quality.

The wooded nature of the wider context serves to enclose parts of the site creating some more intimate areas, other areas in close proximity to residential development and the settlement edge feature more landscape detractors and urbanising elements. Overall the landscape condition is considered fair and components are generally relatively well maintained.

8.4.5 *Value of the Landscape Receptors*

The following paragraphs describe the value of the landscape receptors as assessed by EDP and within published documents. Value and susceptibility to change are considered independently in the assessment of overall 'sensitivity' of landscape receptors, with susceptibility and sensitivity being described in *Appendix 8.3*, in accordance with best practice guidance.

The Application Site

The site does not lie within, or contain, any nationally or locally designated landscapes. It comprises an agricultural landscape with urban edge influences, across the western, eastern and southern fringes, and reduction in tranquillity due to the surrounding road network.

The landscape fabric across the site is generally in a moderate condition. Scenic quality across the site is varied with the main attractions comprising the more enclosed, woodland edges, where there are fewer urban influences, and more enclosure. However, there are no locations on the site with a promoted view.

The site has no features that could be described as rare in the landscape. Biodiversity and historical interest is consistent with an agricultural landscape of this type and is not notable

beyond the local context. There is public access into the site from Fivefield Road and from Tamworth Road.

In summary, the value of the site is assessed as **medium**.

The Site Context

The site's surroundings comprise small to medium scale agricultural fields, residential ribbon development along Tamworth Road, with some larger plots and associated large mature gardens and the commercial units off Brownhill Green Road which influence the perception of this area as an urban fringe landscape. Character guidance suggests that the condition of the wider landscape is fragmented with some positive features resulting in an overall varied condition.

The wider site context is undesignated but displays the characteristics of the Ancient Arden LCT. For these reasons, the site context is assessed as having a **medium** value.

8.4.6 *Baseline Visual Resource*

Using landform data within GIS, EDP has prepared a broad Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) using digital surface modelling (DSM) data. This data includes height data on landform and surface features and therefore accounts for the screening effects of intervening landform, buildings, structures and vegetation. The ZTV was then visited by walking and driving (as appropriate) local roads, rights of way and other publicly accessible viewpoints. Through this exercise, the main visual receptors predicted to have actual visibility to the site were identified and the Zone of Primary Visibility (ZPV) of the site was established.

The ZPV is where the proposed development would be visible to the casual observer on foot, cycling or driving where the views would normally be close-ranging and open; the proposal would be an obvious element of the view. Beyond this area, there is a zone of visibility that is less open, being either partly-screened or filtered. Views from within this wider zone would include the proposal; it may not be immediately noticeable, but once recognised would be a perceptible addition to the view. The extent of the proposal within such views would vary and, in some cases, it would be almost indistinguishable as a consequence of both increasing distance and intervening visual screening.

The visual appraisal identified that the flat landform of the study area means that settlement, structures and vegetation provide effective screening for the scale of development proposed. The visual appraisal, illustrated at *Figure 8.7*, shows the ZPV for the site and its main determinants. It shows that visual containment is provided by:

- **North:** Visibility is largely blocked by the combination of topography, built form and woodland, trees and hedgerows. In most cases, views of the interior of the site are not available due to the site's mature wooded surroundings (i.e. Pikehorne Wood). However, as illustrated in *Photoviewpoint EDP 9*, some intervisibility with the adjacent landscape from elevated land and over tall hedgerows to the north may be possible during winter months.
- **East:** Visibility to the east is possible, as illustrated by *Photoviewpoint EDP 4*, owing to the localised topography. However, long-distance views are generally restricted to the east by built form on the settlement edge of Keresley and the Prologis Park. Intervening field boundary vegetation also filters views towards the site in this direction.

- **South:** Due to the orientation of the Site and the localised topography, it is considered that views from the south and longer-distance view from the south-east would be the most obvious direction for views of the Site to be obtainable, with views from the south-west generally screened illustrated by *Photoviewpoint EDP 3*. However, although views from elevated ground are possible, mature landscape features and woodland prevent any clear views of the site.
- **West:** Visibility, as illustrated in *Photoviewpoint EDP 1*, is restricted by topography, which falls away from the viewer, and by mature landscape features throughout the local context. Visibility of the site from the west is primarily from Tamworth Road, lying adjacent to the site's western boundary and largely comprising of residential and vehicular receptors.

As shown in *Figure 8.8*, there is public access on the site and several other publicly accessible locations and routes across the study area with which the site is visible. Where routes and locations do exist, many fall outside of the ZPV so that visibility to the site from publicly accessible locations is further limited.

It is anticipated that in the absence of development the site would continue to become denuded as a result of the intensive agricultural management of it. There is no clear evidence of an Agri-Environment schemes around all field boundaries or replacement hedgerow and tree planting. The quality of the landscape structure is likely to erode, leading to further losses of valued trees and hedgerows in particular. It is near-certain that the existing baseline described would therefore experience gradual erosion of variety/quality of landscape features over time, without investment and suitable management.

8.4.7 Representative Viewpoint Selection

Based on the desktop study and fieldwork observations, a number of representative viewpoints or PVPs have been selected, the locations of which are shown on *Figure 8.8*, while the views themselves are shown on *Figure 8.10 (Photoviewpoints EDP 1 to 11)*.

These PVPs have been selected to best represent the variety of views available towards the site area from public vantage points and aid the visual assessment along these routes and experienced by visual receptors.

Details of each view and the reason for its selection as a 'representative viewpoint', are given in *Table 8.6*.

PVP. No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance and Direction of View	Reason(s) for selection & Sensitivity of Receptor
1	PRoW Ref. M256	428173, 283094	376m to the proposed development, looking north-east	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
2	PRoW Ref. M313	431093, 283621	On site boundary of the proposed development, looking north	PRoW users (high sensitivity)

Table 8.6 - Representative Photoviewpoints				
PVP. No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance and Direction of View	Reason(s) for selection & Sensitivity of Receptor
3	Tamworth Road travelling north	431135, 283118	506m to the proposed development, looking north	Road users (low sensitivity)
4	PRoW Ref. M315	432157, 283482	629m to the proposed development, looking north-west	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
5	PRoW Ref. M313	431417, 283851	Within the proposed development, looking north-west	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
6	Fivefield Road travelling north-west from Keresley Village	431066, 284252	162m to the proposed development, looking south-west	Road users (medium sensitivity)
7	Fivefield Road travelling south-east towards Keresley Village	431182, 284143	9m to the proposed development, looking south-east	Road users (medium sensitivity)
8	PRoW Ref. M309	431426, 284266	167m to the proposed development, looking south-west	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
9	Hounds Hill on PRoW Ref. M309	431107, 284457	332m to the proposed development, looking south-east	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
10	Tamworth Road travelling south	430612, 283988	5m to the proposed development, looking south-east	Road users (low sensitivity)
11	PRoW Ref. M305	430487, 284967	960m to the proposed development, looking south-east	PRoW users (high sensitivity)

8.4.8 Visual Receptors

As discussed above, the opportunity for views of the site from publicly accessible locations is generally limited in the wider study area. However, users of the following locations and routes, and residents of the following properties, were identified as potentially able to perceive a change because of the proposed development that could result in a notable effect.

The following receptor locations are shown on *Figure 8.8* and described in more detail within *Appendix 8.2 and 8.3*:

- PRoW (*Photoviewpoints EDP 3, 4, 5, 8 and 11*)
 - Ref M313
 - Ref M315
 - Ref M316

- Ref M317/2
- Ref M309 / M311
- Ref M305
- Highway Routes (*Photoviewpoints EDP 3, 7 and 10*)
 - Tamworth Road (B4098)
 - Fivefields Road
 - Bennetts Road (South), Bennetts Road and Bennetts Road (North)
 - Wall Hill Road
- Residential Receptors (*Photoviewpoints EDP 4, 6 and 10*)
 - Group A: Properties on Tamworth Road with property frontages facing west;
 - Group B: The Manor and Manor Lodge;
 - Group C: Properties within Keresley Village
 - Group D: Queenswood Court and Keresley Wood Care Home
 - Group E: Properties on Tamworth Road with property frontages facing east (including Kingswood House and Troyswood House;
 - Group F: Holly Gate and properties on the edge of Keresley Village
 - Group G: Manor Farm and properties on the settlement edge of Holbrooks

8.4.9 Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

Table 8.7 provides a summary of the sensitivity of identified receptors which are likely to experience environmental effects from the proposed development, together with the phase(s) of development when such effects could occur. This confirms which receptors have been carried forward to the impact assessments presented below.

Table 8.7 – Sensitivity of Visual Receptors		
Receptor	Sensitivity	Development Phase where effect(s) considered likely
Receptors using PRow	High	Construction and Occupation
Receptors using Public Highways	Low	Construction and Occupation
Road Users on Minor Routes in the Wider Study Area	Low	Construction and Occupation
Residential Receptors	High	Construction and Occupation

8.5 Mitigation Measures

An understanding of the mitigation measures embedded in the design of the proposed development is fundamental to an appreciation of the potential landscape and visual effects. A key principle of landscape assessment is that the assessment should take account of the effects of proposed mitigation (GLVIA3, para 6.45).

A hierarchical approach towards mitigation (avoid, prevent, reduce, offset) has been used to avoid, where possible, effects through the overall design of the proposed development, the disposition of its elements (prevent), and, subsequently through careful siting of the different elements of the proposed development and its required infrastructure (reduce).

Offset mitigation is not relevant because landscape and visual effects, for example the character of the site or views to it, cannot be replaced by creation of the site character, or views, in another location unlike, for example, the loss of a hedgerow which can be offset by providing a new hedgerow.

8.5.1 Inherent Mitigation Measures

Embedded mitigation provides a form of preventative mitigation and, as discussed above, is that which has been considered as an integral part of the overall design and locational strategy for the proposed development. It is not an 'add-on' measure to ameliorate significant environmental effects, but part of the positive and pro-active approach whereby mitigation has been assessed and considered at all stages of the project to prevent or reduce the occurrence of potentially significant environmental effects.

These measures are shown on the Parameters Plans in *Figures 4.1 and 4.2* and the Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan, included at *Figure 8.9*.

- Retention of the majority of the best quality vegetation which contributes to the character of the Ancient Arden landscape and visual amenity of the site, and the landscape context. This primarily comprises Category A and B trees and field boundary hedges, notably those that are species rich. This is set out in more detail in *Chapter 6*, and in *Appendix 8.4*;
- Retention of existing features that contribute to landscape character, where possible;
- The retained assets to be incorporated, primarily, within areas of multi-functional, linked, green infrastructure where they can be best enjoyed, protected, and enhanced through ongoing management, that could be secured at the reserved matters stage. The green infrastructure also incorporates SuDS features that could be designed for visual, recreational and wildlife amenity, and provides the opportunity for creation of destination and recreational routes within green corridors linking across, and beyond, the site. The green infrastructure will provide a valuable resource for wildlife as well as for visual and recreational amenity. This will also assist in the integration of the new settlement edge with the wider agricultural landscape.

8.5.2 Standard Mitigation Measures

Due to the application being in outline, the exact details of construction methods, timing and phasing are not known at this stage.

Therefore, this assessment has assumed a reasonable worst-case scenario based on conventional best practice approaches. The standard mitigation measures that are proposed to be implemented and adhered to during the temporary construction phase are contained in Table 6.1 of the Draft CEMP (*Appendix 4.1*).

8.6 Assessment of Environmental Impacts

8.6.1 Impact Assessment

This section identifies the likely (significant) environmental impacts and effects that might arise as a result of the proposed development.

Construction Phase Impacts

The construction activities that can potentially cause landscape and visual impacts include:

- Demolition of existing agricultural buildings within the site area;
- Clearance of vegetation within the construction zone, where appropriate;
- Earthworks and temporary storage of topsoil;
- Removal of unwanted waste from the site;
- Erection of site hoarding and fencing around vegetation (tree protection scheme);
- Erection of temporary structures within the main contractor's construction compound, plus materials stockpiling and lay-down areas;
- Potential lighting of the works (during winter corresponding to each build out phase of the scheme);
- Erection of scaffold structures;
- Movement of construction vehicles;
- Partially completed built form;
- Works associated with the implementation of the landscape scheme; and
- Removal of temporary construction facilities.

Construction Phase Effects

This section assesses effects of the proposed development during construction, up to completion.

During construction the principal effects as a result of the proposal would be as a result of the transition of the site from an agricultural landscape to a predominantly urban development over a period of time and prior to the maturation of mitigation planting.

Generally, the landscape and visual effects during the construction phases of the proposed development would be difficult to mitigate due to the nature of these operations. However, the adoption of approved best practice construction methods, as set out in the draft CEMP (*Appendix 4.1*) would aid in reducing the perception of construction activities for those receptors most likely to be affected.

Effects on Landscape Designations during the Construction Phase

The site is not located within, and does not contain, a landscape designated for its landscape quality or value. All such landscapes are located outside the ZPV of the proposed development and have therefore, been scoped out of further assessment.

Landscape Effects during the Construction Phase

The effects of the proposed development on the following landscape receptors during the construction phase are assessed:

- The Landscape Character and fabric of the site itself; and
- The Landscape Character of the host landscape character type – Ancient Arden (Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines, November 1993).

The results of the assessment are shown in *Appendix 8.2* and summarised in *Table 8.8*.

Receptor	Construction Effect
Landscape Character and fabric of the site.	Moderate Adverse
Landscape Character of the host landscape character type – Ancient Arden.	Moderate Adverse

The existing key landscape elements across the site; the hedges, trees, and pond would be predominantly retained and protected during construction. However, the construction of a residential development would fundamentally alter the character of the site from an agricultural landscape, albeit at the settlement edge, to a residential development.

There would be a significant effect on the host Ancient Arden LCT as a result of the construction phase due to the overall change from farmland to urban for the residential development. However, due the extent to which the site is contained by existing road infrastructure and built form to the west and south-east, the perceptual change as the backdrop to adjacent landscapes would not arise and there would be no significant effects on the non-host LCTs.

Visual Effects during the Construction Phase

The effects of the proposed development on *Photoviewpoints EDP 1 to 11*, and on visual receptors during the construction phase, are assessed at *Appendix 8.2* and summarised in *Table 8.9*.

Table 8.9 - Summary of Visual Effects on Photoviewpoints during the Construction Phase		
PVP No.	PVP Name & distance and direction from Site	Construction Effect
PVP 1	View from public footpath (Ref: M256) looking east towards the site.	Minor Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 2	View from public footpath (Ref: M313) looking north towards the site.	Major Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP3	View from Tamworth Road travelling north past the site (local road users incl. roadside pedestrians and cyclists)	Minor Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 4	View from public footpath (Ref: M315) looking north-west towards the site.	Minor Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 5	View from public footpath (Ref: M313) within the site looking north-west.	Major Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 6	View from Fivefield Road travelling north-west from Keresley Village (local road users incl. roadside pedestrians and cyclists)	Moderate/Minor Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 7	View from Fivefield Road travelling south-east towards Keresley Village (local road users incl. roadside pedestrians and cyclists)	Moderate Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 8	View from PRoW Ref. M309 looking south-west towards the Site.	Moderate Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 9	View from Hounds Hill on PRoW Ref. M309 looking south towards the Site.	Moderate Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 10	View from Tamworth Road travelling south passed the site (local road users incl. roadside pedestrians and cyclists)	Moderate Adverse; Temporary; Local
PVP 11	View from PRoW Ref. M305 looking south-east towards the Site.	Minor Adverse; Temporary; Local

Public Rights of Way

For PRoW users, effects are limited by undulating topography and mature landscape features within the wider context.

However, significant effects are experienced at *Photoviewpoints EDP 2 and 5* owing to their location within the site. For these P_{RoW} users, the magnitude of change would be very high, giving rise to a **major adverse** and temporary effect.

From *Photoviewpoints EDP 8 and 9*, in close-proximity to the site, there would be views of the construction activities in places, albeit some would be screened by intervening vegetation during summer months and the rolling topography. Lighting and taller structures and the upper storeys of new buildings might be seen in filtered views at a distance of approximately 500 metres. For P_{RoW} users, the magnitude of change would be medium, giving rise to a **moderate adverse** and temporary effect.

There are no visual effects of moderate adverse or greater significance on other P_{RoW} routes in the wider context. This is primarily due to visual containment of the site provided by mature vegetation of the Ancient Arden LCT including Ancient Woodlands and mature hedgerow trees in combination with the gently rolling topography.

Local Roads and Main Roads

For road users, due to the site context, there would be potential significant effects in short-distance views, largely from vehicular routes to residential areas to the west and east, most notably Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road. Here, sequential views are experienced by these medium sensitivity receptors at *PVPs 7 and 10*.

Construction activities within the view would be clearly noticeable as a result of land clearing works, construction access, traffic and building operations. The construction works would be perceived in the context of pre-existing urbanising elements associated with the existing residential development on Tamworth Road, which in this viewpoint would extend along Tamworth Road, overlooking the site.

For road users, the worst-case magnitude of change during the temporary construction phase is considered to be high, giving rise to a worst-case **moderate adverse** and temporary effect.

Residents

There are predicted to be substantial adverse effects on residents within Group A and B during construction as a result of their close proximity to the proposed development, with major effects on Group C and moderate effects on Group D during construction, as shown in *Appendix 8.2*:

- **Group A:** Properties on Tamworth Road facing west towards the site – **Substantial Adverse**; Temporary; Local;
- **Group B:** Properties on Tamworth Road with curtilage adjoining the Site's western boundary (including Manor Lodge, Queenswood Court, Kingswood House and Troyswood House) – **Substantial Adverse**; Temporary; Local;
- **Group C:** Properties on Fivefield Road – **Major Adverse**; Temporary; Local; and
- **Group D:** Properties on Bennetts Road (South) and Bennetts Road – **Moderate Adverse**; Temporary; Local.

Receptors predicted to experience a significant effect are either located adjacent or in very close proximity to the site boundary (see *Figure 8.8* for receptor locations).

It is notable that residential receptors beyond the immediate surroundings of the application site would not experience significant change. This is due primarily to the screening effect of built form and vegetation surrounding the site and across the site context and the fact that the proposed development would be seen in the context of this existing modern development edge.

The greatest effects during construction (i.e. the movement and activity of construction vehicles and operations) would be short term in duration, and local although the site entrance off Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road will be used for the duration, so effects at these locations will be sustained through the construction phase.

Occupation Phase Impacts

The main potential landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development once completed, irrespective of mitigation measures, are summarised below:

- Change to the character of the landscape of the site, through alteration of land use and introduction of new temporary and permanent features, the latter including beneficial effects such as the creation of new landscape features;
- Change to landscape elements and features within the site caused by the localised removal of existing landscape features; and
- Adverse and beneficial impacts on nearby visual receptors, such as users of public footpaths and bridleways, road users and visitors to local facilities due to visibility of the completed scheme (including built development, traffic and lighting).

Occupation Phase Effects

This section assesses effects of the proposed development at Year 1 and Year 15. At Year 1 the principal effects as a result of the proposal will be as a result of the transition of the Site from an agricultural landscape to a predominantly urban development, in an undesignated landscape, and prior to the maturation of mitigation planting.

In practical terms, the 'operational lifetime' of the proposed development is measured in decades. Given that the proposed development includes landscape proposals which will take time to mature, and that all new development can seem 'raw' until it has 'settled' into its landscape context, the assessment of occupation phase effects is also undertaken at Year 15.

At Year 15 mitigation planting will have matured to an extent that remaining significant effects are considered to be residual albeit that these effects may diminish further with time and as vegetation continues to mature. At Year 15 the principal effects as a result of the proposal will be as a result of the transition of the site from an agricultural landscape to a predominantly urban scene, in an undesignated landscape, and after some maturation of mitigation planting.

Effects on Landscape Designations (Years 1 and 15)

The site does not fall within, or contain, a landscape designated for its landscape quality or value. All such landscapes fall at a distance from, and predominantly outside the ZPV of, the proposed development and so were scoped out of further assessment.

Landscape Character Effects (Years 1 and 15)

The effects of the proposed development on the following landscape receptors at Years 1 and 15 are assessed in *Appendix 8.3* and summarised below in *Table 8.10*.

Receptor	Year 1 Effect	Year 15 Effect
Landscape Character and fabric of the site.	Moderate Adverse, Permanent, Local	Moderate/Minor Adverse, Permanent, Local
Landscape Character of the host landscape character type – Ancient Arden.	Moderate/Minor Adverse, Permanent, Local	Minor Adverse, Permanent, Local

Whilst a **moderate adverse** effect on the site itself has been identified at Year 1, these effects would be tempered as mitigation planting matures and contributes to a well-designed improved urban-rural interface, albeit the urban edge would extend further into the hinterland landscape than currently.

By Year 15, the on-site mitigation planting, including extensive tree planting, buffer planting and ecological enhancements, would have matured to the extent that it would combine to soften the built development and assist in contributing to its integration with the wider context.

Long-term effects on the landscape character of the site would be of no greater than **moderate/minor adverse** significance.

Long-term effects on the character of the host LCT would be of no greater than **minor adverse** significance, due primarily to:

- The small proportion of the host landscape LCT that the site represents;
- The visual containment of the site and resultant low level of visibility to it from the LCT; and
- The site is visible from the LCT in the context of existing residential development and the settlement edge which reduces the scale of change.

Visual Effects (Year 1 and Year 15)

The effects of the site on *Photoviewpoints EDP 1 to 11*, and on visual receptors during the construction phase, are assessed at *Appendix 8.4*. The results of this assessment are summarised in *Table 8.11*.

Table 8.11: Summary of Effects on Photoviewpoints at Years 1 and Years 15				
PVP No.	PVP Name & distance and direction from Site	Receptor	Year 1 Effect	Year 15 Effect
PVP 1	Public footpath (Ref: M256)	PRoW users	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse / Negligible
PVP 2	Public footpath (Ref: M313)	PRoW users	Major Adverse	Major/Moderate Adverse
PVP 3	Tamworth Road	Road users and Pedestrians	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
PVP 4	Public footpath (Ref: M315)	PRoW users	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse / Negligible
PVP 5	Public footpath (Ref: M313)	PRoW users	Major Adverse	Major/Moderate Adverse
PVP 6	Fivefield Road	Road users	Moderate/Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
PVP 7	Fivefield Road	Road users	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse
PVP 8	Public footpath (Ref: M309)	PRoW users	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse
PVP 9	Public footpath (Ref: M309)	PRoW users	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse
PVP 10	Tamworth Road	Road users and Pedestrians	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PVP 11	Public footpath (Ref: M305)	PRoW users	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse / Negligible

Public Rights of Way

At Year 1, effects of **moderate adverse or greater** significance have been identified for receptors within and in close proximity to the site (*PVPs 2 and 5, also 8 and 9*).

These PROWs are predominantly through the centre of the site and to the east where a combination of intervening landscape features and the early maturation of the proposed landscaping, would considerably reduce the likelihood of a noticeable change being introduced to views. In addition, the maturing landscaping will provide effective screening or softening of the development in medium distance views.

In the short-term, due to the nature of existing views from PRoW looking west across a largely rural context, the addition of the site would form a new and recognisable element of the view. The worst-case magnitude of change would be experienced by users in close proximity to the site boundary, where the site would be clearly noticeable. As such, the magnitude of change in the short-term would be high, giving rise to a **major to moderate adverse** effect.

At Year 15, the site would become an established part of the wider landscape. The maturation of the proposed landscaping would considerably soften views of the new settlement edge seen in views from local PRoWs (*Photoviewpoints EDP 8 and 9*). However, due to the proximity of

the receptors on PRowWs within the centre of the site, the long-term magnitude of change on PRowW users would still be high, giving rise to a **major/moderate adverse** effect.

There are no long-term effects of **moderate adverse or greater** significance on PRowWs outside the site beyond 1km. This is primarily due to the visual containment of the site in the wider landscape and the low number of PRowWs within the Zone of Primary Visibility where visual effects are likely to be significant.

Access Routes

While it is likely that there would be significant effects on receptors using Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road, this is to be expected as these routes are located adjacent to the site boundary and will serve as the primary access routes into the site from the west. However, as shown in *PVPs 7 and 10*, the completed development would be visible set back from the retained roadside hedgerows and new tree planting along the road frontage.

Inherent mitigation in the form of early planting of hedgerows (currently degraded) will offer some level of softening on this portion of the new development. Furthermore, residential development is an existing feature on both sides of the Tamworth Road and therefore, the route is already predominately developed. The effects experienced by road users represents the 'worse-case' scenario and are only likely to be experienced for a short section of the route and a short duration of time.

Views from the northern edge of Fivefield Road would be enhanced by new native tree and shrub planting within proposed public open space. As such, the site would be assimilated into the maturing landscape framework, with only parts of it remaining visible. The worst-case magnitude of change for road users is considered to be medium, giving rise to a **moderate/minor adverse** effect.

For road users using Tamworth Road, where views are possible, the character of the view will change, particularly during winter months, to include urbanising features and built form which are not currently experienced. The proposed development is likely to be clearly noticeable due to the lack of existing built form in local views. However, views experienced of the proposed development from this route would only be experienced for a short length.

In the long-term, the built form would be softened by the maturing trees and hedgerows planted at the frontage of the development and within proposed public open spaces, assimilating the site into the existing landscape framework and retained landscape features, with only filtered views of the built form remaining visible.

The mitigation planting is not intended to screen the development entirely in this location, but to soften and filter views to it. Therefore, the overall magnitude of change will be high, giving rise to a **moderate adverse** effect on these medium sensitivity receptors.

Residents (Years 1 and 15)

The effects of the site on residents during the construction phase are assessed at *Appendix 8.4* and summarised in *Table 8.12*.

Residential Receptors	Year 1 Effect	Year 15 Effect
Group A: Properties on Tamworth Road facing west towards the Site	Substantial Adverse	Major Adverse
Group B: Properties on Tamworth Road with curtilage adjoining the Site's western boundary (including Manor Lodge, Queenswood Court, Kingswood House and Troyswood House)	Substantial Adverse	Major Adverse
Group C: Properties on Fivefield Road	Major Adverse	Major/Moderate Adverse
Group D: Properties on Bennetts Road (South) and Bennetts Road	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse
Group E: Properties on the settlement edge of Holbrooks (accessed off Brookford Avenue).	Moderate/Minor Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse

Although significant visual effects are predicted, the establishment and maturation of landscaping and the general acceptance of new development areas over longer timeframes, means that the proposed development would not have an overbearing influence on the amenity of existing properties that would render the property uninhabitable.

Furthermore, it is not entire residences that would experience such an effect, but only those parts where an open view is currently experienced and where existing and proposed vegetation does not form a screen between properties and the proposed development. Such instances are relatively limited for most residential properties.

It should also be noted that the adverse effects set out in *Table 8.12* only apply to existing residents that currently have a view of the undeveloped site. Should they move following construction and new residents occupy the properties, the development will form part of their environmental baseline.

8.7 Cumulative Impact Assessment

The proposed development has assessed the cumulative effects of the proposed development in conjunction with the wider Keresley SUE, including planning permission OUT/2014/2282.

The Keresley SUE is allocated under Policy H2 of the Coventry Local Plan for the following development:

- 3,100 residential dwellings;
- At least one local centre providing retail uses;
- A 2 forms of entry primary school;
- A new distributor road between Long Lane and Winding House Lane; and
- Landscaping and public open space, including a green corridor along Hall Brook.

As there is currently no approved Masterplan for the Keresley SUE, the assessment has been based on the emerging draft Masterplan from Coventry City Council.

8.7.1 Landscape Character

Views of the Keresley SUE may be possible from within the host LCT, but it is not the view that defines the landscape effect, rather it is changes to the physical and wider perceptual qualities (including visual) that lead to the level of effect. Further development within the Keresley SUE would be a notable addition, but within a clustered location. The protection of key landscape features and the retention and enhancement of semi-natural structure, as set out within the guidelines for the wider Ancient Arden LCT which is to 'conserve and restore', would give rise to minor adverse effects on this part of the LCT.

Development would be notable, but consistent with the existing context and confined by a mature landscape framework on the site boundaries. The conservation of key landscape features and the retention and enhancement of semi-natural structure, as set out within the guidelines for the wider LCT, will give rise to beneficial effects. It is therefore considered that development of the Keresley SUE will not lead to a significant cumulative landscape effect.

8.7.2 Visual Amenity

Taking into account the size of the cumulative development, it is expected that there would be locations from which views of both development sites may be gained, in combination or sequentially. In the case of the proposed development and the wider Keresley SUE, in combination views are likely to be limited to the local context, generally from existing urban areas to the west, south and east, while sequential views will be experienced by receptors using vehicular corridors, particularly Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road. A detailed assessment of the cumulative impact on each Photoviewpoint is provided in *Technical Appendices 8.2 and 8.3*.

The assessment identified that the level of cumulative visual effects would predominantly remain as set out for the proposed development. However, an increase in the overall effect is predicted at *PVPs 8 and 9* where, in the short-term, there would be an in-combination cumulative effect with the development of the wider Keresley SUE. As such, the magnitude of change would increase to high, giving rise to a **major/moderate adverse** effect.

In the long-term, the further maturation of the north-eastern boundary, combined with the proposed Public Open Space and associated green infrastructure planting will contribute to greater visual enclosure of the proposed development, ensuring that the potential for an in-combination cumulative effect is considerably lessened. Therefore, the overall magnitude of change would be medium, giving rise to a **moderate adverse** effect.

In all other cases, cumulative effects would either remain as assessed for the proposed development or no cumulative effect would arise.

8.8 Summary

An assessment of landscape and visual components of the site and the wider area where there is the potential for likely significant environmental effects was undertaken through desktop and field study and in accordance with the provisions of current best practice guidance. The assessment work was undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects' of EDP which is a Registered Practice of the Landscape institute and a corporate member of IEMA.

Given the proposed development to residential use, there would be significant adverse effects on the landscape character of the site, largely upon the perceptual and sensory dimensions.

However, there would be beneficial effects as a result of the proposed development through the quantity, variety and distribution of key locally characteristic landscape elements such as woodland, ponds, hedgerows and hedgerow trees which would positively benefit local landscape character. These new elements would enrich a landscape that is not currently being actively managed to promote environmental gains (such as new tree planting or pond creation).

In the long-term, landscape effects on the site and the host LCT would be reduced due primarily to the small proportion of the host landscape that the site represents, its visual containment from the wider LCT and that where the site is visible from the wider landscape, it is seen in the context of existing settlement edge development.

Significant visual effects are predominantly limited to visual receptors within or in close proximity, many being adjacent to the site boundary along Tamworth Road and Fivefield Road. Here, new settlement edge is proposed to be softened through the use of locally represented (and therefore visually appropriate), new tree planting to ensure that the edge of the proposed development is not considered to be abrupt.

There are no significant long-term visual effects on off-site PRowS beyond 1km. This is primarily due to the visual containment of the site in the wider landscape and the low number of PRowS within the Zone of Primary Visibility.

The occupation-phase landscape and visual effects have been mitigated where possible through the design of the proposed development to ensure that the built development is sensitive to the existing landscape and views.