APPENDIX PC-4: VISUAL EFFECTS

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | | | | | | • | | Residual (a growth of pla 15, includin mitigation) | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View south from PRoW 035 at junction with PRoW 033 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is located approximately 358m north-of the Appeal Site, at the junction between PRoW 035 and PRoW 033. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area, with minimal cultural associations and limited scenic quality. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities where the focus of their attention will be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed to be High. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium . | Transient | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited | At Year 1, the intervening mature vegetation and built form will remain the dominant feature in the view with glimpsed views of the rooftops of the Proposed Development possible between the existing roofscape – views of potential built form would be further screened within the summer months when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, although from this location there will be little change to the view beyond that at Year 1. | | Negligible Adverse | Very Small Adverse | Negligible Adverse |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | | | | | | | | | Residual (a growth of pla 15, including mitigation) | nting by Year |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View south from PRoW 033 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is located approximately 87m north of the Appeal Site, on PRoW 033 as it passes near the recent residential development to the north of the Appeal Site. Residential receptors are located in close proximity to the north albeit subject to some screening from boundary vegetation, so the pedestrian experience is used as the scenario of maximum visibility from this location. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Medium-Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations and scenic quality, albeit I note the value attached to them locally. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities where the focus of their attention may be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed to be High. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium. | Transient | Filtered | Partial | Partial | At Year 1, the landscape improvements to the Appeal Site boundary vegetation would have little effect with the Proposed Development partially visible above and between the intervening vegetation visible across the view. There will be partial views of the new built form set back beyond a landscape buffer within the northern extent of the Appeal Site - further views of the proposed built form within the wider Appeal Site would be screened. The new predominantly two storey elements on this edge will increase the amount of built form visible on the skyline in these closerange views. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, further softening views of the Proposed Development. During the summer months when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf, views of potential built form would be further screened, and thereby reducing the potential effects. | | Moderate- Major Adverse | Medium Adverse | Moderate Adverse |
| 03 View east from Little Bushey Lane Pedestrian / Resident | The viewpoint is located immediately adjacent to the western Appeal Site boundary, on the pedestrian footway associated with Little Bushey Lane. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Medium-Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider | Fixed | Filtered | Full | Partial | At Year 1, in the context of existing views of built development to north and south in this view, there would be direct views of the new built form set back beyond an area of open space, with the proposed landscape structural planting providing some, albeit limited mitigation within the intervening open space. The open space would provide softening of the built | On roadside: Large- Medium Adverse | Moderate- Major Adverse | Medium Adverse | Moderate Adverse |

2

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | eceptor ewpoints peal Site context Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) otograph | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | | | | Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation) | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | | | | | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| | the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations and scenic quality, albeit I note the value attached to them locally. Visual receptors at this location include either people travelling along a secondary road who have a Medium susceptibility or people at their place of residence who have High susceptibility. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium . | | | | development and a focal sense of place in the immediate streetscene. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, softening and filtering views of the Proposed Development. | On PROW 040 within Appeal Site: Large Adverse | Moderate Major Adverse | Medium-Large Adverse | Moderate Adverse |
| View north-east from Little Bushey Lane Pedestrian / Resident | The viewpoint is located immediately adjacent to the western Appeal Site boundary, on the pedestrian footway associated with Little Bushey Lane. The short break in development along Little Bushey Lane allows brief views over the Appeal Site. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Medium-Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations and scenic quality, albeit I note the value attached to them locally. Visual receptors at this location include either people travelling along a secondary road who have a Medium susceptibility or people at their place of residence who have High susceptibility. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium. | Filtered | Full | Partial | At Year 1, in the context of existing views of built development to north and south in this view, there would be direct views of the new built form set back beyond an area of open space and private driveway. The proposed landscape structural planting would fill the existing gap in hedgerow vegetation and there would be some, albeit limited mitigation within the intervening open space. Hedgerow restoration would repair landscape condition in line with published character guidance. At Year 15, the hedgerow restoration will have matured, to include dense boundary vegetation, which will screen (in summer) and filter (in winter) views of the Proposed Development. | | Major- Moderate Adverse | Medium- Small Adverse | Minor- Moderate Adverse |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | | | | | | | | | Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation) | |
|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View north-east from Mendip Road Pedestrian / Resident | The viewpoint is located approximately 69m west of the Appeal Site, representing views from residential development accessed off Little Bushey Lane. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area. I consider the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations and limited scenic quality. Visual receptors at this location include either people travelling along a secondary road who have a Medium susceptibility or people at their place of residence who have High susceptibility. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium | | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited | The view looks along the road, where there are heavily restricted framed views of the existing boundary vegetation along the western boundary of the Appeal Site, further reduced by the scale of recent built development on the corner with Little Bushey Lane. This restricts views over the wider Appeal Site and landscape beyond. At Year 1, the intervening mature vegetation and built form will remain the dominant feature in the view with glimpsed rooftop views of the Proposed Development possible in the centre of the view. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, to include boundary vegetation, this will further soften and filter views of the Proposed Development. | Small Adverse | Minor Adverse | Very Small Adverse | Negligible Adverse |
| 06 View north-east from Wayside Avenue Pedestrian / Resident | Representative of views from the nearby residential streets, the viewpoint is on Wayside Avenue, approximately 265m from the Appeal Site boundary. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Medium-Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider the nature of the view to have limited | Transient | Partial Glimpse | Glimpse | Limited | Existing, including recent, development almost entirely screens views towards and over the Appeal Site from this location. Views are heavily restricted by the existing built form. The residential properties located adjacent to the Appeal Site boundary off Wayside Avenue have views over the Appeal Site and would view the Proposed Development, albeit the proposed school in the southwestern part of the Appeal Site adjoins some of the | Roadway: None | Neutral | None | Neutral |
| | cultural associations and scenic quality, albeit I note the value attached to them locally. Visual receptors at this location include either people travelling along a secondary road who have a Medium susceptibility or people at their place of residence who have High susceptibility. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium | | | | | properties and therefore would remain largely open. Properties on The Squirrels have a similar range of considerations. All boundary vegetation of hedgerows with trees will be reinstated and reinforced, densely filtering the Proposed Development once established. In summer months, by year 15, screening would be in place that would reduce effects further. | Residential Properties adjoining Appeal Site: Medium- Large Adverse | Moderate- Major Adverse | Medium Adverse | Moderate Adverse |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | | | | | | | | | Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation) | |
|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View west from PRoW 008, at Hilfield Park Reservoir Pedestrian | The viewpoint is at a viewing platform at the end of PRoW 008, approximately 1.14km from the Appeal Site boundary. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Medium as they are not from or over a designated for landscape quality although I consider the nature of the view to have some cultural associations and scenic quality, including noting the 'community views' in Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities where the focus of their attention may be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider the susceptibility of visual receptors to be High. On the basis of the above, I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium-High | Transient | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited / None | The view looks over Hilfield Reservoir that dominates the immediate foreground and middle distance. Beyond this the mature vegetation located between the reservoir and Hilfield Lane and that located along the M1 motorway embankment is visible, providing a verdant back drop to the reservoir. There are long distance heavily filtered views of the rooflines of existing development along Little Bushey Lane and adjoining roads. At Year 1, the existing mature vegetation will heavily restrict views from the outset. Where there are potential views of the proposals these would be long distance heavily filtered / glimpsed views, with development seen in the context of the existing settlement edge of Bushey. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, this will further soften and filter views further of the Proposed Development. In summer months, there would be less visibility of the proposed built form owing to vegetated screening. | | Negligible Adverse | None | Neutral |
| 17 View south-west from PRoW 038 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is along PRoW 038, approximately 0.73km from the Appeal Site boundary. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations albeit some scenic quality. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities where the focus of their attention may be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed be High. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium | | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited / None | The view looks over gently arable fields, beyond which the mature vegetation provides an extensive backdrop. There are filtered views of the existing recent residential development to the north of the Appeal Site in the centre of the view. There are no views possible of the ground plane of the Appeal Site from this location. At Year 1, the existing mature vegetation will heavily restrict views from the outset. Where there are potential views of the proposals these would be heavily filtered / glimpsed views, with development seen in the context of the existing recent development to the north of the Appeal Site. During the summer months there would be no views of the development when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, this will further screen any views of the Proposed Development. | | Negligible Adverse | None | Neutral |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | | | | | | | | Residual (a growth of pla 15, includin mitigation) | |
|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View south from A41 bridge over the M1 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is located approximately 431m north of the Appeal Site, on the A41 bridge over the M1. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area with minimal cultural associations and scenic quality. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities albeit the focus of their attention adjoining major roadway infrastructure is unlikely to be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed to be Medium. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium-Low. | Transient | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited | The view from the overbridge looks along the M1 transport corridor and includes the recent residential development to the north of the Appeal Site being partially visible in the right of the view. Beyond there are glimpsed views into and over the Appeal Site, including existing development. The combination of the existing intervening features heavily restricts views towards and over the Appeal Site. At Year 1, the roadways and associated mature vegetation will remain the dominant features in the views albeit glimpsed views of the Proposed Development would be obtained over and between existing vegetation – potential views of built form would be further screened within the summer months when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, further integrating and softening the appearance of the proposed built form. | | Negligible Adverse | None | Neutral |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | Receptor | | | | | | | | Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation) | |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| View south-west from PRoW 040 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is on PRoW 040, approximately 189m from the Appeal Site boundary. I consider the value of the views obtained from this location to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area. I consider the nature of the view to have limited cultural associations and limited scenic quality. Visual receptors at this location are people using the footpath for recreational activities where the focus of their attention may be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed to be High. On the basis of the above, I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium | Transient | Filtered | Glimpse | Limited | The view looks over the immediate heavily grazed pasture field, with a series of large mature trees associated with the field boundary. To the left there is a collection of vehicles within a storage yard and stock-piled materials. To the right of the view, between the canopies of the large mature trees there are filtered views in winter towards and over the Appeal Site, including development within Bushey as the context beyond. At Year 1, the intervening vegetation will remain the dominant feature in the view with glimpses of the Proposed Development within the Appeal Site, in the right of the view, replacing existing views of the recent development to the north of the Appeal Site. Views of built form would be further screened within the summer months when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured, the enhanced vegetation to the Appeal Site boundary and within the proposed open space will further soften and filter views. | Medium Adverse | Moderate Adverse | Medium-Small Adverse | Minor- Moderate Adverse |
| View south-west from PRoW 040 Pedestrian | The viewpoint is on the PRoW 040 M1 overbridge, approximately 274m from the Appeal Site boundary. A further glimpsed view is obtained through a gap in vegetation from the A41 corridor a short distance to the north-west of this location. I consider the value of the views obtained from these locations to be Low as they are not from or over a designated area and I consider the | | Filtered / restricte d | Glimpse | Limited | The view looks along the M1 transport corridor and the view from the A41 corridor is oblique and fleeting, and barely obtained in summer months. The lighting columns associated with the motorway, mature trees visible to the north of VP20 and the pylons associated with the overhead powerlines that pass through the Appeal Site form notable vertical features within the landscape. The layering effect of the intervening vegetation structure in combination with the undulating landform results in views from this elevated position being limited to partial / filtered views. | Small Adverse | Minor Adverse | Very Small Adverse | Negligible Adverse |

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial

| Visual Receptor Viewpoints (Appeal Site | | | | | accounts for proposed | | Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation) | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| Context Photograph no.) Receptor type | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor (1) | Transient / Fixed | Nature of View (2) | Degree of Visual Intrusion (3) | Proportion of Development Visible (4) | Commentary on Development | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect | Magnitude (5) and Type (7) of Change | Significance (6) and Type (7) of Effect |
| | nature of the view to have minimal cultural associations and scenic quality. Visual receptors at these locations are people using the footpath for recreational activities, albeit crossing a major roadway where the focus of their attention is unlikely to be on the enjoyment of views. As such, I consider susceptibility of visual receptors to the type of development proposed to be Medium. On the basis of the above I consider the sensitivity of receptors at this location to be Medium-Low . | | | | | Where there are views into and over the Appeal Site, it is seen in the context of the existing settlement edge and the recent residential development to the north of the Appeal Site. At Year 1, the intervening vegetation will remain the dominant feature in the view with partial and glimpsed views of the Proposed Development within the Appeal Site. The built form would be more visible in the northern part of the Appeal Site, where it will be seen in the overall composition of the views as a limited extension to existing development. Views of potential built form in the Appeal Site will be further screened within the summer months when the intervening vegetation is in full leaf. At Year 15, the landscape scheme for the Proposed Development will have matured and thus the enhanced vegetation to the Appeal Site boundary and within the proposed open space will further soften and filter views. | vegetation on A41 corridor: Medium-Small | Minor- Moderate Adverse | Small Adverse | Minor Adverse |

8

- Sensitivity of receptor: High, Medium, Low

 Nature of View (degree of visibility of Development): Open, Partial (Filtered), None

 Degree of Visual Intrusion (extent of the view that would be occupied by the Development): Full, Partial, Glimpse, None

 Proportion of Development Visible: Full, Most, Partial, Small Amount, None
- Magnitude of Change: Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, None
- Significance of Effect: Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible
- 7 Type of Change/Effect: Adverse, Neutral, Beneficial