

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P1           | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: General opening comments about SPG needing to be clearer, more authoritative, less repetitive etc.

Item Question Representation Text

1 Details

This response has been prepared by members of the CPRW Brecon & Radnor committee.

The role of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (LDP Manual Edition 2) is to 'provide further detailed information in support of the LDP. .... The LDP contains policy; SPG contains guidance and advice only.'

Landscape Supplementary Planning Guidance should set out clearly to applicants, agents and local residents - and planning officers - the minimum landscape assessment information which the Local Planning Authority will require to be provided in support of a planning application. As currently drafted this SPG fails to do this.

In summary, as drafted, this SPG needs to be clearer, more authoritative and less repetitive. As it stands the SPG:

- 1.Does not set out clearly how an applicant should prepare landscape information and what is the appropriate level of information required to be provided for determination of an application;
- 2.Does not set out guidance on what Development Management expect in terms of landscape protection;
- 3.Is not clear about the use of all 5 Landmap layers;
- 4.Is not clear about the modern challenges to landscape protection. For example, industrial scale intensive livestock units are not discussed at all;
- 5.Does not set out the respective roles of Development Management and other bodies involved in landscape protection through the planning process, especially NRW and CADW;
- 6.Does not clearly set out the technical tools/regulations such as EIA, ZTV, LVIA, Landmap or provide links to further information and guidance, data sources etc. The SPG needs to set out clearly what these are, how and when they have application or must be used.

This SPG offers the opportunity for Development Management to adopt a more rigorous approach to the protection of landscape. However, to do so the guidance must be rigorous, helpful and prescriptive. As this will represent something of a departure for officers, it is also essential that planning officers are given appropriate training in the application of this guidance. Powys residents have been distressed to see the low priority which has sometimes been given to landscape protection. To give just three examples from recent years:

- Penarth poultry sheds P/2015/0131: No landscape consideration or Landmap information provided.
- Penllanerch single wind turbine P/2013/1064: NRW concerns re understatement of landscape impacts in applicant's documentation not followed up.
- Lower House Farm poultry sheds P/2016/0397: Inadequate consideration of landscape – see extract from CPRW Brecon & Radnor objection below i . It should also be noted that at the planning committee meeting, committee members were misled by the planning officer who incorrectly stated that CADW were the responsible body for assessment of impacts on Landmap Historic Landscape aspect areas.

Also see endnote i ;

i "The applicant has not provided an assessment of landscape and visual impacts, an omission the Officer should have challenged. The site lies outside a designated landscape and so the responsibility for assessing the acceptability of landscape and visual impacts falls to the LPA, who should follow LANDMAP guidance in their assessment...

The officer also fails to use LANDMAP in an appropriate manner, referring only to the Visual and Sensory layer of LANDMAP (rated HIGH), and failing to draw attention to the OUTSTANDING Historic LANDMAP layer (aspect area RDNRHL914). The Officer also fails to draw attention to the LANDMAP assessor's remarks in relation to the Visual and Sensory aspect area (RDNRVS127) remarks that this landscape is "...one of the finest landscapes in the region".

Landscape impacts of Intensive Poultry Units (IPUs) are substantial. At Bage Court, Dorstone in neighbouring Herefordshire, the impacts on landscape have been a reason for repeated refusal of a proposed intensive poultry unit and for the dismissal by the Planning Inspectorate of three separate planning appeals." (Extract from CPRW B&R branch objection to application P/2016/0397 25/1/2018).

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P2           | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Wording of para 2.1 needs revision, with changes to paras 1.2 and 2.2

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

•1.2 leave this out. Repeated in 2.1.

•2.1 bullet 3 (Repeated in 2.2 bullet 4): Development Management must assess not only impacts on views and visual amenity but also impacts on landscape character. In order to reach an informed conclusion on the effect of the application scheme, the LPA normally needs sufficient information to firstly, identify and assess the likely effects of a proposed development on the surrounding landscape and visual amenity, and secondly be confident that the "scale of investigation" that is undertaken is "appropriate and proportional" to the particular site and scheme ii.

SPG must clearly set out application requirements. Wording needs revision along the lines: "what information the Council will require for specific types of development proposal...to assess the impact of the development on the Powys landscape."

•2.1 and 2.2: We suggest these should be condensed/amalgamated.

Also see endnote ii;

ii - paragraph 1.17, Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, 2013.

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P3 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Queries meaning of 'special status' in para 3.3. suggests rewrite.

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

•3.3 refers to 'special status' of policies within the LDP. What, if anything, does this mean? Could this entire paragraph be rewritten to read simply: "This SPG is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications according to LDP Policy."

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P4 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Para 4.1 needs rewriting to provide clarity and remove contradiction

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•4.1 The opening sentence incorrectly states that planning is primarily concerned with the visual and sensory aspects of landscape, and contradicts the final sentence. This is confusing and wrong. This paragraph must be rewritten to make it unequivocally clear that all aspects of landscape impact must be considered in determination of a planning application.

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P5 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests insertion of European Landscape Convention definition, and how all landscape is valued and protected.

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•4.2 We are pleased to see reference to the European Landscape Convention. By way of emphasis it would be helpful to include beneath the ELC definition of landscape the following extract from guidance:  
"This is a purposely non-scientific definition that should resonate widely.

- Landscape is important, not as just scenery or a backdrop, but because it links culture with nature, and past with present.
- Landscape has many values not all of them tangible; it matters to, and is valued by, people and provides a context for people's lives.
- It puts emphasis on the whole landscape not just the 'best bits' and applies to all landscapes everywhere and in any condition – land, inland water, inter-tidal, marine, natural, rural, urban and peri-urban, outstanding, ordinary and degraded.
- The ELC is forward looking in its approach, and recognises the dynamic nature of landscape – with an emphasis on management of change and creating new landscapes as well as managing the landscapes that we inherit iii."

In the context of landscape protection within Powys and outside the National Park it is particularly important to emphasise that all landscape whether or not designated has value and is to be protected.

See also endnote iii;

iii European Landscape Convention Guidance Part 1 Natural England 2009 <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6361194094919680?category=31019>

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P6           | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Amending para 4.4 to underline value of landscape to well-being of residents and visitors

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•4.4 Amend to refer to the importance of landscape for the well-being of Powys residents and a wider range of people, including visitors.

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P7 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests insertion of text to qualify lack of SLAs in Powys

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•4.5 Powys Council has chosen not to designate Special Landscape Areas. We recommend the insertion of the following words, or similar, to emphasise that absence of SLAs does not imply a low value placed on Powys landscapes: "Powys has not designated SLAs because PCC considers all Powys landscapes are of high value and deserving of protection. The extra protection of specific areas through SLA designation has been forgone in favour of a rigorous assessment of the landscape impact of development on a case-specific basis. Landscape assessment is therefore a fundamental part of planning decision-making throughout the county"

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P8 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: for paras 4.6 to 4.18 there should be a separate heading before an indented 4.7

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Paragraphs 4.6 to 4.18: For clarity this section should have a separate heading beneath which paragraphs 4.7 to 4.18 need to be indented. A list of the resources and publications, together with relevant guidance, at the start of this section is required.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P9           | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Recommend moving explanatory text in 5. Policy

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•5. Policy. For greater clarity we recommend that the explanatory text be placed below the boxed policy text.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P10 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggest insertion of full text of Policy SP7 1 to 3

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•5.3 SP7 box. It is unclear what is conveyed by ellipses, and this truncation of the policy fails to reflect that SP7 requires the consideration not only of Registered Historic Landscapes but also their settings. We recommend the inclusion of the full text of SP7 1 to 3 since conservation areas, rights of way etc. are all integral to the perception of landscape and assessment of development impacts.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P11 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggest presentation in full of policies DM2, DM3 and DM7

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•5.6 We recommend the presentation of policies DM2, DM3 and DM7 in full. This is more helpful to the reader.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

|                 |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>5466.P12</b> | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggest, due to importance of message, para 5.8 be moved to beginning of Section 5

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•5.8 This is a very important message to applicants and agents and deserves emphasis. We feel this could be achieved by making this point at the opening of section 5, with reference to specific types of development to which this might apply at 5.7/5.8 below. These developments would include, for example, large scale agricultural buildings.

|                 |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>5466.P13</b> | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggest alternative text for para 5.9

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•5.9 Meaning is unclear. We recommend: "In addition to this Landscape SPG, specific guidance for Natural and Historic Environment, Renewable Energy and Residential Design is contained in other SPGs which are also material considerations in determining planning applications."

|                 |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>5466.P14</b> | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Remove brackets from para 6.4

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•6.4 Remove brackets from "(and their settings where relevant)".

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P15          | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Clarification in para 6.5 of who undertakes site visits

### Item Question Representation Text

1 Details

•6.5 "... a site visit is necessary" – it is unclear who is expected to undertake site visits. We recommend "Planning Officers will make a site visit".

5466.P16 Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai

24/02/2019  E O W M

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggestions for rewording 6.8 Step by Step guide

### Item Question Representation Text

1 Details

•6.8 Step by Step Guide – this does not reflect how planning applications are developed. We recommend that LVIA, ZTV and Landmap are flagged up earlier on in the SPG with clarification where they are described.

Step 1: should be called 'Pre-Application Stage'. It should be clear that Powys Development Management will require a blue line outline of the land within the applicant's ownership and information to determine whether alternative siting is available. Information about the pre-application process should be included here and scoping and EIA should also be discussed within this step. The term LVIA is introduced without explanation.

Step 2: should be called 'Baseline Landscape Assessment'. The term ZTV is introduced without explanation.

Step 3: should be called 'Definitive Siting' because discussion of the site or potential sites will already have featured in pre-application.

Step 4: Should be called 'Detailed Landscape Assessment and refinement of plans'. The term LVIA is introduced without explanation.

Step 5: Should be called 'Preparation and Submission of Application'. This step should make clear what documents and specific information the application must contain. For example, requirement for red and blue line areas and the location of the site indicated on an Ordnance Survey contour map of the immediate and wider area should be made explicit. At present many applications are submitted without clear OS contour maps, essential to understanding the site location, which is unacceptable.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P17          | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests alternative wording for para 6.14 to make the SPG clearer

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•6.14 The wording 'this may include' should be replaced by 'Where relevant, Powys Development Management will expect these to include...' SPG needs to set out clearly what is required within a planning application.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P18 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggesting changes to paras 6.22 to 6.32 concerning LVIA etc

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•6.22 and 6.31: LVIA stands for 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' and not 'appraisal'. Delete '(known as Landscape Visual Impact Appraisal)' from 6.31.

•6.29 to 6.32: The structure of this section is unclear. We recommend that this should be rewritten along the lines:

"A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required for the following:

oEIA proposals where landscape impacts are possible

oAll wind energy proposals

oMost major developments (as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012

oOther projects considered to have a significant landscape impact (See policy DM4)

•6.32: "in consistence with" – grammar

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P19          | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Seeking changes to para 6.40

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•6.40 bullet 1 (either as..... ) or ? – grammar. Bullet 3 reword ‘it will be necessary...permission’ as ‘will be refused’.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P20 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Questioning the redaction to the OS Map

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Z: why redaction from Ordnance Survey map?

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P21 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Seeks to remove repetition from paras 8.9-10, 8.26-27, 8.33-34 and 8.41-42 and to reference relevant guidance

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Landmap: There is scope for removing repetition from this section e.g. 8.9-8.10, 8.26-8.27, 8.33-8.34, 8.41-8.42.

We would recommend that specific reference should be made within this section to all relevant guidance, as available on NRW website iv.

See also endnote iv;

iv <https://naturalresources.wales/guidance-and-advice/business-sectors/planning-and-development/evidence-to-inform-development-planning/landmap-the-welsh-landscape-baseline/?lang=en>

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P22          | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Fig 2 in Section 9 requires amendment

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Section 9 fig 2 keeps referring back to fig 2! This should be Figure 3. The vertical boxes do not fit with "stages" down the left hand side.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P23 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Raises questions about the detail contained in Section 10 Monitoring

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•10. Monitoring: It is unclear how any of this is to be achieved or who the 'landscape professionals' (given that Powys has no Landscape Officer) referred to in 10.2 might be. What about monitoring whether development actually has the same or worse impacts compared with those identified in application? Who will report on 'developments that may have an unacceptable adverse impact on the valued characteristics and qualities of the landscape throughout Powys ... without an accompanying LVIA'? To do so would be an admission of having failed to require information necessary for the determination of an application (and likely to lead to its refusal) so there can be no incentive for planning officers to come forward with this information. Does this monitoring methodology have any likelihood of revealing the effectiveness or otherwise of the planning policies and SPG? We suggest that this section requires some further thought.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P24 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Querying the absence of Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Assessments within SPG as a whole.

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

In addition to the points raised above we would like to raise the following issues:

•We would expect to see mention of Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Assessments within this SPG. Although not a requirement from applicants, an explanation would be an aid to understanding and LCSAs may be relevant to the development of an application.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5466.P25          | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |       |              | 24/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | C    | W    | M      |                 |

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Comment about PCCs Enforcement and the need for mitigations to be monitored

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Enforcement of planning conditions: planning conditions may prescribe actions which are important for the mitigation of landscape impacts. It is unacceptable that Powys frequently fails to enforce conditions applied to approval of a development. Mitigation undertakings must be monitored.

|          |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5466.P26 | Brecknock and Radnorshire Committee of the Campai |  |  | 24/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: SPG needs to explain that NMAs which alter original assessment conclusions will not be allowed

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

•Non Material Amendments: It should be set out in this SPG that NMAs which alter the original landscape assessment conclusions will not be allowed.

|         |                      |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5815.P1 | Mid Wales Art Centre |  |  | 14/01/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | W | M |  |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Support for landscape protection

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

I am delighted to read that the value of the landscape is appreciated and valued.  
It is of great importance to the physical and mental health and well being of the present generation and for the future of mankind.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>   | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>5815.P2</b>           | Mid Wales Art Centre |              |                     | 14/01/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | C           | W           | M             |                        |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Caersws area's historic importance

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Powys has an exceptionally beautiful landscape with many important historic and geological features.

I note that the area around Caersws is not registered as being of historic importance, despite having 2 Roman Forts, the Moat at Moat Lane, several very ancient buildings including my own home which can be dated to the early 1500's or before, having connections with Ceiriog Hughes ( the 'Robert Burns of Wales' ) who worked at Caersws Station and is buried in Llangynog and the old railway junction of Moat Lane.

**5815.P3** Mid Wales Art Centre

14/01/2019  E O W M

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Impact of static caravan sites

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

I am also concerned about the proliferation of static caravan sites particularly on the A470.

The proposals to allow more on Moat Lane contravenes every part of this consultation paper.

I question why there is special guidance for solar farms and not for static caravan sites.

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P1           | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Approach in para 1.4 implies only a protective approach to landscape at odds with NRW Guidance

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 1.4 ... 'This SPG has been prepared to provide information and guidance on how, through implementation of the policies in the LDP, development proposals should ensure that the landscape is appropriately considered, protected and where feasible enhanced.'

This approach implies only a protective approach towards landscape which precludes consideration of an objective in some areas for landscape change.

This is at odds with draft Natural Resources Wales Guidance "Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity in relation to on-shore wind and solar photo-voltaic developments: An assessment approach for Wales – August 2018" 1 which is currently being consulted upon

1 NRW Draft Guidance (currently out for consultation) : <https://naturalresources.wales/guidance-and-advice/environmental-topics/consultations/our-own-consultations/landscape-sensitivity-and-capacity-assessment/?lang=en>

|         |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5911.P2 | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Focus on para 2.1 should be on acceptability of changes, so suggest a text change to reflect this

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 2.1 ...'To ensure development proposals are successfully integrated within the landscape; and to prevent development proposals from having a negative impact on the valued characteristics and qualities of the Powys landscape.'

Commercial infrastructure proposals may give rise to negative or adverse effects however the focus should be on the acceptability of any changes. We therefore suggest 'a negative' should be replaced with 'unacceptable'.

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P3           | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns over the attributes of landscape in para 4.1

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 4.1.. 'The term landscape can be applied to a range of different concepts however with regards to planning and land use it refers primarily to the visual appearance and sensory qualities of the land; including its remoteness, tranquillity, shape, patterns, form, land uses, vernacular, textures and colours.'

The term landscape also applies to its physical attributes, as expressed through different landscape character types.

|         |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5911.P4 | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: SPG needs to recognise that Powys landscape will change through provision of national Renewable Energy development

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 4.4... 'The Powys landscape is part of the County's identity and an important asset, with areas of local and national significance (as demonstrated in LANDMAP section eight). It attracts tourism, enables outdoor recreation and provides local employment opportunities. It also delivers benefits to the health and well-being of the residents of Powys, forms the basis of the natural environment and gives a sense of place and a sense of history which in turn contributes to individual, local and national identity. These factors highlight the importance of the LDP policies and this guidance when it comes to managing the impacts of development proposals on the Powys landscape.'

The draft SPG should also acknowledge that the Powys landscape should also consider landscape change through the provision of nationally important renewable energy development, as identified within TAN8, Planning Policy Wales and other relevant National Planning Policy.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P5           | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: SPG needs to reference NRW Guidance from Aug 2018

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 4.14 ... 'The Landscape Sensitivity Study (2017) was conducted to assess the likely impact of solar photovoltaic energy development on the landscape in 33 distinct areas.'

The draft SPG does not reference the NRW draft publication "Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity in relation to on-shore wind and solar photo-voltaic developments: An assessment approach for Wales – August 2018". We would suggest that the guidance should be cross referenced in the final SPG.

|         |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5911.P6 | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Apparent contradiction between para 4.14 and 4.15 requires clarification

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 4.15 .... 'Following the identification of the LSAs it was recognised that one of the main planning considerations yet to be addressed was the effect of solar development proposals on the landscape.'

This seems to contradict paragraph 4.14 which says that "The Landscape Sensitivity Study (2017) was conducted to assess the likely impact of solar photovoltaic energy development on the landscape in 33 distinct areas. The 33 areas were defined in the Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy Assessment (AECOM, 2017) as potential Local Search Areas (LSAs)."

We would welcome clarification in the final SPG.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>        | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>5911.P7</b>           | Scottish Power Renewables |              |                     | 23/02/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | O           | W           | M             |                        |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: SPG terminology should better reflect that of DM4 with regard to 'unacceptable adverse/negative impacts'

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

LDP Policy DM4

Adopted 'Policy DM4 – Landscape' is clear that development proposals outside settlements must not have unacceptable adverse effects. As noted in response to section 2.1, we would therefore ask that the final SPG is updated to reflect "unacceptable adverse impacts" rather than any negative impacts.

**5911.P8** Scottish Power Renewables

23/02/2019  E O W M

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests changes to Fig 1. on page 11

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Figure 1. 'Step by step process for showing how to implement Policy DM4.'

We would suggest that the process outlined acknowledges that landscape is only one of a wide range of considerations that may influence the siting and design of development in the countryside.

We would suggest that the draft SPG is updated to acknowledge that landscape input is not independent from, but an integral part of, the design response to a major development proposal.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>        | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>5911.P9</b>           | Scottish Power Renewables |              |                     | 23/02/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | O           | W           | M             |                        |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concern re apparent conflict with existing recognised UK assessment processes

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Page 12 & 13. 'STEP 2 - BASELINE ASSESSMENT'

We are concerned that the advice contained in this section does not align with existing assessment processes that are fully recognised across the landscape profession in the UK. For example, those set out in the Landscape Institute's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA 3).

We would therefore suggest that the SPG is amended to indicate here that any requirement for LVIA (assessment or appraisal) meets the requirements of the Landscape Institute's GLVIA 3 guidance.

|                 |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>5911.P10</b> | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Recommends usefulness of referencing a raft of guidance issued by Scottish Natural Heritage and widely used across UK

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Page 14 'STEP 3 – SITING AND DESIGN STAGE'

The draft SPG provides a brief overview of some of the elements that are pertinent to siting and design of development. It could usefully acknowledge here that in relation to commercial wind energy, there is a raft of guidance published by SNH that has been successfully applied across the UK. During the Mid-Wales Public Inquiry, all parties acknowledged the relevance of the guidance already published by SNH in this regard and we would therefore recommend that the SPG refers to current SNH guidance.

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P11          | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns about the use of the words unacceptable adverse effect in relation to LVIA

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

para 6.23... 'Where the LVIA or the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape, then either mitigation measures should be undertaken, or the development proposal should be taken back to the siting and design stage.'

We have concerns with the current wording of this section. LVIA does not determine whether development has acceptable or unacceptable effects. Acceptability is determined by the decision maker, through the planning balance, where a wider range of considerations including but not limited to landscape, is weighed. We would therefore suggest that section 6.23 is reworded to reflect the role of the LVIA and the decision-maker in determining the acceptability of potential impact.

5911.P12 Scottish Power Renewables

23/02/2019  E O W M

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Disagreeing with wording in para 6.31 with regard to non-EIA LVIA (Appraisal)

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 6.31 ... 'In some cases, there may already be a requirement for an LVIA to be carried out as part of an EIA (see paragraph 6.25); where this is not the case the LVIA (known as a Landscape Visual Impact Appraisal) should still identify and assess the significance of the effects of change resulting from development on both the landscape as a resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity.'

We do not agree with statement 6.31 as currently drafted. A non-EIA LVIA (Appraisal) should not identify whether effects are significant or not as the identification of a significant effect may mean that an EIA should have be required.

This point is confirmed by the Landscape Institute in its Statement of Clarification of GLVIA 3 dated June 2013:

"Statement of Clarification 2 The Phrase 'Significant in EIA Terms':

In carrying out LVIAs, landscape professionals have on occasion identified effects as being 'significant in EIA terms'. It is recommended that this phrase should not be used in a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). It is understood that the phrase does not appear in any relevant EIA Regulations or associated statutory publications. (see GLVIA3 Page 40, Para 3.32)".

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P13          | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Seeks clarification in para 6.35 re interpretation of LVIA and the determination of acceptability/unacceptability

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 6.35 .... 'Applicants following the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' still need to be mindful that the development proposal meets the policy requirements of the LDP. This includes making sure proposals are sited and designed to be integrated within the landscape (as per Step 3 above), are appropriate and sensitive, take into consideration cumulative impacts, and don't have an unacceptable adverse effect on the valued characteristics and qualities of the Powys landscape (these should be identified as part of the baseline assessment).'

The application of best practice in LVIA, as set out in GLVIA 3, will not determine acceptability/ unacceptability of effects. This is a planning judgement and a matter for the planning balance. See point in response to 6.23 above. [Rep P11]

|          |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5911.P14 | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns about the use of "unacceptable adverse effects" in para 6.36

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 6.36.... 'To demonstrate that there are no unacceptable adverse effects minor development proposals will be expected to undertake an informal landscape assessment.'

See point in response to 6.23 above [Rep P.11]

[copied from P.11;

We have concerns with the current wording of this section. LVIA does not determine whether development has acceptable or unacceptable effects. Acceptability is determined by the decision maker, through the planning balance, where a wider range of considerations including but not limited to landscape, is weighed. We would therefore suggest that section 6.23 is reworded to reflect the role of the LVIA and the decision-maker in determining the acceptability of potential impact. ]

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P15          | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns about the subjectivity of para 6.38 and application and interpretation of LVIA

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 6.38.... 'Appropriate planning and location within the landscape should avoid areas of high sensitivity; these are areas of high/ outstanding value that are likely to be harmed by the development proposal.'

and

' ..... Where the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape,...'

We have concerns with the statement as currently drafted as this is subjective and pre-supposes that all development must be harmful.

LVIA (assessment or appraisal) in itself will not identify acceptable or unacceptable effects, if best practice is to be followed (as per GLVIA 3). Acceptability is a matter for the planning judgement having regard to the overall effects of a development, both positive and negative. We would therefore suggest that section 6.38 is amended to reflect this.

|          |                           |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5911.P16 | Scottish Power Renewables |  |  | 23/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Issue with National Policy wording "where adverse effects on landscape character cannot be avoided, it will be necessary to refuse planning permission"

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

page 18 ... 'In addition to failing to comply with LDP Policy DM4, Planning Policy Wales (edition 10) states "where adverse effects on landscape character cannot be avoided, it will be necessary to refuse planning permission".'

As per previous points, large-scale infrastructure development will likely cause some effects on the landscape and visual resource, including on landscape character. Therefore focus should be on determining the acceptability of such impacts.

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor               | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5911.P18          | Scottish Power Renewables |       |              | 23/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggest referencing on page 37 the well-developed advice from Scottish Natural Heritage's guidance, used in Wales previously.

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Page 37;... 'Wind Energy Proposals'

We would suggest that consideration is given to reference the well-developed advice of SNH's Siting & Designing Windfarms guidance, which provides detail guidance, applicable to commercial wind energy proposals and has been accepted for use in Wales previously.

|         |                      |  |  |  |                          |  |  |  |   |  |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5923.P3 | Powys County Council |  |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |  |  | M |  |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|

Document:Landscape SPG

|         |                     |           |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6264.P1 | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |  | 22/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns about the application and interpretation of LVIA in para 6.23.

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Para 6.23: Where the LVIA or the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape ...

The LVIA would identify what effects would occur, the degree and nature (whether adverse or beneficial) of the effects, and whether they would be significant.

It would be for the Authority to determine whether the effects would be acceptable or not.

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor         | Agent     | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6264.P2           | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |              | 22/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Disagreeing with wording in para 6.31 with regard to non-EIA LVIA (Appraisal).

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 6.31: ... where [LVIA is not to be carried out as part of an EIA] the LVIA (known as a Landscape Visual Impact Appraisal) should still identify and assess the significance of the effects of change resulting from development on ...

The Landscape Institute (LI) advises that, outside of an EIA, an LVIA should identify the degree and nature of landscape and visual effects of a development, but not their significance, since that is a function of formal EIA.

Other descriptors such as "major" or "important" may be used instead.

The rest of the SPG distinguishes between an LVIA where an EIA may be required from an "informal assessment", identified in para 6.31 as 'Landscape Visual Impact Appraisal'. This distinction needs to be maintained throughout the SPG.

It is conceivable that significant landscape or visual effects could occur but not other significant environmental effects. In such cases, a single-topic EIA could be sought, assessing only landscape and visual effects and their significance.

|         |                     |           |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6264.P3 | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |  | 22/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concerns about the application and interpretation of LVIA in para 6.38.

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 6.38: ... Where the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape ...

See comment on para 6.23 in relation to "unacceptable adverse impact" [Rep P1]

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor         | Agent     | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6264.P4           | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |              | 22/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Concern that figs. 2 & 3 process charts on page 29 and 30 need clarification and cross referencing to be checked.

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Figure 2: No – Go to Figure 2 (occurs twice)

This chart is Fig 2 - should this say "Go to Figure 3"?

Lower boxes of Figure 2: "where unacceptable impact consider going back to siting and design stage"

As previous comment for para 6.23. [Rep P.1]

Close parenthesis missing in last box: after 'EIA'? Presumably DAS is considered a separate exercise and document?

Figure 3: references to significant impact and unacceptability of effects

As previous comments to paras 6.23 and 6.31. [Reps.P1 and P2]

|         |                     |           |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6264.P5 | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |  | 22/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Seeks clarification and more detail regarding wording in para 10.1

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Para 10.1: reference to unacceptability of adverse impacts

As previous comments to paras 6.23 and 6.31. [Reps P.1 and P.2]

Para 10.1: The number of developments that could have a significant landscape or visual impact permitted without an accompanying LVIA will also be monitored.

The meaning of this statement is not clear. "... that could have ...": should not this be determined pre-application stage and if significant effects are anticipated, then EIA/ LVIA should be sought?

Or if an application is made that is considered to have "significant landscape or visual impact", then shouldn't a EIA/ LVIA be sought before registering or determining the application?

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor         | Agent     | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6264.P6           | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group |              | 22/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests changes to terms used in the Glossary.

---

### Item Question Representation Text

#### 1 Details

Glossary: We make the following observations and make the following suggested changes:

Aspect Area: LANDMAP Guidance Note 1 section 7 defines aspect areas as: areas of "unique landscape characteristics and qualities.", rather than "character", which results from the composite of all the aspects.

Baseline Assessment: We suggest the following is added to Meaning: '..., the conditions against which the future changes or changes resulting from a development proposal can be measured'.

Feature: In the context of development proposals, a "feature" may also be a particular aspect of the project.

Informal Assessment: typo in first line: "looks"; Add 'or Appraisal' after 'Assessment'; Add to Meaning: '..., predicting effects, although not their significance, and considering how adverse effects might be mitigated'.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment / Appraisal (LVIA): delete '/ Appraisal' – the LI advises that this term is used for informal/ non-EIA assessments and it will be useful not to mix the terminology. Informal appraisals do not assess significance of effects, a term reserved for the EIA context, although they may identify 'important' effects.

Townscape: Add after 'open spaces': 'including green spaces'.

Visual Receptors: This is the definition of Visual Effects.  
Visual Receptors are: Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by changes in views or visual amenity at different places.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV): Insert 'theoretically' in 'may be seen'.

---

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>  | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>6264.P7</b>           | Pennant Walters Ltd | WYG Group    |                     | 22/02/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | O           | W           | M             |                        |

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Suggests changes to elements within Appendix 1

---

*Item Question*   *Representation Text*

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

1 Details

Appendix 1

Agricultural Buildings

Colour:

Add to penultimate sentence "and, in general, should be selected from the olive - brown part of the spectrum".

Grouping: "For this reason, new buildings should form part of a group rather than stand in isolation"

Shouldn't this decision come out of the baseline analysis of the site in its context, so the proposal can respond to context?

Planting: Planting proposals should also reflect green infrastructure principles e.g. extending or improving habitats, ensuring connectivity, relationship to public rights of way, views available, etc.

Dwellings

Form - Dwellings should have a horizontal emphasis and generally be low rise.

Again, this decision should emerge from an analysis of the local characteristics - the local vernacular could be more vertical in emphasis and a horizontal-emphasis building might then conflict with the prevailing character

Boundaries – Existing vegetation such as hedgerows and trees should be retained: add" ... and their condition enhanced".

Lighting - External lighting should be directed downwards:

Add "and shielded so that light does not "spill" beyond the area needing to be lit"

Solar Energy Proposals

Landcover - Maintain field pattern

Historic or characteristic field pattern may be degraded, in which case it should be investigated and the opportunity taken to reinstate it, where that would be compatible with the solar farm use.

Design ... panels should be lower than any hedgerows on the site: this could conflict with the desire to work with smaller scale field patterns, as solar panels need to be sited so as not to be shaded by tall hedgerows.

Add similar advice re colour of ancillary infrastructure as for Agricultural Buildings above.

Wind Energy Proposals

Skylines - it is particularly important that a wind farm avoids skylines ...

Delete: It is very unlikely that wind farms could avoid skylines as they must make the most of the wind resource. Better to focus on layout designs that work with the topographic characteristics of the site and the nature of the views available.

Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor              | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6323.P6           | Innogy Renewables UK Ltd |       |              | 14/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Para 6.23 wording concerning EIA requirements

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Paragraph 6.23 states “Where the LVIA or the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape, then either mitigation measures should be undertaken, or the development proposal should be taken back to the siting and design stage, not doing this may result in the planning application being refused”. In my view, paragraph 6.23 confuses ‘significant’ effects (in environmental impact assessment (EIA) terms) and ‘acceptability’ (in terms of the planning balance). Significant effects in EIA terms can still be acceptable when balanced against other considerations (e.g. the benefits of a scheme). A developer can take a view on whether they consider the impacts of their proposal to be acceptable but ultimately this is a judgement that can only formally be made by the decision-maker (i.e. the local planning authority or the Welsh Ministers). This paragraph should instead read:

“Where the LVIA or the informal assessment identifies that the development proposal will have [struckthrough; an unacceptable adverse impact] [insert; significant effects] on the landscape, then [insert; the developer should consider] [struckthrough; either] mitigation measures [insert; (where possible)] [struckthrough; should be undertaken], or the development proposal should be taken back to the siting and design stage. [struckthrough; not doing this may result in the planning application being refused]”. The identification of ‘significant impacts’ in EIA terms will not necessarily lead to a planning application being refused (in the same way that the identification of ‘no significant impacts’ in EIA terms will necessarily lead to a consent) so the final part of the sentence should be deleted – this is a factor inherent in any planning application and does not need to be stated.

|         |                          |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6323.P7 | Innogy Renewables UK Ltd |  |  | 14/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|---------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Para 6.26 Suggesting additional wording re EIA

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Paragraph 6.26: “The requirement for EIA in these circumstances is determined through a Screening Opinion carried out by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) [insert; or a Screening Direction carried out by the Welsh Ministers].”

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>       | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>6323.P8</b>           | Innogy Renewables UK Ltd |              |                     | 14/02/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | S           | W           | M             |                        |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Para 6.29 exclusion of anemometry from LVIA

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Paragraph 6.29: requires LVIA to be carried out for "...all wind energy proposals (excluding anemometry masts)..." – this exclusion is welcomed.

|                |                          |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>6323.P9</b> | Innogy Renewables UK Ltd |  |  | 14/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Para 6.38 wording concerning informal assessment

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

The comment against paragraph 6.23 above [Ref.P6] equally applies to paragraph 6.38 – it is not the purpose of the informal assessment to determine the 'acceptability' of a proposal. Determining 'acceptability' is the decision-maker's responsibility based on an assessment of 'significance' in the informal assessment and all other material considerations.

|                 |                          |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>6323.P10</b> | Innogy Renewables UK Ltd |  |  | 14/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | W | M |  |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Section 9 Fig2&3 Wording of 'Process Chart'

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Section 9 Figures 2 and 3: the point against 6.23 and 6.38 above on acceptability vs significance also applies to the wording used in the 'Process Chart'. The fourth green box in Figure 2 should read 'Scoping Opinion or Direction' not 'Scoping Report'.

**Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor           | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6395.P2           | Canal and River Trust |       |              | 04/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | C    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: No Comment

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Thank you for your consultation in relation to the draft Landscape and Renewable Energy SPGs. Glandŵr Cymru, the Canal & River Trust in Wales, (the Trust) have reviewed these documents and have no comments to make on the draft documents.

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6746.P1 | Parc Cenedlaethol Eryri / Snowdonia National Park |  |  | 22/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Supports para 5.4

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Comments on the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Landscape

The Authority welcomes paragraph 5.4 which notes: "It requires development proposals (individually or cumulatively) not to have an unacceptable adverse effect on the valued characteristics and qualities of the Powys landscape. All proposals should be appropriate and sensitive in how they are designed and integrated within the landscape and must have regard to visual amenity, LANDMAP, Registered Historic Landscapes, adjacent National Parks and adjacent Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty."

|         |   |  |  |            |                          |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6746.P2 | Parc Cenedlaethol Eryri / Snowdonia National Park |  |  | 22/02/2019 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | W | M |  |
|---------|---|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Supports para 6.7

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

The Authority welcomes paragraph 6.7 which notes: "Major development, development within visually prominent locations and development with a wide visual influence that can be seen from neighbouring national designations such as National Parks and Areas of Outstanding National Beauty will need to avoid adversely affecting the setting and outlook of these statutory designated landscapes."

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor                                       | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 6746.P3           | Parc Cenedlaethol Eryri / Snowdonia National Park |       |              | 22/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | S    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Supports para 6.24

### Item Question Representation Text

1 Details

The Authority also welcomes the consideration given to the Park with regard to developments and their effects as noted in paragraph 6.24: "Consideration will also need to be given as to the impact of the development proposal on any adjacent National Parks, Areas of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB) and Registered Historic Landscapes."

7085.P1 Land Quality Advisory Service

04/02/2019  E C W M

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: No Comment

### Item Question Representation Text

1 Details

Thank you for consulting the Land Quality Advisory Service on the draft supplementary planning guidance. I can confirm that the Department do not have any comments on the draft guidance.

For information

To assist LPA's in meeting Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Policy requirements (PPW Para 3.54 & 3.55), the Department has produced the 'Predictive Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Map for Wales (2017)'. This map is available to view, and can be downloaded by LPA's from <https://lle.gov.wales/home>.

The map has been produced to assist LPA's make informed decisions regarding agricultural land quality and application of BMV Policy at an early stage in plan development, and as an evidence base for strategic planning and sustainability appraisal. Where the Department holds detailed ALC survey information for a site, this is also shown on the map.

The Department has also produced guidance on the use of the Predictive ALC Map and when to commission a detailed ALC survey. The guidance is available on the Welsh Government website at: - <https://beta.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-02/agricultural-land-classification-predictive-map-guidance.pdf>

The Department remain available to provide advice to LPA's on agricultural land quality information.

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor             | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late?                    | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 7086.P1           | Peter Richards & Co Ltd |       |              | 21/02/2019  | <input type="checkbox"/> | E      | O    | W    | M      |                 |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: No clear guidance on what constitutes a development which does not require a Landscape Impact Assessment.

---

*Item Question Representation Text*

1 Details

Please refer to Appendix 1 and Paragraph 6.9 - 6.16, 6.29 and 6.36

We full understand the difficulty in finding the balance between gaining the right information and the scale of the development.

We feel that the guidance is clear on what constitutes a major project and what is required it is felt that there is no clear guidance on what constitutes a development which does not require a Landscape Impact Assessment. Just the below is quoted;

Landscape Assessment for Developments that do not Require a LVIA

6.36 LDP Policy DM4 requires all proposals not to individually or cumulatively have an unacceptable adverse effect on the valued characteristics and qualities of the Powys landscape. To demonstrate that there are no unacceptable adverse effects minor development proposals will be expected to undertake an informal landscape assessment.

Whilst Major developments have box which show the below;

Major development is defined in article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 as:

'major development' means development involving any one or more of the following -

(a) the winning and working of minerals or the use of land for mineral-working deposits;

(b) waste development;

© the provision of dwellinghouses where -

(i) the number of dwellinghouses to be provided is 10 or more; or

(ii) the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more and it is known whether the development falls within sub-paragraph ©(i);

(d) the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more, or,

€ development carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more.

---

## Consultation Draft Landscape SPG Representations

## Powys County Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=P; Status<>D; Document=Landscape SPG

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i>      | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i>             | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>7086.P2</b>           | Peter Richards & Co Ltd |              |                     | 21/02/2019         | <input type="checkbox"/> | E             | O           | W           | M             |                        |

Council Officer: CS

Document:Landscape SPG

Summary: Clearer clarification on project types and what is required will make the planning process more simple

---

### *Item Question*   *Representation Text*

#### 1      Details

Appendix 1 is helpful in outlining what needs to be considered in regards to what is need to be considered when putting something together rather than what is required to be submitted.

The process information and flow diagrams are helpful once you know what category you fall into. It is considered from guidance in Appendix 1 that a conversion will not be considered the same as a new build but it is not clearly shown in the main body of text and what is required of applicants.

We think clearer clarification on project types and what is required will make the planning process more simple for applicants and Council staff, especially when the policy is new.

---