Technical Appendix 5.1: Methodology

Technical Appendix 5.1: Methodology

5.1.1 Scope of Assessment

5.1.1.1 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers effects on:

- Landscape fabric, caused by changes to the physical form of the landscape and its elements;
- Landscape character, caused by changes in the pattern of key characteristic features and elements of the landscape as a result of the Proposed Development;
- Designations and classifications, caused by changes to the special qualities of such landscape as a result of the Proposed Development; and
- Visual amenity, caused by changes in the composition and scenic qualities of views on visual amenity as a result of the Proposed Development.

5.1.1.2 Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CLVIA) assess both in addition effects (which pertain to what the Proposed Development adds to the cumulative context) and, where relevant, in combination cumulative effects (which concerns the total effect of the Proposed Development and other cumulative developments combined). It is important to note that the principal consideration of the cumulative assessment is that of in-addition cumulative effects. The priority has been to establish what effects are specifically attributable to the Proposed Development and whether this represents a significant increase in the influence of wind energy development. Conversely, in-combination effects are more relevant in establishing the degree to which wind energy development is currently a key characteristic or 'the' defining characteristic of the landscape or view, and whether proposed developments would alter this.

5.1.1.3 The cumulative assessment considers effects in respect of four different scenarios:

- Scenario One: Which comprises the baseline context which includes the Proposed Development and operational wind farm developments;
- Scenario Two: Which comprises the baseline context in Scenario One, along with consented (but currently unbuilt) wind farm developments;
- Scenario Three (future baseline): Which comprises the context in Scenario Two and selected projects in-planning (i.e., subject to a valid planning application); and
- Scenario Four (future baseline): Which comprises the context in Scenario Three and a high-level assessment of developments in the scoping and pre-application stages where applicable and thought relevant.

5.1.1.4 In addition to the cumulative developments mentioned in Scenario Three, a number of scoping schemes have been included in the assessment, including Glasa; Beinn Tharsuinn repowered and extended; Tarvie and Braelangwell wind farms. The turbine layouts of these schemes may change, they might not proceed to a planning application, or they may not be consented. Given the degree of uncertainty on the design and timescales of these schemes a high-level assessment has been completed. In the event that any of these schemes do proceed to a full application each of them would need to assess the Proposed Development in the cumulative baseline of the respective CLVIA.

5.1.1.5 Scenarios One and Two have the highest degree of certainty and are considered most likely to form the development context in which the Proposed Development would be seen. In contrast, there is a higher degree of uncertainty regarding the final design or likely consenting of application-stage and scoping-stage schemes in Scenarios Three and Four.

Technical Guidance

5.1.1.6 The scope of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses that are summarised in the **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Amenity (EIAR Volume 2)**, and the following published technical guidance:

- Landscape Institute and IEMA, Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA), Third Edition (2013)[1];
- Landscape Institute, Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01. Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (2024)[2];
- Landscape Institute, Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Technical Guidance Note 06/19[3];
- Landscape Institute, Technical Guidance Note 02-21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations[4];
- Landscape Institute, Technical Guidance Note 2/19 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)[5];
- NatureScot, Guidance on Aviation Lighting Impact Assessment (2024)[6];
- NatureScot (October 2025) NatureScot pre-application guidance for onshore wind farms[7];
- NatureScot, Guidance for Assessment of Effects on Special Landscape Qualities (AESLQ)[8];
- NatureScot, Technical Guidance: Assessing Impacts on Wild Land Areas (September 2023)[9];
- Scottish Natural Heritage, Landscape Character Assessment[10];
- Scottish Natural Heritage, Siting and Designing Wind Farms in the Landscape[11];
- Scottish Natural Heritage, Visual Representation of Wind Farms: Good Practice Guidance, Version 2.2[12];

[1] Landscape Institute and IEMA, (2013) 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment', Third edition, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013).

[2] Landscape Institute (20240, Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01, Notes and clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3).

[3] Landscape Institute (2019), Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note 06/19.

[4] Landscape Institute (2021), Technical Guidance Note 02-21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations.

[5] Landscape Institute (2019), Technical Guidance Note 2/19 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA).

[6] NatureScot (2024), Guidance on Aviation Lighting Impact Assessment.

[7] NatureScot (October 2025), NatureScot pre-application guidance for onshore wind farms.

[8] NatureScot (January 2025), Special Landscape Qualities – Guidance on assessing effects.

[9] NatureScot (September 2023), Technical Guidance: Assessing Impacts on Wild Land Areas.

[10] Scottish Natural Heritage (2019), National Landscape Character Assessment.

[11] Scottish Natural Heritage (August 2017), Siting and Designing Wind Farms in the Landscape, Version 3a.

[12] Scottish Natural Heritage (2017), Visual Representation of Wind Farms, Version 2.2.

- Scottish Natural Heritage, Guidance: Assessing the Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impacts of Onshore Wind Energy Developments[13];
- The Highland Council, Onshore Wind Energy: Supplementary Guidance (2016) including Addendum Supplementary Guidance Part 2b (2017) and Strategic Environmental Assessment' (OSWESG)[14]; and
- The Highland Council, Visualisation Standards for Wind Energy Developments[15].

Method of Baseline Data Collection

Study Area

5.1.1.7 The Study Area used in the LVIA comprises a 35 km radius extending from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. The Study Area is illustrated on **Figure 5.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**.

5.1.1.8 The extent of the Study Area was selected after the production of a preliminary Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) based on the scoping layout of the Proposed Development and considering guidance and consultation with the Energy Consents Unit (ECU), The Highland Council (THC), and NatureScot (NS).

Desk Study

5.1.1.9 A desk study was undertaken to establish the baseline landscape and visual context for the Proposed Development, including the physical components of the landscape resource (i.e., the landscape fabric) as well as the distinctive and recognisable pattern of features that establish the landscape character of the area, and the special qualities of designated and classified landscapes within the Study Area. Sensitive visual receptors and receptor locations were also identified, including the residents of settlements, and scattered residential properties, road users, recreational receptors at tourist locations and on promoted trails or core paths, and hill walkers at summits.

Fieldwork

5.1.1.10 To verify the findings of the desktop study and to capture assessment viewpoint photography field work was undertaken during the summer of 2024 and throughout 2025. These Site visits were used to:

- Augment and verify published descriptions of landscape character with field observations;
- Undertake an assessment of the quality or condition of baseline landscape and visual resources;
- Identify any notable features and elements in the landscape such as major blocks of vegetation or built form that would potentially screen or filter views of the Proposed Development and thereby updating assumptions based on the ZTV;
- Visit each viewpoint location to microsite each position in accordance with good practice guidance and to obtain accurate grid coordinates;
- Undertake photography at each agreed viewpoint locations. The selected viewpoints were visited and evaluated using draft wirelines, web mapping, GIS and GPS data collection systems and augmented reality tools such as Ventus Trueview; and
- Identify landscape features and elements that may be altered or removed with an adverse or beneficial effect because of the Proposed Development.

5.1.1.11 Fieldwork also allowed the wider Study Area to be refined and therefore focus the assessment stage of the LVIA on receptors with the most potential for a significant effect.

Measurements

5.1.1.12 Where distances to the Proposed Development are given, these relate to the distance to the nearest turbine of the Proposed Development unless stated otherwise. Where measurements relate to Landscape Character Types (LCTs), designations and classifications, the measurement is to the nearest boundary of the LCT or designated/classified area rather than the nearest area with potential views of the Proposed Development. This is important because effects experienced within such areas may occur at a considerably greater distance, with corresponding consequences for the level of residual effects.

5.1.1.13 The assessment of visual effects including the amenity of residents in settlements was taken from the nearest publicly accessible location. A residential visual amenity assessment was not required as no residential properties are located within 2 km of the nearest proposed turbines and effects were not considered to be overbearing on any individual properties beyond that distance.

Illustrative Materials

5.1.1.14 The LVIA is informed and illustrated by a range of materials such as ZTV plans, photographs, wireline images and photomontages. All outputs have been prepared and verified in line with current best practice.

5.1.1.15 ZTVs have been prepared to assist in the identification of areas from which there is potential visibility of the Proposed Development, illustrated in **Figures 5.6-5.7 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. They are based on Ordnance Survey (OS) digital terrain data supplied as gridded height data at 5m interval resolution. This data does not reflect the screening effect of vegetation or built structures and so the geographical extent of visibility represents a 'worst case scenario' and is more extensive than would be experienced on the ground. Where the ZTV shows no visibility, it is predicted that no wind turbines or associated infrastructure within the model would be seen.

5.1.1.16 It should be noted that the ZTV identifies 'theoretical' visibility and does not reflect the effect of weather, light conditions or distance all of which may influence potential visibility. A ZTV also does not indicate what the Proposed Development would look like or the nature of visibility. The visibility assumptions for the Proposed Development were refined following field work to establish visibility on the ground.

5.1.1.17 To establish the theoretical visibility of the cumulative sites, illustrated on **Figure 5.13 (EIAR Volume 3a)**, paired or grouped ZTVs were prepared for all operational, under construction, consented and proposed in-planning wind energy developments including some in-scoping developments where relevant within the Study Area. Refer to **Figures 5.14-5.25 (EIAR Volume 3a).**

Requirements for Mitigation

5.1.1.18 Based on the preliminary baseline analysis and assessment of potential effects, embedded design and mitigation measures were generated for both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. This was undertaken in an iterative manner, as reported in **Chapter 4: Design Evolution and Alternatives (EIAR Volume 2)**.

[13] NatureScot (2021), Guidance – Assessing the cumulative landscape and visual impact of onshore wind energy developments.

[14] The Highland Council (2017), Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance.

[15] The Highland Council (2017), Visualisation Standards for Wind Energy Developments

5.1.2 Criteria for the Assessment of Effects

5.1.2.1 The aim of the LVIA is to identify, predict and evaluate potential significant effects arising from the Proposed Development. Wherever possible, identified effects are quantified, but the nature of landscape and visual assessment requires interpretation by professional judgement. To provide consistency to the assessment, landscape sensitivity to the type of development proposed, the magnitude of change and assessment of significance of the residual effects are based on pre-defined criteria. The level of residual effects has been determined by combining judgements about the sensitivity of receptors and the magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development.

5.1.2.2 The Proposed Development is a repowering project. In line with NatureScot guidance the LVIA assesses the Proposed Development in two baseline scenarios: the 'comparative baseline' and the 'restored baseline'. These two scenarios are described in detail in **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Amenity (EIAR Volume 2)**.

5.1.2.3 The LVIA considers the landscape and visual effects on designated landscapes in the Study Area, including National Scenic Areas (NSAs) and Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). Inventory listed Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs) are not assessed in this LVIA. The assessment of effects on GDLs is described in **Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (EIAR Volume 2)**. GDL are considered in the context of sensitivity of LCTs, national and local landscape designations rather than an assessment of them as cultural heritage assets. Wild Land Areas (WLA) have been noted and considered in the context of landscape sensitivity of LCTs and landscape designations but are not subject to full assessment in the LVIA since the Proposed Development is not located in a WLA. Viewpoints in WLAs have been provided and these are assessed. In addition, a comparative ZTV (**Figures 5.5 and 5.11 (EIAR Volume 3a)**) showing any areas of additional visibility arising from the Proposed Development in WLAs and the wider Study Area has been produced. Where ZTV analysis shows limited, distant or no theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development, designated and classified landscapes have been omitted from the LVIA.

5.1.2.4 Representative viewpoints were chosen in consultation with THC, NS, and non-statutory consultees, as summarised in **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Amenity (EIAR Volume 2) Table 5.1**. These viewpoints are considered to be representative of the main sensitive receptors in the Study Area. The viewpoints have also been checked against the cumulative ZTVs for existing/consented and proposed wind farms within the Study Area in order to ensure that they provide representative coverage of potential cumulative visibility and related effects. Viewpoint locations are listed and described in **Technical Appendix 5.3 Viewpoint Assessment (EIAR Volume 4)** and are shown on **Figures 5.4 to 5.9 (EIAR Volume 3a)**.

5.1.2.5 Analysis of the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity arising from the Proposed Development at each of these viewpoints has been carried out. This analysis has involved the production of computer-generated wirelines and/or photomontages to predict the operational views of the Proposed Development from each of the agreed viewpoints. The existing and predicted views from each of these viewpoints have been analysed to identify the magnitude of change and the residual effects on landscape character and visual amenity at each viewpoint location.

Criteria for Assessing the Sensitivity of Receptors

5.1.2.6 As identified in GLVIA3 potential and visual effects are identified by establishing and describing the changes to the landscape and visual baseline resulting from the different components of the Proposed Development. The assessment of effects is derived from a comparison of the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of change anticipated as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY

5.1.2.7 The sensitivity of the landscape is defined as 'high', 'medium' or 'low' based on professional interpretation of a combination of its susceptibility to the type of development proposed, and the value attributed to the landscape. In respect of susceptibility, paragraph 5.40 of the GLVIA3[16] notes that:

"This means the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/ condition of a particular character type or area, or an individual element and/ or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) 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."

5.1.2.8 The following aspects inform the susceptibility of the landscape to wind energy development:

- Landscape scale and landcover;
- Existing land-use;
- The pattern and complexity/simplicity of the landscape;
- Visual enclosure/openness of views and distribution of visual receptors;
- The scope for mitigation, which would be in character with the existing landscape; and
- The degree to which the particular element or characteristic contribution to the landscape character and can be replaced or substituted.

5.1.2.9 The value of the landscape receptor is not simply dependant on a formal designation, but rather, is predicated on a number of other related factors (based on GLVIA3 Box 5.1, page 84 and LT TGN 02/21 Table 1), such as:

- Landscape quality and condition - the more intact the intrinsic characteristics of the landscape the higher the value;
- Scenic quality – the degree to which the landscape appeals to the senses (primarily but not exclusively visually);
- Rarity and distinctiveness – this may be the presence of a rare feature or quality, and/or the extent to which the character of the landscape is uncommon or where a strong sense of identity is expressed;
- Representativeness – the extent to which the landscape contains elements that are referred to as exemplary or considered important;
- Conservation and natural heritage interest – including the presence of valued wildlife, earth science, archaeological, historical or cultural aspects;
- Recreation value – where the landscape is evidently valued for recreational activity for which the experience of the landscape is important;

[16] Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013), 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' Third Edition

- Perceptual aspects – in particular, the sense of wildness and/or tranquillity present within the landscape; and
- Associations with historic people or events.

5.1.2.10 The evaluation of landscape susceptibility and landscape value is described for each landscape receptor assessed. The overall evaluation of sensitivity combines the susceptibility and value judgements. Table 5.1.1 shows how the two judgements are combined to arrive at the overall sensitivity assessment rating. The table is not prescriptive and where susceptibility and value are judged to be lie between the stated definitions, professional judgement has been used to assign an intermediate assessment. The same table is used for visual sensitivity which is described in more detail below.

Table 5.1.1: Evaluation of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity

Landscape and Visual Value	Landscape and Visual Susceptibility			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	High	High/Medium	Medium	Low
Medium	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low	Low
Low	Medium	Medium/Low	Low	Negligible

VISUAL SENSITIVITY

5.1.2.11 Visual receptor sensitivity is defined as 'high', 'medium' or 'low' based on an interpretation of a combination of parameters and relates to the susceptibility and value ascribed to visual receptors or receptor location. The following criteria have been utilised in determining viewpoint sensitivity:

- The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and
- The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.

5.1.2.12 Visual receptors consist of a particular person or group of people likely to be affected at a specific location and are assessed in terms of both their susceptibility to the change in views and also the value attached. Value in respect of views is determined by taking account of the following:

- The recognised value attributed to a view (e.g., a view from or to a designated or classified landscape;
- Recognition or importance given to the view in literary or historical documentation or oral history; and
- Formal vantage points or dedicated places for the appreciation of the view and seascape/ landscape.

5.1.2.13 The susceptibility of different visual receptors to change in views and visual amenity is mainly a function of the following:

- The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations;
- The extent to which the receptor attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and the visual amenity they experience at that particular location; and
- The frequency and duration of use of the receptor location[17].

5.1.2.14 Visual sensitivity is defined in in Table 5.1.2 below. Where sensitivity is judged to lie between the stated definitions, professional judgement has been used to assign an intermediate assessment.

Table 5.1.2: Sensitivity in Relation to Receptor Type and Activity

Sensitivity	Receptor type and activity
High	▪ Tourists and those engaged in outdoor recreational activities for which the landscape and views form a key part of their experience, including hill walkers and visitors to formal vantage points; ▪ Passengers and tourists travelling on key routes; ▪ Passengers on trains and ferries where visual amenity and scenic qualities form an integral part of receptors experience and expectations; ▪ Walkers on strategic recreational footpaths or on hills, cycle routes or rights of way; ▪ Visitors to landscapes/sites that have a strong physical, cultural or historic connection with the landscape or a particular view; and ▪ Residential receptors at individual dwellings and within settlements.
Medium	▪ Local road users/commuters who are generally travelling alone and/or are focused on the road rather than the adjoining landscape.
Low	▪ People engaged in outdoor sports or recreation (other than appreciation of the landscape); and ▪ Receptors located in commercial and retail buildings, industrial complexes, and other locations where people's attention may be focused on their work or activity.

Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Change

5.1.2.15 The magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development may be described as substantial, moderate, slight, negligible or none based on the interpretation of a combination of largely quantifiable parameters, as follows:

- The distance of receptors from the Proposed Development;
- The duration of the predicted impacts and whether they are reversible;
- The size and scale of the impact anticipated;
- The geographical extent of the Study Area, landscape character unit, designation or route that would be affected;
- The angle of view in relation to main receptor activity;
- The degree of contrast;
- The background context to the Proposed Development; and
- The extent and nature of other built development visible, including vertical elements.

5.1.2.16 Table 5.1.3 provides a brief definition for different magnitudes of change. Where the magnitude of change is judged to lie between the stated definitions, professional judgement will be used to assign an intermediate assessment.

[17] With cognisance of the high value ascribed to receptor locations within WLAs despite relatively low frequencies of use.

Table 5.1.3: Magnitude of Change	
Magnitude	**Definition**
Substantial	The Proposed Development would represent a considerable alteration to key elements, features or the characteristics of the baseline landscape character and/or the composition of views resulting in a substantial change to baseline conditions.
Moderate	The Proposed Development would represent a considerable alteration to key elements, features or characteristics of the landscape character and/or composition of views. The Proposed Development would result in a notable partial loss or alteration to one or more key features or characteristics of the baseline, resulting in a prominent, but localised change within a broader unaltered context.
Slight	The Proposed Development would represent a modest alteration to key elements, features or characteristics of the landscape character and/or composition of views. Change arising from the loss/alteration would be discernible but the underlying landscape character or view composition would be broadly consistent with baseline.
Negligible	The Proposed Development would represent a very limited or barely discernible alteration to key elements, features of characteristics of the landscape and/or composition of views. The underlying landscape character or view composition would be essentially unchanged from the baseline context.
None	No aspect of the Proposed Development would be discernible. The Proposed Development would result in no appreciable change to the baseline landscape resource or view.

Cumulative Assessment

5.1.2.17 In the assessment of potential cumulative landscape and visual effects, consideration has been given to cumulative effects arising from combined and/or consecutive (concurrent) visibility (where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint location), and sequential effects (where a number of similar developments would be visible individually or simultaneously over a sequence of connected viewpoints, such as would be found along a road or footpath). This is in accordance with current NS guidance.

5.1.2.18 A distinction has been made in the assessment between in-addition effects (i.e., the additional effect attributable specifically to the Proposed Development when considered in the context of cumulative developments) and in-combination effects (i.e. the effect arising from the Proposed Development taken together with other similar development). This is considered particularly appropriate in respect of this Proposed Development due to the extensive developed context within parts of the Study Area. The cumulative assessment considers only the restored baseline as this would give the 'worst case' assessment in any given cumulative scenario.

5.1.2.19 The final list of cumulative developments for consideration has been agreed with THC and NS and is summarised in **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Amenity (EIAR Volume 2)** Table 5.6. No consideration has been given to single or wind turbines less than 50 m to maximum blade tip height above ground level.

Criteria for Assessing Cumulative Change and Effects

5.1.2.20 Cumulative magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development when considered in conjunction with other similar developments is determined using the same approach as described above but also conders the following:

- The number of existing, consented and proposed wind farms visible;
- The distance to each of the visible developments from the receptor location;
- The direction of each development in relation to the viewpoint;
- The extent of the view occupied by each development;
- The cumulative effect of development upon the fabric or key landscape components; and
- In the case of LCTs, residential areas and transportation/recreational routes – the proportion of the area or route subject to cumulative views.

5.1.2.21 As recommended by NatureScot cumulative guidance, the aims is to identify the "additional cumulative change which would be brought about by the proposed development." The cumulative assessment therefore concentrates on 'in-addition' effects and describes 'in-combination effects only where relevant. Table 5.1.4 below provides a brief definition for different magnitudes of cumulative change.

Table 5.1.4: Magnitude of Cumulative Change	
Magnitude	**Definition**
Substantial	In-Addition: The Proposed Development would represent a considerable or possibly fundamental increase in the influence of wind energy development on the character of the landscape and/or the composition of views. In-Combination: The Proposed Development, taken together with cumulative developments would constitute 'the' defining characteristic of the landscape or view.
Moderate	In-Addition: The Proposed Development would represent a notable and possibly considerable increase in the influence of wind energy development on the character of the landscape and/or the composition of views. Moderate cumulative impacts may, however, equate to a localised change within an otherwise unaltered context. In-Combination: The Proposed Development, taken together with cumulative developments would constitute 'a' defining characteristic of the landscape or view.
Slight	In-Addition: The Proposed Development would represent a minor addition to the influence of wind energy development on the character of the landscape and/or the composition of views. The change would be discernible, but the original baseline conditions would be largely unaltered. In-Combination: The Proposed Development, taken together with cumulative developments would constitute 'a' characteristic element/feature in the landscape or view.'
Negligible	In-Addition: The Proposed Development would represent a barely discernible addition to influence of wind energy development on the character of the landscape and/or the composition of views. The baseline condition of the landscape or view would, for all intents and purposes, be unaffected. In-Combination: The Proposed Development, taken together with cumulative developments would constitute a barely discernible feature or element in the landscape or view.
None	No other cumulative development would be apparent.

5.1.2.22 Where the magnitude of change is judged to lie between the stated definitions, professional judgement has been used to assign an intermediate assessment.

Criteria for Assessing Significance

5.1.2.23 Table 5.1.5 below illustrates how residual effects are determined by combining the sensitivity of receptors with the anticipated magnitude of change. For the purposes of this assessment **Major** or

Major/Moderate effects are considered to be significant. Where 'Moderate' effects are predicted, professional judgement is used to assess whether the effect is Significant or Not Significant thereby ensuring that the potential for significant effects is robustly considered. Justification is provided for the judgement reached.

Table 5.1.5: Residual Effects

Landscape and visual sensitivity	**Magnitude of change**				
	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible	None
High	**Major**	**Major/ Moderate**	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	None
Medium	**Major/ Moderate**	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	None
Low	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Minor/None	None

5.1.2.24 In line with the recommendations in GLVIA3 this matrix is not used as a prescriptive tool or arithmetically, and the methodology and analysis of potential effects at any particular location must allow for the exercise of professional judgement. Descriptions of residual effects, especially those considered significant, are described in narrative text.

5.1.2.25 Landscape and visual effects can be adverse (i.e., having a detrimental effect on the physical elements, character and visual amenity of the area) or beneficial (i.e., having a positive effect on the landscape and visual amenity of the area through strengthening or augmentation of baseline conditions and/or improvement of the existing landscape or views). For the purposes of this assessment residual effects are assumed to be adverse, unless stated otherwise.