


# **Mysten Leah Solar Farm**

## **Preliminary Environmental Information Report**

### **Volume 3**

#### **Appendix 11.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology**

**April 2026**



## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Establishing a Baseline.....	2
1.3	Direct and Indirect Effects.....	2
2.	Landscape Effects.....	2
2.2	Landscape Sensitivity.....	3
2.3	Magnitude of Landscape Effect.....	4
3.	Visual Effects.....	5
3.2	Visual Receptor Sensitivity.....	5
3.3	Magnitude of Visual Effect.....	6
3.4	Combining Scale of Change, Extent and Duration to Determine Magnitude of Landscape and Visual Effects.....	8
3.5	Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects.....	9
3.6	Beneficial/Adverse.....	10
3.7	Cumulative Effects.....	10
4.	Methodology for Production of ZTV Plans and Visualisations.....	12
4.2	Visibility Maps: Zone of Theoretical Visibility.....	12
4.3	Viewpoint Photography.....	12
4.4	Stitching of Photographic Panoramas.....	13

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 The purpose of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) when produced in the context of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is to identify and report any likely significant landscape and visual effects.
- 1.1.2 The following appendix sets out the methodology and criteria against which the assessment of landscape and visual effects will be undertaken.
- 1.1.3 The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3)<sup>1</sup> are widely recognised as the primary source of guidance for LVIA in the United Kingdom (UK) but clearly state that: *“The guidance concentrates on principles while also seeking to steer specific approaches where there is a general consensus on methods and techniques. It is not intended to be prescriptive, in that it does not provide a detailed ‘recipe’ that can be followed in every situation. It is always the primary responsibility of any landscape professional carrying out an assessment to ensure that the approach and methodology adopted are appropriate to the particular circumstances.”* (paragraph 1.20)
- 1.1.4 GLVIA 3 also states that: *“professional judgement is a very important part of the LVIA”* (paragraph 2.23) and that *“in all cases there is a need for the judgements that are made to be reasonable and based on clear and transparent methods so that the reasoning applied at different stages can be traced and examined by others.”* (paragraph 2.24).
- 1.1.5 It goes on to state that *“there are no hard and fast rules about what effects should be deemed significant but LVIA’s should always distinguish clearly between what are considered to be the significant and non-significant effects.”* (paragraph 3.32)
- 1.1.6 Wherever possible, identified effects are quantified, but as noted above, the nature of landscape and visual assessment requires interpretation using professional judgement. In order to provide a level of consistency to the assessment, the prediction of magnitude and the assessment of significance of the residual landscape and visual effects are based on pre-defined criteria as set out in this appendix.
- 1.1.7 Landscape and Visual Assessments are separate, though linked processes which GLVIA3 notes are *“related but very different considerations”*. The assessment of the potential effect on the landscape is carried out as an effect on the environmental resource (i.e. the landscape). Visual effects are assessed as an inter-related effect on people.
  - Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape elements which may give rise to changes in its distinctive character and how this is experienced, including consideration of aesthetic and perceptual aspects.
  - Visual effects relate to changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people’s responses to the changes and to the overall effects with respect to visual amenity.

## 1.2 Establishing a Baseline

- 1.2.1 The baseline for consideration of landscape and visual effects is evaluated through desk study and site work and is the current situation at the time of the assessment, unless noted otherwise. Existing operational/built development and development under construction is considered as part of the baseline.
- 1.2.2 The future baseline, where relevant, incorporates any anticipated natural change to the landscape (e.g. change to land cover through natural regeneration or forestry rotation), and also in the case of built development, changes which are considered certain or likely to happen (including consented proposals which are not yet present in the landscape but which are expected to be constructed). These may or may not be included as part of the landscape and visual baseline depending on individual project circumstances. Where the future baseline differs from the current baseline, it is clearly stated in the LVIA which baseline has been adopted for the assessment of effects and a rationale for the approach taken is provided as necessary.

## 1.3 Direct and Indirect Effects

- 1.3.1 Direct and indirect effects are defined in GLVIA3. Direct effects may be defined as resulting “*directly from the development itself*” (paragraph 3.22). An indirect (or secondary) effect is one that results “*from consequential change resulting from the development*” (paragraph 3.22) and is often produced away from the site of the proposed development or as a result of a complex pathway or secondary association.

## 2. Landscape Effects

- 2.1.1 The starting point for an assessment of landscape effects is a desk-based assessment of published landscape studies, which may include landscape character assessments, sensitivity and capacity studies and/or landscape designation reviews. Relevant documents are listed as appropriate in the assessment and relevant extracts may be included as appendices where this is judged appropriate. Desk based assessment is supplemented by field work to verify the key characteristics of the landscape.
- 2.1.2 In accordance with GLVIA3, the significance of landscape effects is determined by combining judgements regarding the sensitivity of the receiving landscape and the magnitude of the landscape effects arising from the proposed development.
- 2.1.3 An assessment of the degree to which the proposed development changes “*distinct and recognisable pattern of elements, or characteristics, in the landscape that make one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse*” (‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England, 2014<sup>2</sup>), enables a judgement to be made as to the significance of the effect in landscape character terms.
- 2.1.4 In order to reach an understanding of the effects of development upon the landscape resource it is necessary to consider different aspects of the landscape baseline including:

- Landscape fabric/elements: The individual features of the landscape, such as hills, valleys, woods, hedges, tree cover, vegetation, buildings and roads for example which can usually be described and quantified.
- Landscape key characteristics: The particularly notable elements or combinations of elements which make a particular contribution to defining or describing the character of an area, which may include experiential characteristics such as wildness and tranquillity.

## 2.2 Landscape Sensitivity

2.2.1 It should be noted, as stated in GLVIA3, “*LVIA sensitivity is similar to the concept of landscape sensitivity used in the wider arena of landscape planning but is not the same as it is specific to the particular project or development that is being proposed and to the location in question*” (paragraph 5.39).

2.2.2 In LVIA, landscape sensitivity is assessed by combining judgements about the value attached to a landscape and its susceptibility to the type of change and nature of the development proposed. The overall sensitivity of the landscape to a particular development is described in the assessment as High, Medium or Low.

- **Landscape Value:** This is the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities. Sometimes it is used as a basis for designation or recognition which expresses national or local authority consensus, because of its special qualities/attributes. Whilst the presence of formal designations are an important component when determining landscape value, other aspects are also considered as part of the judgement process as explained in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02-21<sup>3</sup>, especially when considering the value of landscapes outside of national designations. These include factors related to natural and cultural heritage (for example ecological, geological or heritage matters), landscape condition, cultural associations (in terms of connections with people, arts or events), distinctiveness (i.e. a sense of unique identity in the landscape), recreational opportunities, perceptual aspects (including scenic quality, wildness and tranquillity) and landscapes with a clearly identifiable role or function. In this assessment, the value attributed to the landscape is described as: National, Regional or Community.
- **Landscape Susceptibility:** Landscape Susceptibility according to GLVIA3 means “*the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies*” (paragraph 5.40). The susceptibility of the landscape varies depending on the type of development proposed and the particular site location. Judgements on landscape susceptibility include references to both the physical and aesthetic characteristics and the potential scope for mitigation. In this assessment, the susceptibility of the landscape is described as High, Medium or Low.

- 2.2.3 The criteria and the detailed judgements regarding susceptibility and value of landscape receptors are identified within the sensitivity tables included within **Appendix 11.3: Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal** in **Volume 3** to this PEIR.
- 2.2.4 Sensitivity is evaluated taking into account the component judgements about the value and susceptibility of the receptor as illustrated in **Table 2.1** below. Where sensitivity is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment is adopted. Note that equal weighting is attributed to susceptibility and value when determining overall landscape sensitivity.

**Table 2.1: Landscape sensitivity criteria**

		Susceptibility		
		High	Medium	Low
Value	National	High	High/Medium	Medium
	Regional	High/Medium	Medium	Medium/Low
	Community	Medium	Medium/Low	Low

### 2.3 Magnitude of Landscape Effect

- 2.3.1 The magnitude of landscape effect arising from Mylen Leah Solar Farm at any particular location is assessed in terms of *“size or scale, the geographic extent of the area or receptor that is influenced and its duration and reversibility”* (paragraph 5.48 GLVIA3).
- 2.3.2 Judgements concerning the **Scale of change** take account of:
- degree of loss or alteration to key landscape features/elements; characteristics; and for designated areas – special qualities and/or purposes of designation;
  - distance from the development; and
  - landscape context to the development.
- 2.3.3 The approach to assessing effects on landscape character is to consider the key characteristics for the Landscape Character Area (LCA) within which Mylen Leah Solar Farm is located (the host LCA) and, if relevant, the adjacent LCA’s (non-host) and identify which of these Mylen Leah Solar Farm would affect. A large scale change in landscape character is likely to occur where key characteristics would be lost or substantially changed. A small scale change is likely to occur where key characteristics are altered to a lesser degree and this can be influenced by distance and surrounding context.
- 2.3.4 Where particular views are a key characteristic of a landscape type, large or medium scale landscape character effects may occur where Mylen Leah Solar Farm becomes a key feature of those views. A similar approach applies to designated landscapes, for which the effects on the defined purposes of designation and special qualities are considered.
- 2.3.5 In this PEIR, the scale of landscape change is described as: **Large, Medium, Small or Negligible.**

- 2.3.6 Having established the scale of change to the landscape baseline, the **Geographic Extent** of the change can be identified. In this PEIR, the geographical extent of landscape change is described as: **Wide, Intermediate, Localised** or **Limited**.
- 2.3.7 **Duration and Reversibility** can be linked depending on the nature of the development. Reversibility is a judgement about the practicality of reversing the landscape effects of a proposed development (for example, solar farms are ultimately largely reversible whilst housing is permanent). Duration reflects how long the change will last and can include the frequency the effect would be experienced. In this PEIR, the duration of the change would be considered:
- **short term** when lasting less than 2 years;
  - **medium term** when lasting between 2 and 10 years;
  - **long term** when lasting between 10 and 50 years, and
  - **permanent** for more than 50 years.

### 3. Visual Effects

- 3.1.1 In accordance with GLVIA3, the significance of visual effects is determined by combining judgements regarding the sensitivity of visual receptors (people who view the landscape) and the magnitude of the change they would experience arising from Mylen Leah Solar Farm.

#### 3.2 Visual Receptor Sensitivity

- 3.2.1 In visual assessment, visual receptor sensitivity is assessed by combining judgements about the value attached to views and the susceptibility of the viewer to the type of change and nature of the development proposed. The overall sensitivity of the visual receptor to a particular development is described in this PEIR as **High, Medium** or **Low**.
- **Value of Views:** The value of public views, which is the focus of GLVIA3, will vary depending on the nature, location and context of the view and the recognised importance of the view. Considerations include cultural associations; designation or policy protection; views of or from landmarks; and/or the scenic quality of the view. It should be noted that the value attributed relates to the value of the view only (e.g. a National Trail is nationally valued for access, but not always for the available views from every section). In this PEIR, the value attributed to visual amenity is described as: **National, Regional** or **Community**.
  - **Susceptibility of Visual Receptors:** Those living within view of a proposed development are usually regarded as the highest susceptibility group as well as those engaged in outdoor pursuits for whom landscape experience is the primary objective. The susceptibility of potential visual receptors will also vary depending on the activity of the receptor. For visual receptors, susceptibility and value are closely linked - the most valued views are also likely to be those where viewer's expectations will be highest. In this PEIR, visual receptor susceptibility is defined in accordance with the criteria below.

**High** - Local residents; tourists; people engaged in outdoor recreation focused on an appreciation of views including users of footpaths and quiet country lanes, beauty spots and picnic areas and people experiencing views to or from important features of physical, visual, cultural or historic interest.

**Medium** - Local road users and travellers on trains. People engaged in outdoor recreation with some appreciation of the landscape e.g. road cycling, nature conservation, golf and water based recreation.

**Low** - Workers, users of facilities and commercial buildings (indoors) experiencing views from buildings. Road and rail users on fast moving commuting or trunk routes. Visual receptors where views are incidental to the activity and/or location.

- 3.2.2 Sensitivity is evaluated taking into account component judgements about the value and susceptibility of the receptor as illustrated in **Table 3.1** below. Where sensitivity is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment is adopted. Note that a greater weight is intentionally attributed to the susceptibility of the visual receptor than to value. This is in recognition of the fact that relatively few views are specifically recognised through designation or cultural reference. This approach still acknowledges that value associations influence sensitivity.

**Table 3.1: Visual sensitivity criteria**

		Susceptibility		
		High	Medium	Low
Value	National	High	High/Medium	Medium
	Regional	High/Medium	High/Medium	Medium/Low
	Community	High/Medium	Medium	Low

**3.3 Magnitude of Visual Effect**

- 3.3.1 The magnitude of visual effect arising from a proposed development is assessed in terms of its size or scale, geographic extent of the area or receptor that is influenced and its duration.
- 3.3.2 Representative viewpoints are used in the LVIA as ‘samples’ on which to base judgements of the scale of change experienced by visual receptors. The wider extent of the effect and its duration are not captured in the viewpoint analysis (as a viewpoint cannot capture these factors for an entire route or area). As duration and extent are necessary considerations in determining magnitude of change, judgements concerning magnitude and significance are provided for visual receptors and not for representative viewpoints. The only exception to this would be a specific viewpoint – where people visiting that location to look at the view are assessed as a visual receptor group in its own right.
- 3.3.3 With the exception of specific viewpoints (as noted above), each route (e.g. a footpath or road) and receptor group (e.g. a community or village) will encompass a range of possible views, which might vary from no view of the

development to very clear, close views. Therefore, effects are described in such a way as to identify where views towards the development are likely to arise and what the scale and duration and extent of those views is likely to be. In some cases, this will be further informed by a nearby viewpoint and in others it will be informed with reference to ZTV studies, aerial photography and site visits. Each of these individual effects are then considered together in order to reach a judgement of the effects on the visual receptors along that route, or in that place.


- 3.3.4 The **Scale of change** arising from a proposed development as experienced by a visual receptor group reflects the degree to which the nature of the views from that location would be changed taking into account:
- The distance of the viewpoint from the development;
  - the degree to which the development is visible or screened;
  - the angle of view in relation to main receptor activity or main focus of the view;
  - the horizontal and vertical field of view occupied by the development; and
  - the extent and nature of other built development visible.
- 3.3.5 In this PEIR, the scale of change in view is described as: **Large, Medium, Small or Negligible**.
- 3.3.6 The approach to assessing effects on views is to consider the full 360 degree view from any given receptor – not just those towards the development and/or shown in visualisations. It is assumed that the change would be seen in clear visibility and the assessment is carried out on that basis. Seasonal variation in visibility due to varying vegetation cover is also taken into account in all judgements. Where there are operational (and consented) developments considered as part of the baseline, the visual effects consider the effects of adding Mylen Leah Solar Farm to that baseline. Where appropriate, comment may be made on lighting and weather conditions.
- 3.3.7 For visual receptors moving through the landscape (e.g. road and footpath users), the length of their journey during which they would see Mylen Leah Solar Farm is reflected in the judgement of the **Geographic Extent** of effects. In this PEIR, the geographical extent of visual change is described as: **Wide, Intermediate, Localised or Limited**.
- 3.3.8 Duration reflects how long the change will last and judgements are framed in the same way as described above for landscape effects. In this PEIR, the duration of the change would be considered:
- **short term** when lasting less than 2 years;
  - **medium term** when lasting between 2 and 10 years;
  - **long term** when lasting between 10 and 40 years, and
  - **permanent** for more than 50 years.
- 3.3.9 Magnitude of effect is considered taking into account the three contributory factors as illustrated by the diagrams in **Plate 3.1** below.

### **3.4 Combining Scale of Change, Extent and Duration to Determine Magnitude of Landscape and Visual Effects**


- 3.4.1 Scale of change is the first and primary factor in determining magnitude. Geographical extent and duration of the effect are modifying factors to the overall magnitude judgement which may be higher if the effect is particularly widespread and/or long lasting, or lower if it is constrained in geographic extent and/or timescale.
- 3.4.2 The diagrams presented below in **Plate 3.1** illustrate in outline how these two modifying factors are considered in a two-stage process. A judgement is first formed about the scale of the change to the landscape or visual receptor. The geographic extent of the effect is then considered as a modifying influence in the first part of **Plate 3.1** (Stage 1). The result or outcome of Stage 1 is then considered again in relation to the duration of the effect as illustrated in the second part of **Plate 3.1** (Stage 2). The outcome of Stage 2 is the overall magnitude of effect judgement reported in the assessment. **Plate 3.1** is not intended to be interpreted rigidly as a chart to provide definitive answers; professional judgement is employed as appropriate to arrive at an overall magnitude judgement.
- 3.4.3 In this PEIR, the magnitude of effects is described as **Substantial, Moderate, Slight** or **Negligible**. Where magnitude is judged to lie between levels, an intermediate assessment will be adopted.

**Plate 3.1: Illustration of how magnitude of change is established**

**Stage 1 - Modifying Influence of Geographic Extent on Magnitude of Effect**



**Stage 2 - Modifying Influence of Duration on Magnitude of Effect**



**3.5 Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects**

- 3.5.1 The significance of any identified landscape or visual effect is described as Major, Moderate, Minor or Negligible. These categories are based on the consideration of receptor sensitivity with the predicted magnitude of effect. **Table 3.2** below is not used as a prescriptive tool and illustrates the typical outcomes, allowing for the exercise of professional judgement. In some instances a particular parameter may be considered as having a determining effect on the analysis.

**Table 3.2: Significance of effect criteria**

		Susceptibility			
		Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible
Receptor Sensitivity	High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Minor
	Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor/ Negligible
	Low	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Negligible

3.5.2 Where the effect has been classified as Major or Major/Moderate, this is considered to be equivalent to a likely significant effect. Where ‘Moderate’ effects are predicted, professional judgement is applied to determine whether the effect is significant or not ensuring that the potential for significant effects to arise has been thoroughly considered and justification is provided for the judgement reached as appropriate. Effects of Moderate/Minor, Minor, Minor/Negligible or Negligible significance are considered to be not significant.

### 3.6 Beneficial/Adverse

3.6.1 Landscape and visual effects can be beneficial or adverse and in some instances may be considered neutral. Neutral effects are those which overall are neither adverse nor positive but may incorporate a combination of both. Whether an effect is beneficial, neutral or adverse is identified based on professional judgement. GLVIA3 indicates at paragraph 2.15 that this is a “*particularly challenging*” aspect of assessment, especially in the context of a changing landscape.

3.6.2 However, for the avoidance of doubt, in this PEIR it has been assumed that where new infrastructure is introduced into the landscape or views, this will generally constitute an adverse effect. Any variation from this stance will be clearly justified.

### 3.7 Cumulative Effects

3.7.1 In a broad generic sense, cumulative impacts “*result from the incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project*”.<sup>4</sup> However, an assessment of cumulative effects should focus on whether there are any potential cumulative impacts which are reasonably foreseeable and which are likely to influence the decision making in relation to a proposed development, rather than an assessment of every potential cumulative effect,<sup>5</sup> which in practice means focusing on other nearby development proposals and the effects that might arise from the combined influence of those developments on landscape and visual receptors.

3.7.2 As recommended by the NatureScot cumulative guidance, this assessment focusses on the “*additional cumulative change which would be brought about by the proposed development*”.<sup>6</sup>

3.7.3 As noted above, operational developments are included in the baseline. Consented developments which are expected to be constructed, form part of

the future baseline and will be included as such. However, where there is some uncertainty regarding the future construction of consented developments, they may be considered as the first scenario of the cumulative assessment.

- 3.7.4 Proposals in planning are considered where there is good reason to assume that the timing of decisions may be similar and significant cumulative effects are likely. The assessment of effects is considered within the cumulative assessment.
- 3.7.5 Proposals in scoping are noted but not considered within the cumulative assessment, as there is no certainty that these proposals will progress to planning submissions and the nature of the proposed schemes may be subject to change.
- 3.7.6 The assessment is based on the same landscape and visual baseline and receptor groups as the main LVIA, and the methodology is also the same in terms of forming and expressing judgements.
- 3.7.7 Cumulative effects on landscape receptors arise from combined direct and/or indirect effects on the same receptor – such as two developments within the same character area; or one development within, and one visible from, a designated area.
- 3.7.8 Cumulative effects on visual receptors arise either from two (or more) developments both being visible from the same place; or from sequential views as people travel through the landscape.
- 3.7.9 In order to simplify what may otherwise be a complex assessment, where appropriate, the following approaches are also used:
- The cumulative assessment considers scenarios within which developments may be ‘grouped’ - for instance two nearby cumulative proposals may be considered in one scenario if it is considered that the cumulative effects arising if one or both are developed are likely to be similar.
  - Receptors judged to receive Negligible or Slight/Negligible magnitude effects are not considered for cumulative effects on the basis that any significant effects arising would primarily be caused by the cumulative developments and would be unlikely to be contributed to by Mylen Leah Solar Farm.
  - Only those receptors judged likely to experience effects from the cumulative development(s) being considered within a given scenario are described within that scenario.
- 3.7.10 Qualitative assessment of design and aesthetic considerations arising as a result of cumulative development, and/or considerations set out within local guidance provided in relation to cumulative development, is also provided where relevant.

## 4. Methodology for Production of ZTV Plans and Visualisations

4.1.1 All Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) maps, photography, visualisations (wirelines and photomontages) and their graphical presentation has been undertaken in line with the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19, Visual Representation of Development Proposals<sup>7</sup>.

### 4.2 Visibility Maps: Zone of Theoretical Visibility

4.2.1 ZTV maps are presented in **Figures 11.2 – 11.3** in **Volume 2**. The ZTVs have been generated using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to assist in identifying areas where visibility would not occur as well as viewpoint selection, illustrate areas from where part or all of Mylen Leah Solar Farm may be visible and to indicate its potential influence in the wider landscape.

4.2.2 Specifically, the ZTVs have been generated using the Viewshed routine in the Visibility Analysis plugin for QGIS software. The development is modelled as a grid of points 75m apart across the extent of the area covered by panels. The viewer's eye height has been set at 2m above ground level and the ZTVs include an adjustment that allows for the earth's curvature and light refraction.

4.2.3 The ZTVs show the maximum theoretical extent of visibility for the structures modelled (as indicated on the individual ZTVs) taking into account the screening effect of topography, principal woodlands and buildings. In order to generate the ZTVs a digital surface model has been derived from the Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (Defra) LiDAR 2020 2m digital terrain model with the locations of woodland and buildings taken from the Ordnance Survey (OS) Open Map Local dataset. Buildings are modelled at an assumed height of 7.5m, and woodland at an assumed height of 10m. Visibility on these ZTV outputs is illustrated using a 5m x 5m grid size. The ZTVs do not take into account some localised features such as hedgerows or individual trees and therefore tend to give an exaggerated impression of the extent of visibility. This is particularly the case in relatively flat landscapes which contain hedgerows and other vegetation not captured in the OS Open Map Local dataset. The actual extent of visibility on the ground will be less than suggested on the plan.

### 4.3 Viewpoint Photography

4.3.1 All photography presented in the PEIR has been taken in accordance with guidance outlined in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 . All viewpoint photography and associated visualisations are presented in, **Visualisations for viewpoints 1 – 33** in **Volume 4**.

4.3.2 All photography has been taken using a Canon EOS 5D MK IV digital Single Lens Reflex (SLR) camera with a high quality fixed 50mm focal length lens. This camera has a Full Frame Sensor.

4.3.3 For all viewpoints, the camera has been mounted on a panoramic head equipped tripod, levelled and set up with the camera at 1.5m height Above Ground Level.

- 4.3.4 At each viewpoint, a series of photographs (landscape orientation) have been taken to capture a 360 degree panorama. The panoramic head has been set to 20 degrees between shots giving a 50% overlap between adjacent shots.
- 4.3.5 At each viewpoint the OS grid coordinates have been captured using a handheld Global Positioning System.

#### **4.4 Stitching of Photographic Panoramas**

- 4.4.1 For each of the viewpoints, photographs have been stitched and presented as panoramas. Photographs have been stitched using PTGui software.

<sup>1</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition; Spon; 2013

<sup>2</sup> An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment', Natural England, 2014

<sup>3</sup> Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02-21: Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations

<sup>4</sup> GLVIA3 page 120, paragraph 7.1 quoting Hyder, 1999 ' Guidelines for the assessment of indirect and cumulative impacts as well as impact interactions'

<sup>5</sup> GLVIA3 page 121 paragraph 7.5.

<sup>6</sup> Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments, NatureScot, 2021

<sup>7</sup> Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19, Visual Representation of Development Proposals

<sup>8</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p155

<sup>9</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p156

<sup>10</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p156

<sup>11</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p157

<sup>12</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p157

<sup>13</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013;

<sup>14</sup> The Landscape Institute; Technical Guidance Note 02/21 Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations

<sup>15</sup> The Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Spon; 2013; p157