TEESWORKS

LONG ACRES ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

VOLUME 2: CHAPTER L
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

DECEMBER 2020

Long Acres, South Tees

Volume 2: Environmental Statement (December 2020)

Chapter L: Landscape and Visual Impact

Building Design Partnership Ltd.
11 Ducie Street
Piccadilly Basin
Manchester
M60 3JA

62682/02/AGR/KB
19297080v2

Contents

L1.0 Introduction

L1.1 This Chapter of the Environmental Statement ('ES') has been prepared by BDP on behalf of the applicant, South Tees Development Corporation ('STDC'). It assesses the proposed development described in Chapter B and it considers the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development.

L1.2 The baseline situation is considered before the likely environmental effects of the development are identified, both during construction and operational phases of the development. Mitigation measures to reduce any adverse environmental effects are identified as appropriate before the residual environmental effects are assessed.

L1.3 This Chapter is supported by the following technical appendices:

1 Appendix L1: Landscape Character Zone Plan;

2 Appendix L2: Viewpoint Location Plan;

3 Appendix L3: Technical Methodology for AVR;

4 Appendix L4: AVR Images;

5 Appendix L5: Email Correspondence with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council on the scope of assessment; and

6 Appendix K6: Viewpoint Descriptions

About the Author

L1.4 The lead author of this chapter is Duncan Mackay MRTPI, a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute who has over 15 years' experience as a town planner for major developments with a specialism in EIA. Duncan Mackay has been assisted by Jenny Ferguson CMLI, a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute with over 15 years' experience as a landscape architect.

L2.0 Policy Context

Legislation and Policy Context

L2.1 The following guidelines, legislation, and planning policy documents provide the framework for the protection and conservation of landscape within the study area. Current planning policy and legislation directly relevant to the assessment of landscape and visual effects for the STDC proposals are briefly outlined below.

National Legislation

L2.2 This section provides detail on parts of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') that are relevant to Landscape and Visual assessment. More general information on the NPPF is included within Chapter B of the ES.

L2.3 Section 7 sets the requirement for good design in the built environment and provides the overarching guidance in relation to the design of new development: *"Although the visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment."* (para 61)

L2.4 Section 11 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment), explains that the planning system should protect and enhance, valued landscapes: *"Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value"* (para. 111).

L2.5 Section 11 also states that local authorities should: *"Set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure."* (para 114)

Local Planning Policy Context

L2.6 Local planning authorities have powers to designate local areas of outstanding scenic quality and character via the development plan process. However, no such designations have been made within the Teesworks area. With regard to the intrinsic interest of the landscape context of the proposals, both Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council have local plan policies that recognise ecological interest at international, national, and local levels.

L2.7 With regard to other aspects of intrinsic landscape interest, the Teesworks area includes no scheduled ancient monuments, registered common land, or ancient semi-natural woodland. Concerning public rights of way, the majority of the proposals' area is in private ownership with no public access.

L2.8 Key relevant local planning documents include:

1 Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Core Strategy;

2 Landscape Character SPD; and

3 South Tees Area SPD.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan (2018)

L2.9 The following policies are relevant to landscape and visual impact assessment for the proposed site:

1 N1 Landscape - supports the protection and enhancement of the Borough's landscape based on the character areas identified through the Landscape Character Assessment, Landscape Character SPD, and Historic Landscape Characterisation, and restricts any development which leads to the loss of important features of landscape character and supports measures to enhance, restore or create those special features; and

2 N4 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - supports the protection and enhancement of the Borough's biodiversity and geological resource.

Redcar and Cleveland LDF Landscape Character SPD (2010)

L2.10 Section 1 outlines the purpose of the SPD: *"This document explains the role of landscape character areas and sets out guidance to be used in designing development and new landscape features of each area, building on the 'Redcar and Cleveland Landscape Character Assessment' (2006)"* (para 1.2)

L2.11 Appendix D: Landscape Character Areas outlines the designations of Broad Landscape Areas, Sensitive Landscapes, and Restoration Landscapes in the borough. The site does not sit within a designated sensitive or restoration landscape area. Redcar Flats Broad Landscape Area lies to the north of the site and Eston Hills Broad Landscape Area lies to the east.

South Tees Area SPD (2018)

L2.12 The South Tees Areas SPD outlines several development principles to guide the regeneration of the area.

1 Development Principle STDC7: Natural Environmental Protection and Enhancement states that developments must respond to their environmental setting to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity interests. All proposals are required to comply with Local Plan Policy N4 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; and

2 Development Principle STDC12: North East Industrial Zone states that the council, in partnership with STDC, will encourage development proposals relating to advanced manufacturing, research and development, testing and laboratory services, and industrial and technology training. Development proposals will also need to consider the need for, and definition of, a buffer zone to protect existing environmental assets within and adjacent to the North East Industrial Zone. The North East Industrial Zone also includes and is adjacent to environmental assets, including a proposed expansion area for the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar Site. Development within this zone especially will have significant potential to have adverse effects upon biodiversity and designated sites. The need for a 'buffer zone' to protect assets within the adjacent Coastal Community Zone will be considered in the Environment and Biodiversity Strategy and all development proposals will be expected to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy N4 and should have regard to Development Principal STDC7.

L3.0 Assessment Methodology & Significance Criteria

Assessment Methodology

L3.1 The approach and methodology used in this LVIA have been developed using best practice guidance, as set out in the following documents:

1 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013);

2 An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment published by Natural England (2014); and

3 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19, Sep' 2019.

L3.2 Reference has also been made to several additional sources of data and information; these are referred to in the relevant sections of the baseline information.

L3.3 The guidelines acknowledge the relationship between the perceptions of landscape character and the experience of viewers (referred to as receptors – defined as residents, people in their workplace, attending school, using recreational facilities, using the countryside, shoppers, etc.) and the development proposals.

L3.4 The Guidelines for Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3) acknowledges that LVIA can be carried out either as a standalone assessment or as part of a broader EIA. The GLVIA3 note that the overall principles and core steps in the process are the same but that there are specific procedures in EIA with which an LVIA must comply.

L3.5 This report has been prepared as part of a broader EIA and addresses matters of individual resources, character areas and representative viewpoints. The LVIA includes analysis of the sensitivity of receptors (both landscape and visual), the magnitude of impact, and professional judgements on the likely effects of these impacts.

L3.6 The key purpose of EIA directives and legislation is to ensure that likely significant effects on the environment are taken into account during the development control process. This methodology has been prepared to identify likely significant landscape and visual effects to inform the EIA and decision-making process, but also to identify lesser effects, to help provide a rounded picture of the effect a development proposal may have on its landscape and visual context.

L3.7 The terminology adopted in the LVIA assessment makes a clear distinction between impact, as the action being taken, and effect being the result of that action (GLVIA3 para 1.15).

L3.8 The assessment process comprises the following key stages:

1 Determine the scope of the assessment;

2 Collate baseline information of existing landscape character and visual context of the receiving environment through desk study research and field-based appraisal;

3 Review the type of development proposed and identify and describe the likely impacts (enabling specific judgments to be made on the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors);

4 Establish the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors (balancing judgments on value and susceptibility);

5 Determine the magnitude of impacts (balancing judgments on size/scale, duration and reversibility);

6 Assess the significance of likely landscape and visual effects through a balanced approach and clear description of professional judgments on sensitivity and magnitude; and

7 Identify any design and mitigation measures appropriate to the development proposals and landscape of the receiving area, to avoid or remedy impacts and the subsequent reassessment of likely effects.

L3.9 An initial desk study of existing information has been undertaken to gather baseline information for the assessment. This stage informs subsequent field surveys, providing a crucial information base that underpins the assessment of character and visual impact. Subsequent field surveys and assessments were then undertaken to record the visual, aesthetic, and perceptual qualities of the proposal site and surrounding area.

L3.10 Key tasks undertaken through a combination of desk study and site survey comprise the following:

1 Analysis of existing landscape and visual assessment data derived from previous environmental studies of the area;

2 Desk-based analysis of Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping and aerial photography relating to landform, vegetation, settlement pattern, and land use of the wider area;

3 Preliminary desk-based plotting of potential landscape character zones derived from the above analyses;

4 Site appraisal and appropriate modification of preliminary zones. Site recording involved annotation of 1:1250, 1:10,000, and 1:25,000 scale OS plans defining the zones and the key landscape elements determining character;

5 Site photography to illustrate character zones, notable views, viewpoints, and key landscape elements;

6 Drafting and description of landscape character zones, including analysis of their sensitivity towards, and capacity to accommodate, change;

7 Assess the requirement for the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV);

8 Review of available planning and policy documentation relevant to the study area; and

9 Evaluation of change in character and the potential resultant effect on existing quality.

L3.11 Two categories of effects are considered (GLVIA para 3.20-3.21):

1 Landscape effects relate to changes in the physical fabric, and/or character of the landscape. Landscape effects may include direct impacts upon specific physical landscape elements (for example loss of distinctive topography, woodland or hedgerows) or effects on wider landscape character (for example available views of the development, lighting or sound effects, which may affect how the wider landscape is perceived). Effects on areas of designated landscape (for example National Parks) are also included in this category; and

2 Visual effects relate to changes that would occur in the composition of view character as a result of implementing development. View receptors include residents, users of public rights of way, of roads and recreational facilities. Effects in views from cultural heritage features (for example World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, other sites of archaeological interest, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) may also be considered within this category where they are known to be of tourist or community importance.

EIA and LVIA

L3.12 EIA Regulations specify than an assessment of likely significant effects should cover certain aspects of a proposed development, these are set out in Table L3.1 below and cross-referenced to the LVIA process for clarity:

Table L3.1 Relationship between EIA Regulations and LVIA processes

Relationship between EIA Regulations and LVIA Process	
EIA Aspects	Interpretation of EIA Aspects Within LVIA Process/Reporting
Direct Effects	Direct physical effects of a proposal should be described in the LVIA, including quantities where appropriate (for example, loss of Xha broadleaved woodland, or land regrading and re-profiling)
Indirect and secondary effects	Indirect effects include perceptual and visual effects on landscape character and visual effects on specific receptors. Secondary effects may include further LVIA effects arising from related development, which may be remote from the development site itself (for example, borrow pits, the requirement for additional permanent power supplies and off-site drainage improvements)
Cumulative effects	The LVIA process should identify, in consultation with the planning authority, whether cumulative effects are likely to arise or not, based on the nature of the development proposal and its context. If the potential for cumulative LVIA effects exists the assessment should address this issue.
Whether effects are likely to be short, medium or long term	The LVIA process should identify effects during various stages of a project including the construction stage and/or phased implementation.
Whether effects are temporary or permanent	In relation to the above, the LVIA process should identify whether effects are temporary or permanent (e.g. are they reversible or irreversible). For certain developments, LVIA effects at the decommissioning stage should also be assessed.
Whether effects are positive or negative	This is interpreted as the nature of the effect being either beneficial (positive) or adverse (negative) in LVIA terms.

Landscape Assessment Criteria

L3.13 The landscape character assessment identifies landscape sensitivity, its capacity to accommodate change and the magnitude of change that would result from the proposals. The assessment process has been informed by the identification of character, analysis of intrinsic quality, and an appreciation of value. This necessitates a combination of professional judgements, drawn from desk study and site surveys.

Character

L3.14 The landscape character of the site and surroundings have been identified and described based on a review of existing characterisations studies and field appraisals. The identification of landscape receptors with the potential to be affected directly or indirectly by the proposed development was then undertaken.

L3.15 Landscape character is the distinct and recognisable pattern of physical and cultural elements within areas of the landscape. Landform, hydrology, vegetation and land cover, land use pattern,

and cultural and historic features interact to create a 'sense of place' and identity which can be used to categorise areas into definable, homogenous units known as character zones.

L3.16 The wider landscape of the Teesworks area has been classified into distinctive character zones, underpinned by the broad-scale Landscape Character Map of England definitions and other character studies, where available. The criteria used to define character include scale, density and mix, appearance, layout, cultural associations, and land use.

L3.17 Based on the above criteria, Landscape Character Zones (LCZ's) with the potential to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the proposed development were identified to form the basis of the overall landscape assessment. Sensitivity can then be ascribed in relation to these receptors which vary in their capacity to accommodate different forms of development. A map illustrating the LCZ's is shown at **Appendix L1**.

Landscape Sensitivity to Change

L3.18 Sensitivity relates to the stability of baseline character and its vulnerability towards change resulting from the type of development proposed. The sensitivity of the landscape to change is based on interpretation of a combination of judgements relating to their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape. Sensitivity is assessed by considering both perceptual and physical characteristics of the receiving environment and the degree to which an area receiving change would be able to recuperate from either damage or loss of components.

L3.19 Landscape quality is a reflection of its attributes, such as the condition of the spaces or landscape components and the attractiveness, aesthetic appeal and scenic quality of the area, as well as its sense of place. A landscape with consistent, intact and well-defined, distinctive attributes is generally considered to be of higher quality and, in turn, higher sensitivity, than a landscape of inappropriate or discordant elements which has detracted from its inherent attributes. The higher the quality of a receptor, the greater its sensitivity to the proposed development. The vulnerability of the Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) is the degree to which its component parts could be readily replaced if lost as a result of the proposed development. The more vulnerable the receptor the greater is its sensitivity to the proposed development.

Landscape Value

L3.20 Landscape value relates to areas of particularly scenic quality or those displaying important historic and cultural associations. Both quality and value are frequently addressed by reference to international, national, regional, and local designations. A lack of formal policy designation on a given landscape does not, however, necessarily infer the landscape is of low quality or value.

L3.21 The following factors are generally agreed to influence value (GLVIA p.84, para 5.28):

1 Landscape quality (condition);
2 Scenic quality;
3 Rarity;
4 Representativeness;
5 Conservation interests;
6 Recreation value;
7 Perceptual aspects; and
8 Associations.

L3.22 Following consideration of the above, and guidance contained in GLVIA3, the sensitivity of the LCZ is graded as low, medium or high, definitions of which are provided in Table L3.2.

Table L3.2 Value of Landscape Character Areas

Level of Value / Importance of the landscape	Definition
High	Designated areas at an International or National level (including, but not limited to, World Heritage Site, National Parks, AONB's) and also considered an important component of the country's character, experienced by high numbers of tourists. Landscape condition is good and components are generally regularly maintained to a high standard. Rare or distinctive elements and features are a key component that contributes to the character of the area. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and presence/absence of major infrastructure, the landscape has an elevated level of tranquillity. Extensive and promoted opportunities are available for recreation within the landscape.
Medium	Designated areas at a Regional or County level (including, but not limited to, green belt, regional-scale parks, designated as open space or a Conservation Area in local planning documents) and also considered a distinctive component or the region/county character experienced by a large proportion of its population. Landscape condition is fair and components are generally relatively well maintained. Rare or distinctive elements and features are a notable component that contributes to the character of the area. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and presence/absence of major infrastructure, the landscape has moderate levels of tranquillity. Opportunities are available for recreation within the landscape, some of which is incidental.
Low	No formal designations but a landscape of local relevance (including, but not limited to, public or semi-public open spaces, village greens or allotments) and also green infrastructure and open spaces within residential areas likely to be visited and valued by the local community. Landscape condition is poor and components are generally poorly maintained or damaged. Rare or distinctive elements and features are not a notable component that contributes to the character of the area. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and presence/absence of major infrastructure, the landscape has limited levels of tranquillity. There are few/no opportunities for recreation within the landscape.

Landscape Susceptibility

L3.23 The GLVIA3 explains the susceptibility to change, as, *"the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies"*. The more susceptible the receptor is to the type of change proposed, the greater is its sensitivity to the proposed development.

L3.24 The following table sets out the criteria that have been considered for determining landscape susceptibility.

Table L3.3 Criteria for landscape susceptibility

Susceptibility	Criteria
High	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed due to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover and built form. Nature of land use – landscapes with no or very little existing reference or context to the type of proposed development. Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (e.g. ancient woodland, mature trees, historic parkland). Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where these are present but their influence on the landscape is limited.
Medium	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a medium capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed due to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover and built form. Nature of land use – landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of proposed development. Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted. Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and the influence of these on the landscape is noticeable.
Low	Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a high capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed due to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover and built form. Nature of land use – landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of proposed development. Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted, or where there are few/no existing elements present (e.g. cleared brownfield sites). Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and the influence of these on the landscape is dominant.

L3.25 Having considered in detail the contributing factors to landscape value and the susceptibility of the site and surrounding area to the type of the development proposed, conclusions on landscape sensitivity can be drawn by balancing the judgements on value and susceptibility.

L3.26 As advocated in the GLVIA3, determination of landscape sensitivity is based on professional judgement, however, high value/ high susceptibility receptors are likely to be highly sensitive to change, with lower value and/or low susceptibility receptors being likely to be of low sensitivity to change. A three-point scale is used to define landscape receptor sensitivity: 'High', 'Medium' and 'Low' as detailed in the table below:

Table L3.4 Landscape Sensitivity Criteria

Sensitivity	Designated Landscapes (Value) Landscapes recognised and valued for their quality and/or cultural associations	Key Characteristics and Features As recognised in published Landscape Character Assessments	Landscape Condition Degree to which the landscape is intact and legible	Susceptibility Degree to which the landscape can accommodate change
High	National / Regional Importance (Landscape Designations - AONB, National Park, Registered Parks and Gardens)	Features which are dominant within the landscape and are fundamental to defining the distinct landscape character of an area. Important characteristics and features recognised as forming an intrinsic part of nationally and regionally designated landscapes. Distinctive individual or rare features.	Distinct landscape structure with a strong pattern and intact features. Few detractors or uncharacteristic features or elements present.	Considered susceptible to relatively small changes.
Medium	Local Importance (Other Designations - Special Landscape Areas / Green Belt / Protected Features)	Locally important and notable features that contribute to the overall character of an area. Features and elements protected by local policy.	Landscape exhibits recognisable structure and characteristic patterns. Some detracting features present.	Considered reasonably tolerant of change.
Low	No Designation	Features or elements that are uncharacteristic and detract from the landscape character of an area.	Degraded landscape structure with fragmented pattern and poor legibility of character. Detracting features notable within the landscape.	Considered tolerant of a substantial level of change.

Capacity to Accommodate Change

L3.27 Capacity to accommodate change is broadly derived from a consideration of landscape quality and sensitivity of the Teesworks area. This requires careful consideration of the potential magnitude of landscape change likely to result from the proposals.

Magnitude of Change

L3.28 The magnitude of change considers the extent to which the proposed development would emerge as a new component in the landscape and would change the balance between components that currently constitute baseline character. In general, a high magnitude of change might arise from significant tree planting proposals or loss of strong existing landscape features.

Table L3.5 Criteria for determining the magnitude of landscape impacts

Magnitude	Criteria
Substantial	The size and scale of change are considered large due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects. The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to the character are considered large. Where the geographical extent would have a substantial influence on the landscape at a regional scale, i.e. across several landscape character areas/types. Duration of impacts would be considered long term and where the potential reversal of the impact is not likely and in practical terms would be very difficult to achieve
Moderate	The size and scale of change are considered moderate due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects. The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to the character are considered moderate. Where the geographical extent would influence the landscape at a local scale, i.e. a single landscape character area/type (or potentially multiple areas/types where a site is located on the boundary between areas). Duration of impacts would be considered midterm and where the potential reversal of the impact is likely and in practical terms would be difficult to achieve.
Minor	The size and scale of change are considered small due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects. The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to the character are considered small.

Magnitude	Criteria
	Where the geographical extent would influence the landscape in the immediate setting of the site, i.e. limited to the influence of part of a single landscape character area/type. Duration of impacts would be considered short term and where the potential reversal of the impact is more likely and in practical terms would easily be achieved
Negligible	The size and scale of change are considered very small due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects. The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to the character are considered very small. Where the geographical extent would substantially influence the landscape of the site only. Duration of impacts would be considered very short term and where the potential reversal of the impact is very likely or committed and in practical terms would very easily be achieved

Visual Impact Assessment Criteria

L3.29 The visual impact assessment draws from an identification of the sensitivity of receptors (locations from which people would be able to view the proposed development) within the local area and the magnitude of change that would result from the construction and operation of the development, based upon information gathered through site surveys and analysis of the design proposals.

L3.30 The impact assessment describes the current visual context from important viewpoints within the landscape and evaluates the implications of the proposals for residents, visitors, and users of the areas neighbouring the proposed development. It also describes any mitigation measures that help to avoid or reduce the potential for adverse visual effects.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

L3.31 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping (GLVIA3, para 6.8) has not been used for this assessment on the basis that a sufficiently accurate model could not reasonably be prepared to reflect the complex array of manmade structures and detailed topography that surrounds the development site and influences views towards it. This approach is regularly applied in townscape and visual impact assessments in urban settings. Although this assessment is of landscape and visual impacts, the number and scale of manmade structures introduce certain similarities to a townscape assessment and as such, no ZTV has been applied to the assessment.

Viewpoint Selection

L3.32 All visual receptors within 1km of the development boundary have been considered in the assessment and beyond this distance, where intervisibility with the development would occur, we have selected appropriate viewpoints from sensitive and prominent receptors.

L3.33 A key part of the visual assessment is the assessment of effects from several predetermined viewpoints, which reflects views of the proposed development that would be experienced by different receptors. Viewpoints fall into three categories, as set out in GLVIA p.109, para 6.19:

1 Representative viewpoints (selected to represent the experience of different types of the visual receptor);

2 Specific viewpoints (a key view or sometimes promoted viewpoint within the landscape, for example, a specific local visitor attraction); and

3 Illustrative viewpoint (which illustrate a particular effect or specific issue, for example, the restricted visibility at a certain location).

L3.34 Representative viewpoints have been selected for key visual receptors within the study area in agreement with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC), as described in paragraph L3.67. The viewpoint locations are shown in **Appendix L2**.

L3.35 It is impractical to consider views from all residential properties, including private land, due to access restrictions. The emphasis of this assessment is on potential effects, and it was considered appropriate to consider viewpoints from Public Rights of Way (PRoW), residential areas (GLVIA, pg.107, para 6.17), as visual receptors most susceptible to change include residents at home (GLVIA, pg. 113, para 6.33), and recognised vantage points. The viewpoints within this LVIA include Representative and Specific viewpoints.

L3.36 The assessment of potential visibility from selected representative viewpoints is typically aided by the use of visually representative material. In order to illustrate the potential effects of the proposed development and to enable interested parties to gain an appreciation of the potential scale and appearance of the proposed development within the landscape a 'massing model' of the site masterplan has been used to create 12 viewpoints of the proposed development.

L3.37 Key visual receptors that are potentially sensitive to landscape change have been initially recorded by reviewing the settlement, land use, topography, vegetation, access, and transportation pattern of land within the landscape study area. Each receptor was visited and surveyed during two site visits in November and December 2020.

L3.38 Factors considered during the site assessment of visual receptor sensitivity to landscape change included:

1 Receptor type and number (e.g. dwelling/footpath);

2 Receptor height relative to potentially intrusive elements of the proposals;

3 Proportion of view likely to be occupied by any aspect of the proposals;

4 Viewpoint position (view up/view down/level view);

5 Angle of view (acute/perpendicular/average);

6 Position of the scheme in the view (foreground/mid-ground/background); and

7 Analysis of potential impact.

Visual Sensitivity to change

L3.39 The sensitivity of a visual receptor is dependent on the importance of the viewpoint, the value and quality of the view, and the nature and expectation of the viewer. This includes heritage values, as well as a wider spectrum of considerations on community use, location, economic, and social factors.

L3.40 A viewpoint that is marked on tourist maps, signposted, or otherwise recognised will have greater importance, and this may be increased if facilities for the enjoyment of the view are

provided, such as a viewpoint indicator, benches or footpaths. Conversely, a viewpoint located on a minor road will tend to have limited importance. A viewpoint that is visited or used by a large number of people will tend to have greater importance than one visited by very few people, although this is not always the case. The importance of the view experienced by the receptor also contributes to an understanding of the susceptibility of the visual receptor to change as well as the value attached to the view.

L3.41 The GLVIA identifies that the susceptibility of visual receptors to changes in views and visual amenity, is a function of (GLVIA3, para 6.32):

1 The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at a particular location; and

2 The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and visual amenity they experience at particular locations.

L3.42 Visual receptors most susceptible to change are generally likely to include (GLVIA3, pg. 113, para 6.33):

1 Residents at home;

2 People, whether residents or visitors, who are engaged in outdoor recreation, including the use of public rights of way, whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and particular views;

3 Visitors to heritage assets, or to other attractions, where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience;

4 Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area.

L3.43 A judgement is also made on the value attached to the views experienced. This takes account of (GLVIA, para 6.37):

1 Recognition of the value attached to particular views, for example in relation to heritage assets, or through planning designations; and

2 Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors, for example through appearance in guidebooks or on tourist maps, provision of facilities for their enjoyment (signboards, interpretive material) and references to them in literature or art.

L3.44 The value and quality of the view is a reflection of the scenic qualities of view. The value of the view will be increased if it overlooks a designated area such as an AONB or Conservation Area. The quality of the view will be increased if the condition of the landscape is near to its optimum for its type. Views that are well known at a local level for their scenic qualities can also have an increased value, even if there is no formal recognition or designation. The greater the value and quality of the view, the greater its sensitivity is likely to be.

L3.45 Viewers whose attention is focused on the landscape, for example, walkers that are travelling through an area to enjoy the view, are likely to have a higher sensitivity. A view that is gained from a place where people gather, with some awareness of and focus on their surroundings, may also have increased importance, as will residents of properties that may gain constant views of the proposed development. Viewers travelling in cars or on trains will tend to have lower sensitivity as they are transient. The least sensitive viewers are usually people at their place of work, as they tend to be less sensitive to changes in the view unless a location has been specifically selected for enjoyment of the view as part of the work environment.

L3.46 Following consideration of the above, and taking into account guidance contained in the GLVIA3, the sensitivity of the visual receptor is graded as low, medium or high, as defined in Table L3.6.

Table L3.6 Visual receptor sensitivity to change

Sensitivity	Description
High	The view is likely to be an internationally, nationally or regionally important view. Could include landmark features of international, regional or national importance with high amenity value. The view will include significant elements of visual interest and attractive or notable compositional qualities. Also, the view will be enjoyed by a large number of recreational users and visitors, possibly for the sole purpose of enjoying the view or the public amenity. Viewers could also include residents (predominantly ground floor rooms). The view could also include significant heritage assets such as World Heritage Sites and Grade I and II listed buildings.
Medium	This view is likely to be an undesignated view or a locally recognised view. The view could include some features of value or interest with limited signs of neglect or degradation. The view will be either intentional or incidental to the viewer, with some amenity value. The view could include significant elements of visual interest and attractive or notable compositional qualities. It may also be a view that contains heritage assets such as world heritage sites, Grade I or II* listed buildings, scheduled monuments, grade I or II* historic park/ gardens with clear historic significance, but not best represented in this particular view.
Low	The view is likely to be an undesignated view, which does not include any landmark features and is low amenity value, showing signs of neglect and degradation. The view is unlikely to include elements of visual interest and attractive or notable compositional qualities. The view will be incidental to the viewer, and in most cases, the viewer will be in motion. It may contain heritage assets such as Grade II listed buildings, conservation areas or locally listed buildings with clear historic significance, but not best represented in this particular view.

L3.47 The assessment has been aided by a series of computer-generated 'Photomontage' Accurate Visual Representation (AVR) images. These visualisations combine a photograph of an existing view with a computer-generated massing model the proposed buildings. They provide a representation of the scale of the proposed development. Refer to **Appendix L3** for the methodology. The AVR images use false (bright and different) colours to allow a more accurate understanding of building plot articulation, this is particularly helpful in views where several building plots are visible and allows for a more nuanced assessment of likely visual effects. It should be noted that the colours used in the AVRs are not those that will be used for any buildings on site and that the likely visual impact of the development will likely be less than implied by the AVRs (refer to chapter B for more commentary on the building design). The visual impact assessment takes these factors into account and the AVRs should not be viewed in isolation from the visual impact assessment.

L3.48 A comprehensive photographic study was also undertaken with 360-degree high-resolution digital photography taken at each viewpoint. Figures from each viewpoint are included within **Appendix L4**.

Assessment Method

L3.49 The evaluation of effects assessment has involved the following considerations:

1 The extent to which the proposed development would change the composition of the existing view, components of the landscape, its character and how this is experienced (magnitude of change); and

2 The sensitivity to change based on the information gathered through site survey and analysis of the planning of the proposed development in relation to the sensitivity of the landscape and the baseline conditions.

Magnitude of Change to Visual Receptors

L3.50 The magnitude of change within views is an important element of visual impact assessment. For these proposals, this has considered the extent of the project likely to be visible, and the degree of change to current views that would result from the proposals. The magnitude of change is ranked as follows:

Table KL.7 Definitions of Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Description
Substantial	The proposed development constitutes an immediately apparent feature in the landscape and visual context and has a material influence on the receptor.
Moderate	The proposed development constitutes a visible and recognisable feature in the landscape and visual context is generally distinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics and has a readily apparent influence on the receptor.
Minor	The proposed development forms a minor component of the landscape and visual context, is generally indistinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics, and its influence on the receptor may be missed.
Negligible	The proposed development is barely discernible within the landscape and visual context, is indistinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics, and its influence on the receptor equates to a 'no change' situation.

L3.51 The extent to which a sensitive receptor may be affected by the proposed development will influence the magnitude of change. If the proposed development influences a limited part of an LCZ or visual receptor, the magnitude of change will generally be lower.

L3.52 The degree of change in the character of the receptor will influence the magnitude of change. The greater the degree of contrast between the existing and the proposed character, the higher the magnitude of change.

L3.53 The degree of change in the quality and value of the landscape will also influence the magnitude of change. The greater the degree to which the proposed development results in a loss of elements of quality or value or their introduction, the higher the magnitude of change

L3.54 Several aspects affect the magnitude of change to visual receptors. These are as follows:

1 The distance between the visual receptor and the proposed development – Generally, the greater the distance, the lower the magnitude of change, as the proposed development will constitute a smaller and generally less apparent external influence or component of the view;

2 The extent of the receptor that will be affected by visibility and, therefore, the influence of the proposed development – If the proposed development affects a limited part of the visual receptor, such as a road route, the magnitude of change will generally be lower;

3 The extent of the proposed development that will be seen – Visibility may range from part of, to the whole proposed development. The implication of this on the visual character receptor can vary and is largely dependent on distance. While an outlook over the majority of the proposed development will generally increase its influence on the receptor, a long view in which the whole proposed development is visible can have a more limited influence and, therefore, a lower magnitude of change than a close view where only part of the proposed development is seen, due to intervening landform or existing built form. Views may be glimpsed, partial, filtered or open;

4 The position of the proposed development in relation to the principal orientation of the visual receptor or in relation to any existing focus of views from the receptor – If the proposed development is seen in a specific, directional vista from a receptor such as a route, the magnitude of change will generally be greater; if the proposed development is seen in the context of an existing external influence or eye-catching external feature, the magnitude of change may be greater;

5 The context within which the proposed development will be seen – This is important as it will determine the contrast that the proposed development will have on the existing outlook. The scale and patterns of the landscape, the existing land uses, and the degree and type of proposed development and settlement seen in the view will all be relevant.

6 The proportion of the view that is affected by the visibility of the proposed development – Where an elevated viewpoint may offer views of the entire proposed development it may be seen in the context of a wide panorama or a long depth of field thus reducing its importance within the view.

7 The extent to which a sensitive receptor may be affected by the proposed development will influence the magnitude of change. If the proposed development influences a limited part of an LCZ or visual receptor, the magnitude of change will generally be lower.

Significance Criteria

L3.55 The objective of the assessment process is to identify and evaluate the potentially significant effects arising from the proposed development. The assessment identifies the residual effects likely to arise from the finalised design taking into account mitigation measures and change over time. The significance of effects is assessed by considering the sensitivity of the receptor and the predicted magnitude of effect in relation to the baseline conditions.

L3.56 To provide a level of consistency and transparency to the assessment, and allow comparisons to be made between the various landscape and visual receptors subject to assessment, the assessment of significance is based on pre-defined criteria as outlined in Table L3.8 and Table L3.9. When assessing significance, individual effects may fall across several different categories of significance and professional judgement is used to determine which category of significance best fits the overall effect of a landscape or visual receptor.

Table L3.8 Significance criteria used to assess the landscape effect of proposals

Significance of effect	Description
Substantial Beneficial	Enhance the character of the receiving landscape. Enable the restoration of characteristic elements and features lost as a result of changes from previous inappropriate management or development. Enable a sense of place to be enhanced.
Moderate Beneficial	Improve the character of the receiving landscape.

Significance of effect	Description
	Enable the restoration of characteristic elements and features partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from previous inappropriate management or development. Enable a sense of place to be restored.
Minor Beneficial	Complement the character of the receiving landscape. Maintain or enhance characteristic elements and features. Enable some sense of place to be restored.
Neutral / Negligible	Maintain the character of the receiving landscape. Blend in with characteristic elements and features. Enable a sense of place to be retained.
Minor Adverse	The proposals may detract slightly from, or not quite fit the distinctive visual character and quality of the receiving landscape. Have some variance with characteristic elements and features. Have a limited influence on the sense of place.
Moderate Adverse	Be at variance or inconsistency with the character of the receiving landscape. Degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic elements and features. Detract from the sense of place
Substantial Adverse	Be at substantial variance with the character of the receiving landscape. Result in the total loss of a range of characteristic elements and features. Damage the sense of place.

Table L3.9 Significance criteria used to assess the visual effect of the proposals

Nature of effect	Description
Substantial Beneficial	The proposed development would cause a material improvement in a view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a very high or high sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a moderate/ major magnitude of change and that is beneficial in nature. Alternatively, a moderate magnitude of change on a highly sensitive receptor or a major magnitude of change on a moderate sensitivity receptor may result in a major level of significance.
Moderate Beneficial	The proposed development would cause a notable improvement in view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a moderate sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a moderate magnitude of change that is beneficial in nature. Alternatively, a minor magnitude of change on a highly sensitive receptor or a major magnitude of change on a low sensitivity receptor may result in a moderate level of significance.
Minor Beneficial	The proposed development would cause a perceptible improvement in view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a low/ moderate sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a minor/ moderate magnitude of change that is beneficial in nature.
Neutral / Negligible	The proposed development would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in a view. In most instances, a negligible effect will arise

Nature of effect	Description
	where a low sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a negligible magnitude of change.
Minor Adverse	The proposed development would cause a perceptible deterioration in a view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a low/moderate sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a minor/ moderate magnitude of change and one which is adverse in nature.
Moderate Adverse	The proposed development would cause a notable deterioration in a view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a moderate sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a moderate magnitude of change that is adverse in nature. Alternatively, a minor magnitude of change on a highly sensitive receptor or a major magnitude of change on a low sensitivity receptor may result in a moderate level of significance.
Substantial Adverse	The proposed development would cause a material deterioration in a view. In most instances, this category of significance will arise where a very high or high sensitivity receptor is assessed as being likely to experience a moderate/ major magnitude of change that is adverse in nature. Alternatively, a moderate magnitude of change on a highly sensitive receptor or a major magnitude of change on a moderate sensitivity receptor may result in a major level of significance.

L3.57 Landscape and visual effects classified as Moderate and Substantial are likely to be Significant in EIA terms. Those classified as Minor or Negligible are likely to be Not Significant in EIA terms

L3.58 The nature of each effect is based on the ability of the landscape character or visual receptor to accommodate the proposed development, and the appearance of the proposed development within the receiving context, and is assessed to be beneficial or adverse. A change to the landscape or visual resource is not considered to be adverse simply because it constitutes an alternation to the existing situation.

L3.59 With regards to the judgement of significant landscape effects, GLVIA3 states:

"There are no hard and fast rules about what makes a significant effect, and there cannot be a standard approach since circumstances vary with the location and landscape context and with the type of proposal. At opposite ends of a spectrum it is reasonable to say that:

1. *Major loss or irreversible negative effects, over an extensive area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that are key to the character of nationally valued landscapes are likely to be of the greatest significance;*
2. *Reversible negative effects of short duration, over a restricted area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key characteristics of the character of landscapes of community value are likely to be of the least significance and may, depending on the circumstances, be judged as not significant;*
3. *Where assessments of significance place landscape effects between these extremes, judgements must be made about whether or not they are significant, with full explanations of why these conclusions have been reached."*

L3.60 With regards to the judgement of significant visual effects, GLVIA3 states:

"There are no hard and fast rules about what makes a significant effect, and there cannot be a standard approach since circumstances vary with the location and context and with the type of proposal. In making a judgement about the significance of visual effects the following points should be noted:

1. *Effects on people who are particularly sensitive to changes in views and visual amenity are more likely to be significant;*
2. *Effects on people at recognised and important viewpoints or from recognised scenic routes are more likely to be significant;*
3. *Large-scale changes which introduce new, non-characteristic or discordant or intrusive elements into the view are more likely to be significant than small changes or changes involving features already present within the view."*

L3.61 The following terms have been used to define residual effects on the landscape resources:

1 Adverse: the proposed development results in a direct loss of physical resources, weakens key characteristics or negatively affects the integrity of a landscape designation; and

2 Beneficial: the proposed development may replace physical resources or strengthen the landscape characteristics.

L3.62 The following terms have been used to define residual effects on the visual resources:

1 Adverse: the proposed development results in a loss of visual amenity; and

2 Beneficial: the proposed development improves visual amenity.

L3.63 The effects will be further categorised according to the duration, i.e. short, medium or long-term and reversibility whether the effect is permanent or temporary (demolition and construction works are considered to be temporary).

L3.64 Significance criteria are determined as follows in Table L3.10:

Table L3.10 Significance criteria

	Sensitivity of Receptor			
Magnitude of Change		Low	Medium	High
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor to Moderate*
	Moderate	Minor	Moderate*	Moderate* to Substantial*
	Substantial	Minor to Moderate*	Moderate* to Substantial*	Substantial*

*Moderate and substantial effects are considered to be significant.

Cumulative Effects

L3.65 Cumulative landscape and visual effects can occur when two or more consented or proposed developments might begin, in combination and in the future, to influence the perception of landscape character or important views (the presence of operational developments and those currently under construction are treated as part of the baseline situation). Cumulative visual effects occur when multiple proposed developments would be visible either in combination or succession from a particular viewpoint.

L3.66 In total, 25 cumulative schemes have been identified. These have been divided into 'Tier 1' and 'Tier 2' schemes, where Tier 1 schemes include the proposed development and the four other STDC outline applications, and Tier 2 schemes comprise 'other relevant development'. Detailed analysis of cumulative effects is presented in Chapter N: Cumulative Effects.

Consultation

L3.67 Consultation to agree on potentially sensitive landscapes and visual receptors has been undertaken as follows:

1 November 2020: Baseline information issued to Client

2 November 2020: Desktop study and field analysis determined the area for Landscape Character Area study, and identified locations of potential sensitive landscapes and visual receptors.

3 November 2020: Consultation with RCBC over proposed viewpoints.

4 November 2020: Consultation with sub-consultant with local knowledge of the area as part of previous LVIA assessments.

5 November 2020: These viewpoints were agreed with RCBC.

L3.68 **Appendix L5** includes email correspondence on the above topics.

Assumptions and Limitations

L3.69 As the emphasis of this assessment is on potential significant effects, it was considered appropriate to consider viewpoints from residential areas with representative views of the proposed development (GLVIA, pg.107, para 6.17) as visual receptors most susceptible to change include residents at home (GLVIA, pg. 113, para 6.33). As it is impractical to consider views from all residential properties a representative selection of viewpoints has been assessed. Access to private residential properties was not requested as part of the visual assessment of effects. The assessment was made based on views obtainable from nearby publicly accessible locations, i.e. roads and public rights of way and an informed assessment of the view from the property was recorded.

L4.0 Baseline Conditions

Existing Conditions

L4.1 This section provides an understanding of the existing landscape and visual context of the proposals. It draws from desk-study and site assessments to provide a classification of landscape character and quality.

Site Description

L4.2 The site located within the northeastern part of the Teesworks area and is the area identified as the 'Teardrop site and CLE31' in the STDC Master Plan, in the North East Industrial Zone. In relation to the wider Teesworks area, it lies to the south-east of the 'Redcar Works Complex', to the west of 'Coatham Marsh', and to the north of the 'Redcar Steel House and surrounding area'.

L4.3 The site is immediately bounded by the Darlington to Saltburn Railway line to the south-east; a private internal road and open industrial land to the north-west; a section of the former Hot Metal Transfer railway line, open land, and South Gare Road to the north; and the boundary wall of Marsh Farm House and adjacent industrial unit and by open land to the northeast.

L4.4 The site was previously partially occupied by the Warranby iron and steelworks and in part has been previously used as a licensed landfill for the disposal of byproducts from iron and steel making, principally slag.

L4.5 More detail on the site's description is included in chapter B of this ES.

L4.6 The maximum footprint of the buildings will be determined at reserved matters stage, however, the parameters plans associated with the development provide detail on the indicative layout, land-use, massing, and height of the proposed development. Details relating to landscaping and boundary treatments are not included at this stage.

Landscape Character

L4.7 Key elements that are considered of special importance in defining landscape character are identified for both the proposal site and the surrounding area. The wider landscape context has been considered in terms of national, regional, and local interest levels. The assessment includes the visual context to the proposals.

National Context

L4.8 Natural England has defined areas of cohesive landscape character at a broad national scale. The national landscape area relevant to the site and surrounding environs is '23 – Tees Lowlands'. The principal characteristics of this area, as identified by Natural England, are summarised below:

1 A broad, low-lying and open plain of predominantly arable agricultural land, with low woodland cover and large fields, defined by wide views to distant hills.

2 A large area of urban and industrial development around the Tees Estuary, much of which is on reclaimed land, contrasts with the quieter rural areas to the south and west.

3 Major industrial installations around Teesmouth form a dramatic skyline but are juxtaposed with expansive mudflats, sand dunes and salt marshes which are nationally and internationally designated for their assemblage of waterfowl.

4 Slow-moving rivers Tees and Leven meander through the landscape with steep, well-wooded banks.

5 A distinctive area of low-lying farmland with remnants of former wetland habitat in the flood plain of the River Skerne to the north-west.

6 Permo-Triassic red mudstones and sandstones are masked by glacial drift and alluvial material but can be seen outcropping at the coast in places.

7 Principal transport corridors, power lines and energy infrastructure are conspicuous elements in the landscape.

8 Brownfield sites where semi-natural vegetation has started to regenerate on previously developed land.

9 Green corridors such as minor valleys and former railway lines provide links between urban areas and the surrounding countryside.

Regional Context

L4.9 At a regional level, the landscape context of the site is characterised by the Tees Lowlands. This constitutes a broad, low-lying plain framed by the Cleveland Hills to the south, which forms a more subtle transition into the Vale of Mowbray and beyond. The River Tees meanders through the heart of the area dividing the lowlands to the north and south.

L4.10 The Tees Lowlands are also bounded by the Pennine Fringes to the west, merging into the Durham Magnesium Limestone plateau to the north. The general topography indicates that the whole area is located within a basin surrounded by a series of mountain chains. The majority of the area is gently undulating or nearly flat, with much of it below 30m AOD.

Local Context

L4.11 Following desktop analysis and fieldwork, the following text has been produced to describe the Local Landscape Character of the site, its immediate surroundings and the wider study area. This is in line with Regional and National Policy as outlined in L2.0 of this chapter and Landscape Institute and Natural England Guidance for undertaking Landscape Character Assessments (LCA). This was carried out to understand the likely visual impact of the development from surrounding areas. The findings of this are summarised below and form the basis for further assessment of the Landscape value and the sensitivity of receptors.

L4.12 Within the development site boundary, the landscape is low lying and has an open and exposed feel. It is free from built structures but contains several permanent roads and a rail line. This includes the former Hot Metals Transfer Railway line and the adjacent road which cross the site from south to north and has an embankment which is around 10m AOD at the southern end, approximately 4m above surrounding ground level, which gradually lowers to meet existing ground levels at its northern end. The Fleet watercourse crosses the site from east to west, although it arcs in a southerly direction before heading in a north-west direction. The area to the east of the former Hot Metals Transfer Railway line and north of the Fleet watercourse was previously used as a landfill and is now a steep-sided mound with a flat plateau at 19.5m AOD. The ground levels surrounding the mound vary from 7.5m AOD to 9m AOD. The ground cover on the plateau is principally slag material from the landfill use with some grasses and shrub type vegetation on the sides of the mount. There are some trees alongside the former railway line and the Fleet. The areas to the west of the former Hot Metals Transfer Railway line and south of the Fleet watercourse are relatively flat, comprising mainly of grasses and scrub as well as a small clump of trees.

L4.13 Immediately to the north-west of the site, the Redcar Blast Furnace is a prominent feature in views from the site, as well as in views from South Gare and Coatham Sands directly to the north of the site. The coastal landscape that spans from South Gare to Saltburn includes the South Gare and Coatham Sands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), as designated by Natural England, and the Local Landscape Designation of Coatham Marsh Local Nature Reserve (LNR). These areas encompass the intertidal Tees Estuary, sand and mudflats, natural salt marshes and dunes, and reclaimed land for industrial purposes. These areas have a naturalistic, coastal and open landscape character and support a variety of wildlife and habitats despite much of the landscape being originally formed from blast furnace slag.

L4.14 From the South Gare Peninsula wide, open panoramic views can be seen of the Tees estuary and the North Sea with its associated off-shore wind farms, providing distant views across the estuary to the Teesmouth National Nature Reserve, Seal Sands, and the adjacent large expanse of the industrial estate. Collectively, the industrial developments to the west and across the estuary create a prominent and varied skyline of large buildings, towers, chimneys, cranes and pylons. To the south-west, is the rising plateau of the Eston Hills, creating a green backdrop for urban development. Upon approach to the South Gare peninsula, the dominant landscape feature is the Redcar Steelworks, which is highly visible through the perimeter fencing. This contrasts with the natural, gently rolling grassy landscape of the SSSI. Further along the 2 and a half-mile stretch of breakwater and peninsula, 'Paddy's Hole' harbour and a small, isolated settlement of fishermen's huts nestled into the landscape add to the historic interest and character of this section of coastline, part of the 'English Coast Path' as designated by Natural England.

L4.15 Cleveland golf course is accessible to public use, the topography of the grass bunds and dune landscape screens views of the industrial areas other than those within the immediate locality.

L4.16 Sitting within the coastal character area, South Coatham Marsh has a secluded feel and wetland character, with a sheltered microclimate created by bunds and native planting which enclose the majority of the 134-acre nature reserve. Boardwalks and gravel paths provide a circular walk around the lakes, marsh and wet meadows. Footpaths also lead up onto to a large and prominent ridgeline with grassland flora and naturally colonised scrub. From this open aspect, the historic, imposing structures of the disused Steelworks are close and a visible feature. To the west, the blocky structure of the 1970's Steel House building creates another distinct landmark and feature. Further in the distance to the west, the STDC Industrial sites can be seen, creating a broken skyline of built infrastructure beyond the foreground grassland slopes and scrub vegetation

L4.17 To the south-west of the site, lies a wider expanse of industrial sites of the South Tees Development Corporation, Lackenby Steelworks, and large operational industrial developments including the industrial and manufacturing site of Lazenby, PD Ports, and Teesport docks, as well as and Stockton-on Tees Industrial estate to the north of the river. These industrial areas comprise a variety of buildings and infrastructure, with varying form, massing and height, some of which are imposing and dominate the skyline, but which together create a combined character of heavy industrial landscape throughout, in similarity to the development site. Tall cranes along the docks and pylons add to the overall landscape character. Immediately to the south, the site is segregated from the wider industrial development by a small rectangular area of undeveloped grassland.

L4.18 To the west of the site, the River Tees passes through the industrial landscape, with hard-edged shores, primarily to facilitate the working dockside requirements. Access to the River Estuary is limited for the general public. To the north of the estuary, an area of open grassland creates a soft interface with the river and an opportunity for public vantage points from the Stockton-on-

Tees industrial estate into the development site. Vegetation is sparse and has colonised naturally, and mudflats are exposed during low tides and within bays to the east of the estuary.

L4.19 The operational Tees Valley train line passes through the wider Teesworks area and runs along the southwestern boundary of the site. South Bank railway station including associated platforms and footbridge is located approximately 5km south-west of the site and is publically accessible. To the south of the railway line, the Teesdale Way Public Right of Way (PRoW) footpath runs from east to west. A 4-mile section of the way between Middlesbrough and Redcar is known locally as 'The Black Path', a linear walkway route once used by steelworkers. The public footpath is narrow and is channelled between a 2m high palisade fencing to the north and a varied boundary treatment of wall, fencing, and naturalised vegetation to the south. Levels along the path are flat, and views into the development site and wider industrial site are prominent, except for in locations of stockpiled materials which limit views beyond. Overhead pylons create background noise along with occasional noise from operating manufacturing equipment. The Teesport Commerce Park lies adjacent to the railway station, with recent large warehouse-style commercial development.

L4.20 To the east, as well as further afield to the south, the landscape character is comprised of urban settlements, primarily residential housing, as well as retail, some commercial development, and urban green spaces. The residential areas of Dormanstown and Coatham are closest to the development site, as well as the nearby town of Redcar. Kirkleatham lies to the south-east of the site, whilst the residential districts of Eston, South Bank, Normanby, Teesville and Grangetown to the south comprise the most built-up part of the borough.

L4.21 These collective urban settlements are bounded by industrial sites and the A66 to the north, and the quieter setting of the Eston Hills to the south. The urban grain of these settlements is generally dense, with the housing comprising mostly of semi-detached properties from the 1950s / 1960s, which expanded rapidly with the growth of iron and steel industries. Some older Victorian terraces and newer developments are interspersed, creating some distinction and variety within the housing stock, but with a similar scale and height. Some demolition of Victorian terraces has occurred, in particular in the areas of South Bank and Grangetown, and their plots are now defined by amenity grass. Regeneration and new development are underway to improve housing, forming part of the Redcar and Cleveland planned regeneration strategy, and there is also new commercial and retail provision, in particular along the A1085 Trunk Road. Developments tend to follow road infrastructure, creating open green space and 'green corridors' in between, comprising of amenity space, playing fields or private land. The industrial and manufacturing site of Lazenby segregates Teesville and Grangetown from Dormanstown and Redcar, where towers, chimneys and built infrastructure dominate the immediate skyline and vistas from these districts.

L4.22 To the south of the Teesworks area is the prominent sandstone escarpment of the Eston Hills, designated by Natural England as 'Lowland heath'. The agricultural landscape becomes woodland as the topography rises. At its highest point the rocky sandstone outcrop of 'Eston Nab' is a local landmark and the highest vantage point in the area, with a series of long-range views of Middlesbrough, Redcar and the coastline. This site has historic links, and a monument in the form of a sandstone pillar, along with a cluster of radio masts is visible from the low-lying settlement areas to the north. Vegetation includes natural woodland, and heathland, including Flatts Lane Woodland Country Park, managed as a Local Nature Reserve, Lazenby Bank Nature Reserve, and Dave's Wood, situated within this natural landscape. Within the immediate foreground, the urban settlement of Eston and the A174 road are visible. Also, the strongly gridded development pattern of Lazenby is apparent, with dominant buildings being the power station and chimney stack, with plumes of steam emerging into the skyline. Nearby Errington Woods, to the south of New Marske, is a publicly accessible popular walking destination with

Local Nature Reserve status, offering a range of long-range views to the north and east from the car park and footpaths.

L4.23 The road infrastructure is broadly arranged in a grid pattern of north-south and east-west alignments. The three primary roads running east-west are the A66 dual carriageway, the A174 dual carriageway, and the A1085 Trunk Road which sits between the two. These connect Redcar with Middlesbrough and are used by goods vehicles, through traffic, and local residents. Green infrastructure lines the perimeter of much of the primary roads, combining elements of native hedgerows and linear blocks of tree planting, including some areas of formal street trees where the roads pass through residential housing. This green infrastructure is often enhanced by landscape bunds where roads are elevated, which softens the edges of the roads and creates a green buffer of planting against residential areas, limiting views of the road and the industrial site to the north. Occasional glimpses of the Teesworks area can be seen from the primary roads as they bridge over the secondary roads below.

L4.24 The topography rises sharply beyond the town of Eston to the south. The elevated ridge of the Eston Hills, sits approximately 200m above sea level, with Eston Nab forming the highest point, at 242, approximately 200m above sea level, continues eastwards as far as Errington Woods and New Marske, forming the Eston Hills, and creates the highest vantage point in the area, affording views of the borough to the north and the coastline to the east.

L4.25 At the local level, this assessment has used Regional and National Policy to inform additional desk and field-based study of the local context in greater detail. From this, several key landscape typologies have been identified, and are expressed through the following Landscape Character Zones (LCZs):

1 LCZ 1 – Industrial – Including heavy plant and manufacturing
2 LCZ 2 – Urban – Including commercial, retail and housing
3 LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary
4 LCZ 4 – Coast and peninsula
5 LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh
6 LCZ 6 – Eston Hills
7 LCZ 7 – Saltholme wetlands
8 LCZ 8 – Rural
9 LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space

L4.26 The form, quality, value, and sensitivity of the LCZs are described below in Table L4.1 below.

L4.27 The location of the LCZs is shown in **Appendix L1**.

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

L4.28 The sensitive landscape receptors listed below have the potential to be affected by effects arising from the proposed development. The identification of sensitive landscape receptors has taken into account the considerations, studies and assessments set out above. This has allowed due consideration of the important features and characteristics that contribute to landscape quality and enabled the identification of their sensitivity.

Table L4.1 Form, quality, value, and sensitivity of LCZs

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Combination of working and disused heavy industry, containing large infrastructure and the built development, characterised by including large scale warehouse structures, chimneys, towers, tanks and imposing plant equipment. Tall vertical structures within the landscape also include electricity pylons, and this scale of the structure is further present in the port dock cranes at several locations along the length of the River estuary. Noise and smells from industrial equipment add to the perception of urbanisation and manmade influences on the character of the landscape area. Vegetation is sparse, comprising of natural colonisation of low growing plants and scrub. There is very little amenity value or quality to the physical characteristics. There are no landscape designations within this LCZ. There is historical value in some of the features, which are of a manmade quality. The characteristics of this LCZ can absorb change without fundamentally altering the character of the landscape and the susceptibility is considered to be Low. As such the landscape quality is also considered to be Low. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Low.	Low
LCZ 2 - Urban	This LCZ is comprised of urban settlements, primarily residential housing, with also retail, and commercial along primary roads. Comprises a mix of residential styles and types, primarily privately owned or Local Authority owned 2-storey housing. The buildings are of moderate to low quality, and demonstrate a degree of change. This LCZ includes common features found in many towns, of a moderate to low quality. This landscape demonstrates a high degree of change. There are no national, regional or local landscape designations which apply to this LCZ. The characteristics of this LCZ can absorb change without fundamentally altering the character of the landscape and the susceptibility is considered to be Low. As such the landscape quality is also considered to be Low. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Low.	Low
LCZ 3 - Intertidal Estuary	This LCZ includes Seal Sands intertidal mudflats, part of Teesmouth National Nature Reserve (NNR), a nature reserve designated as having national importance. Valued primarily for wildlife and habitats for birds and seals. The edge condition of this LCZ contains both hard dockside and mudflats, creating inconsistencies within the appearance and amenity value.	Medium

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	Conservation interests include some historic dockside features, however, these are not publically accessible. High value as a conservation area, but a low quality of landscape due to the hard infrastructure of industrial use. Based on the descriptions above this area is considered to have a Medium value. This area has a medium capacity to accommodate change without changing the perception of the character of the landscape, therefore the susceptibility is considered to be Medium. Overall the sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium.	
LCZ 4 - Coast and peninsula	This area includes the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, and also South Gare and Coatham Sands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which are statutory designations at an International level. This area is also identified at a Regional level as having a 'sensitive' landscape character within the Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework Landscape Character SPD 2010. This coastline is valued for important habitat and rare species conservation, and also for its scenic qualities. This LCZ has historic value, with distinct cultural characteristics of the Fisherman's huts and harbour. Manmade structures within this LCZ include the concrete breakwater peninsula, and the proximity of the disused steelworks, which detract from perceptions of rural and remoteness. Combined perceptual qualities of remoteness, tranquillity and also human activity. Panoramic views range from open seascape and dunes to the industrial development of the estuary, where the skyline is of various heights and scales of infrastructure. The characteristics of this LCZ have some capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the present character of the landscape and the susceptibility is considered to be Medium. As such the landscape quality is considered to be good resulting in a Medium value. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Medium.	Medium
LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh	Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and, Proposed Ramsar as identified by Natural England. This area is identified at a Regional level as having a 'sensitive' landscape character within the Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework Landscape Character SPD 2010. This site has a secluded feel and wetland character, and this is represented in the quality of visual amenity. It is valued for habitat and wildlife, and on upper embankments and ridges, grassland flora and scrub. Visual amenity in the lower-lying landscape is high, with a distinct character of ponds and reedbeds.	Medium-High

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	From the open aspect of the upper ridges, the historic, imposing structures of the disused Steelworks are close and are a prominent feature. The proposed development site lies partially within this LCZ on former industrial land adjacent to Coatham Marsh. Based on the descriptions above this LCZ has a value of High. The characteristics of this LCZ has some capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the present character of the landscape and the susceptibility is considered to be Medium. Taking all of this into account, the overall sensitivity is considered to be Medium.	
LCZ 6 – Eston Hills	This area includes Flatts Lane Woodland Country Park Local Nature Reserve (LNR), Eston Moor (LNR) and Errington Wood (LNR), which are statutory designations at a Local Authority level. This area is also identified at a Regional level as having a 'sensitive' landscape character within the Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework Landscape Character SPD 2010. This area is valued for the moorland and woodland character and wildlife, along with visual amenity and recreational use. It is a place with wildlife and geological features that are of special interest locally. This area has a geological value of the sandstone escarpments and historic value as an Iron Age hill fort located at Eston Nab. The characteristics of this LCZ have very little capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the present character of the landscape and the susceptibility is considered to be High. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be High.	High
LCZ 7 – Saltholme wetlands	Wetland habitat of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Ramsar and SPA with conservation interests. Valued for wildlife and recreation purposes such as walking for local residents or birdwatching. Proximity is the manmade North Tees Works, Oil refinery and associated development, which detract from the scenic qualities of the wetland. The value of this LCZ is considered to be High. Given the existing industrial context of this LCZ, the susceptibility to change is considered Low-Medium. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to me Medium.	Medium
LCZ 8 - Rural	This area is identified at a Regional level as having a 'restoration' landscape character within the Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework Landscape Character SPD 2010. Interspersed farmland within a flat landscape setting. Includes Dormanstown Foxrush Farm Community Woodland Maintained hedgerows and copses of trees. The value of this LCZ is considered to be Medium-High.	Medium

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	Given the existing industrial and urban context of this LCZ, the susceptibility to change is considered Medium. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to me Medium.	
LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space	Includes Grangetown recreation area, Smith's Dock Park and open green spaces. Comprises flat areas of grass, often bounded by mature trees, grass bunds and shrubby vegetation, and featuring small woodlands – all common features found in many green spaces within towns. Principally connecting residential developments of Southbank, Grangetown and Normanby. Also along Spencer Beck bordering the Middlesbrough district boundary. This LCZ is primarily a high-use landscape and has defined edges of residential development. Landscape quality varies, with some open green space appearing underused or unkempt, with very little vegetation or tree cover. There are no national, regional or local landscape designations which apply to this LCZ. The landscape quality is considered to be good, however, some areas are of poorer quality, resulting in a Low-Medium value. The characteristics of this LCZ have some capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the present character of the landscape, and the susceptibility is considered to be Low-Medium. Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Low-Medium.	Low-Medium

Visual Impact

L4.29 This section considers the broad and local visual context of the proposed site.

Broad Visual Context

L4.30 The broad context within which the proposals would take place has been described in the landscape character assessment which outlined the nature and context of the proposed development site and the structure and relationships between varying landscape features.

L4.31 The broad context has been identified through desk-based interrogation of the visual envelope; the key attribute of which are described below.

L4.32 The site is located within an area dominated by port side and industrial activity on the Tees estuary, resulting in few visual receptors and either contained or intermittent views over a generally flat landscape throughout.

L4.33 The wide nature of the Tees estuary allows for long but contained views to the north and south.

Local Visual Context

L4.34 This section identifies principal receptor location neighbouring the proposed development site from where the views are potentially attained within 2km of the proposed development. They also identify any prominent viewpoint locations and features which, from varying distances, would contain the proposed development in the overall outlook.

L4.35 A detailed overview of the existing visual context for identified receptors is provided in Table L4.2. The specific context for each viewpoint identified during the preliminary appraisal is explained in detail, with particular reference made to groupings of visual receptors afforded a similar outlook, and for receptors which are considered particularly sensitive to alterations in the view.

Sensitive Visual Receptors

L4.36 The sensitive visual receptors listed below have the potential to be affected by effects arising from the proposed development. The identification of sensitive visual receptors have taken into account the considerations, studies and assessments set out above, in addition to site visits. This has allowed due consideration of the important features and characteristics that contribute to visual quality and enabled the identification of their sensitivity.

Table L4.2 Sensitive Visual Receptors

No.	View location	Direction of View	Reasons
Vp1	Eston Nab Hill	N-W	Representative of views from the public footpath and the highest vantage point in the area of the site
Vp4	Uvedale Road, Steele Crescent Junction, South Bank	N-E	Representative of views from residential housing, recreation space and footpaths
Vp6	Seal Sands	S-E	Representative views from Seal Sands to Steel Works site
Vp7	South Gare peninsula	S	Representative of views from South Gare & Coatham Sands SSSI and fishing huts
Vp9	Footway from Trunk Road	N	Representative views from footway of trunk road to development sites
Vp10	Coastal Path	W	Representative view from footpath to Steelworks site
Vp11	Coastal Path	W	Representative view from footpath to Steelworks site
Vp12	Kirkleatham Roundabout	N-W	Representative views from footway if roundabout east of Wilton Works.
Vp13	Errington Woods, New Marske,	N-W	Representative of views from public footpath, woodland, and New Marske residential area

L4.37 A full description of Viewpoint locations is included in **Appendix L6**. The Viewpoint locations described in Appendix L6 include the description of susceptibility, value and sensitivity. These criteria are then applied in the visual impact assessment. **Appendix L2** illustrates the location of the Viewpoints. **Appendix L4** is the full set of Verified Views which has informed the visual impact assessment. To enable an accurate assessment of cumulative visual effects the Verified Views model includes all development parameters for the Lackenby, Dorman Point, Foundry, Steel House and Long Acres planning applications. The sensitive visual receptors relevant to this EIA are listed above. However, to aid understanding of the wider visual context and cumulative effects, the appendices to this chapter include the full suite of 15 viewpoints and related Verified

Views. It should be noted that only those sensitive visual receptors where the proposed development can be observed are included within the visual impact assessment.

L4.38 The following receptors were included in the initial assessment but were scoped out following site visits and discussions with RCBC. For the reasons outlined below these receptors have been discounted.

Table L4.3 Visual Receptors Scoped Out

Receptor	Description
Dormanstown Foxrush Farm Community Woodland	Viewpoint 13 provides an appropriate view from the Public Right of Way (PRoW) in this area.
Grangetown Recreation area	Proposed development not visible due to vegetation cover and also cover formed by urban development in the middle ground.
Smith's Dock Park Open Green Space	Proposed development not visible due to vegetation cover; cover formed by urban development in the middle ground and the rising topography of the A1085 Trunk Road to the north.
Black Path PRoW	Visibility variable along the route. The path is bounded on the north by 2m high palisade security fencing, and on the south by varied security treatments of walls, concrete and metal fencing. Views of the site along the PRoW are perpendicular to the line of travel and transitory in nature. The South Bank train station footbridge gives a better overall impression of the likely visual impact of the proposed development site. For details refer to Representative Viewpoint 4.

Future Baseline

L4.39 The Teesworks Master Plan identifies 1,188ha of potential development land across five broad zones. The proposed development will form part of the South Industrial Zone which totals some 350ha. There will be a significant level of development across the Teesworks area over the next 10-15 years and the local landscape context will change accordingly, both through the new development as well as through the removal of redundant industrial structures which are currently very prominent in LCZ1 and the viewpoints of the site of the proposed development.

L5.0 Potential Effects

Embedded Mitigation

L5.1 EIA is an iterative process which informs the development of the project design. Where the outputs of the preliminary assessment identify likely significant effects changes to the design can be made or mitigation measures can be embedded in the proposal to reduce these effects. Appropriate mitigation measures have been explored to eliminate, minimise or manage identified potential significant landscape and visual effects. The embedded mitigation measures relevant to LVIA are the fixing of development parameters via the Outline Planning Application. The LVIA also assumes the implementation of construction best practice including the installation of suitable site hoarding, careful siting and management of materials stockpiles and the sensitive siting of site welfare and other temporary structures as set out in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Full details of the mitigation measures embedded in the scheme are provided in Section B8.0 of Chapter B.

Development Parameters Assessed

L5.2 A full description of the proposed development is contained in Chapter B. However the main elements of the proposed development which are likely to affect the surrounding landscape and views are as follows:

1 The construction of new developments of Use Class B2 (General Industry), Class B8 (Storage and Distribution), and Class E (Office – maximum 10% of overall floor space) to support future manufacturing within the Teesworks area;

2 The parameter plans associated with the outline application provide sufficient detail (layout, land-use, massing, and height) to allow the proposed development to be assessed as one distinct development; and

3 The assessment of the construction phase for the proposed development has been based on likely assumptions of the nature and size of development from the parameters plans, as well as timescales for construction. The visual impact assessment is based on a 'massing plan' of the masterplan, as set out on the accompanying Site Arrangement plan. Assessing the visual impact of the full parameters plan would not give a very accurate impression of the likely significant visual impacts of the proposed development. The Arrangement Plans, although illustrative at this stage and not fixed via the outline planning application, allows for a more accurate assessment of a likely development scenario. As reserved matters applications are progressed it may be necessary to review the potential visual impact of the proposed development and prepare supplementary assessments based upon the fixed design for these future reserved matters applications.

L5.3 The following assumptions on the proposed development have been applied to the assessment:

1 The proposed development will comprise up to 185,806sqm B2, B8, and E floorspace;

2 The parameters for the proposed development are set at a maximum development height of 43.5m AOD and a maximum building height of 36m AOD. The finished floor level of the proposed development will be set at a minimum of 5.2m AOD.

3 Site works are expected to commence in 2022 with the first-floor space delivered in 2023. The assessment of construction effects assumes 10 years to build out the full proposed development.

Major Hazards and Accidents

L5.4 The risk of major hazards and accidents is not relevant to the assessment of significant landscape and visual effects.

Phasing

L5.5 The LVIA does not take into account the phasing of development. The indicative arrangement plan is used to inform both the landscape and visual impact assessments as the likely worst case scenario i.e. the likely maximum extent of development. The LVIA does not assess phases of construction, or interim phases of operation. The likely landscape and visual effects of phased construction and operation will be of a lesser scale and significance than those effects assessed and reported in this LVIA.

During Construction

L5.6 The effects of the construction phase have been assessed based on typical construction methodologies for large commercial buildings and the information presented in the Framework CEMP.

L5.7 The construction effects on the surrounding landscape and views will be temporary and are limited to effects such as the presence of large machinery, cranes, materials storage (both construction material and temporary mounds for site remediation) and site accommodation.

L5.8 The most significant visual effects associated with the construction process will be the presence of cranes, construction compounds and materials storage. The presence of such temporary structures is inevitable in connection with construction of the type and scale envisaged. This temporary situation is common as a consequence of building activity and there is no practical way of avoiding it, nor is it an unusual view, and is commonly experienced at many similar sites in the region.

L5.9 Construction effects on Viewpoints 1, 4, 10, and 11 are considered to be **Moderate Adverse** and **Significant,** whereas effects on all other Viewpoints are considered to be Negligible (Not Significant).

L5.10 The above aspects of the construction phase will have a Negligible effect on all LCZs due to the nature of the surrounding development, which is not considered to be significant.

L5.11 Therefore, construction of the proposed development will result in effects ranging from Negligible (Not Significant) to a temporary, **Moderate Adverse (Significant)** effect upon views and the landscapes surrounding the site.

Table K5.1 Summary of Potential Landscape and Visual Effects during construction

Receptor	Magnitude of Change	Attribute of Change	Nature of Effect	Recommendation and Mitigation
All LCZs	Negligible		Direct and short-term	None
VP 1,4,10 and 11	Moderate	Adverse	Direct and short-term	Installation of suitable site hoarding Minimising height and volume of material storage

VP 6,7,9,12 and 13	Negligible		Direct and short-term	Installation of suitable site hoarding Minimising height and volume of material storage

During Operation

Landscape Assessment

LCZ1: Industrial

L5.12 There would be some intervisibility between this LCZ and the site, limited in part due to intervening built form and the scale of the LCZ. The scale, pattern, and nature of the proposed development would be similar to that of other buildings and uses throughout the existing Industrial areas. There is no proposal to remove any detractors from the existing landscape. The proposed development site itself, which sits partially within this LCZ contains no features of value or character which would be affected by the proposed design.

L5.13 The previous used industrial land has the potential to be improved through the proposed development, restoring landscape qualities and features. The historic value and associations of the site as an area of industrial and manufacturing use may also be improved through the nature of the proposed development, therefore the proposed development is likely to have some benefits of renewal of this LCZ.

L5.14 The proposed development would not result in a large shift away from baseline conditions, and would not significantly affect the character of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.15 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Beneficial level of effect, which is not considered to be Significant.

L5.16 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the limited intervisibility between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.2 LCZ1 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Low	Minor	Minor beneficial	Direct, Permanent

LCZ2: Urban

L5.17 There would be some intervisibility between this LCZ, in particular for residential receptors close to the proposed development site, though intervening built form and vegetation reduces the magnitude and significance of the effect within the overall LCZ. Looking at the LCZ as a whole, it is likely that construction would result in a minor shift away from baseline conditions, and would only partially affect the character of the LCZ.

L5.18 The proposed development may detract slightly from visual character and quality of the LCZ, however, it will have limited influence on the sense of place or features within the LCZ of value.

L5.19 Residential receptors within proximity to the proposed development would be likely to experience indirect, Minor Adverse effects during construction, and in the operational stage.

L5.20 Due to the scale size and permanence of the proposed development, this would result in a minor change in the visual character of the landscape away from baseline conditions. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.21 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

L5.22 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the limited intervisibility between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.3 LCZ2 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 2 - Urban	Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ3: Intertidal Estuary

L5.23 This LCZ has a Medium sensitivity to change as it has National Nature Reserve status, however, has a variable immediate context of wildlife areas and heavy industry, which reduces the value and quality of the LCZ. There would be limited intervisibility between this LCZ, and distance from the estuary, as well as intervening built form from existing industrial infrastructure and existing vegetation, reduces the magnitude and significance of the effect within the overall LCZ.

L5.24 The character of the receiving landscape would remain the same in the operational stage due to the development of similar nature, size and scale within proximity to this LCZ. The proposed development will not have any direct impacts or effects on the wildlife areas and mudflats within this LCZ, however some indirect temporary effects during the construction stage.

L5.25 Due to its proximity from the site, the proposed development is unlikely to alter the baseline character of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.26 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

L5.27 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the limited intervisibility between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.4 LCZ3 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ4: Coast and Peninsula

L5.28 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium, as this area is designated as having Special Protection Area (SPA) status, however, has industrial context and varied views for footpath users, including of the wider industrialised landscape, which forms the character of this LCZ. The proposed development is located on the edge of this LCZ

L5.29 The proposed development will not detract from the character or sense of place of the LCZ. Footpath user receptors are from a long distance away and are unlikely to experience any adverse effects during construction, or in the operational stage.

L5.30 The scale and size of the proposed development are similar to existing build form and infrastructure and have no characteristic that detracts from the value associated with the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.31 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

L5.32 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the limited intervisibility between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.5 LCZ4 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 4 – Coast and Peninsula	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ5: Coatham Marsh

L5.33 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium-High, as this area is designated as being a wetland with Local Nature Reserve (LNR), and Ramsar status, however, has some industrial context and which is perceived by footpath receptors from some of the views within this LCZ. A portion of the proposed development is located within this LCZ, but outside of the protected area of Coatham Marsh.

L5.34 The proposed development will not significantly detract from the character or sense of place of the LCZ. Footpath user receptors are from a long distance away and are unlikely to experience any significant adverse effects during construction, or in the operational stage.

L5.35 The scale and size of the proposed development are similar to existing built form and infrastructure and have no characteristic that detracts from the value associated with the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.36 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

L5.37 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the relationship between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.6 LCZ5 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect

LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh	Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ6: Eston Hills

L5.38 The sensitivity of this LCZ is High, as this area is designated as Woodland Country Park Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and is perceived by footpath receptors from locals and visitors at points within this LCZ. There is moderately-high intervisibility between this LCZ and the proposed development.

L5.39 The proposed development will be distinctive within the distant view, but will not constitute a significant new component due to other buildings within the context of the proposed development which have similar size and scale. The proposed development will not detract from the overall character or sense of place of this LCZ, as it is situated within an existing area of industrial and manufacturing nature.

L5.40 The scale and size of the proposed development are visibly large, however, is similar to existing build form and infrastructure, and has no characteristic features that detract significantly from the value associated with the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Moderate.

L5.41 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

L5.42 Embedded mitigation measures are likely to have a positive influence on the operational effects but are unlikely to reduce the significance of the effects due to the limited intervisibility between the LCZ and the site. Only a small portion of the LCZ is likely to experience indirect effects, so would therefore be very localised.

Table L5.7 LCZ6 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 6 – Eston Hills	High	Moderate	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ7: Saltholme Wetlands

L5.43 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium, as this area is designated as a PSA and Ramsar, and has wildlife value, and footpath user receptors, however, is also within the immediate context of industrial areas. There is very little visibility between this LCZ and the proposed development site due to intervening industrial development to the north of the estuary.

L5.44 There will be no distinctive components or visual features that will detract from the perceptual and physical qualities of this LCZ.

L5.45 The scale and size of the proposed development are comparable to built forms within the vicinity of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.46 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.8 LCZ7 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect

LCZ 7 – Saltholme wetlands	Medium-High	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ8: Rural

L5.47 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium, as this area combines a high-value landscape with a medium susceptibility to change. This LCZ comprises open agricultural fields which are mostly accessed by road users, with interspersed private farmland, and some local access footpaths. There is very little visibility between this LCZ and the proposed development Site due to intervening industrial and commercial development, as well as hedgerow and tree planting throughout this LCZ.

L5.48 There will be no distinctive components or visual features within the proposed development that will detract from the perceptual and physical qualities of this LCZ, due to the nature and context of the site, and also the distance from this LCZ.

L5.49 The scale and size of the proposed development are comparable to built forms within the vicinity of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.50 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.9 LCZ8 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 8 – Rural	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ9: Urban Green Space

L5.51 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Low-Medium, as these recreation grounds and playing fields are undesignated landscapes, however, have value to residential receptors. The LCZ covers a range of locations, scattered throughout the Borough, therefore the impact of the proposed development is varied. Urban Green Spaces within closer proximity to the proposed development site will experience perceived character changes to the LCZ more significantly than those further away. Many of the urban green spaces have only partial views of the proposed development due to intervening urban features and built forms comprising of housing, commercial and retail and also industrial development, along with tree planting.

L5.52 The scale and size of the proposed development are comparable to built forms within the vicinity of the LCZ. There will be some distinctive visual features within the proposed development that will be visible from this LCZ, however, given the contextual nature of development between the proposed development and the LCZ, the magnitude is reduced.

L5.53 Based on the descriptions above the magnitude of change is considered to be Moderate.

L5.54 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table K5.10 LCZ9 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space	Low-Medium	Moderate	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

Visual Assessment

Representative Viewpoint 1

L5.55 Figure VP1-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.56 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view looks down onto the proposed development site, which would be visible due to the elevated height and position of this viewpoint relative to the proposed development.

L5.57 The proposed development will be somewhat distinguishable from the baseline condition of the immediate development area, which is of brownfield site, however the proposed development would not be uncharacteristic when set within the receiving visual context of the other industrial and manufacturing developments within the vicinity. The existing blast furnace and associated steel making infrastructure to the west of the site boundary is to be retained. These are very large features which dominate views of the Teesworks area. The articulation of the indicative arrangement plan responds to the retained steel making infrastructure and the orientation of the indicative plots is sympathetic to the site constraints, particularly the docks to the west and the blast furnace to the north. The two largest plots on the indicative arrangement plan are consistent in form and scale to the exiting Teesworks area conditions and will be foregrounded by the retained blast furnace to the west.

L5.58 The proposed development will form a minor component in the overall visible landscape and may not have a readily apparent influence on the receptor or negative influence on the perceived quality of the view due to the wider context, and views being of a varied and panoramic nature, rather than focussed directly on the proposed development site.

L5.59 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.60 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Moderate Adverse** level of effect, which is considered to be **Significant.**

Table L5.11 Vp1 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP1	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 4

L5.61 Figure VP4-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.62 The proposed development would be located in the mid distance view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site, from the footbridge of South Bank train station. A number of Development Plots within the proposed development site are visible from view.

L5.63 The height and scale of the proposed development creates a fairly consistent horizontal plain of new built development, sitting behind existing taller infrastructure of varying heights and forms.

L5.64 The existing infrastructure of the gas cylinder, Dorman Long Tower and the Steelworks is situated in the intermediate view, the proposed development does not dominate or visually alter these elements or the overall skyline. The proposed development would form a moderately new component and visible feature in the landscape and visual context, and will be apparent to the

receptor. It is not largely distinguishable from existing baseline characteristics and in the wider context of the view, features within it are of similar nature.

L5.65 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor toModerate.

L5.66 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.12 Vp4 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP4	Rail overbridge users/Footpath users Low	Minor - Moderate	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 6

L5.67 Figure VP6-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.68 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view looks across the estuary to the proposed development site, which would be visible due to the uninterrupted views in this LCZ and the scale of the proposed development.

L5.69 The proposed development will be somewhat distinguishable from the baseline condition of the immediate development area, which is of brownfield site, however the proposed development would not be uncharacteristic when set within the receiving visual context of the other industrial and manufacturing developments within the vicinity. The proposed development will be largely screened by intervening development to the west and will not be readily discernible in long range views.

L5.70 The proposed development will form a minor component in the overall visible landscape and may not have a readily apparent influence on the receptor or negative influence on the perceived quality of the view due to the wider context, and views being of a varied and panoramic nature, rather than focussed directly on the proposed development site.

L5.71 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligble.

L5.72 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligble level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.13 Vp6 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP6	Footpath Users High	Negligible	Negligble	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 7

L5.73 Figure VP7-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.74 The proposed development would be located in the middle-distance view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view only the northern portion of the proposed development will be visible and this will be partially screened by intervening industrial development. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.75 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users is Medium. The scale and massing of the proposed development is visually less dominant in the view than other buildings in the visual context. The skyline is not altered by the height and form of the proposed development, but there will be an increase in the perception of building mass to the east of the retained blast furnace.

L5.76 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.77 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.14 Vp7 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP7	Footpath Users Medium	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 9

L5.78 Figure VP9-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.79 The proposed development would be located in the middle distance view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the southern portion of the proposed development will be partially visible, though largely partially screened by intervening industrial development. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.80 The receptor sensitivity of footway and highway users is Low. The scale and massing of the proposed development is visually less dominant in the view than other buildings in the visual context. The skyline is not altered by the height and form of the proposed development, and there is no perceptible change to the baseline characteristics of the view due to the proposed development.

L5.81 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.82 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.15 Vp9 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect

VP9	Footpath and Road Users Low	Negligible	Negligible	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 10

L5.83 Figure VP10-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.84 The proposed development would be located in the foreground of the view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the eastern portion of the proposed development will be visible, though partially screened by the sand dunes and coastal topography. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.85 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users is High. The scale and massing of the proposed development is visually less dominant in the view than other buildings in the visual context. The skyline is not significantly altered by the height and form of the proposed development, but there will be an increase in the perception of building mass in the foreground of the retained blast furnace.

L5.86 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be minor.

L5.87 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Moderate Adverse** level of effect, which is considered to be **Significant**.

Table L5.16 Vp10 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP10	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 11

L5.88 Figure VP11-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.89 The proposed development would be located in the middle-distance view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the eastern portion of the proposed development will be partially visible, though largely screened by sand dunes and intervening industrial development. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.90 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users is High. The scale and massing of the proposed development is visually less dominant in the view than other buildings in the visual context. The skyline is not altered by the height and form of the proposed development, but there will be an increase in the perception of building mass in the foreground of the retained blast furnace.

L5.91 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be minor.

L5.92 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Moderate Adverse** level of effect, which is considered to be **Significant**.

Table L5.17 Vp11 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP12	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 12

L5.93 Figure VP12-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.94 The proposed development would be located in the middle-distance view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the southern portion of the proposed development will be partially visible, though nearly totally screened by intervening industrial development. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.95 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users is Medium. The scale and massing of the proposed development is visually less dominant in the view than other buildings in the visual context. The skyline is not altered by the height and form of the proposed development, and there is no perceptible change to the baseline characteristics of the view due to the proposed development.

L5.96 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Negligible.

L5.97 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Negligible level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.18 Vp12 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP13	Footpath Users Low	Negligible	Negligible	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 13

L5.98 Figure Vp13-B in Appendix 4 illustrated the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.99 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view is looking slightly down onto the proposed development. The proposed development has minor visibility due to the height of this viewpoint relative to the proposed development.

L5.100 Some development plots are perceived as one plot of proposed development from this AVR and long range view, which increases the perceived magnitude of effect. In reality this could be mitigated by careful selection of materials to help each Development Plot read as a separate entity to help break up the visual mass of the development.

L5.101 The proposed development would not form a recognised feature or component in the landscape, and is generally indistinguishable from the baseline condition. This is due to the horizontal nature of the proposed development, which sits amongst existing industrial infrastructure of a range of sizes and forms of built development. The variety and concentration of development within this view lowers the magnitude of effect.

L5.102 The proposed development will be indistinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics when set within the receiving visual context of the other industrial and manufacturing developments in the vicinity. The general form and massing is comparable to the existing Industrial development within the context of the view. The skyline has minor alterations from the proposed development, but does not alter it significantly by way of detracting from wider views or landmarks, or present itself as a negative detractor in the skyline from other valued features.

L5.103 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be Minor.

L5.104 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is considered to be Not Significant.

Table L5.19 Vp13 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP14	Footpath Users Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

L5.105 Table L5.20 below provides a summary of the potential visual effects detailed above during the operational stage of the proposed development.

Table L5.20 Summary of Potential Visual Effects during operation

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP1	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse - Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP4	Rail overbridge users/Footpath users Low	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP6	Footpath Users High	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP7	Footpath Users Medium	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP9	Footpath and Road Users Low	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP10	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP11	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse Significant	Direct, Permanent
Vp12	Footpath Users Low	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
Vp13	Footpath Users Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

L6.0 Mitigation and Monitoring

L6.1 A number of mitigation measures have been proposed to minimise or manage identified potential significant landscape and visual effects. Until more details are known on the design of the scheme, these proposals are likely to have a positive influence on the effects but are unlikely to reduce the overall significance.

During Construction

L6.2 The following mitigation measures are proposed during the construction phase of the development and will form part of the Framework CEMP (as noted above):

1 Implementation of construction best practice techniques;

2 Installation of suitable site hoarding, for example a 2.4, timber site hoarding with a plastic wrap incorporating appropriate graphics;

3 Careful siting and management of materials stockpiles to reduce prominence on site by limiting the height and volume of material stored on site; and

4 Sensitive siting of site welfare and other temporary structures within the site compound.

During Operation

L6.3 The following mitigation measures are proposed during the operational phase of the development:

1 Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing. Buildings to be stepped down to site boundaries to reduce the perception of massing in local and mid-range views and site layouts to present legible blocks of development with appropriate breaks to reduce visual impact; and

2 Building colour and cladding to be appropriate to surrounding colour palette, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials. Use of colour gradation in the largest buildings to reduce the perception of height and massing in mid and long-range views. Buildings on individual plots to have a sensitive and complementary palette of materials and cladding to enable the development to be read as separate blocks in mid to long-range views.

L7.0 Residual Effects

L7.1 Residual effects for the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development are identified below.

During Construction

L7.2 Construction of the proposed development will result in effects ranging from Negligible to a temporary, **Moderate Adverse** (Significant) effect upon views and the landscapes surrounding the site.

During Operation

L7.3 A summary of operational effects upon LCZs and Viewpoints is presented in Table L7.1 below.

Table L7.1 Summary of Operational Landscape and Visual Effects

LCZ/Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Low	Minor	Minor Beneficial – Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
LCZ 2 - Urban	Low	Minor	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	Medium	Negligible	Negligible - Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 4 – Coast and Peninsula	Medium	Negligible	Negligible – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh	Medium-High	Negligible	Negligible - Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 6 – Eston Hills	Medium-High	Moderate	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 7 – Saltholme wetlands	Medium-High	Negligible	Negligible – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 8 – Rural	Medium	Negligible	Negligible – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space	Low-Medium	Moderate	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Indirect, Permanent
VP1	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse - Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP4	Rail overbridge users/Footpath users Low	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP6	Footpath Users High	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP7	Footpath Users Medium	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP9	Footpath and Road Users Low	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP10	Footpath Users	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Direct, Permanent

LCZ/Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
	High		Significant	
VP11	Footpath Users High	Minor	Moderate Adverse Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP12	Footpath Users Low	Negligible	Negligible Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP13	Footpath Users Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

L8.0 Summary & Conclusions

L8.1 TableL8.1 below presents a summary of the anticipated land and visual effects of the proposed development. There will be Moderate Adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 1, 4, 10 and 11 during construction. There will be Moderate Adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 1, 6, 10 and 11 during operation. All other effects are anticipated to be Minor or Negligible (and Not Significant). There are not expected to be any significant effects on landscape character of sensitive visual receptors during the construction or operational phases of the proposed development.

Table L8.1 Summary of Effects

Receptor	Impact	Potential Effects (taking account of embedded mitigation)	Additional Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effects
During Construction				
All LCZ	Impact of construction activities on Landscape Character	Negligible – Not Significant	None	Negligible - Not Significant
VP 1,4,10 and 11	Impact of Construction upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	**Moderate Adverse - Significant**	Installation of site hoarding Minimising height and volume of material storage	**Moderate Adverse - Significant**
VP 6,7,9,11 and 13	Impact of Construction upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Negligible - Not Significant	Installation of site hoarding Minimising height and volume of material storage	Negligible - Not Significant
During Operation				
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Minor beneficial – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Minor beneficial – Not Significant
LCZ 2 - Urban	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help	Minor Adverse – Not Significant

Receptor	Impact	Potential Effects (taking account of embedded mitigation)	Additional Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effects
			break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Negligible - Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible - Not Significant
LCZ 4 – Coast and Peninsula	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Negligible – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible – Not Significant
LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Negligible - Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible - Not Significant
LCZ 6 – Eston Hills	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Minor Adverse – Not Significant

Receptor	Impact	Potential Effects (taking account of embedded mitigation)	Additional Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effects
LCZ 7 – Salthouse wetlands	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Negligible – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible – Not Significant
LCZ 8 – Rural	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Negligible – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible – Not Significant
LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space	Impact of completed development upon Landscape Character	Minor Adverse – Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Minor Adverse – Not Significant
VP1	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	**Moderate Adverse - Significant**	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	**Moderate Adverse - Significant**
VP4	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing	Minor Adverse Not Significant

Receptor	Impact	Potential Effects (taking account of embedded mitigation)	Additional Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effects
			Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	
VP6	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**
VP7	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Negligible Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible Not Significant
VP9	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Negligible Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible Not Significant
VP10	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**

Receptor	Impact	Potential Effects (taking account of embedded mitigation)	Additional Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effects
VP11	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	**Moderate Adverse** **Significant**
VP12	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Negligible Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Negligible Not Significant
VP13	Impact of completed development upon Sensitive Visual Receptor	Minor Adverse Not Significant	Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	Minor Adverse Not Significant

L9.0 Abbreviations & Definitions

1 AVR – Accurate Visual Representations
2 GLVIA – Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
3 LCZ – Landscape Character Zone
4 LNR – Local Nature Reserve
5 LVIA – Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
6 NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework
7 PRoW – Public Right of Way
8 RCBC – Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
9 SSSI – Site of Special Scientific Interest
10 STDC – South Tees Development Corporation
11 ZTV – Zone of Theoretical Visibility

L10.0 References

1 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013)

2 An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment published by Natural England (2014); and

3 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19, Sep' 2019.