

The Great Grid Upgrade

North Humber to High Marnham

Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 3: Appendix 6.1 Landscape Assessment
Methodology

February 2025



nationalgrid

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
1.1	Overview	4
1.2	Guidance Specific to Landscape Assessment	4
1.3	Definition of Landscape Effects	5
2.	Approach to Landscape Assessment	6
2.1	Assessing Landscape Effects	6
2.2	Assessing Cumulative Effects	7
2.3	Study Area	7
	Approach to Defining the Study Area	8
2.4	Baseline Data Gathering	9
	Method for Assessing Landscape Effects	9
	Landscape Value	10
	Establishing Landscape Sensitivity	12
2.5	Predicting Magnitude of Change	15
	Size and Scale of Effect	15
	Geographical Extent of Effect	16
	Duration and Reversibility	16
	Making Professional Judgements	16
2.6	Judging Levels of Landscape Effect	18
2.7	Mitigation and Residual Effects	19
3.	References	20

Table 2.1 - Apparent height of 50 m structure when viewed at arm's length	8
Table 2.2 - Typical importance of landscape receptors	10
Table 2.3 - Indicators of landscape value	11
Table 2.4 - Indicators of landscape receptor susceptibility	14
Table 2.5 - Indicators of magnitude of landscape change	17
Table 2.6 - Categories and indicators of significance	18

North Humber to High Marnham Document Control

Document Properties

Organisation	Gillespies
Author	Gillespies
Approved by	National Grid
Title	Preliminary Environmental Information Report Appendix 6.1
Document Register ID	NHHM-NG-ENV-REP-001
Data Classification	Public

Version History

Document	Version	Status	Description / Changes
Appendix 6.1	1.0	Final	First Issue

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 The North Humber to High Marnham Project (the 'Project') is a proposal by National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) referred to as National Grid in this report, to reinforce the transmission network between a new Birkhill Wood Substation, close to the existing Creyke Beck Substation in Yorkshire, and a new substation adjacent to the existing High Marham Substation in Nottinghamshire. This would be achieved by reinforcing the transmission network with a new 400 kilovolt (kV) electricity transmission line over approximately 90 kilometres (km).
- 1.1.2 This report has been produced as an appendix to **Chapter 6 Landscape** in Volume 1 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).
- 1.1.3 The environmental effects of the two substations including their associated overhead line reconfigurations, hereafter referred to as the Proposed Substation Works, have accordingly been considered within **Chapter 20 Substations and Associated Works**. For the purpose of this appendix the Proposed Overhead Line between the proposed Birkhill Wood Substation and the Proposed High Marnham Substation is hereafter referred to as the Proposed Overhead Line.
- 1.1.4 This Appendix to **Chapter 6 Landscape** describes the methodology used in the production of the preliminary landscape assessment and is also that proposed to produce the landscape chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES). It describes the methods used to determine the baseline conditions, sensitivity of the receptors, the magnitude of change and the approach to judging the level or importance of likely landscape effects.
- 1.1.5 The methodology is an updated version of that submitted as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report (Ref 1.1) and takes into account comments received as part of the Scoping Opinion (Ref 1.2). Detailed information on production of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) map and site photography is provided in **Appendix 7.1 Visual Assessment Methodology**.
- 1.1.6 Landscape assessment deals with the effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right (landscape receptors), whilst the assessment of visual effects considers the changes to specific views and general visual amenity experienced by people (visual receptors).
- 1.1.7 Landscape and visual assessments are inter-related. Visual effects can be considered independently of the effect on the landscape in which it is seen, but landscape effects require consideration of the visual effects of the Project.

1.2 Guidance Specific to Landscape Assessment

- 1.2.1 In accordance with the approach to the EIA outlined in **Chapter 5 Approach to Preparing the PEIR**, the landscape assessment, cumulative landscape assessment, and presentation of landscape effects adhere to relevant legislation and standards. Additionally, the assessment follows the applicable guidelines, as they apply to the Project, including:

- Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – 3rd Edition (GLVIA3), 2013 (Ref 1.3);
- Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 Notes and Clarifications on aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 2024 (Ref 1.4);
- Technical Information Note (TIN) Landscape Character Assessment (TIN 08/15), 2016 (Ref 1.5);
- Landscape Institute TGN 02/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations, 2021 (Ref 1.6);
- Holford Rules (Ref 1.7);
- Landscape Institute TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, 2019 (Ref 1.8);
- Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment, 2024 (Ref 1.9);
- An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management Natural England, 2019 (Ref 1.11); and
- Natural England - An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment, 2014 (Ref 1.12).

1.3 Definition of Landscape Effects

1.3.1 The assessment of landscape effects, as defined in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3), means:

‘the effects of change and development on landscape as a resource. The concern ... is with how the proposal will affect the elements that make up the landscape, the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape and its distinctive character.... The area of landscape that should be covered in assessing landscape effects should include the site itself and the full extent of the wider landscape around it which the proposed development may influence in a significant manner’.

1.3.2 Two categories of landscape receptor are considered in the assessment:

- Designated landscapes; and
- Landscape character (combinations of landscape elements and aesthetic and perceptual aspects that make an area distinctive).

1.3.3 The Project may have direct (physical) effects on the landscape as well as indirect effects on landscape character, which may be indirectly perceived over a wide area.

2. Approach to Landscape Assessment

2.1 Assessing Landscape Effects

- 2.1.1 The methodology used for conducting the landscape assessment builds upon the general assessment methodology outlined in **Chapter 5 Approach to Preparing the PEIR** and detailed in this appendix. This ensures that the landscape assessment follows a consistent and structured approach in line with the overall EIA methodology.
- 2.1.2 The methodology draws on guidance in GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) and associated Notes and Clarifications (Ref 1.4).
- 2.1.3 GLVIA 3 (Ref 1.3) is the established good practice guidance for landscape assessment and complies with the requirements of National Policy Statements EN-1 (Ref 1.13) and EN-5 (Ref 1.14).
- 2.1.4 GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) emphasises that the assessment should reflect the scale and complexity of the development, focusing on the likely significant effects rather than every possible effect. This approach allows for scoping out receptors where significant effects are unlikely, resulting in a more concise and meaningful assessment.
- 2.1.5 The GLVIA3 approach to assessing landscape effects is summarised as follows:
- **Identify a study area:** This is the geographical area where potential landscape effects from the Project could be experienced. The extent of the study area is determined through the preparation of ZTV maps, which indicate the areas of landscape likely to be affected by the presence of the Project. The ZTV maps help define the spatial scope for assessing landscape impacts. **Establish baseline conditions:** This involves desk studies and field/photographic surveys to evaluate the current landscape across the Study Area. The baseline includes a review of published landscape character assessments, an appraisal of the existing landscape (including any existing high-voltage infrastructure), and a judgment on the relative value of the landscape. Recognising that landscapes are dynamic, potential future changes independent of the Project are also considered, although these do not form the basis of the assessment.
 - **Determine landscape receptor sensitivity:** This involves making separate professional judgements on the value of the landscape and its susceptibility to changes introduced by the Project.
 - **Assess effects on landscape receptors:** Effects are evaluated based on their size/scale, geographical extent, and their duration and reversibility. This analysis helps determine the magnitude of change likely to occur.
 - **Apply professional judgement:** An overall judgment on the significance of effects is made by weighing the value of the landscape and its susceptibility to change against the magnitude of the anticipated change introduced by the Project.
- 2.1.6 This structured process allows for a comprehensive evaluation of how the landscape would be impacted and whether the changes are likely to result in significant effects.

2.2 Assessing Cumulative Effects

- 2.2.1 In line with good practice, an appraisal of cumulative landscape effects related to the Project will be conducted and presented in the landscape chapter of the ES. This assessment will follow the Government's latest guidance (Ref 1.9). As explained below, both intra-project effects (impacts within the Project) and inter-project effects (impacts in combination with those of other nearby developments) will be identified and assessed.
- 2.2.2 Cumulative effects are the result of multiple actions on environmental receptors or resources. There are two major sources of cumulative effects: 'intra-project' and 'inter-project' effects.
- Intra-project effects (also referred to as combined or 'interactive effects' (between topics',) occur where a single receptor is affected by more than one source of effect or aspect of the Project. An example of an intra-project effect would be where a local community is affected by dust, noise, and traffic disruption during the construction of the Project, with the result being a greater level of nuisance than each individual effect alone.
 - Inter-project cumulative effects occur where a receptor is affected by two or more projects at the same time, potentially amplifying the overall effect. Individually the effects may not be significant, but when considered together could create a significant cumulative effect.
- 2.2.3 The assessment of intra-project and inter-project cumulative effects will follow the Government's latest guidance (Ref 1.9), which is outlined in **Chapter 21 Cumulative Effects**. The results of the assessment will be presented as a separate chapter in the ES as described in **Chapter 21 Cumulative Effects** of the PEIR.
- 2.2.4 Existing developments, such as wind turbines and other vertical infrastructure (e.g., overhead lines and telecommunications masts), form part of the baseline environment.
- 2.2.5 The assessment will consider the contribution of the Project to the total cumulative landscape effects created by the construction and operation of all the developments included in the cumulative assessment.

2.3 Study Area

- 2.3.1 The study area for the preliminary assessment (based upon the same approach that will be adopted when defining the EIA Study Area) was determined by the potential visibility of the Project in the landscape and is proportionate to the size and scale of the Project and nature of the surrounding landscape. Paragraph 5.2 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) states that the study area should include:

'the full extent of the wider landscape around it which the Proposed Development may influence in a significant manner'.

- 2.3.2 The proposed study area for the assessment extends 5 km from the Limits of Deviation (LoD)¹.
- 2.3.3 To inform the assessment, a preliminary ZTV map has been produced based on the pylon heights for the Proposed Overhead Line, as set out in **Appendix 4.2 Indicative Pylon Schedule and** following the approach set out in this appendix. The ZTV map is shown on **Figure 7.2 Zone of Theoretical Visibility** and indicates the geographical area over which the Proposed Overhead Line could potentially give rise to landscape effects up to a maximum distance of 10 km from the LoD. Although significant effects at this distance are unlikely, the 10 km radius for the ZTV is used to:
- Assess cumulative landscape effects with other developments.
 - Ensure that the effects of taller elements such as the pylons at the River Ouse crossing are fully evaluated.
 - Identify effects on distant landscapes which are very susceptible to change arising from the Project.
- 2.3.4 To ensure that all likely significant landscape effects are captured in the assessment, the study area will continue to be reviewed in the light of feedback received during statutory consultation, ongoing site surveys, and following the production of an updated ZTV as the Project develops.

Approach to Defining the Study Area

- 2.3.5 The study area was informed by guidance on the perceived height of pylons when seen at varying distances (Ref 1.15). This study used a mathematical model to calculate the apparent height of a pylon when its true height and distance from a viewer are known.
- 2.3.6 The apparent height of a pylon is defined as the height that the structure would appear at arm's length (61 cm) from the viewer (i.e. the structure would appear to be the same height as an 'X' cm high object held at arm's length (61 cm) from the viewer). Using this calculation the apparent height of a 50 m tall pylon was calculated for varying distances from a viewpoint. The results are shown in Table 2.1 .

Table 2.1 - Apparent height of 50 m structure when viewed at arm's length

Distance	Apparent Height
100 m	30.50 cm
200 m	15.25 cm
300 m	10.16 cm
400 m	7.63 cm
500 m	6.10 cm

¹ At scoping a 5 km offset from the Project was assumed as a worst-case scenario but as the Project continued to be reviewed during the preliminary assessment (and following receipt of early design information, it became apparent that likely significant effects would derive from activities and infrastructure within the LoD. Therefore, for proportionality reasons, a more focussed study area was adopted based on an offset from the LoD for proportionality reasons.

Distance	Apparent Height
1000 m (1 km)	3.05 cm
2000 m (2 km)	1.53 cm
5000 m (5 km)	0.61 cm
10000 m (10 km)	0.31 cm

2.3.7 When testing the apparent heights in the field, it was observed that when a 50 m high pylon broadly appeared to be the same height (or more) as a 7.5 cm object held at arm's length (61 cm) from the viewer, there was potential that the structure may give rise to a greater landscape effect because of its prominence. This is typically when a pylon is around 400 m from the viewer and is seen in open views without any screening from landform or vegetation. Beyond this distance the perceptibility of pylons approximately 50 m tall diminishes considerably in most instances, such that they are rarely perceived in all but the clearest of viewing conditions. At 10 km the apparent height of a pylon is 0.31 cm.

2.4 Baseline Data Gathering

2.4.1 The landscape baseline provides a detailed description of the landscape within the study area. In accordance with GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) which states at page 32, paragraph 3.15:

'its constituent elements and features, its character and the way this varies spatially, its geographic extent, its history (which may require its own specialist study), its condition, the way the landscape is experienced, and the value attached to it'.

2.4.2 The baseline describes the current appearance of the landscape across the study area and includes an assessment of any changes that would occur without the Project i.e., the future baseline.

2.4.3 The baseline description and assessment are established using published landscape character assessments, which are then verified through field surveys to ensure accuracy and sufficient detail for the landscape assessment.

Method for Assessing Landscape Effects

2.4.4 GLVIA3 states that the sensitivity of landscape receptors should be assessed in terms of the susceptibility of the landscape to change and the value attached to the landscape. The magnitude of change should be assessed in terms of the size and scale, geographical extent, duration and reversibility of the effect.

2.4.5 These aspects are considered together, to form a professional judgement regarding the overall significance of landscape effect (GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) Figure 5.1 page 71). The remainder of this appendix sets out the methodology in more detail.

Landscape Value

- 2.4.6 The baseline includes a description of the relative value of the landscape, which is unrelated to the nature of the Project. Page 3 of TGN 02-21 published by the Landscape Institute (Ref 1.6) defines ‘landscape value’ as:
- ‘he relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities’.*
- 2.4.7 An area of landscape may be valued for many reasons – for example its condition, scenic beauty, tranquillity or remoteness, its recreation opportunities, nature conservation, or its historic and cultural associations. Development will not necessarily be incompatible with the valued qualities of a landscape as this will depend on the nature of the proposal and the characteristics of the landscape.
- 2.4.8 Nationally and internationally designated landscapes are generally accorded the highest value. The absence of a formal landscape designation, however, does not necessarily result in a landscape being of lower value. Paragraph 5.29 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) describes value as:
- ‘... the relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society, bearing in mind that a landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons. Considering value at the baseline stage will inform later judgements about the significance of effects. ...A review of existing landscape designations is usually the starting point in understanding landscape value, but the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be carefully considered and individual elements of the landscape – such as trees, buildings or hedgerows – may also have value’.*
- 2.4.9 Table 2.2 sets out the indicators that help to define landscapes of international/national, regional/local, community and limited importance.

Table 2.2 - Typical importance of landscape receptors

Category	Indicators
International/ National	Landscapes which are internationally or nationally designated for their landscape value e.g., National Parks and National Landscapes (formerly Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs))
Regional/Local	Regionally or locally designated landscapes such as Important Landscape areas (ILA), Special Landscape Areas (SLAs), or Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).
Community Importance	Everyday landscapes, which may be valued by the local community but have little or no wider recognition of their value.
Limited	Despoiled or degraded landscape with little or no evidence of being valued by a community.

- 2.4.10 The quality of a valued landscape is often explained in a citation for a designation, but where this isn’t available, value can be determined through the application of a criteria-based comparative landscape approach supported by published documentation such as

tourist leaflets, art, and literature. The value of a landscape or view can also be informed by consultation feedback from people with local knowledge. The value of a landscape or view can also be informed by consultation feedback from people with local knowledge. This is in line with the latest guidance from Natural England (Ref 1.11) and the European Landscape Convention (Ref 1.16), which promote an ‘all-landscapes approach’, founded on the recognition of value in all landscapes.

2.4.11 The appraisal of landscape value includes consideration of the following factors:

- Landscape character and quality;
- Importance in terms of designations;
- Scenic quality;
- Conservation interests;
- Recreational value;
- Perceptual aspects and tranquillity; and
- Cultural associations.

2.4.12 The value of the landscape is described as very high, high, medium or low by applying the indicators listed in Table 2.3. Professional judgements are supported by narrative description linked back to evidence from the baseline study to explain the conclusions reached.

Table 2.3 - Indicators of landscape value

Category	Indicators
Very High	Landscape of very high scenic quality, with all or most of the scenic/special qualities evident, including its flora, fauna, geological and geographical elements and features. Typically, internationally, or nationally designated e.g., National Park or National Landscape (formerly AONB)). Very good condition/very well-managed and intact. Historic interest of designated national or international importance, which contributes substantially to landscape character. Mainly characterised by natural components that are rare and distinctive. Very high recreational value which contributes substantially to recreational/visitor experience. Rich and valued cultural associations. Unique sense of place. No discordant features.
High	Landscape of high scenic quality, with considerable evidence of the scenic/special qualities, including its flora, fauna, geological and geographical elements, and features. Typically designated at a regional or local level such as ILA, SLA or AGLV. Good condition/well-managed and largely intact. Many natural components. Historic interest which contributes to landscape character. Recreational value which contributes to recreational/visitor experience. Valued cultural associations. Strong sense of place. Occasional discordant features.

Category	Indicators
Medium	A landscape with some evidence of scenic/special qualities, albeit with a degree of erosion due to the presence of infrastructure and/or inappropriate built development. A commonplace landscape which may be valued by the local community but has little or no wider recognition of its value. Average condition with some intactness but scope to improve management for land use. Limited historic interest. Some natural components. Limited recreational value and few visitors. No or very few recorded cultural associations. Some features worthy of conservation. Some noticeable discordant features.
Low	A landscape with greater presence of infrastructure and/or inappropriate built development which impacts on the scenic/special qualities of the landscape or one of low scenic quality or with many of the scenic/special qualities eroded. Little or no evidence of being valued by a community. Lack of management has resulted in degradation and poor condition. Limited to no historic interest. Limited to no recreational value. No recorded cultural associations. Frequent or dominant discordant features. Disturbed or derelict land requiring treatment.

Establishing Landscape Sensitivity

- 2.4.13 The next step in assessing the importance of the likely landscape effects is to determine the sensitivity of the landscape receptors to the Project.
- 2.4.14 The sensitivity of landscape receptors is assessed through two separate considerations:
- Value - established and reported as part of the baseline assessment, as explained above.
 - Susceptibility to change - determined through informed professional judgement, guided by the indicators set out in Table 2.4.
- 2.4.15 This approach involves separating sensitivity into value and susceptibility, which slightly differs from the general assessment methodology presented in **Chapter 5 Approach to Preparing the PEIR**. However, it aligns with guidance in GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) and associated Notes and Clarifications (Ref 1.4).
- 2.4.16 Susceptibility varies depending on the character of the landscape and the nature of the development. Therefore, it is tailored to the specific project. Determining the susceptibility of the landscape receptor involves:
- Evaluating how the receptor's characteristics and qualities either align or conflict with the changes introduced by the Project.
 - Assessing the ability of the landscape to absorb or adapt to these changes, while maintaining its baseline conditions and complying with relevant planning policies.
- 2.4.17 Components of the landscape that typically inform the susceptibility of the landscape to a 400 kV overhead line are:
- Landform

- Steep, dramatic, or elevated landforms are generally more susceptible to the visual impact of 400 kV overhead lines. These landforms are often prominent and distinctive, which can result in skylining of pylons and conductors. Single and narrow ridges are especially vulnerable, particularly when the ridgeline is well-defined or steep, or when there are rock outcrops. More complex landforms might offer some screening or opportunities for backdropping², but caution is needed to avoid overwhelming intricate landforms.
- Broad valleys with smooth and regular lines tend to be less susceptible to 400 kV overhead lines. These landforms have a greater potential to provide backgrounding and enclosure, which can mitigate the visual impact of the overhead lines.
- Landcover Pattern
 - This factor focuses on the character of the landscape as shaped by its landscape pattern, including the distribution of vegetation, rather than the material susceptibility of specific landcover types.
 - Landscapes with a variety or mosaic of characteristic or susceptible features, such as trees and woodlands, hedgerows, or traditional/historic field patterns are generally more vulnerable to 400 kV overhead lines. In contrast, simpler, less cluttered landscapes with few distinctive features, or where such patterns have been obscured, are less susceptible.
 - Landscapes with past or ongoing commercial or industrial activities tend to have lower susceptibility. The presence of vertical elements, such as high-voltage electricity infrastructure, wind turbines, communication masts, or other large infrastructure, can make the landscape less susceptible to 400 kV overhead lines the rural character and scenic quality of the landscape may already have been altered. New overhead lines may be perceived as less intrusive because they blend with existing elements and don't introduce an entirely new visual feature.
 - Depending on their scale and distribution, trees and woodland can reduce a landscape's susceptibility to 400 kV overhead lines, especially when combined with landform.
- Landscape Scale
 - Scale is typically related to landform and/or landcover.
 - Landscapes with a larger scale are typically less susceptible to 400 kV overhead lines because pylons generally appear more in proportion to expansive surroundings. In contrast, small scale or intimate landscapes can be more vulnerable, as pylons tend to be more prominent in these settings.
 - Depending on the height differential between valley floors and hilltops, the susceptibility of a landscape to 400 kV overhead lines can either increase or decrease. This is because the perceived size of the pylons may be altered.
 - The size and scale of pylons may be further emphasised when compared with landscape features such as field patterns, landform, individual trees, and buildings. This comparison can highlight the scale and prominence of the pylons

² In landscape assessment, 'backdropping' (also described as 'backclothing') refers to the visual role played by background elements, such as landform, vegetation or built development, in highlighting or minimising a particular feature in this case the pylons.

within the landscape, potentially making them appear more intrusive in relation to these features.

- Prominent Landscape Features and Skylines
 - Landscapes with distinctive ridges or prominent skylines are likely to be more susceptible to 400 kV overhead lines compared to skylines that are less prominent or have already been affected by visually intrusive structures.
 - The presence of distinctive or historic landscape features, such as hilltop monuments, church towers, vernacular villages, country houses, mansions, or other historic features increases the susceptibility of a landscape as overhead lines can detract from or conflict with the landscape setting of these features.
 - Skylines that provide a prominent setting for settlements are also more susceptible. Overhead lines can disrupt the relationship between these settlements and their landscape settings, affecting the visual coherence and setting of the landscape.
- Settlement Pattern
 - This relates to settlement pattern in relation to landscape character, rather than to visibility and views, which is discussed separately.
 - A settlement pattern that is closely integrated with the pattern and form of the landscape, especially where traditional patterns remain intact, is likely to be more sensitive to 400 kV overhead lines. This is because the presence of overhead lines can disrupt the visual harmony between the settlements and their surrounding landscape.
 - Conversely, a settlement pattern that is less closely related to the landscape, such as larger scale developments that rise over ridgelines or obscure field patterns, is generally less susceptible. This is because such developments may already have altered the natural landscape, reducing the potential impact of new overhead lines.

2.4.18 Designated landscapes are typically highly susceptible to new development of the type proposed. This susceptibility is influenced by the special qualities and purposes of designation, as well as the valued elements, qualities, or characteristics of the landscape. The degree to which these aspects may be unduly affected by the Project is an important consideration in assessing the overall impact.

2.4.19 The susceptibility of the landscape to change is categorised as very high, high, medium, or low by applying the indicators listed in Table 2.5. Professional judgements are supported by narrative description linked back to evidence from the baseline study to explain the conclusions reached.

Table 2.4 - Indicators of landscape receptor susceptibility

Category	Indicators
Very High	The landscape receptor is very highly susceptible in that it is unable to accommodate the Project without substantial adverse effects. Attributes that make up the character of the landscape offer almost no opportunities for accommodating the change without its key

Category	Indicators
	characteristics and landscape elements being fundamentally altered or permanently lost, leading to a different landscape character.
High	The landscape receptor is highly susceptible in that it is unable to accommodate the Project without adverse effects. Attributes that make up the character of the landscape offer limited opportunities for accommodating the change without its key characteristics being fundamentally altered, leading to a different landscape character.
Medium	The landscape receptor has some ability to accommodate the Project without adverse effects. Attributes that make up the character of the landscape offer some opportunities for accommodating the change without key characteristics being fundamentally altered.
Low	The landscape receptor is more able to accommodate the Project without adverse effects. Attributes that make up the character of the landscape are more resilient to being changed by the type of development proposed. Only individual elements and/or features, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect may be affected.

2.4.20 In accordance with paragraph 5.5 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) and note 5(9) of the Clarification Notes (Ref 1.4) professional judgements on landscape value and susceptibility will not be combined to arrive at a professional judgement on sensitivity but will separately influence the assessment as part of the overall profile approach which is explained later in this appendix.

2.5 Predicting Magnitude of Change

2.5.1 Paragraph 5.48 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) sets out the criteria which should be considered in reaching a professional judgement on the magnitude of landscape change. These include *'its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration and reversibility'*.

Size and Scale of Effect

2.5.2 For landscape elements or features this depends on the extent of existing landscape elements or features that would be lost or changed, the proportion of the total extent that this represents, and the contribution of that element to the character of the landscape.

2.5.3 In terms of landscape character, this reflects the degree to which the character of the landscape would change because of the removal or addition of landscape components, and how the changes would affect its key characteristics and overall character.

2.5.4 The size/scale of effect is described as large, medium, small, or very small. Professional judgements are supported by narrative description linked back to evidence from the baseline study to explain the conclusions reached.

Geographical Extent of Effect

- 2.5.5 The geographical extent over which the landscape effect would arise is described as small, medium or large based on the definitions set out on page 91 of GLVIA3 and the published landscape character areas/types, as described below:
- Small - the site level or its immediate setting.
 - Medium - at the scale of the landscape; type/character area within which the Project lies.
 - Large - influencing several landscape character types/areas.

Duration and Reversibility

- 2.5.6 The design life of the Project is at least 80 years but with regular maintenance is likely to extend further.
- 2.5.7 Paragraph 5.51 of GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) states that duration '*can usually be simply judged on a scale such as short term, medium term or long term*'. For the purposes of the assessment, duration is determined in relation to the phases of the Project, as follows:
- **Short term** – assumed to cover construction plus one-year reinstatement.
 - **Medium term** – assumed to be 2-15 years post construction and include the effects of permanent vegetation loss on the baseline environment.
 - **Long term** – assumed to be of a duration that extends longer than 15 years post construction once any committed mitigation planting has achieved its design intention.
- 2.5.8 The duration of the effect can also be described as temporary, transient (whether continuous or intermittent) or seasonal (views which would be subject to seasonal leaf cover).
- 2.5.9 In accordance with the principles contained within GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3), reversibility is reported as reversible or irreversible (permanent) and is related to whether the change can be reversed at the end of the construction phase or at the end of the operational lifespan of the Project.

Making Professional Judgements

- 2.5.10 Combining the three separate considerations (size/scale of effect, geographical extent of the effect, and duration and reversibility) in one rating for magnitude of change can distort the aim of identifying significant effects. For example, an increased magnitude of change, based on size/scale, may be reduced to a lower rating if it occurred in a localised area or for a short duration. This might mean that a potentially significant effect may be overlooked if impacts are moderated down due to their geographical extents and/or duration/reversibility. To address this, professional judgements on magnitude are initially based on the size/scale of the change and then adjusted to account for the duration of the change and its reversibility. Additionally, a separate description of the geographical distribution of effects across the study area is provided in the landscape assessment summary to ensure that significant effects are not overlooked.
- 2.5.11 The magnitude of landscape change is categorised as large, medium, small, or very small by applying the indicators listed in Table 2.6. Professional judgements are

supported by narrative description linked back to evidence from the baseline study to explain the conclusions reached.

Table 2.5 - Indicators of magnitude of landscape change

Category	Indicators
Large	The Project (or works to facilitate it) would result in a considerable change to the landscape, with undesirable consequences for the elements, character and quality of the baseline landscape. The Project would form a prominent landscape element and post development the baseline situation would be substantially changed. Physical loss of landscape features that are not replaceable or are replaceable only in the long term. The duration/reversibility of effect is likely to be long-term and irreversible.
Medium	The Project (or works to facilitate it) would result in a noticeable change to the landscape over a wide area or conspicuous change over a limited area, with some undesirable consequences for the elements, character and quality of the baseline landscape. The Project would form a conspicuous landscape element and post development the baseline situation may be noticeably changed. Physical loss of landscape features that are replaceable in the medium term. The duration/reversibility of effect is likely to be long-term but may be reversible.
Small	The Project (or works to facilitate it) would result in a slight change to the landscape with few undesirable consequences for the elements, character and quality of the baseline landscape. The Project would be perceptible, but post development, the baseline landscape may exhibit some differences but would be largely unchanged. Physical loss of landscape features that are replaceable in the medium term. The duration/reversibility of effect is likely to be medium-term and reversible.
Very small	The Project (or works to facilitate it) would result in an inconspicuous change to the landscape over a wide area or slight change over a limited area, with no undesirable consequences for elements, character and quality of the baseline landscape. The Project would be just perceptible and post development, the baseline landscape would appear unchanged. Physical loss of landscape features that are replaceable in the short term. The duration/reversibility of effect is likely to be short-term and reversible.

2.5.12 The assessment also identifies areas where no landscape change is anticipated. In these instances, 'no change' is inserted into the appropriate magnitude of change column and the resulting effect is identified as 'no effect'.

2.6 Judging Levels of Landscape Effect

- 2.6.1 The final step in the assessment involves combining professional judgements on sensitivity and magnitude of effect to arrive at an informed, professional evaluation of the significance of each landscape effect.
- 2.6.2 In accordance with GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) and associated Notes and Clarifications (Ref 1.4), a rigid matrix approach where effect levels are determined solely by combining sensitivity (nature of receptor) with magnitude of change (nature of effect), is not applied.
- 2.6.3 Instead, the evaluations of individual aspects described above (value, susceptibility, size and scale, geographical extent, duration, and reversibility) are considered together to build an overall profile for each identified effect. An overview of the distribution of professional judgements for these aspects is then taken, allowing for a more complete understanding of how various factors collectively contribute to the overall landscape effect. This process draws on good practice principles outlined in GLVIA3 (Ref 1.3) and is guided by the indicators in Table 2.6.
- 2.6.4 Levels of effect are categorised as negligible, minor, moderate, or major, with moderate and major effects deemed significant under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, hereafter referred to as the EIA Regulations (Ref 1.17).
- 2.6.5 In the landscape chapter of the ES, levels of effect will be categorised as negligible, minor, moderate, or major in accordance with the indicators in Table 2.6. Effects judged to be moderate or major are considered significant under the EIA Regulations (Ref 1.17). However, in the preliminary assessment presented in **Chapter 6 Landscape**, effects are only classed as 'significant', or 'not significant' as further assessment work still needs to be undertaken.
- 2.6.6 Given the nature of the Project, the direction of change is considered adverse unless otherwise stated.

Table 2.6 - Categories and indicators of significance

Category	Indicators	Significant effect
Major	<p>The Project would lead to an obvious change in landscape characteristics and character, likely affecting a landscape with high or medium susceptibility to that type of change.</p> <p>This level of significance may also occur when a medium scale of effect acts on a nationally valued landscape.</p> <p>The effect is likely to be long-term and affect a relatively large area.</p> <p>If designated, it is likely to affect the reasons for the designation.</p>	Yes
Moderate	<p>The Project would lead to a noticeable change in landscape characteristics and character, likely affecting a landscape with a medium susceptibility to that type of change.</p>	Yes

Category	Indicators	Significant effect
	<p>This level of significance may also occur when a smaller scale of effect acts on a more widely valued landscape, or a larger scale of effect acting on a landscape valued at a more local level.</p> <p>This level of significance may also occur when a large scale of effect occurs over a relatively short period or over a small area. If designated, it may affect the reasons for the designation.</p>	
Minor	<p>The Project would result in a small change in landscape characteristics and character over a long-term duration.</p> <p>This level of significance may also occur when a larger scale of effect is of short-term duration or confined to the site. If designated, it is unlikely to affect the reasons for the designation.</p>	No
Negligible	<p>The Project would result in a barely perceptible change in landscape characteristics and character. If designated, it would not affect the reasons for the designation.</p>	No

2.6.7 The assessment considers the effects at construction, in year 1 operation, and year 15 operation (by which time any new planting will be established and fulfilling its intended function).

2.7 Mitigation and Residual Effects

2.7.1 The design is being developed iteratively with the assessment process. This means that potentially significant adverse effects that can be avoided or reduced have been incorporated where possible.

2.7.2 The most effective mitigation measures are ones which are integral to the Project. A distinction is therefore made between measures designed as an intrinsic part of the scheme (primary or embedded measures) and those which are intended to specifically counteract any potential residual negative effects of the Project (secondary measures).

2.7.3 Significant residual landscape effects remaining after proposed mitigation are summarised as the final step in the assessment process. Each of the significance categories covers a broad range of effects and represents a continuum or sliding scale. Where an effect falls at the upper or lower end of the category, this will be noted and explained as part of the detailed assessment presented in the landscape chapter of the ES.

3. References

- Ref 1.1 National Grid (2023). North Humber to High Marnham Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN020034/documents> [Accessed: November 2024].
- Ref 1.2 National Grid (2024). Scoping Opinion: Proposed North Humber to High Marnham Scoping Opinion Responses [Online]. Available at: <https://www.national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN020034/documents> [Accessed: November 2024].
- Ref 1.3 Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (2013). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – 3rd Edition. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ref 1.4 Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (2024). Technical Guidance Note 01/24 Notes and Clarifications on aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [Online]. Available at: https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/LITGN-2024-01-GLVIA3-NC_Aug-2024.pdf [Accessed: November 2024].
- Ref 1.5 Landscape Institute. (2016). Technical Information Note 08/15: Landscape Character Assessment. [online]. Available at: https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Landscape-Character-Assessment-TIN-08_15-20160216.pdf [Accessed: November 2024].
- Ref 1.6 Landscape Institute. (2021). Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations. [online]. Available at: <https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/publication/tgn-02-21-assessing-landscape-value-outside-national-designations/> [Accessed: November 2024].
- Ref 1.7 National Grid (1959). The Holford Rules: Guidelines for the Routing of New High Voltage Overhead Transmission Lines [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/sites/default/files/documents/13795-The%20Holford%20Rules.pdf> [Accessed: October 2024].
- Ref 1.8 Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (2019). Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposal [Online]. Available at: https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/2019/09/LI_TGN-06-19_Visual_Representation.pdf [Accessed: December 2025]
- Ref 1.9 Planning Inspectorate (2024). Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-cumulative-effects-assessment> [Accessed: October 2024].

- Ref 1.10 Yorkshire Wolds Designation Project (2024). Statutory and Public Consultation for Proposed Plans to Designate Part of the Yorkshire Wolds as an AONB [Online]. Available at: <https://www.yorkshire-wolds-designation-project.org/have-your-say> [Accessed: October 2024]
- Ref 1.11 Natural England (2019). An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment – to Inform Spatial Planning and Land Management [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/an-approach-to-landscape-sensitivity-assessment-to-inform-spatial-planning-and-land-management> [Accessed: October 2024].
- Ref 1.12 Natural England (2014). An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/an-approach-to-landscape-character-assessment> [Accessed: October 2024].
- Ref 1.13 Department of Energy and Net Zero (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1). [Online]. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65bbfbd709fe1000f637052/overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf> [Accessed: December 2024].
- Ref 1.14 Department of Energy and Net Zero (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5> [Accessed: December 2024].
- Ref 1.15 Gillespies LLP (2014) Wind Turbines and Pylons: Guidance on the application of separation distances from residential properties. [Online] Available at: [https://www.gwynedd.llyw.cymru/en/Council/Documents---Council/Strategies-and-policies/Environment-and-planning/Planning-policy/Supporting-documents/Wind-Turbines-and-Pylons---Separation-Guidance-\(DC.019\).pdf](https://www.gwynedd.llyw.cymru/en/Council/Documents---Council/Strategies-and-policies/Environment-and-planning/Planning-policy/Supporting-documents/Wind-Turbines-and-Pylons---Separation-Guidance-(DC.019).pdf) [Accessed: September 2024]
- Ref 1.16 Council of Europe (2016). European Landscape Convention (ETS No. 176) [Online]. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16807b6bc7> [Accessed: October 2024].
- Ref 1.17 H.M.Government (2017). The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/572/contents> [Accessed: November 2024].

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com