## **TABLE 1: LANDSCAPE EFFECTS**

						Evidence of Peter Radmall (on behalf of Council)						
	Sensitivity to the type of development proposed			Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		Sensitivity to the type of		r 1 - accounts for nitigation measures)	Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)			
Landscape Receptor		Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	development proposed	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect		
Open Pasture Grassland Fields (landscape feature)	Low value High susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Medium Adverse / Very Small Beneficial Balance: Small Adverse	Minor Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility Medium-High sensitivity	Large	Major Adverse	Large	Major Adverse		
Native Hedgerow (landscape feature)	Low susceptibility	Very Small Adverse / Small Beneficial Balance: Very Small Beneficial	Minor Beneficial	Very Small Adverse / Medium Beneficial Balance: Small Beneficial	Minor-Moderate Beneficial	Medium value Medium susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Very Small	Minor Adverse	Small	Minor Beneficial		
Hedgerow Trees (landscape feature)	suscentibility	Very Small Adverse / Small Beneficial Balance: Very Small Beneficial	Negligible Beneficial	Very Small Adverse / Medium Beneficial Balance: Small Beneficial	Minor-Moderate Beneficial	High value  Medium susceptibility  Medium-High sensitivity	Very Small	Negligible Adverse	Small	Minor Beneficial		
Individual field Trees (landscape feature)	Medium sensitivity	Medium Adverse / Medium-Large Beneficial Balance: Very Small Beneficial	Negligible Beneficial	Medium Adverse / Large Beneficial Balance: Small Beneficial	Minor-Moderate Beneficial	High value  Medium susceptibility  Medium-High sensitivity	Very Small	Negligible Adverse	Small	Minor Beneficial		
Stream	<b>Low</b> sensitivity	Small Adverse / Medium-Small Beneficial Balance: Very Small Beneficial	Negligible Beneficial	Small Adverse / Medium-Large Beneficial Balance: Medium- Small Beneficial	Minor-Moderate Beneficial	Medium value Medium susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Very Small	Neutral	Small	Minor Beneficial		
Landform (landscape feature)	Low susceptibility	Small Adverse / Very Small Beneficial Balance: Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Small Adverse / Very Small Beneficial Balance: Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility Medium-High sensitivity	Medium-Large	Moderate-Major Adverse	Medium-Large	Moderate-Major Adverse		
Appeal Site Vicinity character (landscape character)	Low value Medium-Low susceptibility Low sensitivity	Medium-Large Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Medium adverse / Small beneficial Balance: Small Adverse	Minor Adverse	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Appeal Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Medium-High	Large	Major Adverse	n/a	Moderate Adverse		
Open Land Adjoining the Appeal Site	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Medium	Medium	Moderate Adverse	n/a	Minor Adverse		

	Evidence of Patric	k Clark (on behalf o	f Appellant)			Evidence of Peter Radmall (on behalf of Council)						
Landscape	Sensitivity to the type of development	Completion (Year : proposed primary mit	1 - accounts for igation measures)	Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		Sensitivity to the type of	Completion (Year 1 - accounts for proposed primary mitigation measures)		Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)			
		Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	development proposed	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect		
Settlement Edge / Built Up Area		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Low	Medium	Minor Adverse	n/a	Negligible Adverse		
M1 Corridor	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Low	Small	Negligible Adverse	n/a	Negligible Adverse		
	(in this part of the LCA) Low value Low susceptibility Low sensitivity		Minor-Negligible Adverse	Very small adverse / Very small beneficial Balance: Neutral	Neutral	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	Very Small	Negligible Adverse		
	(in this part of the LCA) Low value Low susceptibility Low sensitivity		Minor-Negligible Adverse	Very small adverse / Very small beneficial Balance: Neutral	Neutral	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	Very Small	Negligible Adverse		

## **Table 2: Visual Effects**

						Evidence of Peter Radmall (on behalf of Council)						
Visual Receptor Viewpoints Receptor type	Sensitivity to the type of development proposed	Completion (Year proposed primary mit		Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		Sensitivity to the type of		r 1 - accounts for nitigation measures)	Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)			
		Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	development proposed (PR 8.4 and 8.5)	Magnitude and Type of Change (PR 8.6)	Significance and Type of Effect (PR 8.7)	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect		
View south from PRoW 035 at junction with PRoW 033 Pedestrian	Low value High susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Very Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible		
02 View south from PRoW 033 Pedestrian	Medium-Low value High susceptibility <b>Medium</b> sensitivity	Medium-Large Adverse	Moderate-Major Adverse	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Medium Large	Moderate-Major	n/a	Moderate		
03	Medium-Low value	On roadside: Large- Medium Adverse	Moderate-Major Adverse	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility	Large	Major	n/a	Moderate		

	Evidence of Patri	ck Clark (on behalf o	of Appellant)			Evidence of Peter Radmall (on behalf of Council)					
Visual Receptor	Sensitivity to the type of	Completion (Year proposed primary mit	1 - accounts for igation measures)	Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		Sensitivity to the type of		1 - accounts for nitigation measures)	Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		
Viewpoints  Receptor type	development proposed	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	development proposed (PR 8.4 and 8.5)		Significance and Type of Effect (PR 8.7)	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	
View east from Little Bushey Lane Pedestrian / Resident		On PROW 040 within Appeal Site: Large Adverse	Moderate-Major Adverse	Medium-Large Adverse	Moderate Adverse	(Sensitivity not specified)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
04 View northeast from Little Bushey Lane Pedestrian / Resident	Medium-Low value  Medium susceptibility (road users) / High susceptibility (residents)  Medium sensitivity	Large Adverse	Major- Moderate Adverse	Medium-Small Adverse	Minor-Moderate Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Large	Major	n/a	Moderate	
05 View north- east from Mendip Road Pedestrian / Resident	Low value  Medium susceptibility (road users) / High susceptibility (residents)  Medium sensitivity	Small Adverse	Minor Adverse	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Low Value High susceptibility Medium Sensitivity	Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible	
06 View north- east from		Roadway: None	Neutral	None	Neutral	Low Value Low susceptibility	Very Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible	
Wayside Avenue Pedestrian / Resident		Residential Properties adjoining Appeal Site: Medium-Large Adverse	Moderate-Major Adverse	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	(Sensitivity not specified)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
View west from PRoW 008, at Hilfield Park Reservoir Pedestrian	Medium value High susceptibility Medium-High sensitivity	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	None	Neutral	High value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Very Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible	

	Evidence of Patri	ck Clark (on behalf o	of Appellant)			Evidence of Peter Radmall (on behalf of Council)					
Visual Receptor	Sensitivity to the type of development proposed			Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		Sensitivity to the type of	Completion (Year 1 - accounts for proposed primary mitigation measures)		Residual (accounts for growth of planting by Year 15, including secondary mitigation)		
Viewpoints  Receptor type		Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	development proposed (PR 8.4 and 8.5)	Magnitude and Type of Change (PR 8.6)	Significance and Type of Effect (PR 8.7)	Magnitude and Type of Change	Significance and Type of Effect	
17 View southwest from PRoW 038 Pedestrian	Low value High susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	None	Neutral	Medium value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Very Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible	
View south from A41 bridge over the M1  Pedestrian	Low value  Medium susceptibility  Medium-Low sensitivity	Very Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse	None	Neutral	Low value  Medium susceptibility  Medium-Low sensitivity	Small	Minor	n/a	Negligible	
20 View south- west from PRoW 040 Pedestrian	Low value High susceptibility Medium sensitivity	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Medium-Small Adverse	Minor-Moderate Adverse	Medium value High susceptibility (Sensitivity not specified)	Medium	Moderate	n/a	Minor-Moderate	
View southwest from PRoW 040 Pedestrian	Low value Medium susceptibility Medium-Low sensitivity	Small Adverse  Gap in vegetation on A41 corridor:  Medium-Small Adverse	Minor Adverse  Minor-Moderate Adverse	Very Small Adverse Small Adverse	Negligible Adverse  Minor Adverse	Low value  Medium susceptibility  Medium-Low sensitivity	Medium n/a	Moderate n/a	n/a n/a	Minor n/a	