



11-07-2023

As an overview to both sets of comments and notes supplied by ourselves in response to FPCR/LPA submissions, we have included the following quote from the Landscape Institute **technical guidance note reviewing LVIA's and LVA.**

*The main difference between an LVIA and LVA is that in an LVIA the assessor is required to identify 'significant' effects in accordance with the requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, as well as type, nature, duration and geographic extent of the effect whilst an LVA does not require determination of 'significance' and may **generally hold less detail.** (3rd paragraph)*

The key point here (highlighted) is that an LVA generally holds less detail. We consider that the report as envisaged by the LPA and advising consultant would not in fact add any further pertinent information for the decision maker over what is an already allocated site (and as such already subject to evaluation that has led to a presumption in favour of having capacity to accept residential housing development). As this development is in fact exactly what the LPA must have anticipated in terms of potential landscape and visual impacts through the process of allocation, it must follow that the work of the LVA is to test that no notable or significant effects have been missed through this process. We believe the LVA produced is entirely suitable for this task.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS REGARDING LVA FOR DINTING VALE

3.11 A more detailed and thorough assessment following a robust methodology. The work is robust and they offer no evidence to the contrary. The methodology has been provided.

*in accordance with GLVIA3. I've attached what GLVIA has to say- the text is clear – an LVIA / appraisal needs to include: **Project description; baseline study; identification and description of effects.** The report includes all of these things for both landscape and visual receptors/ Mitigation proposals are only required if relevant to the report findings. In this instance no specific work to reduce visual or landscape effects was identified that went beyond what was already proposed as part of the extensive landscape proposals generally.*

To include consideration of landscape value. Landscape value is a constituent part of the assessment process that is outlined within our methodology and built into the assessment process. This is the main difference between the LVA or outline appraisal where we look to reduce the length and scale of the technical explanation in favour of a narrative description of the assessment process. This is not to suggest that the process of assessment is any different and landscape value is considered alongside susceptibility to form a view on sensitivity. This is expressed as a summary in 3.5 for landscape in the LVA report. If the consultant/LPA are suggesting that the site is a valued landscape in the terms of NPPF then I would disagree and see no evidence to support this.

, a full assessment of landscape receptors, including local landscape character (the HPBC SPD), and visual receptors. I have attached what I think the SPD that FPCR seem to think I should be referencing. You will see that this document directly references a Landscape Character of Derbyshire which is the baseline reference we have chosen to use. For purposes of brevity and to keep the LVA report as short and accessible as possible we have not done what we would do in a full LVIA and exhaustively look to reproduce all of the published material on landscape character. At the end of this it is our professional assessment of the landscape and its sensitivity that is expressed by the report and this is set out at the summary and conclusion. With regards to visual receptors we have clearly identified both receptors and locations and have seen nothing suggesting that this is a) not representative; or b) that we have missed essential other view locations. To criticise this without anything further is simply not acceptable. I do not anticipate referencing the SPD making any change to my view of the landscape effects of the scheme. I do not expect any further view locations will alter my assessment of the visual impacts of the proposal site.

The use of simple assessment tables would be helpful to demonstrate transparency and set out a clear trail of the approach and thinking behind the overall judgements. This is an approach that we would take in a



full LVIA where setting out levels of change against sensitivity leading to effect against multiple receptors would precede the conclusions. It does not in our view support the accessibility and readability of the report nor would this approach alter our overall conclusions. If the consultant experts are not able to follow the report as it is and make their own judgements then this seems more a reflection on their ability rather than ours.

This would also be easier for non-landscape professionals to follow. I disagree

Below are set out our original rebuttal notes to comments and agreement to share the methodology used in developing the report:

Rebuttal Notes

1. 2.5 we believe that the methodology outlined in the document is sufficient for an LVA but we are happy to share the company LVIA methodology which is common to all our assessment work.
2. 2.6 We think the views chosen are representative and will be accepted. The consultants do not suggest any other views to be considered.
3. 2.7-2.8 as above we will share our LVIA methodology and believe this is fully compliant with the latest guidance.
4. 2.9 we draw narrative conclusions as to the effects of both landscape and visual effects together through the document and in the conclusions. We believe this is entirely consistent with what is required for an LVA as set out in GLVIA3.
5. 2.11 I believe that the landscape character baseline is assessed thoroughly assessed and that the pre- assessment and allocation of the site by the LPA is a strong indicator of capacity and sensitivity. The report in an LVA not and LVIA and so relies on a narrative description of the landscape and visual effects which we believe is in full accordance with the guidelines.
6. 2.12 Other locations were considered and discarded as part of the initial site appraisal works. No views were anticipated from Gamesley as topographically views over the site are from greater distances and large banks of vegetation sit between the site and other locations.
7. 2.13 if this were an LVIA I would agree that a table would be an appropriate way of setting out receptors but this is an LVA and as such is designed to be a more accessible document. The comment relating to year 15 effects is quite common place for EIA assessment but is not a requirement for other forms of assessment.
8. 2.18 the summary from the consultant appears to indicate the work is appropriate and so we don't propose any changes to the document with regard to the visual envelope as this seems unnecessary.
9. 2.19 the assessment of sensitivity is conducted through a narrative description but we have shared the more detailed LVIA methodology which gives a clear indication as to how this is approached ,including Landscape Value. The value of the landscape of the site and surrounding landscape is assessed as moderate (see methodology)
10. 2.20 As previously stated this level of technical analysis is in our professional opinion more correctly associated with LVIA and EIA assessment work and is not essential for an LVA which seeks to consider matters of landscape and visual effects through a more accessible narrative description.
11. 2.21 This is not an EIA assessment and so there is not the same fixed requirement to record effects across other discipline areas such as suggested here.



12. 2.26 This is not an EIA assessment. The report seeks to set out effects which are concluded as being low and localised. Specific mitigation is judged as not required to reduce effects although the proposals clearly seek to retain as much as the existing woodland as possible maintaining screening and include substantial new tree and woodland planting throughout which will enhance screening over time.
13. 2.27 We do not agree and think that an LVA assessment for a site which has been allocated for development is completely appropriate and adequate and that testing for year 15 effects when the conclusions find that landscape and visual impacts are generally low and restricted to the site or close to the site boundaries. Where effects occur beyond this they are judged to be at a low level and not notable. I do not consider these are effects which require further testing at year 15 and would suggest this is more typical of a standard EIA approach to assessment.
14. 2.28 this is not correct. A narrative description of effects is offered through the report.
15. 2.34-2.35 this is a technical guidance note and not a requirement. Again this is typical of an LVIA or EIA and not an LVA assessment.