



South Industrial Zone

Environmental Statement
July 2020

Volume 2

Chapter L - Landscape and Visual Impact

Contents

L1.0	Introduction	1
	About the Author	1
L2.0	Policy Context	2
	Legislation and Policy Context	2
L3.0	Assessment Methodology & Significance Criteria	4
	Assessment Methodology	4
	Significance of Effects	17
	Cumulative Effects	20
	Consultation	20
	Assumptions and Limitations	21
L4.0	Baseline Conditions	22
	Existing Conditions	22
	Future Baseline	42
L5.0	Potential Effects	43
	Embedded Mitigation	43
	During Construction	43
	During Operation	44
L6.0	Mitigation and Monitoring	58
	During Construction	58
	During Operation	58
L7.0	Residual Effects	59
	During Construction	59
	During Operation	59
L8.0	Summary & Conclusions	61
L9.0	Abbreviations & Definitions	64
L10.0	References	65

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

About the Author

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

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 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 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 STDC proposals 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 STDC proposal 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
- 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 proposed 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 a number of 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 STDC14: South Industrial Zone noted the potential for an open space recreation and heritage area incorporating the Dorman Long Tower and South Bank Coke Ovens, which is being explored by the council in partnership with STDC as part of the wider Open Space Strategy for the STDC area.

L3.0 **Assessment Methodology & Significance Criteria**

Assessment Methodology

- L3.1 The approach and methodology used in this LVIA has 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 a number of 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 sensitivity of receptors (both landscape and visual), magnitude of impact, and professional judgements on the likely effects of these impacts.
- L3.6 The key purpose of EIA directives and legislation are 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 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 Ordinance 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;
- 9 Evaluation of change in character and 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;
- 2 Visual effects relate to changes that would occur in the composition of view character as a result of implementing a development. View receptors include residents, users of public rights of way, of roads and of 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 that 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, 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 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 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.
- L3.14 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

- L3.15 The landscape character of the proposed development 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.

- L3.16 Landscape character is the distinct and recognisable pattern of physical and cultural elements within areas of landscape. Landform, hydrology, vegetation and landcover, 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.
- L3.17 The wider landscape of the STDC proposal site 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.
- L3.18 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

- L3.19 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.
- L3.20 Landscape quality relates 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 has detracted from its inherent attributes. The higher the quality of a receptor the greater is 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

- L3.21 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.
- L3.22 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.

L3.23 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 contribute 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 contribute 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 contribute 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

L3.24 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.

L3.25 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	<p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with no or very little existing reference or context to the type of proposed development.</p> <p>Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (e.g. ancient woodland, mature trees, historic parkland).</p> <p>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.</p>
Medium	<p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of proposed development.</p> <p>Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted.</p> <p>Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and the influence of these on the landscape is noticeable.</p>
Low	<p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of proposed development.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and the influence of these on the landscape is dominant.</p>

L3.26 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.

L3.27 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)	Key Characteristics and Features	Landscape Condition	Susceptibility
	Landscapes recognised and valued for their quality and / or cultural associations	As recognised in published Landscape Character Assessments	Degree to which the landscape is intact and legible	Degree to which the landscape can accommodate change
High	National / Regional Importance	Features which are dominant within the	Distinct landscape structure with strong	Considered susceptible to

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
	(Landscape Designations - AONB, National Park, Registered Parks and Gardens)	landscape and are fundamental to defining the distinct landscape character of an area. Important characteristics and features recognised as forming intrinsic part of nationally and regionally designated landscapes. Distinctive individual or rare features.	pattern and intact features. Few detractors or uncharacteristic features or elements present.	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 substantial level of change.

Capacity to Accommodate Change

L3.28 Capacity to accommodate change is broadly derived from a consideration of landscape quality and sensitivity of the STDC proposals area. This requires careful consideration of potential magnitude of landscape change likely to result from the proposals.

Magnitude of Change

L3.29 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 magnitude of landscape impacts

Magnitude	Criteria
Substantial	<p>The size and scale of change is considered large due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects.</p> <p>The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to character is considered large.</p> <p>Where the geographical extent would have a substantial influence on the landscape at a regional scale, i.e. across several landscape character areas/types.</p> <p>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</p>
Moderate	<p>The size and scale of change is considered moderate due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects.</p> <p>The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to character is considered moderate.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>
Minor	<p>The size and scale of change is considered small due to the extent and proportion of loss of existing landscape elements or the degree of alteration to aesthetic or perceptual aspects.</p> <p>The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to character is considered small.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
Negligible	<p>The size and scale of change is 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.</p> <p>The nature and scale of change to key characteristics which are critical to character is considered very small.</p> <p>Where the geographical extent would substantially influence the landscape of the site only.</p> <p>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</p>

Visual Impact Assessment Criteria

- L3.30 The visual impact assessment draws from an identification of the sensitivity of receptors (locations from which people would be able to view the development) within the proposals 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.
- L3.31 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

- L3.32 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 introduces certain similarities to a townscape assessment and as such, no ZTV has been applied to the assessment.
- L3.33 For this assessment, 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.
- L3.34 A key part of the visual assessment is the assessment of effects from a number of 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 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 certain location).
- L3.35 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 L3.72. The viewpoint locations are shown on in Appendix L2.
- L3.36 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.
- L3.37 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.

- L3.38 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 May 2020.
- L3.39 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

- L3.40 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.
- L3.41 A viewpoint that is marked on tourist maps, signposted, or otherwise recognised will have a 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 a 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.
- L3.42 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.
- L3.43 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 use of public rights of way, whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and on 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.

- L3.44 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 (sign boards, interpretive material) and references to them in literature or art.
- L3.45 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.
- L3.46 Viewers whose attention is focused on the landscape, for example, walkers that are travelling through an area for the purpose of enjoying 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 an 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 a 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 the purposes of enjoyment of the view as part of the work environment.
- L3.47 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. In addition, 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 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

Sensitivity	Description
	or locally listed buildings with clear historic significance, but not best represented in this particular view.

Development Parameters Assessed

- L3.48 A full description of the proposed development is contained in Chapter B. However, the main elements of the proposed development which are likely to have an effect on the surrounding landscape and views are as follows:
- 1 The construction of new developments of Use Class B2 and Class B8, including large scale warehouse-style storage or distribution facilities to support future manufacturing within the STDC 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 Illustrative Masterplan. 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 Illustrative Masterplan, 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.
- L3.49 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 a number of 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.
- L3.50 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

- L3.51 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);

- 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

L3.52 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. Magnitude of change is ranked as follows:

Table L3.7 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.

L3.53 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 a Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) or visual receptor, the magnitude of change will generally be lower.

L3.54 The degree of change in 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.

L3.55 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

L3.56 There are a number of aspects that 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 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 a Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) or visual receptor, the magnitude of change will generally be lower.

Significance of Effects

L3.57 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.

L3.58 In order 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 to 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. Enable the restoration of characteristic elements and features partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from previous inappropriate management or development.

Significance of effect	Description
	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 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 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 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 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 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 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

Nature of effect	Description
	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.

L3.59 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

L3.60 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.

L3.61 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."*

L3.62 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."*

- L3.63 The following terms have been used to define residual effects on the landscape resources:
- 1 Adverse: the proposed development results in 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.

- L3.64 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 the visual amenity.

L3.65 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).

L3.66 Significance criteria are determined as follows:

Table L3.10 Significance criteria

Magnitude of Change	Sensitivity of Receptor			
		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

L3.67 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.

L3.68 In total, 17 cumulative schemes have been identified. Detailed analysis of cumulative effects is presented in Chapter N Cumulative Effects.

Consultation

L3.69 Consultation to agree potentially sensitive landscapes and visual receptors has been undertaken as follows:

- 1 May 2020: Baseline information issued to Client
- 2 May 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 May/June 2020: Consultation with local resident to review local landmarks, recreation areas and key vantage points of the proposed development site.
- 4 May/June 2020: Consultation with sub-consultant with local knowledge of the area as part of previous LVIA assessments.

5 June 2020: These viewpoints were agreed with RCBC.

6 June 2020: An additional 2No. viewpoints were recommended by RCBC.

L3.70 Appendix L5, includes email correspondence on the above topics.

Assumptions and Limitations

L3.71 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 have 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.

L3.72 The following assumptions on the proposed development have been applied to the assessment:

- 1 The proposed development will comprise up to 418,000sqm B2 and B8 floorspace;
- 2 The parameters for the proposed development are set at a maximum development height of 46m AOD and a maximum building height of 40.21m AOD. The finished floor level of the proposed development will be set at 5.79m AOD.
- 3 Site works are expected to commence in 2021 and the assessment of construction effects assumes an 8-year period to build out the full propose development.

L3.73 Due to the limited project timeframe spanning the spring and early summer months of 2020, it was only possible to complete the viewpoint photography whilst the trees were in full leaf. The viewpoint baseline photography therefore does not represent the 'worst case scenario'. Allowance has been made for this in the assessment which reflects the 'worst case scenario' situation despite this not being represented on the photography. The 'worst case scenario' assessment has been ascertained through detailed site survey work and professional judgement.

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 is located within the STDC area and is part of the wider site known as South Bank / South Industrial Zone. It is located between PD Ports, Teesport, and the Teesport Commerce Park. Previous uses on the site include iron and steel industries and the storage of materials, and freight rail infrastructure uses.

L4.3 The south eastern corner of the site has previously been in use as landfill and waste management facilities used for the disposal of by-products from iron and steel making, cement, metals, and non-hazardous waste.

L4.4 More detail on the site's description is included within chapter B of this ES.

L4.5 At present, the maximum footprint is anticipated to be circa 560m (length) x 160m (width) but this will be determined at reserved matters stage. The parameters plans associated with the development provide detail on the layout, land-use, massing, and height of the proposed development however, details relating to landscaping and boundary treatments are not included at this stage.

Landscape Character

L4.6 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

L4.7 Natural England has defined areas of cohesive landscape character at a broad national scale. The national landscape area relevant to the STDC proposal site and environs is '23 – Tees Lowlands'. The principle 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

- L4.8 At a regional level, the landscape context of the STDC proposal site is characterised by the Tees Lowlands. This constitutes a broad, low-lying plain framed by the Cleveland Hills to the south, which form 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.
- L4.9 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

- L4.10 Following desktop analysis and field work, 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.
- L4.11 Within the development site boundary, the landscape character is low lying, flat and has an open and exposed feel. There are reclaimed materials and gravels on the surface, into which some low-lying vegetation has colonised. A number of large material storage areas to the south east of the site create topographical changes, which interrupt views into and out of the site. South Bank Coke Ovens and Dorman Long tower to the south west corner of the site, along with existing blast furnace chimney stack, are no longer operational but remain distinguishing features which punctuate the skyline and are visible from areas within the site and from surrounding areas to the south. Tall vertical structures within the landscape also include electricity pylons, and port dock cranes of similar scale are present at several locations along the length of the River estuary. Overall, the landscape character of the site itself is heavily industrialised.
- L4.12 To the north of the site, the River Tees passes through this industrial landscape, with hard edged shores, primarily to facilitate the working dockside requirements. Access to the River Estuary is limited for the general public and therefore views into the site are also limited. To the north of the estuary, an area of open grassland creates a soft interface with the river, and a potential opportunity for public vantage points from the Stockton-on-Tees industrial estate into the development site. Vegetation is sparse and has colonised naturally, and mud flats are exposed during low tides and within bays to the east of the estuary.
- L4.13 Immediately to the south, the operational Tees Valley train line passes through the industrial estate. South Bank railway station including associated platforms and footbridge is located at

the south west corner of the site and is publicly accessible and is the closest vantage point of the site from the south west. 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.

- L4.14 The Teesport Commerce Park lies to the west of the site, with recent large warehouse-style commercial development. Close range public viewing opportunities of the development site are present from Smith's Dock Road located to the east of the commerce park. The first close range viewing opportunity of the site from a public amenity space is from Cargo Fleet River View Park to the west of the commerce park. This small public recreation space providing views up and down the river and is most commonly used for dog walking purposes. This is the closest public amenity space to the western edge of the development area.
- L4.15 To the east and south 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 to the south, PD Ports and Teesport docks to the east, 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. Views of the development site are very limited due to the scale and massing of the building infrastructure.
- L4.16 Further afield to the south and south-east, the landscape character is comprised of urban settlements, primarily residential housing, as well retail, some commercial development, and urban green spaces. The residential districts of South Bank and Grangetown are closest to the development site. Teesville, Normanby and Eston lie to the south, Dormanstown and Redcar to the east, and further to the south-east of the site are the districts of Coatham, Newcomen, and Kirkleatham. Of these, Eston, South Bank, Normanby and Grangetown comprise the most built-up part of the borough.
- L4.17 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 housing comprising mostly of semi-detached properties from the 1950's / 1960's, 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 is 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.

- L4.18 Further to the south and south-east, the landscape character is less urban and more rural, with agricultural fields, linear strips of open land, small clustered developments, stables, and farms. Copses of trees and linear native hedgerows define field boundaries and line the roads, but still enable glimpses and views across the broad flat agricultural landscape. Field ponds also add to the landscape character of this area.
- L4.19 To the south of the study 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. In addition, 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.
- L4.20 The coastal landscape character 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 mud flats, 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.
- L4.21 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 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 the 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.
- L4.22 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 immediate locality.
- L4.23 Sitting within the coastal character area, South Coatham Marsh has a secluded feel and wetland character, with a sheltered microclimate created by bunts and native planting which enclose the majority of the 134-acre nature reserve. Board walks and gravel paths provide a circular walk around the lakes, marsh and wet meadows. Footpaths also lead up onto to a large and prominent ridge line with grassland flora and naturally colonised scrub. From this open aspect the historic, imposing structures of the disused Steelworks are in close proximity and are 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.

- L4.24 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 to the north, the A174 dual carriageway to the south, 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 of the industrial site to the north. Occasional glimpses of the development site can be seen from the primary roads as they bridge over the secondary roads below.
- L4.25 A number of secondary north-south roads facilitate local traffic. Occasional glimpses of the site can also be seen from Normanby Road and Church Lane, but the most visible locations are at the key intersections with the A66. The junction of Church Lane and the A66 at the 'Gate 3' entrance to the South Tees Business Park, and Normanby Road and the A66 at the 'Gate 2' entrance to South Tees Business Park, have framed mid-range views into the development site from the retail and commercial development.
- L4.26 To the north, the landscape is low lying with minor topographical changes created by landscaped bunds, designed to screen major through-roads from neighbouring residential settlements. This is typically seen along the length of the A66.
- L4.27 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
- L4.28 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, a number of 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 – Salthouse wetlands
 - 8 LCZ 8 – Rural
 - 9 LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space
- L4.29 The form, quality, value, and sensitivity of the LCZs are described below in Table L4.1.
- L4.30 The location of the LCZs are shown in Appendix L1.

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

L4.31

The sensitive landscape receptors listed in 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 identification of their sensitivity.

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

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
LCZ 1 - Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combination of working and disused heavy industry, containing large infrastructure and 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 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 adds 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 have capacity to 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Low

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The characteristics of this LCZ have capacity to 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. 	
<p>LCZ 3 - Intertidal Estuary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 proposed development site is located within an area dominated by port side and industrial activity on the Tees estuary, resulting in manmade perceptual qualities which detract from the wildlife value and quality. • The edge condition of this LCZ contains both hard dockside and mudflats, creating inconsistencies within the appearance and amenity value. • Conservation interests include some historic dockside features; however, these are not publicly 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 accommodate change without changing the perception character of the landscape, therefore the susceptibility is considered to be Medium. • Overall the sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium. 	<p>Medium</p>
<p>LCZ 4 - Coast and peninsula</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 close proximity of the 	<p>Medium</p>

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	<p>disused steelworks, which detract from perceptions of rural and remoteness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined perceptual qualities of remoteness, tranquillity and also human activity. • Panoramic views range from open seascape and dunes, to 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. <p>Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Medium.</p>	
<p>LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. • From the open aspect of the upper ridges, the historic, imposing structures of the disused Steelworks are in close proximity and are a prominent feature. • 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. <p>Taking all of this into account, the overall sensitivity is considered to be Medium.</p>	<p>Medium-High</p>
<p>LCZ 6 – Eston Hills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>High</p>

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. <p>Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be High.</p>	
<p>LCZ 7 – Salthouse wetlands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 for birdwatching. • Close 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. <p>Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Medium.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>LCZ 8 - Rural</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Given the existing industrial and urban context of this LCZ, the susceptibility to change is considered Medium. <p>Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Medium.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>LCZ 9 – Urban Green Space</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Low-Medium</p>

Landscape Character Zone and Receptor	Description	Sensitivity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Taking all of this into account, the sensitivity is considered to be Low-Medium.</p>	

Visual Impact

L4.32 This section considers the broad and local visual context of the proposed site.

Broad Visual Context

L4.33 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.

L4.34 The broad context has been identified through desk-based interrogation of the visual envelope; the key attributed of which are described below.

L4.35 The proposed development 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.

L4.36 The wide nature of the Tees estuary allows for long but contained views to the north and south.

Local Visual Context

L4.37 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.

L4.38 A detailed overview of the existing visual context for identified receptors is provided. 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

L4.39

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 identification of their sensitivity.

Table L4.2 Sensitive Visual Receptors

No.	View location	Direction of View	Reasons
Vp1	Eston Nab Hill	NW	Representative of views from public footpath and highest vantage point in the area of site
Vp2	Junction of A66 and Church Lane, Grangetown	NW	Representative of views from residential properties, and footpath and road users on A66 and Church Lane
Vp3	Cargo Fleet River View Park	E	Representative of views from public vantage point and river estuary
Vp4	South Bank train station (footbridge)	N-E	Representative of views from public train station, and Teesdale Way PRow
Vp5	Junction of Smiths Dock Road and Dockside Road	E	Representative of views from road junction and proposed access point of site
Vp6	South Gare peninsula	SW	Representative of views from South Gare & Coatham Sands SSSI and fishing huts
Vp7	Coatham Marsh LNR	S-W	Representative of views from footpaths through Coatham Marsh Local Nature Reserve
Vp8	Junction with Tesco Extra	N	Representative of views from A1085 Trunk Road, footpaths and public retail development
Vp9	Uvedale Road, Steele Crescent Junction, South Bank	N-E	Representative of views from residential housing, recreation space and footpaths
Vp10	Junction of A66 and Normanby Road, South Bank	NE	Representative of views from road users, footpaths and public retail development
Vp11	Errington Woods, New Marske,	NW	Representative of views from public footpath, woodland, and New Marske residential area
Vp12	Northern estuary industrial site	SE	Representative of views from the southern estuary mud flats and industrial sites.

L4.40

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
Seal Sands – North East of the site, within the Estuary	Proposed development not visible from public footpaths due to significant distance from the development Site and industrial development in the middle ground including Power Station, Chemical works and Oil Refinery. Important views within this area are focussed on the estuary and immediate wildlife context.
Dormanstown Foxrush Farm Community Woodland	Proposed development not visible due to significant distance from the development Site, vegetation cover and industrial development including Wilton Chemical Works and Lackenby Steel Works.
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.

L4.41 The following table identifies the nature of the Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) to be produced for each view identified as a Sensitive Visual Receptor, such as day and night time representation, and whether the proposed development will be represented by AVRO1 (Wire line) or an AVRO3 (full render).

Representative Viewpoint 1 Eston Nab
Orientation / Location
Figure VP1-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 1 is a specific viewpoint of known value, and long-distance, wide angle view, circa 4km south east of the site boundary. The view is across a number of residential town areas, commercial, retail and industrial developments, towards the southern site boundary.
LCZ
LCZ 6: Eston Hills
Description
This location is from within a designated landscape area, and woodland Country Park, popular for walking and mountain biking, and observing wildlife. At its highest point, ‘Eston Nab’ is a local landmark, and popular vantage point in the area, with a range of long-range views of Middlesbrough, Redcar and the coastline. There is obvious scenic context to the view and value attached to the view, as is typical of such long-range vantage points of this nature.

<p>The visual setting of the proposed development site from this viewpoint is within an area of industrialisation, with large scale structures and manmade features of this character area dominating the skyline. Within the proposed development site, the existing structures of the Doman Long tower, gas cylinder and disused blast furnace are visible on the skyline.</p> <p>Large mounds of reclaimed materials are visible features within the development site and create visual topographic changes.</p> <p>Outside the proposed development site, urban developments of comparable building height are scattered throughout the panoramic view, including tall residential tower blocks in Middlesbrough, and closer to the foreground, Wilton Works, Power Plant and cooling tower, from which rising steam creates a distinct focal point in the immediate view. Dockside cranes, electricity pylons and chimney stacks add vertical structure to the skyline. Beyond the estuary to the north, the skyline features North Tees works industrial site.</p> <p>There is a varied visual experience for the viewer of manmade built features, in contrast to more rural landscape views in the middle ground views, where distinct field patterns are visible. The overall landscape view is juxtaposed of interwoven rural farmland, urban town development, and industrial development. Seascape views of the coastline to the east and glimpses of the estuary and River Tees add to the value of the experience for the viewer.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the value of the view is therefore considered to be High.</p> <p>Footpath receptors where the view is likely to be focussed towards the proposed development Site are considered to have a High susceptibility to visual changes.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	High	Value	High	Visual Sensitivity	High

Representative Viewpoint 2 South Tees Business Park	
Orientation / Location	
<p>Figure VP2-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Viewpoint 2 is representative of views looking north from the Junction of A66 and Church Lane, entrance to South Tees Business Park and entrance to a small residential development, Elgin Avenue. The view is circa 1km south of the site boundary. The view is across the A66 towards the southern site boundary.</p>	
LCZ	
LCZ 2: Urban	
Description	
<p>The foreground of this close-range view comprises the A66 and Church Lane junction. This is a busy and well used junction, along a primary route. Church Lane is used by road users of the local residential area of Grangetown.</p> <p>Immediately ahead and central to the view is the ‘Gate 3’ entrance to South Tees Business Park. Large warehouse style buildings and tall cylindrical infrastructure for commercial use and recycling plant are set back from the road edge, however these create a dominant visual feature within this view. A soft landscape buffer of tree planting partially screens this development from road and pavement level views. The relatively open view along Eston Road to the north is framed by the green infrastructure and vertical highway infrastructure of lighting and signposts. Large industrial buildings can be seen to a lesser extent in the distance.</p> <p>This is an undesignated view and doesn’t include any notable landmark features. There is no obvious scenic context to the view or value attached to the view, however the visual setting also cannot be considered to be degraded. The value of the view is therefore considered to be Low to Medium.</p> <p>This viewpoint is representative of views experienced by road users, who will experience the view as glimpsed and transitory in nature. Road users are considered to have a Low susceptibility to change.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the susceptibility of the view is therefore considered to be Low.</p>	

In this location the views from the small area of residential properties are not orientated towards the proposed development, or within close proximity to the proposed development. Other existing development context is of a similar nature and scale to the proposed development. For this location the susceptibility is therefore low-medium.

Road User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low
Residential	Susceptibility	Low-Medium	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Representative Viewpoint 3 Cargo Fleet River						
Orientation / Location						
Figure VP3-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 3 is representative of views from Cargo Fleet River view park, public amenity space, looking to the east. The view is circa 1.15km south west of the site boundary. The view is towards the western site boundary.						
LCZ						
LCZ 9: Urban Green Space						
Description						
<p>The foreground of the view comprises a mix of hardstanding, brick walls and open green space, and beyond that, the dockside lifting rigs and platform structures dominate and focus attention from the field of wider views.</p> <p>In the distant view the cylinder tank can be seen which is to the south west corner of the proposed development Site. Additional warehouse buildings of Teesport Commerce Park in the mid-range view. Tree planting defines the boundary of this urban green space, which softens the appearance of the infrastructure beyond, and partially screens urban development from the vantage point identified in this park.</p> <p>The space is maintained to a low-medium standard, which reduces the quality and perceptual value and aesthetic value of this park. The recreation use of this park is primarily dog-walkers and those people with an interest in the estuary views and open aspect of the site.</p> <p>There is a recognised vantage point of the estuary from this location, however views are not focussed towards the proposed development site, but rather on the wider estuary vista. The viewpoint is representative of views experienced by pedestrians on footpath, who will experience the view as part of other recreational activities.</p> <p>The scenic context to the view or value attached to the view is medium, however the visual setting is considered to be degraded. The overall value of the view is therefore considered to be Low to Medium. For this location the susceptibility is considered low as it could accommodate a degree of changed based on existing infrastructure context.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low-Medium	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Representative Viewpoint 4 South Bank Train Station						
Orientation / Location						
Figure VP4-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.						

Viewpoint 4 is representative of views looking north from the South Bank train station, footbridge and Teesdale Way and junction with the PRoW footpath. The view is circa 65m south of the site boundary. The view is looking towards the southern site boundary.						
LCZ						
LCZ 1: Industrial						
Description						
<p>South Bank Train Station provides a low frequency of use service to the area known as South Bank. It is publicly accessible from the south. This location also connects with the PRoW footpath known locally as the Black Path, which is part of a longer National Trail from Middlesbrough to Redcar. This viewpoint is representative of pedestrian views from the train station and also the footpath.</p> <p>The foreground view from the footbridge comprises South Bank Train Station platform and the footbridge spanning the railway line. The mid ground view contains building infrastructure of a large gas cylinder tank, Dorman Long Tower, and further afield, the disused Coke Ovens and chimney stack of the old steel works. These create dominant visual features in the skyline. Other scattered built infrastructure creates additional focal features, including very tall electricity Pylons, both in the far distance and nearby overhead. In the far distance the steel slag piles create undulations in land topography, but with no green vegetation. This blurs the outlines of the manmade structures from the view, on the horizon line.</p> <p>The view of the proposed development site would be at sequential points along a route, and the view is not the immediate focus for footpath and train station users.</p> <p>Given the infrequency of use, and the nature and scale of infrastructure elements, the value of the view is therefore considered to be Low-Medium.</p> <p>This location could accommodate a degree of change, based on existing infrastructure context. Therefore, the susceptibility is considered low.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low-Medium	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Representative Viewpoint 5 Smiths Dock Road						
Orientation / Location						
<p>Figure VP5-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Viewpoint 5 is representative of close-range views from the junction of Smiths Dock Road and Dockside Road, looking east. The view is circa 20m west of the site boundary and looks along Dockside Road towards the western site boundary.</p>						
LCZ						
LCZ 1: Industrial						
Description						
<p>This view includes road users and pedestrian receptors, and this location is also intended to form a new entrance point into the proposed development site. The existing road is primarily used by local traffic, gaining access to other areas of engineering, manufacturing and dockside services.</p> <p>The existing gas cylinder on the corner of the proposed development site is the predominant visible structure in this view. Other industrial development including chimney stack provides visible features in the centre of the view.</p> <p>In the foreground, small deciduous trees and grass bunds intervene the wider view from this viewpoint in summer, adding very little softening of the large infrastructure behind. Low level naturally colonised planting can be seen through the palisade fence forming the site boundary, however this does not add much value to the aesthetic qualities of the view.</p> <p>Far distant views are relatively flat and open, punctuated only by tall spires of cranes and pylons. Steel slag piles form the horizon line to the right of the view.</p>						

<p>This is an undesignated view. There is no obvious scenic context to the view or value attached to the view, the visual setting and characteristics are of low quality. The value of the view is therefore considered to be Low.</p> <p>This viewpoint is representative of views experienced by road users, who will experience a view as glimpsed and transitory in nature. Road users are considered to have a Low susceptibility to change.</p>						
Road User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low

<p>Representative Viewpoint 6 Tees Estuary</p> <p>Orientation / Location</p> <p>Figure VP6-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 6 is a specific viewpoint location of known value. This is a long-distance, wide angle view, circa 4.5km north of the site boundary. The view is across the Tees Estuary and STDC Industrial site, looking towards the eastern site boundary.</p> <p>LCZ</p> <p>LCZ 4: South Gare and Coatham Sands</p> <p>Description</p> <p>This location is from within a designated landscape area, and coastal setting, popular for recreational walking, and for visitors. The peninsula is a popular vantage point in the area, with a panoramic view of the North Sea, and offshore windfarm, as well as the wider views of the Estuary, the industrial development in the far distance and of the prominent Eston Hills and wooded escarpments.</p> <p>There is obvious scenic context to the view and value attached to the view. The viewpoint identified is one of a number of scenic views from this location. It is in a landscape setting valued for wildlife, cultural and historical references, and this influences the type of visitors to this viewpoint.</p> <p>The context of the view includes the sand dunes and harbour in the foreground, adding value to the coastal visual characteristics and quality. Behind the sand dunes in the mid ground view is the large imposing structure of Redcar steel works, with cylinders and structures which interrupt skyline and the green plateau of the Eston Hills on the horizon. The dockside cranes create a manmade focal point at the Estuary mouth. In the far distance the North and South Tees industrial sites visual combine to create a continuous skyline of towers, chimneys and large-scale warehouse style buildings.</p> <p>Green infrastructure consists of naturally colonised low growing vegetation, which adds to the visual appeal of the viewpoint, helping to soften the appearance of the low-lying huts within the harbour. Large mounds of reclaimed materials are visible features within the development site and create visual topographic changes.</p> <p>There is a varied visual experience for the viewer of manmade built features, and natural coastal landscape and seascape.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the value of the view is therefore considered to be High.</p> <p>Footpath receptors are not focussed solely on the proposed development site but on the wider vista, and the context and foreground of the proposed development site is of heavy industry, however this reads as one collective entity other than a few distinguishable buildings in the intermediate view. The susceptibility to visual change is considered to be Low.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	High	Visual Sensitivity	Medium

<p>Representative Viewpoint 7 Coatham Marsh</p> <p>Orientation / Location</p> <p>Figure VP7-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Viewpoint 7 is a representative viewpoint from footpaths through Coatham Marsh Local Nature Reserve. This is a long-distance, wide-angle view, circa 3.75km north east of the site boundary. The view is across the STDC Industrial site, looking towards the eastern site boundary.						
LCZ						
LCZ 5: Coatham Marsh						
Description						
<p>This location is from within a designated landscape area, and nature reserve / wetland setting, popular for recreational walking, and for visitors. The rising landscape creates a ridge upon which panoramic views of the coastline, inland and towards the Eston Hills are possible.</p> <p>The scenic quality includes low ponds and rebeds in low lying areas, along with higher grassland and rolling topography as can be seen from the viewpoint. Naturally colonised vegetation dominates the foreground creating a scenic quality. In the mid ground the view is interrupted by the large imposing structure of the steel works to the right-hand side of the view, and the large brick building of Steel House to the left-hand side of the view. These create visual distractions in the landscape view.</p> <p>Framed between Steel House and the Steel Works infrastructure, the South Tees Industrial site dominates the skyline, the overall scale of which visually blends in with the Eston Hills beyond. Sitting within the industrial site, steel slag piles can be seen, interrupting the verticality of manmade structures which punctuate the skyline throughout the view.</p> <p>There is some scenic quality to the view, however the value of the view is lower, as the primary visual focus for this area is of the circular walks around wetland ponds and habitat areas in lower marsh landscape. The view is therefore more incidental to the recreational use in this location.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the value of the view is therefore considered to be Medium</p> <p>Footpath receptors are not focussed solely on the proposed development site but on the wider vista, and the context and foreground of the proposed development site is of heavy industry, with some distinguishable buildings and infrastructure, therefore the susceptibility to visual change is considered to be Low-Medium.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Low-Medium	Value	Medium	Visual Sensitivity	Medium

Representative Viewpoint 8 A1085 Trunk Road						
Orientation / Location						
<p>Figure VP8-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Viewpoint 8 is representative of views from footpath users and public retail development from the A1085 Trunk Road, looking north. The view is circa 1.6km south of the site boundary. The view is across the retail area towards the southern site boundary.</p>						
LCZ						
LCZ 2: Urban						
Description						
<p>The viewpoint location is from a busy and well used section of primary road, for local residents, including footpath users, alongside the road both north and south.</p> <p>This view is taken from the entrance / exit point of a key supermarket in the area, from which views of the proposed development site to the north are visible, due to open aspect of the north and east of the retail outlet.</p>						

Immediately ahead within the view, is the large supermarket structure and smaller kiosk building. Expansive carpark and tarmac circular are visually characteristic of this urban landscape. Beyond that and central to the view is a horizontal backdrop of green infrastructure, comprising of tree planting forming the boundary to the retail development. This helps to screen views in summer of the South Tees industrial site and proposed development site beyond in the far distance. The dominant buildings in the far distance is the gas cylinder, Dorman Long tower and steelworks chimney stack.

This is an undesignated view and doesn't include any notable landmark features. It is not known or recognised for its scenic qualities, context or amenity value, however the visual setting also cannot be considered to be degraded. Overall, the value of the view is therefore considered to be Low.

This viewpoint is representative of views experienced by road users, pedestrians and cyclists, who will experience the view as glimpsed and transitory in nature. Road users are considered to have a Low susceptibility to change. The attention of people in this location is likely to be focussed on the road or on the shopping experience rather than the view.

Based on the descriptions above the susceptibility of the view is therefore considered to be Low for road users and Low-Medium for footpath users.

Road User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Low-Medium	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Representative Viewpoint 9 Uvedale Road
Orientation / Location
Figure VP9-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 9 is representative of views from residential housing and public open green space within Southbank. The view is from Uvedale Road, circa 1km south of the site boundary. The view is looking north towards the southern site boundary.
LCZ
LCZ 9: Urban Green Space
Description
This viewpoint location is on the south west corner of public open green space within a neighbourhood development of Southbank, which is a playing field for informal uses, such as football or Frisbee. It is contained on the north, west and south by two storey semi-detached residential housing, and to the east is open scrub / tufted grassland with small native trees, footpaths, and links to National cycleways. The position of the playing fields to the front of the properties provides a sense of openness for the residential receptors and respite from the dense urban landscape. The nature of the view is open, with the foreground comprising flat playing fields. In the centre is a small play area which has been fenced off and shows signs of disrepair. In the far distance, industrial infrastructure can be seen within the proposed development Site, including the tall gas cylinder, Dorman Long tower and steel works chimney stack, given an obvious urban and industrial context to the playing fields and adjacent landscape. Tall electricity pylons form a detracting feature within the distant view. This infrastructure breaks up the skyline. Housing roofs and chimneys are also a visible feature of the skyline. This is an undesignated view and doesn't include any landmark features. There is no obvious scenic context to the view or value attached to the view. The view is more incidental to the recreational use in this location, however from ground floors of the properties the view will be more of a static view. The visual setting has some elements of degradation. The value is therefore considered to be Low-Medium.

This viewpoint is also representative of residential receptors, who have views orientated towards the proposed development. Residential receptors are considered to have a High susceptibility to visual changes.						
Residential	Susceptibility	High	Value	Low-Medium	Visual Sensitivity	Medium

Representative Viewpoint 10 South Tees Business Park, Normanby Road						
Orientation / Location						
<p>Figure VP10-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 10 is representative of views looking north from the Junction of A66 and Normanby Road, and entrance to South Tees Business Park. The view is circa 50m south of the site boundary. The view is looking north, across the A66 towards the southern site boundary.</p>						
LCZ						
LCZ 2: Urban						
Description						
<p>This view is located at the closest vantage public point from a primary road, to the south of the proposed development site. The foreground of the view comprises the A66 and Normanby Road junction. This is a busy and well used junction. The A66 is used by locals and through traffic for heavy goods vehicles. Normanby Road is well used by local residents of the local residential areas of Southbank, and further south, Teesville, Eston and Normanby.</p> <p>Immediately ahead and central to the view is the 'Gate 2' entrance to South Tees Business Park. The foreground context of the view comprises a local supermarket and business centre, whose scale of building steps down towards Normanby Road. A small element of tree planting helps soften the interface between buildings and roads.</p> <p>In the far distance, attention is focussed on a large distant pylon, and otherwise open vista. The tall gas cylinder and industrial infrastructure is visible within the proposed development Site in the mid view, creating prominent features on the skyline of this close-range view.</p> <p>This is an undesignated view and doesn't include any notable landmark features. There is no obvious scenic context to the view or value attached to the view. A number of commercial buildings in this immediate context are underused and in a degraded state. The area of Southbank is undergoing regeneration.</p> <p>The value of the view is therefore considered to be Low.</p> <p>No residential properties overlook the site from this viewpoint location. This viewpoint is representative of views experienced by road users, who will experience the view as glimpsed and transitory in nature. Road users are considered to have a Low susceptibility to change. The business and retail use does not focus attention on the view of the proposed development Site.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the susceptibility of the view is therefore considered to be Low.</p>						
Road User	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Representative Viewpoint 11 Errington Woods						
Orientation / Location						
<p>Figure VP11-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint. Viewpoint 11 is representative and long-range views from Errington Woods, circa 7km east of the site boundary. The view is across open farmland towards the southern site boundary.</p>						
LCZ						

LCZ 6: Eston Hills						
Description						
<p>This location is from the northern edge of Errington Woods, which has Local Nature Reserve status, and is a publicly accessible popular walking destination. Long range views to the north and east are possible from the car park and footpaths on the edge of the wood.</p> <p>This area of woodland is popular for walking and wildlife and is a high vantage point for wider scenic views of surrounding landscape. Visual receptors will be footpath users.</p> <p>The visual context in the foreground and mid-ground is of rural farmland, with fields defined by rows of maintained native hedgerows, with upper escarpments containing copses of trees and gorse planting. The residential development of New Marske sits in a low-lying area at the base of the escarpment immediately to the north of the viewpoint and is not particularly visible due to the topography changes of the land.</p> <p>In the long distance view the industrial site out South Tees can be seen to the west and the urban development of Redcar to the east, appearing as a fairly consistent line of built development beyond the farmland. Appearing as a fine grain of buildings, towers, and structures on the skyline, some individual components are distinguishable, primarily tall cooling towers with steam rising, and some taller chimney stacks and tower structures.</p> <p>The setting of the proposed development Site from this viewpoint is within an area of industrialisation in the far distance. Feature structures within the proposed development Site such as the Dorman Long Tower are not easily distinguishable from this distance.</p> <p>There is obvious scenic context and value attached to the view</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the value of the view is therefore considered to be High.</p> <p>Footpath receptors where the view is likely to be focussed towards the proposed development Site are considered to have a Medium-High susceptibility to visual changes, given the distance away.</p>						
Footpath User	Susceptibility	Medium-High	Value	High	Visual Sensitivity	Medium-High

Representative Viewpoint 12 South Tees Industrial Area						
Orientation / Location						
<p>Figure VP12-A in Appendix L4 illustrates the baseline view from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Viewpoint 12 is representative and mid-range views from the northern estuary, circa 1km west of the site boundary. The view is looking across the existing North Tees industrial area towards the northern boundary of the site.</p>						
LCZ						
LCZ 1: Industrial						
Description						
<p>This location is from the northern estuary, South Tees Industrial area, and the visual receptors will predominantly be people working there, and also some public access to the wider footpaths and roads. Recent development includes the erection of palisade security fence, which restricts views and public access to the embankment of the estuary and mudflats which become exposed at low tide. This also limits visibility of the proposed development Site on the southern embankment of the estuary.</p> <p>The foreground view is of hard industrialised landscape, and associated infrastructure and silos. The mid-ground view contains pylons and the gas cylinder and Dorman Long Tower within the proposed development Site. Beyond that in the far distance the faint outline of the Eston Hills can be seen through the palisade fence.</p>						

<p>This view has very low scenic qualities or aesthetic value. Receptors where people are at work whose attention is on the work and not focussed on the view is considered to be Low. The overall value for this view is therefore considered to be Low.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions above the view is considered to have a Low susceptibility to change.</p>						
Workers	Susceptibility	Low	Value	Low	Visual Sensitivity	Low

Future Baseline

- L4.42 The South Tees Development Corporation Masterplan identifies 1,188ha of potential development land across 4 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 STDC 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 view points of the site of the Proposed Development.
- L4.43 The removal of structures such as the Coke Works and the Dorman Long tower will significantly alter most of the views into the site as these features currently define the skyline. This will be particularly apparent from viewpoints 1, 3, 4,5, 8, 9, 10 and 12. The effect of these changes will be to change the historic character of LCZ1 from heavy industry to something more akin to a modern employment area.

L5.0 **Potential Effects**

L5.1 This section of the chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development on landscape and visual receptors. It should be read in conjunction with Appendix L4 of this ES.

Embedded Mitigation

L5.2 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 into 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 the installation of suitable site hoarding, careful siting and management of materials stockpiles and the sensitive siting of site welfare and other temporary structures.

During Construction

L5.3 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 Construction Environmental Management Plan.

L5.4 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.

L5.5 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.

L5.6 The above aspects of the construction phase will have a **temporary, short-term, moderate adverse** effect on views 1, 4 and 5; a **temporary, short-term, minor adverse** effect on views; and **temporary, short-term, moderate adverse** effect on views 2, 3, 9 and 10. The impacts of views 2, 3, 9 and 10 are significant. Construction effects upon views 6, 7 and 8 are considered to be negligible.

L5.7 The above aspects of the construction phase will have a **temporary, short-term, minor adverse** effect on the Urban, Intertidal Estuary, Eston Hills and Urban Green Space landscape character zones and a temporary, **short-term, negligible** effect on the Industrial, Coast and Peninsula, Coatham Marsh, Sathouse Wetlands and Rural landscape character zones.

L5.8 Therefore, construction of the proposed development will result in effects ranging from negligible to a **temporary, short-term minor to moderate adverse** effect upon views and the landscapes surrounding the South Tees site.

Table L5.1 Summary of Potential Landscape and Visual Effects during construction

Receptor	Magnitude of Change	Attribute of Change	Nature of Effect	Recommendation and Mitigation
All landscape and visual receptors	Negligible to Moderate	Adverse	Direct and short-term	Implementation of Construction Best Practice

During Operation

Landscape Assessment

LCZ1: Industrial

- L5.9 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 within this LCZ contains no features of value or character which would be affected by the proposed design.
- L5.10 The previous used industrial land has 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.
- L5.11 The proposed development would not result in a shift away from baseline conditions and would not affect the character of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.
- L5.12 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Moderate beneficial** level of effect, which **is considered to be Significant**.
- L5.13 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	Negligible	Moderate beneficial	Direct, Permanent

LCZ2: Urban

- L5.14 There would be some intervisibility between this LCZ, in particular for residential receptors in close proximity 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.
- L5.15 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.

- L5.16 Residential receptors within close proximity to the proposed development would be likely to experience indirect, minor adverse effects during construction, and in the operational stage.
- L5.17 Due to the scale size and permanence of the proposed development, this would result in a minor change in visual character of the landscape away from baseline conditions. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- L5.18 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**.
- L5.19 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

- L5.20 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 some intervisibility between this LCZ, though intervening built form from existing industrial infrastructure and existing vegetation reduces the magnitude and significance of the effect within the overall LCZ.
- L5.21 The character of the receiving landscape would remain the same in the operational stage due to 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.
- L5.22 The proposed development may be perceived as being altered from the baseline character at the boundary interface of this LCZ, detracting slightly from visual character and quality of the LCZ, however it will have limited influence on the sense of place or features within the overall LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- L5.23 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**.
- L5.24 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	Minor	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ4: Coast and Peninsula

- L5.25 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. There would be limited intervisibility between this LCZ and the proposed development, due to intervening built form and vegetation, which reduces the magnitude and significance of the effect within the overall LCZ.
- L5.26 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.
- L5.27 The scale and size of the proposed development is similar to existing build form and infrastructure and has no characteristic that detract from the value associated with the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.
- L5.28 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Negligible** level of effect, which is considered to be **not Significant**.
- L5.29 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

- L5.30 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. There would be some intervisibility between this LCZ and the proposed development, although intervening built form and vegetation reduces the significance of this within the overall LCZ.
- L5.31 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.
- L5.32 The scale and size of the proposed development is similar to existing built form and infrastructure and has no characteristic that detract from the value associated with the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.
- L5.33 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Negligible** level of effect, which is considered to be **not Significant**.
- L5.34 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 L5.6 LCZ5 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 5 – Coatham Marsh	Medium-High	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ6: Eston Hills

- L5.35 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, although existing retained gravel mounds within the side reduces the visual appearance of some of the building plots. This reduces the significance within the overall LCZ.
- L5.36 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.
- L5.37 The scale and size of the proposed development is 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**.
- L5.38 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**.
- L5.39 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	Medium-High	Moderate	Minor Adverse	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ7: Salthouse Wetlands

- L5.40 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 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.
- L5.41 There will be no distinctive components or visual features that will detract from the perceptual and physical qualities of this LCZ.
- L5.42 The scale and size of the proposed development is comparable to built forms within the vicinity of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.
- L5.43 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Negligible** level of effect, which is considered to be **not Significant**.
- L5.44 Specific embedded mitigation measures are not required for this LCZ due to the limited visibility.

Table L5.8 LCZ7 Assessment Summary

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 7 – Salthouse wetlands	Medium-High	Negligible	Negligible	Indirect, Permanent

LCZ8: Rural

- L5.45 The sensitivity of this LCZ is Medium, as this area combines 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 farm land, 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.
- L5.46 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 long-range distance from this LCZ.
- L5.47 The scale and size of the proposed development is comparable to built forms within the vicinity of the LCZ. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.
- L5.48 Combining all of these criteria, it is considered that there will be a **Negligible** level of effect, which is considered to be **not Significant**.
- L5.49 Specific embedded mitigation measures are not required for this LCZ due to the limited visibility.

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

- L5.50 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.
- L5.51 The scale and size of the proposed development is 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.
- L5.52 Based on the descriptions above the magnitude of change is considered to be **Moderate**.
- L5.53 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**.
- L5.54 Specific embedded mitigation measures are not required for this LCZ due to the limited visibility.

Table L5.10 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

Table L5.11 Summary of Potential Landscape Effects during operation

LCZ Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Low	Negligible	Moderate beneficial – Significant	Direct, Permanent
LCZ 2 - Urban	Low	Minor	Minor Adverse – not significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	Medium	Minor	Minor Adverse – 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 – Salthouse 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

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 gravel mounds within the proposed development site will be being retained and offer a degree of screening of Development Plot E (refer to Illustrative Masterplan included at Appendix B4 of this ES) towards the north boundary, helping reduce the magnitude of effect.
- L5-58 The general form and massing will be comparable to the existing Steelworks rolling mill and blast furnace. In particular, Development Plots A, B, C and D (see Appendix B4 of this ES) are arranged in a position which aligns in a parallel formation with the existing Steelworks site. Plot E (Appendix B4) is partially screened by the existing stockpiled mounds of gravels and is a

similar scale and form to the long white steel-rolling building immediately to the south of the proposed development site. Plot F (Appendix B4) appears to be the most clearly articulated and notable within the proposed development from this view, however this has some minor softening from the existing gravel mounds and does not dominate or focus the attention in terms of scale and size, in context with the rest of the view or the overall appearance of the development. Development Plots G, H and I (Appendix B4) are positioned behind existing landmarks features in this location, of the gas cylinder and Dorman Long tower, and chimney stack, the proposed development height does not compete or detract from their visual presence, or significantly alter the skyline.

- L5.59 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.
- L5.60 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- L5.61 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 L5.12 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 2

- L5.62 Figure VP2-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.
- L5.63 The proposed development would be located in the mid distant view, looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. The Development Plots will be primarily screened from view by existing built urban development. The visible Development Plot from this view will be the western elevation of Plot I, where it will appear as a minor component in the overall view. The development appears central to the view as it continues to the North, a road which forms the entrance into the South Tees Business Park but is not used by the majority of general public road users.
- L5.64 The proposed development will be broadly indistinguishable from the baseline condition and is smaller in size and scale relative to development within the intervening view. The proposed development does not significantly alter the skyline, however fills in a small part of it for a focussed area of the overall range of the view. The proposed development would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in the view.
- L5.65 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- 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 L5.13 Vp2 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP2	Road and Residential Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 3

- L5.67 Figure VP3-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.
- L5.68 The proposed development would be located in the far distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. The Development Plots are primarily screened from view by existing intervening-built development, vegetation, including trees, and topography changes. The most visible Development Plot from this view is Plot F, with some very minor visibility of Plot E, which may become slightly more visible during winter months.
- L5.69 The proposed development is indistinguishable from the baseline condition, and Plot I is smaller in scale than the existing gas cylinder structure which is within close proximity. Plot I is also of the same height as the existing warehouse development in which it visually sits behind and fills in the skyline between the warehouse building and the gas cylinder.
- L5.70 The proposed development would form a minor component in the landscape and visual context and is a generally indistinguishable component of the landscape and visual context. The proposed development does not significantly alter the skyline or features within it which add to the value of the view, Plot F however fills in a small part of it for a focussed area within the overall view, and this is likely to be missed by the footpath receptor. The proposed development would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in a view.
- L5.71 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- L5.72 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 Vp3 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP3	Footpath Users Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 4

- L5.73 Figure VP4-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.
- L5.74 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, those being Plots F, G, H and I.
- L5.75 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.
- L5.76 The existing gravel mounds seen in the existing view are now hidden from the proposed view behind Plots F and G, though the new Development Plot height is not too dissimilar to the height and scale of the gravel mounds from this view, and no other landmark features or interest in the skyline is obscured from view by the development.
- L5.77 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 in and wider context of the view, features within it of similar nature.

L5.78 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor-Moderate**.

L5.79 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 L5.15 Vp4 Assessment Summary

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

Representative Viewpoint 5

L5.80 Figure VP5-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.81 The proposed development would be located at a close-range view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the western elevation of Development Plot I is very visible. The remainder of the proposed development site is hidden from view by Plot I.

L5.82 The existing infrastructure of the gas cylinder, and glimpses of the Dorman Long Tower can be seen in the view. The proposed development plot does not exceed the height of these existing structures, though it does alter the view and the previous open landscape characteristics of the filtered view through the palisade fence, which is changed to one of proposed development, of a large scale.

L5.83 The receptor sensitivity in this view is Low, which consists primarily of road users gaining access to neighbouring manufacturing sites. It is proposed to be the entrance to the new proposed development. This view is not visible to residential development or recreation space or public footpaths. The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Moderate**.

L5.84 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 L5.16 Vp5 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP5	Road Users Low	Moderate	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 6

L5.85 Figure VP6-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.86 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view the majority of the proposed development are well screened from the view due to existing infrastructure in the intervening landscape. Partial views of Plots C and E are visible, with almost imperceptible views of Plots B and D. The remainder of the proposed development site is screened from the view by industrial development.

L5.87 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.

L5.88 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.

L5.89 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 L5.17 Vp6 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP6	Footpath Users Medium	Negligible	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 7

L5.90 Figure VP7-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.91 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view many of the Development Plots are well screened from the view due to existing infrastructure of industrial development in the intervening landscape. Partial views of Plots A and C are visible.

L5.92 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users is Medium; however, 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 slightly filled in where Plots A and C are located, however this does not detract from the view, or change the characteristics of the baseline.

L5.93 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Negligible**.

L5.94 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 L5.18 Vp7 Assessment Summary

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

Representative Viewpoint 8

L5.95 Figure VP8-B in Appendix 4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.96 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view Plots G and H are visible.

L5.97 The receptor sensitivity of footpath users and Road Users for this view is Low.

L5.98 Plots G and H can be seen in the view above the existing tree line, the visibility of which may be increased in winter months. The skyline is altered in a very minor way, filling in gaps between existing industrial chimneys and towers.

L5.99 The proposed development does not visually dominate or compete with existing retail buildings and the horizontal nature of the proposed development sits comfortably within the overall view and existing building designs. The proposed development forms a minor component of the landscape and visual context and is generally indistinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics.

L5.100 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.

L5.101 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 Vp8 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP8	Road Users Footpath Users Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 9

L5.102 Figure VP9-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.103 The proposed development would be located in the distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. From this view Plots F, G, H and I are visible.

L5.104 The residential receptor sensitivity of this view is Medium. The combined receptor also includes recreation grounds / playing field. The view from the recreation areas will be transitory in nature and not focussed on the view. Residential receptors may have a more direct view.

L5.105 Development Plots F, G, H can be seen over the top of existing houses and trees in the background of the view. The scale and massing of the Proposed creates a visible and recognisable feature in the visual context, and is a readily apparent influence on the receptor, in particular residential. Users of the recreation area will be less focussed on the view, and therefore the development will be less readily apparent. The proposed development is generally distinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics.

L5.106 The skyline is altered in a minor-moderate way, filling in gaps between residential properties rooflines, in particular the chimney stacks of the properties in front of Plot F. This effect could be minimised dependant on the material selection for the proposed development buildings.

L5.107 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Moderate**.

L5.108 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 L5.20 Vp9 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP9	Residential Medium	Moderate	Moderately Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 10

L5.109 Figure VP10-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.110 The proposed development would be located in the mid distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site. The Development Plots are primarily screened from view by existing built development. The visible Development Plots from this view are H and I, where they appear as a minor component in the overall view, and its influence on the receptor may be missed.

- L5.111 The skyline is altered in a minor way as Development Plot I fills in the view of the road looking north, which forms an entrance to South Tees Business Park, however the proposed development is of comparable scale and massing to existing buildings also within this view, including the ASDA supermarket.
- L5.112 Road user receptors are likely to experience this view as glimpsed and transitory in nature. This view does not affect residential receptors.
- L5.113 The proposed development is generally indistinguishable from the existing baseline characteristics, the existing features of the view are retained such as the Dorman Long Tower and tree planting. The proposed development would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in a view.
- L5.114 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.
- L5.115 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 L5.21 Vp10 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP10	Road Users Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 11

- L5.116 Figure VP11-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.
- L5.117 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. The proposed development plots which can be most clearly seen in the view are Plots A, B and C, with glimpses of Plots F and I further afield.
- L5.118 Development Plots A and B 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.
- L5.119 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.
- L5.120 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.
- L5.121 Based on the above assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.

L5.122 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 L5.22 Vp11 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP11	Footpath Users Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint 12

L5.123 Figure VP12-B in Appendix L4 illustrates the AVR view of the proposed development.

L5.124 The proposed development would be located in the mid-distant view. The view is looking at eye level towards the proposed development site’s northern boundary. From this view Development Plots F, H and I are visible.

L5.125 The receptor sensitivity of workers for this view is Low. This is an area of working industry and people are unlikely to be focussed on the view but rather the task at hand.

L5.126 The existing view towards the proposed development site is filtered through a palisade fence, and therefore the development plots have fairly low visibility in this view. The skyline is altered in a very minor way, replacing a view of the existing stockpiled gravel mounds with new built development. This would cause no discernible deterioration or improvement in the view, and it would change the baseline characteristics in a minor way.

L5.127 The proposed development does not visually dominate or compete with existing buildings or appear out of place within the context.

L5.128 The assessment of the magnitude of change is therefore considered to be **Minor**.

L5.129 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 L5.23 Vp12 Assessment Summary

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP12	Workers Low	Minor	Minor Adverse	Direct, Permanent

Table L5.24 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
VP2	Road and Residential – Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP3	Footpath Users - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP4	Footpath Users - Low	Minor-Moderate	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP5	Road Users - Low	Moderate	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP6	Footpath Users - Medium	Negligible	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP7	Footpath Users - Medium	Negligible	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP8	Road Users Footpath Users - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP9	Residential - Medium	Moderate	Moderately - Adverse Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP10	Road Users – Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP11	Footpath Users - Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP12	Workers - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

L6.0 **Mitigation and Monitoring**

L6.1 A number of mitigation measures have been proposed to eliminate, minimise or manage identified potential significant landscape and visual effects.

During Construction

L6.2 The following mitigation measures are assumed during the construction phase of the development:

- 1 Implementation of construction best practice;
- 2 Installation of suitable site hoarding;
- 3 Careful siting and management of materials stockpiles; and
- 4 Sensitive siting of site welfare and other temporary structures.

During Operation

L6.3 The following mitigation measures are assumed during the operation phase of the development:

- 1 Buildings to be articulated in a way which reduces visual scale and massing.
- 2 Building colour and cladding to be appropriate, and help break up the visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.
- 3 For View Point 5 there mitigation via tree planting and landscaping along the boundary line to soften and reduce the visual scale of the development.

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 The construction phase will have a **temporary, short-term, moderate adverse** (significant) effect on views 1, 4 and 5; a **temporary, short-term, minor adverse** effect on views; and **temporary, short-term, moderate adverse** (significant) effect on views 2, 3, 9 and 10. Construction effects upon views 6, 7 and 8 are considered to be negligible and not significant in EIA terms.

L7.3 The construction phase will have a **temporary, short-term, minor adverse** effect on the Urban, Intertidal Estuary, Eston Hills and Urban Green Space landscape character zones and a temporary, **short-term, negligible** effect on the Industrial, Coast and Peninsula, Coatham Marsh, Sathouse Wetlands and Rural landscape character zones. These impacts are not considered significant in EIA terms.

During Operation

L7.4 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	Negligible	Moderate beneficial – Significant	Direct, Permanent
LCZ 2 - Urban	Low	Minor	Minor Adverse – not significant	Indirect, Permanent
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	Medium	Minor	Minor Adverse – 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 – Salthouse 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
VP2	Road and Residential – Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

LCZ/Representative Viewpoint	Receptor and Visual Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect	Nature of Effect
VP3	Footpath Users - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP4	Footpath Users - Low	Minor-Moderate	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP5	Road Users - Low	Moderate	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP6	Footpath Users - Medium	Negligible	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP7	Footpath Users - Medium	Negligible	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP8	Road Users Footpath Users - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP9	Residential - Medium	Moderate	Moderately - Adverse Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP10	Road Users – Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP11	Footpath Users - Medium-High	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent
VP12	Workers - Low	Minor	Minor Adverse - Not Significant	Direct, Permanent

L8.0 Summary & Conclusions

- L8.1 Overall, the proposed development will result in significant (moderate) adverse visual impacts during the construction phase. However, these are temporary in nature and typical of construction projects of this type and not unusual in the local context.
- L8.2 There is potential for a significant (moderate) beneficial impact upon the industrial LCZ from the operational phase of the proposed development. Other impacts upon specified LCZs are considered to be minor or negligible in nature.
- L8.3 There is the potential for a significant (moderate) adverse effect upon Viewpoint 1 and Viewpoint 9. The effects upon other viewpoint are considered to minor or negligible in nature.
- L8.4 The summary of effects is presented in Table L8.1 below.

Table L8.1 Summary of Effects

Receptor	Potential Effect (including significance)	Mitigation Measure	Residual Effect (including significance)
LCZ 1 - Industrial	Moderate beneficial – 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 beneficial – Significant
LCZ 2 - Urban	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
LCZ 3 – Intertidal Estuary	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
LCZ 4 – Coast and Peninsula	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	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	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	Minor Adverse – not significant

Receptor	Potential Effect (including significance)	Mitigation Measure	Residual Effect (including significance)
		visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials.	
LCZ 7 – Salthouse wetlands	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	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	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	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
VP2	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
VP3	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
VP4	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
VP5	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	Minor Adverse - Not Significant

Receptor	Potential Effect (including significance)	Mitigation Measure	Residual Effect (including significance)
		visual massing, avoiding overly reflective materials. Tree planting and landscaping to site boundary	
VP6	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
VP7	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
VP8	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
VP9	Moderately - 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.	Moderately - Adverse Significant
VP10	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
VP11	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
VP12	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.