



70 Cowcross Street
London EC1M 6EJ
Telephone: (+44/0) 207 608 2409
Email: enquiries@thegardenstrust.org
www.thegardenstrust.org

This Planning and Conservation Advice Note (PCAN) is one of a series published by The Gardens Trust's predecessor, the Garden History Society in 2005.

The PCANs predate the National Planning Policy Framework. Any references to the planning system and planning policy (and particularly Section 8 'Planning Context' and Appendix 3) in the PCANs has been superseded and the conservation advice must be read in the context of the current National Planning Policy Framework published by the Government.

Government department names have changed since the PCAN series was published.

More information on The Gardens Trust's role in the planning system, casework, and our conservation publications and resource hub is available at:

<https://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/>

Email: enquiries@thegardenstrust.org

THE GARDEN
HISTORY SOCIETY

Planning Conservation Advice Note 8

Telecommunications masts



GHS Head Office, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ

Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org

www.gardenhistorysociety.org

The Planning Conservation Advice Notes (PCANs) listed below have been devised by the Garden History Society to advise those wishing to determine the impact upon historic designed landscape of specific proposals for change. This includes local planning authorities, potential developers, owners or other interested parties. These PCANs seek to inform on necessary background information and good conservation practice while at the same time encouraging critical evaluation of the likely type and extent of potential impact. Not all impact is adverse, change is not necessarily detrimental, and opportunities do exist both for development and, where adverse impact has been identified, for appropriate mitigation. Informed evaluation is essential however, if irreversible damage is to be avoided and change is to be implemented in a way that is sympathetic to the historic and visual value of designed landscape.

Titles List

PCAN 1: Change of Use (of landscape, and of principal and/or subsidiary buildings)

PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development

PCAN 3: Extension of Educational/Institutional Establishments

PCAN 4: Executive Housing

PCAN 5: Golf

PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access

PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances

PCAN 8: Telecommunications Masts

PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities

PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting

PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape

PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features

PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments

PCAN 14: Management Plans (including Statements of Significance)

Appendix 1: Lists of subsidiary development generated by particular types of change

Appendix 2: General Evaluation Checklist (All types development/all types landscape)

Appendix 3: Planning Context

Planning Conservation Advice Notes 1 to 12 deal with some of the most common types of change proposed in historic landscape or its setting. Notes 13 and 14 describe documentation required to evaluate and support proposals for such change. Appendices 1 to 3, which separate out specific aspects of proposals in note form for quick reference, may also be useful for evaluation of types of change not covered in PCANs 1 to 12.

Format

PCANs 1 to 12 are divided into the following sections:

Section 1.0: Introduction

Section 2.0: Information Needed to Evaluate the Impact of Proposals

Section 3.0: Further Information Needed

Section 4.0: Potential for Mitigation

Section 5.0: Watchpoints

Section 6.0: Unavoidable Development/Damage

Section 7.0: Application of Advice

Section 8.0: Planning Context

Section 9.0: Evaluation

Evaluation

Most sections follow a set format but Section 9.0 on evaluation differs between various PCANs.

PCANs 3; 6; 8; 9; 10; 11 have a flow chart evaluation questionnaire. This may assist planning officers in particular, both in assessment of proposals and in preparation of recommendations for committee – the advice shown in upper case and bold type being intended to inform particularly on the following:

- level of potential impact
- further input which may be needed from other professionals
- further information which may be required
- where condition or legal agreement would be required to avoid adverse impact

PCANs 1; 2; 7 have checklists of questions intended to:

- highlight other relevant evaluation tools
- highlight potential implications of proposals
- list questions relevant to evaluation of impact

PCANs 4; 5 have short checklists of questions intended to:

- direct evaluation to specific conservation advice in the relevant PCAN
- assist evaluation by highlighting potential implications of proposals

PCAN 12 seeks to assist evaluators by offering conservation advice for particular situations.

Current status of advice notes

These planning conservation advice notes may be amended following trialling or with the introduction of new legislation. Any comments, and suggestions for improvement would be welcomed by the Society and feedback on content, usefulness, layout etc. of the sections on evaluation (including flow-charts) would be particularly appreciated.

Acknowledgements

Individuals and organisations too numerous to mention have been involved in various stages of preparation of these PCANs and the Society would like to acknowledge this invaluable assistance and to offer its thanks to them all.

The Society would also like to highlight the input of the Society's conservation team in place at the time the original concept was devised (David Lambert, Anthea Taigel, Kath Gibson, Sarah Couch and Linden Groves), with particular thanks to David Lambert for identification of subjects, Sarah Couch for invaluable advice and for her work on PCAN 14 and advice flow charts, Kath Gibson for invaluable advice, particularly on PCANs 1 and 7, and Linden Groves for her support and enthusiasm. The Society is also indebted to the Jubilee Fund Trustees who provided initial funding for 'pilot' PCANs, and to the GHS Conservation Committee, which has supported this initiative throughout, with particular thanks to John Sales who has provided the text for Statements of Significance (included in PCAN 14). Format and text of PCANs and Appendices were otherwise devised by Anthea Taigel (former principal conservation officer of the GHS), with the advice and guidance of Elisabeth Whittle, (Chairman of the GHS Conservation Committee).

Copyright of the text of PCANS and appendices rests jointly with The Garden History Society and Anthea Taigel.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Historic designed landscape is an area of landscape which has been ornamented by structures, planting and features, which are linked together to form a cohesive entity. Such entity may be regarded as a three dimensional (and living) art work. Invariably, design will be changed over time by the introduction of new features, by removal, decay or growth of others, and by redesign of some or all areas. A designed landscape may also be extended or contracted in the course of its history.
- Nonetheless, unless a landscape has suffered permanent damage (e.g. through introduction of irreversible elements which were not designed to preserve or enhance the site, such as a new motorway or housing estate) or the potential for repair has been otherwise irreversibly compromised (e.g. through loss of land to coastal erosion), it will remain a designed and cohesive entity, albeit often in need of varying degrees of repair.
- 1.2 Intricately designed and detailed areas and features (e.g. formal gardens, arboreta, airing courts [in asylum landscapes], canals, lakes and avenues) and ornamented structures (e.g. chapels [in ornamental cemeteries], lodges, temples and glasshouses) may be readily identifiable in a designed landscape.
- Other designed elements which are also integral to the cohesive whole, such as vistas, viewpoints, compositions (e.g. designed views of a temple across a lake with backdrop woodland, or a lodge with ornamental garden apron and entrance splay) and panoramas (e.g. wide views of sweeping parkland from a ride or knoll) may be less immediately apparent; particularly if a landscape has been unmanaged or inappropriately managed for some time.
- 1.3 Integral to any comprehensive design will also be consideration of adverse visual impact (the screening of any undesirable view or element) and, on landscapes designed for privacy and seclusion, the prevention of intrusion. Landscape designs may include a high perimeter wall or wide perimeter tree belts to exclude public gaze, the siting of service and utility areas/facilities (e.g. stables, farm buildings, pump houses) at low points in the landscape or their enclosure in belts of planting.
- The desirability of views of particular areas and elements will usually be related to what was fashionable in the period of design inception or design change (e.g. in periods of interest in new agricultural techniques, views of farm complexes were often highly valued and these were included in circuit drives and walks; in other periods such complexes were wholly or partly screened from view).
- 1.4 Desirable views outside the defined boundary of a designed landscape were often 'borrowed' by a landscape designer to create additional effects within the overall composition. Thus a high point within the designed landscape might be swept clear of planting to enable a wide panorama of the adjacent countryside or coast to be appreciated, or new planting could focus views of a distant structure (such as a church spire), or natural features (such as a crag, gorge or winding river). 'Borrowed landscape views' might also be used to increase the apparent extent of a designed landscape or estate.
- See also *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Designed Landscapes*
- 1.5 The way in which an ornamental landscape was perceived from outside was an important consideration. For maximum effect, the eye had to be drawn towards the designed landscape and designers were careful to avoid potential visual conflict.
- A boundary could be planted to give staged views into the interior (e.g. vistas cut through boundary woodland to focus in sequence on a mansion and landscape, being approached along a public road). Public roads were often realigned either to give the best view, or to increase the status of an approach. In an urban setting a public road might be widened and lined with trees to form a prestige approach to a new public park or ornamental cemetery; on the country estate, a public road might be turned away and/or narrowed beyond a main entrance (such entrances usually being further embellished by ornamental gates, lodge etc.).

Alternatively, the presence (and status) of a designed landscape could be emphasised by dense and continuous boundary planting, broken only by a series of entrance lodges around the perimeter; the significant contrast with the landscape outside being sufficient to raise the profile of that inside.

- 1.6 A landscape designer would also have regard to function and purpose, and the essential ambience of a designed landscape invariably reflects this aspect. Thus an ornamental cemetery would be designed to promote quiet contemplation and reflection; a country house landscape to exhibit status and exclusivity, and a public park to ensure separation of areas of genteel promenade from noisier and more active sports and leisure pursuits.

2.0 Information needed to evaluate proposals

- 2.1 Establish the extent of potential visibility of any proposed telecommunications mast, if necessary by setting up a Red Flag Test.

N.B. An application for a telecommunications mast may state the height of the mast, but that of the additional facilities (antennae, dishes etc.) may be omitted or expressed only as a 'mid height'. For assessment of potential impact on historic landscape, the total height of the proposed facility should be determined.

It will be helpful to plot potential arcs of view onto a map of the site.

- 2.2 With the help of the English Heritage or Cadw (for Wales) Register entry for the site, or of any district inventory* entry for sites not on the Register, establish the design intention and significance (see 1.1 to 1.6 above) of the features and areas which lie within the arcs of view identified in 2.1.

*Where a site is unregistered but designated of local or regional historic significance, local inventories (as produced by local authorities, county gardens trusts or other interested organisations) may provide a similar level of information to the Register. Further information may be contained in listed building and conservation area descriptions.

N.B. While the Register is a reliable guide, and local inventory entries may provide useful information, these should not be viewed as comprehensive descriptions, and the potential for additional structures and areas of importance to be identified should be recognised. A historic landscape assessment should be used as a supplement if the English Heritage Register Entry or local inventory entry does not give a clear explanation of the features and areas which lie within the arcs of view identified and insufficient information is presented with an application. See also *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

- 2.3 In addition to the location of any mast, information should be available on any necessary subsidiary development (e.g. compounds, vehicle access routes and parking areas), and evaluation of potential impact should include that of such subsidiary development.

See also *GHS PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*

3.0 Additional information required

- 3.1 Some local authorities require that a proper impact assessment accompanies all applications for telecommunications facilities.

- 3.2 In assessing the potential impact of proposals on historic landscape, the potential for repair also needs to be taken into account.

(Where a historic landscape has been unmanaged or inappropriately managed for some time, the significance of a particular area may not be immediately apparent e.g. where these are overgrown or where new structures have been sited, or areas hard surfaced. Evaluators need to ensure that development will not compromise future repair of important historic landscape areas and features e.g. the reopening of a vista through woodland; replanting of an avenue; reinstatement of a circuit walk with associated features etc.).

For example, a block of conifer planting may mitigate against adverse visual impact of a telecommunications mast but, if such planting is not part of design intention, it may be desirable in any future repair of the landscape to remove it, e.g. to open up a designed view. In such a case, the existence of a mast could therefore compromise potential for future repair of the historic landscape.

Any evaluation of change on historic landscape should therefore include assessment of:

1. Existing damage (e.g. areas of tarmac for vehicle parking; modern buildings, structures, access ways,

planting etc. which were not designed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a historic landscape) and its potential reversibility.

2. Decay (e.g. lost features, lost or overgrown planting) and potential for its repair.

A full historic landscape assessment can be an invaluable aid to understanding the provenance and significance of structures, features and areas of a historic landscape. A Conservation Management Plan, based on a Historic Landscape Assessment will confirm such potential for repair in cases of doubt.

See *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans

4.0 Potential for Mitigation

4.1 ‘Stealth Solutions’ (i.e. erection of a structure which may house and thus obscure a mast, or an alternative form of mast e.g. in the form of a tree, a lamp standard, etc.).

Where these are proposed in historic landscape, evaluators should assess the potential impact of the proposed form/structure as a new feature.

(See *GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of new Landscape Features*)

4.2 Existing structures and planting within the historic landscape or its setting may provide opportunity for mitigation against adverse visual impact (but see 3.2 above).

For such mitigation measures to succeed, it must be possible to impose a condition to ensure their maintenance in perpetuity, within the context of the application.

(See also *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*)

Where this involves planting, potential visual impact at all stages of future replacement should be considered. A continuous programme of selective felling and replanting will usually be preferable to clear felling and total replanting at extended intervals. Appropriate future management should be considered therefore within conditions of consent.

4.3 Consideration of potential for repair of a historic landscape (through historic landscape assessment and a conservation management plan) may offer additional opportunities for structures and planting which would mitigate against adverse visual impact if reinstated or appropriately managed.

4.4 Most guidance on telecommunication masts advises consideration of extension of existing facilities (including sharing between networks) before the creation of additional sites. Such extension usually involves an increase in height of a mast of several metres to accommodate the additional circle(s) of antennae etc.

If the impact of an existing mast is low but an increase in height would result in adverse impact on sensitive areas or features of the historic landscape, consideration may be given to installation of parallel masts rather than to upward extension (see also Section 8.0 below).

5.0 Watchpoints

5.1 Potential impact of the height of proposed structures changes with relative height of vantage point.

5.2 Structures which are seen against a skyline or above a clearly defined upper canopy of trees have a greater visual impact than those seen against a visually varied backdrop.

5.3 Views across and beyond historic landscape change markedly with different seasons.

5.4 An alien structure, such as the top of a mast, is likely to be more intrusive if viewed within a formal and regular feature (such as an avenue) than within informal planting (e.g. a wooded area of mixed height trees).

5.5 Imposition of an alien structure, or parts of it, on the periphery of a focussed view (e.g. along an avenue or between ornamental buildings or block planting) can immediately draw the eye away from that designed view (conflict of visual priority).

Similarly, a telecommunications mast sited within a vista, a viewpoint, landscape composition or panorama is likely to present as an ‘exclamation point’; drawing the eye and conflicting with design intention.

- 5.6 Mitigation of visual impact, which relies on existing or new planting immediately around a mast and compound, should take into account possible changes in the density of such planting in different seasons and at different ages of the planting (e.g. young Scots Pine may successfully screen a service compound initially but, since this species progressively bares out at the base with age, will not provide long term screening effect).
- 5.7 The potential impact of overtly modern structures is likely to be greater on areas and views of historic landscape where no such imposition has occurred to date (see also 1.6 above).
- 5.8 The more areas of a landscape from which the facility is visible the greater will be the cumulative effect.
- 5.9 Where stealth solutions are proposed as alterations or additions to listed buildings in historic landscapes or their settings, impact assessment should include assessment of any potential changes on view from or within the historic landscape, as well as potential impact on the structure itself.

6.0 Unavoidable Development

- 6.1 If the proposed site of a telecommunications mast would result in significant adverse impact, but there is no other accessible site which would not result in adverse impact, within the required range (e.g. in areas of extreme topography), and other material considerations outweigh damage to historic landscape, every attempt should be made to mitigate against such impact, and corresponding gain for the affected historic landscape should be secured as part of the application. This may include funding towards a comprehensive conservation management plan or, if such a plan is already in place, funding for specific repair projects, planting etc.

7.0 Application of Advice

- 7.1 If proposals for telecommunications equipment, or its extension cannot be justified in the context of unavoidable damage and would result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape, and where potential for mitigation of such impact has not been identified or cannot be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 If an application for telecommunications equipment, or its extension can be justified in the context of unavoidable damage, OR would not result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape, OR if appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impact can and would be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant, the Society would be unlikely to object to such an application and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.3 Should there be doubt over the extent of impact on the historic landscape of an application for a telecommunications mast, or its extension, we advise that a request be made via our London office* for the Society's regional conservation officer to discuss the case with the local authority.
*Such request should be made to the Society's Conservation Casework Manager, at The Garden History Society, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ. Email conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org or telephone 020 7608 2409.

8.0 Planning Context

This section highlights some parts of government Planning Policy Guidance notes (general guidance on specific topics), which may be particularly relevant to applications for change on historic landscape. Further information may be accessed via the planning website (see 8.15 below).

PPG 8 Telecommunications

- 8.1 Under the **General Policy** section of this PPG, it is noted that, 'The government places great emphasis on its well established national policies for the protection of the countryside and urban areas – in particular The Heritage Coast and areas and buildings of architectural or historic importance'.
- 8.2 Paras 14 and 15 **Environmental consideration** refer to 'protection from visual intrusion ...' as an important consideration in determining applications.

- 8.3 Para 20: **Mast and Site Sharing** notes, 'Authorities will need to consider the cumulative impact upon the environment of additional antennas sharing a mast or masts sharing a site'.
(The response to point 8 of the committee report 2000–2001, quoted below, observed, 'However, mast sharing is not always the most suitable solution for a particular development. A couple of slim and unobtrusive masts, for example, may well be better than one cluttered one'.)
- 8.4 Para 24: **Design** notes, 'In seeking to arrive at the best solution for an individual site, authorities and operators should use sympathetic design and camouflage to minimise the impact of the development on the environment. Particularly in designated areas, the aim should be for the apparatus to blend into the landscape'.
And para 25 encourages continuation of development of innovative design, '... in terms not only of the structure of masts and antennae but also of materials and colouring'. Para 28 refers to careful consideration regarding screening and planting.
Consultation on applications: Response in government session 2000/2001 to the committee report on mobile phone masts* indicated intention to strengthen public consultation requirements on mobile phone masts below 15m in height, 'so that they are exactly the same as for mast proposals above 15m in height which require application for planning permission'.
*DETR consultation paper 31st July 2000 (proposed amendments to planning legislation under Part 24 of the General Permitted Development Order and related Guidance including *PPG8: Telecommunications*).

PPG15: Planning & the Historic Environment

- 8.5 Para 2.24 instructs that 'planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens in preparing development plans and in determining planning applications'.
Para 2.24 also confirms that the effect on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in assessing an application.
N.B. It is important to recognise the difference between setting of a listed building, which may comprise historic landscape, and the setting of the landscape itself, the evaluation of which involves a range of different issues. (See *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*)
- 8.6 Para 2.16 notes that when authorities consider applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works which potentially affect a listed structure they should pay special regard to certain matters including the desirability of preservation of the setting of a listed building.
Para 2.16 also notes that, 'The setting is often an essential part of the building's character, especially if a garden or grounds have been laid out to complement its design or function and para 2.17 continues, 'In some cases setting can only be defined by a historical assessment of a building's surroundings'.

PPG16: Archaeology and Planning

A significant number of historic parks and gardens (registered and unregistered) are included on county sites and monuments records (SMRs) either in their own right or as part of the setting of other monuments.

- 8.10 Section B: Advice on the Handling of Archaeological Matters in the Planning Process
B16: **Development Plans**. '...Authorities should bear in mind that not all nationally important remains meriting preservation will necessarily be scheduled; such remains and, in appropriate circumstances, other unscheduled archaeological remains of more local importance. may also be identified in development plans as particularly worthy of preservation.
B18: **Planning applications** 'The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether the monument is scheduled or unscheduled' '...Where local planning authorities are aware of a real and specific threat to a known archaeological site as a result of the potential exercise of permitted development rights (as set out in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act General Development Order 1988) they may wish to consider the use of their powers under **Article 4** of that order to withdraw those rights and to require specific planning permission to be obtained before development can proceed'.
B21: **(b) Field Evaluations** 'Where early discussions with local planning authorities or the developer's own research indicate that important archaeological remains may exist, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request the prospective developer to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out before any decision on a planning application is taken.

B22: 'Local planning authorities can expect developers to provide the results of such assessments and excavations as part of their applications for sites where there is good reason to suspect there are remains of archaeological importance If necessary, authorities will need to consider refusing permission for proposals which are inadequately documented'.

PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation

8.12 Para 17: **Developments within Open Space** 'Local authorities should (i) avoid any erosion of recreational function and maintain or enhance the character of open spaces....'

8.14 **Annex: Definitions**

2: 'The following typology illustrates the broad range of open space that may be of public value

- i. parks and gardens – including urban parks, country parks and formal gardens ...
- v. amenity green space ... including ... domestic gardens
- vii. allotments, community gardens ...
- viii. cemeteries and churchyards'

Planning Website

8.15 The website of the office of the deputy prime minister (www.odpm.gov.uk) may be accessed for full information on the above PPGs and other relevant planning guidance e.g.

PPG13: Transport

Planning and Access for Disabled People: A Good Practice Guide

See also *GHS Appendix 3* for further parts of

PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment

PPG16: Archaeology and Planning

PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation

AND *Planning Policy Wales*

9.0 Evaluation of Impact

The most likely adverse impact on historic landscape, of the siting of telecommunications equipment and associated development, will be visual and the following checklist is designed to determine potential visual impact.

Questions should be answered in order. The findings of each section should enable a summary of type and level of visual impact to be devised. Any finding of 'IMPACT HIGH' should be regarded as potentially damaging to the historic landscape.

PROPOSED SITE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Q1 Does the site fall within the historic landscape? Go to Q2

Does the site fall within the setting of the historic landscape?

See *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Landscape* **AND** Go to Q2

Q2

ACCESS

Q1 Will an existing vehicle access route to this area be used?

If No, Go to Q2

If Yes, Go to Q1A

Q1A Does the existing access route cross the historic landscape?

If No, Go to Q3

If Yes, Go to Q1B

Q1B Will higher, wider or heavier vehicles access the area? **OR**

Will a significantly greater number of vehicles access the area? **OR**

Would changes to the drive be proposed? (*Include new surfacing; increased widths, signage, lighting, etc.*)

If No, Go to Q1C

If Yes, **SEPARATE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF CHANGED ACCESS ON HISTORIC LANDSCAPE REQUIRED** Go to Q1C

Q1C Will any major changes to main entrances to the historic landscape be required? (*Include assessment of turning requirements from a public road, need for improved visibility splays etc.*)

If No, Go to Q3

If Yes, **SEPARATE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT REQUIRED** (see *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*) Go to Q3

Q2 Will the new vehicle access route cross the historic landscape?

If No, Go to Q3

If Yes, Has the historical development history of the area proposed for the new route been fully explained (i.e. its purpose within the overall design of the site)?

If Yes, Go to Q2A

If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED before proceeding with evaluation**

Q2A Is the proposal for a new route supported by the development history?

If Yes, Go to Q2B

If No, **POTENTIAL IMPACT HIGH** Go to Q2B

Q2B Will surfacing of the new route be appropriate to the areas through which it travels?

If Yes, Go to Q2C

If No, **SEEK ALTERNATIVE** Go to Q2C

Q2C Is any subsidiary development proposed? (*Include speed restriction measures, signage, lighting, CCTV etc.*)

If No, Go to Q3

Q2D Is design and location of subsidiary development appropriate in the historic landscape?

(*Include cumulative effect of such development on character of areas of the historic landscape*)

If Yes, Go to Q3

If No, **SEEK AMENDMENTS** Go to Q3

PROPOSED SITE (ground level service compounds + additional areas for reversing and turning of large vehicles)

Q3 Has the historical development history of the proposed site been fully explained (i.e. its purpose within the overall design of the site)?

If Yes, Go to Q4

If No, Go to Q3A

Q3A Has the area already been compromised by development?
If Yes, Go to Q3B
If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED before proceeding with evaluation**

Q3B Are such changes irreversible?
If Yes, Go to Q5
If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED before proceeding with evaluation**

Q4 Does the area in question comprise or include a specific feature(s); important 'link' or defined element in design of the landscape (e.g. pleasure ground, walled garden or service area in public park)?
If No, Go to Q5
If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT/ DAMAGE HIGH** Go to Q5

Q5 Will the compound, or associated elements such as lighting, be visible from significant* areas of the wider landscape? (*See 1.2 above and include assessment of potential visibility from high points and from designed circuit walks and drives)
If No, Go to Q6
If Yes, Go to Q7

Q6 What prevents visibility?
a. lie of the land **LOW VISUAL IMPACT.** Go to Q8
b. planting
Is such planting deciduous or evergreen?
If deciduous treat as visible. Go to Q7
If planting is evergreen, is there potential within this application for condition for maintenance of such planting in perpetuity and is such planting appropriate*?
If No, treat as visible. Go to Q7
If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q8
c. existing buildings intervene
Are such structures temporary or permanent?
If temporary treat as visible. Go to Q7
If permanent treat as not visible. Go to Q8

Q7 Is there potential for appropriate* screening of the compound for mitigation of visual impact by use of alternative materials, colours etc?
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE VISUAL IMPACT HIGH** Go to Q8
If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q8
(*Such screening should not in itself alter the character or compromise landscape design – e.g. a high earth bund, Leylandii hedge or coniferous tree planting may restrict visibility of development but present an incongruous line or obstruction across historic landscape – a historic landscape assessment will inform).

MASTS (and other supporting structures for antennae etc.)

Q8 Do identified arcs of view (see 2.1 above) include significant* areas of the historic landscape?
(*See 1.2 above and include high points and designed circuit walks and drives)
If Yes, Go to Q9
If No, use Q6 (a–c) to determine whether there is potential for visibility. If no areas of potential visibility are identified, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW TO MODERATE.** (BUT consider possible cumulative visual effect on all areas – see 5.8 above.) If areas of potential visibility are identified, for each area answer Q10.

Q9 Is the proposed structure an extension of an existing facility?
If No, Go to Q10
If Yes, Go to 9A

Q9A Will the extension

EITHER bring the structure into view of hitherto unaffected areas of the HL?

OR involve new structures (e.g. a ring of dishes)?

OR increase visibility by more than 25%?

(N.B. the 25% increase guideline relates to that part of the mast which is VISIBLE. It DOES NOT relate to the overall height of a mast – e.g. a 5m increase in height on a 20m high mast, which has an existing 1m visible above a tree line, will result in 6m being visible i.e. a 500% increase in visibility.)

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**

If Yes, Go to Q10

Q10 Will the structure, or such parts of it as will be visible

EITHER be seen against a skyline or above a tree line?

OR conflict with visual priority or landscape design intention (See 5.5 above)?

OR appear incongruous in the areas identified (e.g. does the arc of view already include that of overtly modern facilities such as pylons)?

If No, **VISUAL IMPACT LOW**

If Yes, **POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACT HIGH** Go to Q11

Q11 Is there potential for appropriate* mitigation of visual impact? (For 'stealth' structures see *GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*)

If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE VISUAL IMPACT HIGH**

If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED**

(*See 3.2 and 4.3 above. Where mitigation of impact involves planting it is recommended that the **advice** of the LANDSCAPE OFFICER is sought.)