

8. Landscape and Visual

Introduction

- 8.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Scheme in relation to landscape character and visual amenity.
- 8.2 The Chapter describes the technical consultation that has been undertaken during the EIA, the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology, and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 8.3 In line with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both primary and tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details) and is informed by the EIA Scoping process (**Appendix 2.1**) and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 8.4 This Chapter, and its associated **Figures 8.1 – 8.9** and **Appendices 8.1 – 8.2**, is intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 5**).
- 8.5 In addition, this Chapter should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 14: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.

Summary of Consultation

- 8.6 **Table 8.1** provides an overview of the consultation that has been undertaken to inform the Proposed Scheme and EIA, including the consideration of likely significant effects and the methodology for assessment.

Table 8.1: Summary of Consultation

Body / Organisation	Contact	Date and Form of Summary Consultation
Neath Port Talbot Council (NPTCBC)	Landscape officer and planning officers	Meeting, 4 August 2022 and subsequent email correspondence, 10 November 2022 Agreement of 10 viewpoint locations for assessment in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and agreement of the presentation format of views and type of visualisation.

Outputs of PAC process

- 8.7 Natural Resource Wales provided a pre-application consultation response on the 4th October 2023. No reference was made to landscape and visual matters in this response. No other feedback relating to landscape and visual matters has been received from the PAC process.

Scope of the Assessment

- 8.8 As set out in **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the scoping of the EIA and ES has utilised a combination of informal consultation with NPTCBC, culminating in a formal request for an EIA Scoping Opinion in June 2023, supported by an EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**). As the Scoping Opinion was not issued before the planned submission date for the Application, the request for EIA Scoping Opinion was withdrawn in October 2023.
- 8.9 Although the EIA Scoping Report looked to establish the overall framework of the EIA and ES, an iterative scoping process has been adopted in order to respond to the evolving engineering design of the Proposed Scheme. In a similar manner, a number of changes have occurred to the Proposed Scheme since the preparation and submission of the EIA Scoping Report, as set out within **Chapter 1: Introduction** and **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**. As a result, it has been necessary to review the scope of assessment proposed.
- 8.10 As such, this section provides a review, validation and update, where necessary, on the scope of the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Effects Not Considered to be Significant

- 8.11 The following effects were not considered significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) and, taking account of the changes occurring to the Proposed Scheme, are considered to remain unchanged and therefore are not considered further in this Chapter (with detailed justification provided within the EIA Scoping Report and supporting assessment of all receptors provided in the LVIA at **Appendix 8.1**):
- Changes to the special qualities and landscape characteristics of the Margam Special Landscape Area and Margam Mountain Registered Landscape of Outstanding Special Interest in Wales;
 - Changes to local landscape character areas surrounding the Site;
 - Changes to visual amenity experienced by private residents due to the introduction of the Proposed Scheme; and
 - Changes to visual amenity experienced by specified visual receptors due to the introduction of the Proposed Scheme.
- 8.12 Following the EIA Scoping Process, the following effect is now not considered significant and the evidence to support this determination is outlined below.

Changes to the character and amenity of views experienced by users of the Wales Coast Path (WCP) on Margam Mountain during the operational stage

- 8.13 Following the production of verified views based on the fixed detailed scheme (**Appendix 8.2**), which were not available at scoping stage, greater clarity was provided on the changes to views experienced by the visual receptor users of the WCP on Margam Mountain (as demonstrated

by RV6). This is due to the fact that the proposed built form of equipment and plant across the PDZ and specifically the enclosed ground flare are lower than the assumed maximum height parameter considered at the EIA Scoping stage. The general reduction in massing is expected to reduce the overall prominence of the Proposed Scheme in the context of existing views. Therefore, changes to the character and amenity of views for users of the WCP on Margam Mountain (as demonstrated by RV6) during the operational stage is not considered to be significant and will not be considered further in this ES Chapter.

- 8.14 A full description of the changes to views experienced by all the visual receptors is provided in **Appendix 8.1**.

Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

- 8.15 The following effects (**Table 8.2**) were considered likely to be significant at the EIA Scoping stage and remain unaffected by the changes to the Proposed Scheme since submission of the EIA Scoping Report, and therefore these have been assessed and reported within this Chapter:

Table 8.2: Effects Considered Likely to be significant

Likely Significant Effect	Receptors	Applicable Development Stage
Changes to the character and amenity of views	Users of the WCP to the north and west of Crown Wharf (as demonstrated by RVs 1, 2, 3, & 7)	Construction and operation
Changes to the character and amenity of views	Users of the WCP on Margam Mountain (as demonstrated by RV6)	Construction
Changes to Landscape components within the Site	Vegetation on Site	Construction and Operation

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

- 8.16 The following legislation and policy have informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 8.1**:

- European Landscape Convention¹;
- Planning Policy Wales, Edition 11 (Welsh Government, February 2021);
- Technical Advice Note 12: Design (Welsh Government, March 2016)²;
- Future Wales, The National Plan 2040 (Welsh Government, February 2021); and
- Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council, Local Development Plan (2011-2026) – Adopted January 2016.

The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 8.1**:

- Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3)³;
- An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment⁴;
- Landscape Character Assessment Technical Information Note 08/2015⁵; and
- Visual Representation of Development Proposals⁶.

Defining the Study Area

- 8.17 The study area for the landscape and visual assessment includes both the Site and the surrounding wider context within a 2km radius, as illustrated in **Figure 8.1**. This study area is the same as that which was identified at the EIA scoping stage and is considered an appropriate area of study in terms of the enclosure of the Site and the scale of the Proposed Scheme.
- 8.18 The extent of the study area was informed by the field study, review of available mapping data and the production of a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (**Figure 8.7**), which identifies where in the surrounding landscape the Proposed Scheme is likely to be visible. This was modelled using the latest light detection and ranging (LiDAR) data available for the Site and surrounding context and the maximum height of proposed buildings within the PDZ^a and looks at a wider 5km study area.
- 8.19 The 2km study area is considered appropriate as even though there will be more distant areas beyond with some inter-visibility with the Site, it is considered that any effects on such receptors would be so minimal that detailed assessment is not warranted. This approach is supported by GLVIA3 which states that the scale of assessment “*should be appropriate and proportional to the nature of the proposed development*”.

Background Studies to Inform the ES / Establishing the Baseline

- 8.20 **Table 8.3** summarises the background studies undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

^a Since the last iteration of the ZTV in August 2023, minor amendments have been made to the height of proposed buildings and plant and proposed ground level. Heights remain within the range tested in previous iterations of the ZTV and as a result, it was not deemed proportionate to update the ZTV again.

Table 8.3: Background Studies

Study / Survey / Overview Analysis / Evaluation	Date Completion	of
Baseline Analysis	The current baseline conditions of the existing landscape character and visual receptors of the Site and surrounding area was established through desk studies of online mapping sources, a site visit carried out in September 2022 and consultation with NPTCBC as outlined in Table 8.1. The photography for the Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs or visualisations) was captured in December 2022.	September 2022 - July 2023
Standalone LVIA	A LVIA has been undertaken to ascertain and evaluate all likely effect of the Proposed Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity in accordance with GLVIA3. The findings are set out in the standalone LVIA at Appendix 8.1 , whereby those effects considered to be significant have been reported as part of this Chapter.	July 2023

Assessment Process

8.21 The following methodology was adopted:

- Assessment methodology is drawn from GLVIA3. The detail of the methodology is set out in full in the standalone LVIA at **Appendix 8.1** and summarised below;
- The purpose of the standalone LVIA (**Appendix 8.1**) has been to establish all effects arising from the Proposed Scheme on landscape and visual receptors, to ascertain significant effects for reporting through the EIA and this Chapter. Such an approach aligns with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** and associated best practice regarding proportionality;
- The assessment of landscape character effects has been informed by the identification of Local Landscape Character areas (LLCAs), carried out in accordance with An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment and the Landscape Institute's Technical Information Note 08/2015⁷; and,
- Representative viewpoint photography and AVRs have been used to support and inform the standalone LVIA and therefore also this Chapter. All photography and visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the Landscape Institutes Technical Guidance Note 06/19. The detailed methodology for producing AVRs by specialist consultant Ocean CGI is set out at the end of **Appendix 8.2**. The AVRs prepared do not include the Marine Unloading/Loading Facility as the exact location at Crown Wharf is unknown. Furthermore, as the Marine Unloading/Loading Facility will require a Marine License to be prepared and submitted separately, exact details of the Marine Unloading/Loading Facility are not fully established (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for more details). Instead, the assessment has been based on

professional judgment based on the assumed parameters, set out in **Chapter 4: Development Specification**, alongside the AVRs for the wider project. Furthermore, the AVRs also do not include nighttime images. Night-time visual effects have been interpreted based on professional judgement and qualitative interpretation of the existing night-time scene, as checked during the field study, and consideration of how this may change given the likely lighting assumed through details provided in **Chapter 4: Development Specification and Lighting Assessment and Strategy by AECOM**.

Reporting of the Environmental Effect and Significance Criteria

8.22 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme has taken into account the construction stage and operational stage. This assessment has been conducted by carrying out the following steps:

- Step 1: Assess the sensitivity of key landscape receptors, which is determined by:
 - the value of landscape receptors; and
 - how susceptible the landscape receptors are to change.
- Step 2: Assess the sensitivity of key visual receptors, which is determined by:
 - the value attached to the views; and
 - an assessment of the susceptibility of each receptor to the type of change proposed.
- Step 3: Determine the magnitude of change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive key landscape and visual receptors; and
- Step 4: Determine the significance of effect by considering the sensitivity of, and the magnitude of change for, the key landscape and visual receptors.

8.23 These steps are outlined in more detail below.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

8.24 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **high, medium, low** or **negligible**.

Step 1: Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

8.25 The baseline landscape appraisal includes a mixture of desk study and field work to identify and record the character of the landscape (which is defined to include ‘townscape’). The first stage involved a review of the landscape character context as set out in the current published landscape character studies relating to the study area at national, regional and local level. This was followed by an assessment of the key characteristics of the local landscape character and the identification of local landscape character areas. The key landscape receptors (landscape character areas, landscape features or landscape characteristics) with potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are then identified and a judgement is made on the sensitivity of each of these. This is based on an assessment of the ‘value’ of each receptor and its

'susceptibility to change'^b. This judgement is made based on the approach set out in GLVIA3 and as described below.

- 8.26 The value of each of the identified landscape receptor was assessed with reference to the following:

Any designations or policies (both national and local) which may be present; and,

The presence or absence of other attributes which contribute to landscape value such as landscape condition, scenic quality, rarity, representativeness, conservation interests, recreation value, perceptual aspects or associations e.g. with writers, artists or historic events.

- 8.27 Judgements on value are made based on the criteria set out in **Table 8.4**.

Table 8.4: Value of landscape receptors

Value	Typical scale of importance/Rarity	Typical Examples
High	International, National, Regional	World Heritage Sites and/or key features of World Heritage Sites, National Parks or AONBs, Registered Landscapes of Outstanding and of Special Interest in Wales and/or key features of these, Scheduled Monuments, some Conservation Areas, and landscape areas with typically a significant number of Grade I/II* listed buildings, and/or Registered Historic Park and Gardens. No or limited potential for substitution.
Medium	Regional, Local	Landscape areas designated at local level e.g. Special Landscape Areas, and other undesignated areas or features which are of notable scenic quality or recreational value with value perhaps expressed through non-official publications or demonstrable use. Limited potential for substitution.
Ordinary	Local	Landscape features or character areas which are not related to designated, or non-designated heritage assets, or a planning designation; and/or mentioned in guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature; and/or is of little scenic or landscape importance. Considerable potential for substitution.
Low	Local	Landscape features or local character areas in poor condition or quality and/or identified for recovery.

^b When the type and general nature of development proposed is not known at the time of the baseline assessment, the assessment of the sensitivity of receptors is not undertaken as part of the baseline assessment. In those instances (as recommended by GLVIA3) the assessment of sensitivity is undertaken as part of the assessment of effects.

- 8.28 GLVIA3 defines landscape susceptibility as *‘the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies’* (Para. 5.40).
- 8.29 Judgements on the susceptibility to change of each of the identified landscape receptors are made based on the scale set out in **Table 8.5**.

Table 8.5: Susceptibility to change of landscape receptors

Susceptibility to change	Description
High	Landscape receptor ^c would be unlikely to accommodate the type of development proposed without undue negative consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. Landscape receptor has little or no relationship to the type of development proposed and/or would be difficult to replace or substitute if lost e.g. ancient woodland, veteran trees and historic parkland. Landscape receptor is highly sensitive and would be fundamentally altered by the type of development proposed.
Medium	Landscape receptor would be compromised by the type of development proposed and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies would be compromised. Landscape receptor has some relationship to the type of development proposed and/or could be partially replaced or substituted if lost. Landscape receptor is moderately sensitive and characteristics of the receptor would be altered by the type of development proposed. The general features or character of the receptor would remain but would be weakened by the type of development proposed.
Low	Landscape receptor would be likely to accommodate the type of development proposed without undue negative consequences for the maintenance of the baseline landscape character and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. Landscape receptor has a close relationship to the type of development proposed and could be easily replaced or substituted if lost. Landscape receptor is of low sensitivity and characteristics of the receptor would not be significantly altered by the type of development proposed. The general landscape character is resilient to change.

- 8.30 A judgement on the overall sensitivity of each landscape receptor (ranging from high to negligible) is made based on the combined evaluation of susceptibility and value attached to the receptor together with informed professional judgement and guidance provided in GLVIA3. For example, a landscape receptor that has a high sensitivity is likely to have a high

^c Includes landscape character areas, landscape elements or features and particular aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape.

value and a high susceptibility to change, a landscape receptor that has a low sensitivity is likely to have a low value and a low susceptibility to change.

Step 2: Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

- 8.31 The baseline visual appraisal established the area in which the Site, and emerging Proposed Scheme, may be visible; the different groups of people who may experience the views of the development (defined as visual receptors); and, the nature of these views. These factors interrelate, but for the purpose of the assessment are dealt with in that order.
- 8.32 The visibility of the Site was assessed by a walkover survey which established the area within the study area from which the Site is currently visible. The key visual receptors within this area were then identified (i.e. groups of people within this area who experience (or may experience) views of the Site).
- 8.33 In most assessments, unless specifically requested by the Local Planning Authority, visual receptors are restricted to groups of people in publicly accessible places. Normally, views from private residential properties are not included as changes to private views are not a planning consideration^d unless the development is likely to be so overbearing or dominating that they could result in unacceptable living conditions and therefore a change to their residential visual amenity. For this project this has not been specifically requested, and given the distance of the Site (and the Scheme within it) to the nearest residential properties, it is not expected that such changes could arise.
- 8.34 Following identification of the key visual receptors, representative viewpoints were identified to reflect typical views from the key visual receptors. The number and location of representative viewpoints were agreed with NPTCBC as part of pre-application correspondence. A description and evaluation of the identified views was then undertaken as part of the standalone LVIA (**Appendix 8.1**) which took into account the following:
- type and relative numbers of people, and their occupation or activity;*
- location, nature and characteristics;*
- nature, composition and characteristics of the views (including directions);*
- elements which may interrupt, filter or otherwise influence the views; and*
- seasonal changes in the view.*
- 8.35 The sensitivity of the visual receptor comprises a judgement on the value attached to the views and an assessment of the susceptibility of each receptor to the type of change proposed.
- 8.36 A judgement on the value attached to the views is made with reference to the following criteria and the definitions of value set out in **Table 8.6**.

Planning designations e.g. Designated Views or Protected Vistas identified in local or regional planning policy;

^d Aldred's Case in 1610 established in English law that views from private property cannot be protected.

Other designations relating to landscape features or heritage assets e.g. key views identified in conservation area appraisals or recorded in citations for listed buildings or registered parks and gardens; and,

Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors e.g. views identified in guidebooks or on tourist maps, official viewpoints (often with sign boards and interpretive material) or views referenced in literature or art.

Table 8.6: Value attached to views

Value	Typical scale of importance / Rarity	Typical Examples
High	International, National, Regional	Designated views of international, national or regional importance e.g. views of noted importance to sites of international or national importance e.g. World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Scheduled Monuments, AONBs, Grade I/Grade II* listed buildings, and/or Registered Historic Park and Gardens or Registered Landscapes of Outstanding and of Special Interest in Wales.
Medium	Regional, Local	Views identified or protected at local level e.g. identified in local planning policy or guidance and views associated with heritage or landscape features of regional or local importance e.g. some local landscape designations, Conservation Areas and Grade II/II* listed buildings. May also include views which are undesignated but value perhaps expressed through non-official publications or its contribution to enjoyment of a designated or non-designated heritage asset.
Ordinary	Local	The view from the identified visual receptor is not related to designated, or non-designated, heritage assets, landscape features or a planning designation; and/or mentioned in guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature; but contributes positively to the general visual amenity experienced by the receptor.
Low	Local	The view from the identified visual receptor is not related to designated, or non-designated, heritage assets, or a planning designation; and/or mentioned in guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature; and/or is of little visual amenity importance and does not make a positive contribution to local visual amenity.

- 8.37 The assessment of susceptibility of visual receptors is based on the approach set out in para 6.32 of GLVIA3 which notes that:

'the susceptibility of different visual receptors to changes in views and visual amenity is mainly a function of:

The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations: and,

The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focussed on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations’.

- 8.38 Judgements on the susceptibility of a visual receptor to change are broadly based on the descriptions of susceptibility set out in **Table 8.7** below.

Table 8.7: Susceptibility to change of visual receptors

Susceptibility	Description
High	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of high importance to the experience or activity including: people engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and on particular views e.g. waymarked walks through the landscape; and visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience.
Medium	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of moderate importance to the experience or activity including: Travellers on most road or rail routes.
Low	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of low importance to the experience or activity including: people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape; and, people at their place of work whose attention may be focussed on their work, not on their surroundings, and where the setting is not important to the quality of working life.

- 8.39 A judgement on the overall sensitivity of each visual receptor (ranging from high to negligible is made based on the combined evaluation of susceptibility and value attached to the receptor together with informed professional judgement and guidance provided in GLVIA3. For example, a visual receptor that has a high sensitivity is likely to have a high value and a high susceptibility to change, a visual receptor that has a low sensitivity is likely to have a low value and a low susceptibility to change.

Step 3: Determining the Magnitude of Change

- 8.40 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive receptor and has been considered on a scale of **large, medium, small** or **negligible**.

- 8.41 Landscape effects include:

Changes to, and/or complete or partial loss of features, elements, characteristics or perceptual aspects that contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the Landscape/local Landscape area; and/or,

Introduction of new elements or features that influence the character and distinctiveness of the Landscape/local Landscape area.

- 8.42 The magnitude of change for landscape effects considers the size or scale of the effect, the geographical extent of the effect and the duration and reversibility of the effect. Judgements

on the magnitude of Landscape effect are made broadly based on the descriptions of magnitude set out in **Table 8.8** below.

Table 8.8: Defining magnitude of change (effect) – Landscape receptors

Magnitude of Change (Effect)	Definition
Large	Permanent loss of all or most of the key characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of major new elements which would be dominant features with little or no relationship to the landscape receptor. Changes would substantially alter the character of a large area.
Medium	Permanent partial loss or change to some of the key characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of new elements which would be prominent features. Changes would result in a large change to the character of a small area or a noticeable change to a larger area.
Small	Permanent limited/localised loss or change to common characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of new elements which would be noticeable features but largely in keeping with the existing character. Changes would result in a small change to the character of a large area or a noticeable change to a small area. Also includes temporary and/or reversible changes of larger scale or extent.
Negligible	No, or barely discernible, change to landscape receptor.

8.43 Visual effects include:

Changes to, and/or complete or partial loss of features, elements, characteristics or perceptual aspects that contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the view; and/or;

Introduction of new elements or features that influence the character and distinctiveness of the view.

8.44 The magnitude of change for visual effects considers the size or scale of the effect, the geographical extent of the effect, and the duration and reversibility of the effect. Judgements on the magnitude of visual effect are broadly based on the descriptions of magnitude set out in **Table 8.9** below.

Table 8.9: Defining magnitude of change (effect) – Visual receptors

Magnitude of Change (Effect)	Definition
Large	Permanent loss of all or most of the key characteristics of a view and/or addition of major new elements which would be dominant features. Changes would substantially alter the character of the view.
Medium	Permanent partial loss or change to some of the key characteristics of the view and/or addition of new elements which would be prominent features. Changes would result in a large change to the character of a small part of the view or a noticeable change to a larger part of the view.
Small	Permanent limited/localised loss or change to a view and/or addition of new elements which would be noticeable features but largely in keeping with the existing character of the view. Changes would result in a small change to the character of a large part of the view or a noticeable change to a small part of the view. Also includes temporary and/or reversible changes of larger scale or extent within the view.
Negligible	No, or barely discernible, change to the view.

Step 4: Determining the Level of Effect and Significance

- 8.45 The significance of landscape and visual effects will be based on the sensitivity of each receptor and the predicted magnitude of change for each receptor from the baseline conditions. The assessment of significance has been determined using professional judgement and **Table 8.10** has been a tool which has assisted with this process.
- 8.46 For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is ‘*beneficial*’ or ‘*adverse*’ or ‘*neutral*^e’.

^e GLVIA3 states at Para 5.37, p94 and p118 that an informed professional judgement should be made about whether the landscape or visual effects should be categorised as positive or negative (or in some cases neutral), with the criteria used in reaching this judgement clearly stated. Where neutral effects are identified in this Chapter, it is based on the following criteria: ‘*no overall harm or improvement to the landscape, view or visual amenity (likely to be the result of a combination of both adverse and beneficial effects or very small changes).*’

Table 8.10: Matrix to Support Determining the Level of Effect

		Sensitivity (or value / importance)			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Magnitude of Change	Large	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

8.47 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified:

Major effect: where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity.

Moderate effect: where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which has a degree of adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability.

Minor effect: where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change or/and can recover from the change; and

Negligible: where the Proposed Scheme is unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity or there is a considerable change at a receptor which is not considered sensitive to a change.

8.48 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

Determining Significance

8.49 For each effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is '**Significant**' or '**Not Significant**'. This assessment will be based on professional judgement and supported by the matrix set out in **Table 8.10** below which is a tool to assist with the process. Whilst the matrix at **Table 8.10** provides levels of effect, professional judgement will determine a definitive assessment of significance for each effect. Typically, significant effects on landscape and visual receptors will be moderate or above. Effects identified can be 'beneficial', 'adverse' or 'neutral'.

8.50 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e., following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 8.51 A baseline landscape and visual appraisal of the Site and its surroundings was undertaken by chartered landscape architects and is set out in full within the standalone LVIA (**Appendix 8.1**). A summary of the landscape and visual baseline conditions for receptors that are likely to be subject to significant effects and therefore considered within this Chapter is set out below. Baseline conditions for other receptors are set out within the standalone LVIA.

Summary of Landscape Baseline Conditions

- 8.52 The landscape comprises a number of resources or receptors; these are defined within GLVIA3 as the 'constituent elements of the landscape, its specific aesthetic or perceptual qualities and the character of the landscape in different areas'. These form the elements or 'units' which need to be considered when assessing the potential landscape effect of a Proposed Scheme or other change. The final stage of the baseline landscape appraisal was therefore to identify the key landscape receptors with potential to be affected by redevelopment of the Site. **Appendix 8.1** includes detailed information on the landscape character context of the Site at national and borough level. It also includes the identification of Local Landscape Character Areas and a description of the key characteristics of these areas. These were assessed in the LVIA and effects were not deemed significant.
- 8.53 One feature of the Site that was considered a component of the landscape that contributes to its overall character is the vegetation on Site that was identified as a separate landscape receptor, the baseline conditions of which are described below.

Vegetation on Site

- 8.54 Aside from a group Leyland cypress trees on the eastern boundary of the PDZ, the Site comprises mainly self-seeded trees and shrubs, including Japanese Knotweed which is classified as an invasive species in the UK, and controlled plant under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. A detailed Tree Survey was conducted by The Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) in July 2022 (Arboricultural Baseline Report (inc. Tree Survey) submitted as a standalone application report). The survey identified 64 individual trees and 62 groups of trees; the group of Leyland cypress was categorised as B (moderate arboricultural quality and value), while the rest of the vegetation was categorised as C (low arboricultural quality and value) or U (considered unsuitable for retention).
- 8.55 Within the immediate surrounding area including TCA1 and TCA West and parts of TCA East, due to the functioning industrial use of the steelworks, open space is limited to peripheral 'left-over' areas between processing and stock-piling areas. These are largely unmanaged areas of semi-improved grassland and scrub. These areas have no public access. The scrub and grassland within the PDZ and the three TCAs contribute to a green edge to the Port Talbot Docks which is seen in some views from the wider area.
- 8.56 The vegetation on Site is typically in poor condition and has therefore been identified as being of low value in accordance with criteria for defining landscape value in the LVIA methodology at **Table 8.4**.

Summary of Visual Baseline Conditions

- 8.57 The visibility of the Site has been established through both a desktop analysis of the surrounding area and by confirming on Site the localised screening effect of the landform, vegetation and built form.

- 8.58 The visibility of the Site and potential visibility of the Proposed Scheme has been further assessed using aerial imagery and the ZTV generated in GIS provided in **Figure 8.7**. The ZTV mapping utilises LiDAR data with 1m and 2m grid resolution, incorporating available information on existing topography, built form and mature vegetation. The latest ZTV was prepared in August 2023 using the heights of the proposed buildings and plant within the PDZ as defined in the building schedule at the time. There have since been minor amendments to heights of the proposed buildings and plant in response to engineering and pre-application consultation (PAC). As the changes to heights were within the maximum height range tested in previous iterations of the ZTV, it was not considered proportionate to redo this again, as the changes to the results of ZTV would have been barely discernible. The ZTV remained valid for the purposes of understanding potential visibility of the Proposed Scheme and confirming visual receptors and representative views. The extent of visibility has been further tested through the preparation of AVRs based on the fixed scheme information. Because fixed height information for the TCAs and the Marine Unloading/Loading Facility are not known, these were not included in the ZTV.
- 8.59 The blue colour on the ZTV indicates where in the surrounding landscape the proposed structures within the PDZ would potentially be visible. The grey/white areas demonstrate parts of the landscape where the Proposed Scheme is likely to be obscured.
- 8.60 The ZTV was produced for an area within a 5km radius of the PDZ. There are likely to be some more distant viewpoints beyond this from which the Proposed Scheme would be visible, but it would appear as a very small feature in the background of the view, in the context of the industrial scale and character of Port Talbot's industrial foreshore. As such, visual impacts from this distance would not be significant or material to the decision-making process.
- 8.61 As demonstrated by the ZTV, the principal areas where the Site and any proposed development within the PDZ would generate a discernible visual effect are within 2km of the Site. This includes: areas around Crown Wharf to the north; sections of the M4 and Harbour Way, particularly as the latter passes closer to the PDZ; other streets with vistas orientated towards the PDZ (Afan Way, Darwin Road, Aberavon Rd, Talcennau Rd, Abbey Rd); and potential glimpsed views from areas of public open spaces within the study area. The ZTV also indicates that views would be possible from sections of the WCP Route 4.
- 8.62 Key visual receptors with existing views towards the Site have been identified and the existing views experienced by these receptors are summarised in **Table 8.11** below where significant effects are anticipated. Where effects are not considered significant, the baseline assessment for the visual receptors are provided in the standalone LVIA in **Appendix 8.1**.

Table 8.11: Visual Receptors baseline assessment

Receptor	Commentary
Users of the WCP, to the north and west of Port Talbot Docks <i>RVs 1, 2, 3 & 7</i>	The WCP is a designated long-distance trail which follows or runs close to the coastline of Wales. As the path passes close to the edge of Port Talbot Docks, views towards the Site are possible. For a section, the path runs alongside Harbour Way. Views are open in character, framed by industrial uses to the west, and a wide grassed verge to the east, beyond which low rise residential buildings are visible. The Margam Mountains in the background of views contribute to the scenic quality in parts. As the path runs close to the Site (RV2), there are open views across TCA1, TCA East and the PDZ. As the path runs along the northern edge of Port Talbot Docks, views are partially filtered by metal fencing, scrub and the Hanson Cement Works (RV1). The path then runs behind a small industrial estate which obscures views. Further to the west, views look across the River Afan and the Site is obscured by scrub on the river bank in the foreground and the Hanson Cement Works (RV3). Travelling further towards Mariner's Point (RV7), views encompass more of the Port Talbot Docks with the Margam Mountains a significant feature to the background of views. Areas of scrub within the Site are glimpsed to the background of these views and structures within the wider TATA steelworks and Hanson Cement Works are also prominent. Views and visual amenity are likely to be of high importance to people walking or cycling along the promoted path.
Users of the WCP, on Margam Mountain <i>RV 6</i>	The WCP is a designated long-distance trail which follows or runs close to the coastline of Wales. As the path passes through Port Talbot, it runs outside the industrial foreshore splitting into Route 4 of the National Cycle Network along Harbour Way, considered as a separate receptor (described above), and the Coast Path edging the Margam which is a Designated Special Landscape Area, providing panoramic views towards Swansea Bay. Views towards the Site are possible from the WCP on the south western edge of the mountains at Mynydd Emroch and Mynydd Brombil which provides vantage points for views over the Site to the west (RV6). Key features of the views include the Swansea Bay, glimpsed views of grade II listed Dyffryn Chapel and Port Talbot. The TATA steelworks have a dominant presence in the views. Views and visual amenity are likely to be of high importance to people walking or cycling along the path.

Future Baseline

- 8.63 Without the implementation of the Proposed Scheme, the baseline conditions would continue to evolve with key changes being the continued growth of existing trees and scrub within the Site. This is likely to result in an increase in screening to some views into the Site from the

adjacent stretches of Harbour Way and the WCP. Where Japanese Knotweed is left unmanaged it would continue to spread across the Site.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

Construction Stage

8.64 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the construction stage assessment is outlined below.

- Use of site hoardings, management of construction traffic, control of working hours and other appropriate housekeeping on the Site in accordance with the CEMP (further details provided within **Chapter 4: Development Specification**).

Operational Stage

8.65 The following primary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the operational stage assessment is outlined below. As an industrial facility, the Proposed Scheme has been designed and laid out to ensure compliance with relevant health and safety regulations and remove potential risks, including fire risk. As such, there are limited measures incorporated in the scheme to specifically address impacts on landscape and visual receptors.

- The maximum height of structures within the Proposed Scheme are comparable to existing structures within the surrounding context including the Tata Steelworks and the Hanson Cement Works. At an early stage in the design process the proposed flare was changed from an open tall flare stack (up to 80m) to a lower ground flare (up to 20m) and was positioned set back away from key residential receptors.
- Available landscaped spaces to the peripheries of the PDZ are multi-functional to provide SuDS features, have a biodiversity value/function and contribute to the landscape structure and amenity of the Site (further details provided within **Chapter 4: Development Specification**).
- The main proposed habitat is flower-rich grassland and pioneer vegetation which will be established on nutrient-poor substrates, features that should be equivalent to habitats of biodiversity value in the wider Port Talbot Docks. Proposed landscape features will include flower-rich grassland/pioneer vegetation, modular biodiversity (bespoke gabion) walls, gravel substrate rain gardens, regionally sourced boulders and biodiverse gabion walls, bee hotels and biodiverse brown roof on the administrative building/amenity shelter and Gatehouse 1. These are documented in the Landscape Strategy by EDP (submitted as a stand alone application report).
- Japanese knotweed will be subject to management, via herbicide spraying, as part of site preparation works, and continue with ongoing herbicide spraying as part of a long-term management strategy for Japanese Knotweed.

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Stage

8.66 **Appendix 8.1** provides a detailed assessment of effects on the local landscape character within study area. The effects were not considered to be significant and so are not assessed further in this Chapter.

Changes to landscape components within the Site

Vegetation on Site

- 8.67 The value of the landscape receptor (vegetation on Site) in the PDZ and TCAs was established in the baseline assessment as low (based on criteria set out in **Table 8.4**). The susceptibility to change based on the criteria set out in **Table 8.5** is medium. The landscape receptor would be compromised by the Proposed Scheme. The vegetation has colonised the Site as a result of the brownfield land no longer being in use. Whilst there are opportunities to improve landscape features, the Proposed Scheme allows for limited replacement. As a result, the sensitivity is considered to be medium-low.
- 8.68 The existing self-seeded scrub and trees would be cleared to accommodate the construction works of the Proposed Scheme, including the works to identify the existing Japanese knotweed on-site, followed by the implementation of a Japanese Knotweed management plan to effectively control the Japanese Knotweed across the construction phase. The clearance of vegetation would result in a reduction in greenery that currently encloses the port and provides containment to some of the industrial areas. This would reinforce the industrial nature of the landscape. This would reinforce the industrial nature of the landscape. Following their use, TCA East will be left as cleared land, TCA 1 and TCA West will be returned to their previous condition or agreed alternative position determined by the Associated British Ports (ABP) as landowner. Within the PDZ the permanent removal of vegetation, which is an existing component of the landscape, would be fundamentally changed by the Proposed Scheme. However, the quality of this feature is low due to the presence of invasive species.
- 8.69 The sensitivity of the vegetation on Site is considered to be medium-low. The magnitude of change is considered to be large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 8.70 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified. As an industrial facility, the Proposed Scheme has been designed and laid out to ensure compliance with relevant health and safety regulations and removal of potential risks, including fire risks. As such, the ability to mitigate on-Site has been maximised.

Residual Effect

- 8.71 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual effects for 'vegetation on Site' is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 8.72 This effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Changes to the character and amenity of views

- 8.73 The sensitivity of visual receptors being assessed through this chapter are summarised in **Table 8.12**, based on the detail provided within the standalone LVIA in **Appendix 8.1**, which also considered the sensitivity of all visual receptors. Judgements on sensitivity of visual receptors is based on the value attached to the view by the receptor group (based on the criteria set out in **Table 8.6**) and the susceptibility to change of the receptor group (based on the criteria set out in **Table 8.7**).

8.74 **Table 8.12** below provides a summary of the sensitivity of the visual receptors where effects were deemed significant and provides an assessment of the likely key effects of the Proposed Scheme on these visual receptors during the construction stage. The visual receptors would experience a range of effects to visual amenity as a result of the Proposed Scheme. This range of effects is described in its entirety. The RVs and associated baseline photography provided at **Appendix 8.2** have been used to inform the overall assessment. The construction works are not depicted in the visualisations so a qualitative assessment has been prepared based information set out in **Chapter 4: Development Specification**.

Table 8.12: Assessment of Effects on Visual Receptors during Construction Stage

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
Users of the WCP, to the north and west of Port Talbot Docks. <i>Representative Views (RVs) 1, 2, 3 & 7</i>	The changes to views from the stretch of the path that runs parallel to Harbour Way would be the same as that experienced by road users, albeit experienced at a slower pace by pedestrians and cyclists than by road users with more attention likely to be given to views. The most noticeable changes to views would be experienced as Harbour Way runs adjacent to TCA 1 as demonstrated by RV2. The demolition of existing structures within TCA East and clearance of scrub and grassland from the Site would be noticeable as would the appearance of construction plant and barges, construction compounds and associated lighting and the emergence of proposed structures as they are prefabricated. This would result in some increased containment to views and would block some views across the open water of the docks. The existing vegetation on the Site (which is a positive features of some views) would be replaced with construction works and associated lighting, albeit experienced from a busy A road and in the context of the wider steelworks (which also has significant lighting as a dominating feature of the vicinity). As the road travels round the northern side of docks, views of the construction works would decrease and would be partially	The sensitivity of pedestrians and cyclists on the WCP, to the north and west of Crown Wharf is considered to be medium-high. The magnitude of change is considered to vary from medium (direct views across TCA 1) to negligible (views across the harbour), given the transient nature of the receptor and varying intervisibility along the path. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, and temporary^f, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to vary from moderate to negligible. RV1: small / minor adverse RV2: medium / moderate adverse RV3: negligible / negligible RV7: small / minor adverse

^f Changes such as vegetation removal would be permanent, whereas the construction works would be of a temporary nature

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
	obscured by existing industrial features including the Hanson Cement works and the industrial area along Llewellyn's Road. Fencing and scrub along the road would also reduce the visibility of the construction works as demonstrated by RV1. Whilst these changes would be noticeable, they would result in little change to the overall appearance and character of views due to the existing structures in views and the backdrop of the Tata steel works. As the path extends away from Harbour Way and towards Mariners Point as demonstrated by RV3, structures associated with the construction stage of the Proposed Scheme would be visible beyond the River Afan. There would be a slight reduction in scrub and grassland glimpsed to the background of views and an increase in structures of an industrial appearance. The wider views towards the Margam Mountains in the background and River Afan in the foreground would be maintained. Travelling further round the bay, as demonstrated by RV7, clearer views would be possible of structures under construction within the PDZ. Works would be partially obscured by the Hanson Cement works. The glimpsed views of scrub within the TCA West would also be removed. Although the industrial context to the background of views would increase, the features in the foreground and background that contribute to the scenic quality of views would be maintained.	
Users of the WCP, on Margam Mountain <i>Representative View 6</i>	Views from the stretches of the WCP that cross the mountains would continue to be influenced by scrub and trees along the route which would filter some views and the topography which provides containment to parts of the path as demonstrated by the ZTV (Figure 8.7). Where visible, the Proposed Scheme would extend the extent of industrial uses in views	The sensitivity of users of the WCP, on Margam Mountain is considered to be medium-high. The magnitude of change is considered to vary from medium (where construction works block views of Port Talbot Docks) to negligible (views obscured

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
	with some open areas changing from scrub due to topography and to construction sites with associated vegetation). Therefore, there lighting and demolition and construction is likely to be a direct, activities as demonstrated by RV6. Long temporary, short-term, distance views towards the sea in the adverse effect which is background would be maintained. The use considered to vary from of TCA 1 would increase the visibility of the moderate to negligible. Proposed Scheme during the construction stage. There would be an increase in views of construction activities (including associated lighting and barges) together with emerging built form, plant and cranes alongside Port Talbot Docks; some views of the docks would be obscured due to the construction works within the three TCAs. The changes to views would be experienced in the context of the large scale steelworks which have a dominant influence on the panoramic views (and already include substantial lighting). Key features of views would be maintained such as the extended views across Swansea Bay and the glimpsed views of Dyffryn Chapel.	RV6: medium / moderate adverse

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 8.75 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified. As an industrial facility, the Proposed Scheme has been designed and laid out to ensure compliance with relevant health and safety regulations and removal of potential risks, including fire risks. As such, the ability to mitigate on-Site has been maximised.

Residual Effect

- 8.76 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effects for the visual receptors is that same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 8.77 In isolated locations (where users of the WCP pass adjacent to TCA1 and where views across the docks from the Margam Hills are obstructed by construction works) users would experience moderate adverse effects which are considered to be **Significant**. Adverse effects elsewhere are considered not significant.

Operational Stage

- 8.78 **Appendix 8.1** provides a detailed assessment of effects on the local landscape character within study area. The effects were not considered to be significant and so are not assessed further in this Chapter.

Changes to landscape components within the Site

Vegetation on Site

- 8.79 The value of the landscape receptor (vegetation on Site) was established in the baseline assessment as low. The susceptibility to change based on the criteria set out in **Table 8.5** is medium. The landscape receptor would be compromised by the type of development proposed. The vegetation has colonised the Site as a result of the brownfield land no longer being in use. Whilst there are opportunities to improve landscape features, the type of development proposed would allow for limited replacement. As a result, the sensitivity is considered to be medium-low.
- 8.80 During the operational stage, TCA East will be left as a cleared site and TCA1 and TCA West would be left as cleared land and could be allowed to recolonise naturally or taken up for other uses as determined by ABP. As the uses is not confirmed, it has been assumed that there would be a permanent reduction in greenery that currently encloses the port and provides containment to some of the industrial areas. This would reinforce the industrial nature of the landscape.. The majority of the PDZ would be occupied by hardstanding and built form. Soft landscaping would be incorporated to the peripheries of the PDZ surrounding the Site entrance, enclosed ground flare and car park. The proposed rain gardens, self-seeding grassland and biodiverse brown roofs would introduce new plant species and habitat into the Site that would have an amenity value that would make a small positive contribution to the experience for workers. The control of invasive species would also be a positive ongoing change. As a whole, there would be little opportunity for vegetation within the Site given the nature of the industrial uses. There would be a noticeable reduction in the perceived greening to the edges of Port Talbot and Crown Wharf. Areas of scrub and trees would remain in the wider context.
- 8.81 The sensitivity of the vegetation on Site is considered to be medium-low. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium-large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 8.82 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified. As an industrial facility, the Proposed Scheme has been designed and laid out to ensure compliance with relevant health and safety regulations and removal of potential risks, including fire risks. As such, the ability to mitigate on-Site has been maximised.

Residual Effect

- 8.83 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effects for 'vegetation on Site' is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 8.84 This effect for the PDZ and TCA East is considered to be **Significant** and not significant for TCA1 and TCA West.

Changes to the character and amenity of views

- 8.85 The assessment of effects likely to arise from the Proposed Scheme during the operational stage comprised initially, an assessment of the likely extent of visibility of the Proposed Scheme and the visual receptors likely to be affected and secondly, an assessment of the impacts on the views experienced by each of the visual receptors. This assessment should be

read in conjunction with the AVRs prepared by Ocean CGI set out at **Appendix 8.2**, the viewpoint location plan provided at **Figure 8.8**, the summer viewpoint photography at **Figure 8.9** and the ZTV of the Proposed Scheme provided at **Figure 8.7**.

Extent of Visibility of the Proposed Scheme

- 8.86 The visibility of the Site would increase following the implementation of the Proposed Scheme. This is due to the presence of new built form within areas of currently open landscape. The extent of visibility is demonstrated by the computer generated ZTV provided at **Figure 8.7**. This demonstrates a ‘worst (maximum) case’ scenario of where the development would be visible. It was created earlier in the assessment process using the maximum heights^g for all plant, equipment and buildings and development extents of the proposed buildings and available lidar data which doesn’t include all recent built development and the full extent of trees and hedgerows. It therefore indicates a greater extent of visibility than would be experienced in reality.
- 8.87 The area which is likely to experience the greatest level of change in views arising from the Proposed Scheme is that of the immediate context of the Site. Due to the industrial nature of the Site and surrounding context there are limited publicly accessible viewpoints with clear views of the Proposed Scheme. The steelworks to the south and southeast largely prevents views from the south and southeast. Views are possible from parts of Harbour Way, sections of the WCP across Port Talbot Docks and within the Margam Mountains and limited residential streets that are oriented towards the Site.

Assessment of Effects on Visual Receptors

- 8.88 **Table 8.13** below provides an assessment of the likely effects of the Proposed Scheme on the visual receptors identified during the baseline study. The visual receptors would experience a range of effects to visual amenity as a result of the Proposed Scheme. This range of effects is described in its entirety for the visual receptors.
- 8.89 The RVs demonstrate a snapshot of this experience and have been used to inform the overall assessment. The level of effect on the specific identified RV is also identified in **Table 8.13**, and is part of the range of effects identified for the visual receptors below.

Table 8.13: Assessment of Effects on Visual Receptors during Operational Stage

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
Users of the WCP, to the north and west of Port Talbot Docks. <i>Representative Views 1, 2, 3 & 7</i>	During the operational stage, built form and lighting within the Proposed Scheme would be set away from Harbour Way at distances of over 400m. The changes to views from the stretch of the path that runs parallel to Harbour Way would include clear views looking across TCA1, where large scale structures would be visible alongside Port	The sensitivity of road users of the WCP, to the north and west of Crown Wharf is considered to be medium-high. The magnitude of change is considered to vary from medium-small (direct

^g Since the last iteration of the ZTV in August 2023, minor amendments have been made to the height of proposed buildings and plant and proposed ground level. Heights remain within the range tested in previous iterations of the ZTV and as a result, it was not deemed proportionate to update the ZTV again.

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
	Talbot Docks as demonstrated at RV2, views across TCA 1) to Appendix 8.2. TCA1 to the foreground of the view would appear as cleared ground and allowed to regenerate naturally or be taken up for other uses as determined by APB. With TCA1 no longer in use as a construction area, the clearance of structures in TCA East would also be noticeable removing some existing structures that are in a poor condition from views. Some structures adjacent to the eastern boundary of the PDZ would remain. The marine unloading/loading facility extending away from Crown Wharf (dock wall) would also be noticeable and ships transporting ethanol feedstock and SAF product to and from the Site would be visible at times (estimated to be approximately average of 2no. two-way movements a week). The Proposed Scheme would result in noticeable changes to the middle ground of views due to the presence of additional large-scale structures and lighting. This would reinforce the industrial character of views (both in daytime and night time), seen in context with existing structures in the steelworks. The additional built form would replace the scrub and greenery that is currently seen alongside the water in Port Talbot Docks. The proposed structures would be similar in height to existing structures in the views, including the Hanson Cement Works. Module E1 & E2 and the 40m stacks associated with the HP Boiler Package would be noticeable on the skyline, although chimneys and structures in the wider Tata Steelworks (seen in Viewpoint Panorama) would remain the most prominent structures on the skyline during day and night. On approach to the Site from the south, as the WCP emerges from the Central Road underpass to the railway line, the proposed buildings, and other structures within the PDZ would be partially obscured by the Tata Steelworks. Clearer views would become possible on approach to the Harbour Way roundabout. In these views, the proposed structures would be set back behind the	negligible (views across the harbour). Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to vary from moderate to negligible. RV1: small-negligible / minor adverse RV2: medium-small / moderate adverse RV3: negligible / negligible RV7: small / minor adverse

Receptor	Commentary	Magnitude of change & Assessment of Effect
	water which would retain a sense of openness to the foreground of views. Structures in the steelworks would remain prominent. As the path extends away from Harbour Way and towards Mariners Point as demonstrated by RV3, Figure 8.8 structures associated with the Proposed Scheme would be visible beyond the River Afan. This would primarily be limited to views of the Module E1 & E2 and the two stacks associated with the HP Boiler Package (and associated lighting) which would be seen amongst other similar structures (which also have associated lighting). There would be a slight reduction in scrub and grassland glimpsed to the background of some views and a slight increase in structures of an industrial appearance. The wider views towards the Margam Mountains would be maintained. Travelling further round the bay, as demonstrated by RV7, Figure 8.8 clearer views would be possible of structures within the PDZ. A series of storage tanks and Module E1 & E2 and the two stacks associated with the HP Boiler Package would be visible seen alongside the Hanson Cement Works and chimney within the Tata Steelworks. Although the industrial context to the background of views would increase (with a small increase in the amount of associated lighting), the features that contribute to the scenic quality of views would be maintained. The mountains would continue to form the backdrop of views with built form sitting well below these features on the skyline.	

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 8.90 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified. As an industrial facility, the Proposed Scheme has been designed and laid out to ensure compliance with relevant health and safety regulations and removal of potential risks, including fire risks. As such, the ability to mitigate on-Site has been maximised.

Residual Effect

- 8.91 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effects for the visual receptors is that same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 8.92 In isolated locations (where users of the WCP pass adjacent to TCA1) users would experience moderate adverse effects which are considered to be **Significant**. Adverse effects elsewhere are considered not significant.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 8.93 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions have been identified.
- In regard to the visual assessment, the assessment has not attempted to predict the visual effects of seasonal changes throughout the year, or the detailed differences between day and nighttime effects, but describes the 'worst case' position in terms of the view when the Proposed Scheme would be most visible i.e., daytime views in the winter (when trees would have lost their leaves). The effects of proposed lighting have also been noted where relevant.
 - It is considered that qualitative analysis from existing viewpoints is sufficient to inform the assessment of construction and night-time effects. Night-time verified views / photomontages are not required due to the context of the Site.
 - Whilst a selection of representative viewpoints has been provided and further evaluation of the kinetic experience of visual receptors has been undertaken, not every available view within the study area has been illustrated and professional judgement has been used to assess the effects of the Proposed Scheme and when defining effects which are and are not significant.
 - The ZTV provided a tool early in the LVIA process to understand the potential visibility of the Proposed Scheme and confirm the key visual receptors and representative views. The ZTV was not updated to reflect the final fixed heights of proposed structures within the Site as changes to heights were relatively minor and within the range of heights tested within the earlier iterations of the ZTV. The assessment of effects on visual receptors is based on more detailed information provided from the AVRs and the information on the Proposed Scheme set out in **Chapter 4: Development Specification**.

Summary

- 8.94 **Table 8.14** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within the Chapter.
- 8.95 The table only provides a summary of the residual effects identified within the assessment and details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation that has been taken into account is set out in detail within the Chapter and summarised within the Environmental Management Plan included within **Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.
- 8.96 A separate, standalone LVIA has also been undertaken (included at **Appendix 8.1**) which included the effects of the Proposed Scheme on all identified landscape and visual receptors which were not considered to be significant and were therefore excluded from the assessment within this Chapter and ES.

Table 8.14: Summary of Residual and Significant Effects

Effect	Receptor	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
Construction Stage			
Changes to the character and amenity of views	Users of the WCP to the north and west of Crown Wharf (as demonstrated by RVs 1, 2, 3, & 7)	Varies from moderate to negligible adverse	YES In isolated locations (where users of the WCP pass adjacent to TCA1) users would experience moderate adverse effects which are considered to be significant. Adverse effects elsewhere are considered not significant.
	Users of the WCP on Margam Mountain (as demonstrated by RV6)	Varies from moderate to negligible adverse	YES In isolated locations (where views across the docks from the Margam Hills are obstructed by construction works) users would experience moderate adverse effects which are considered to be significant. Adverse effects elsewhere are considered not significant.
Changes to Landscape components within the Site	Vegetation on Site	Moderate adverse	YES
Operational Stage			
Changes to the character and amenity of views	Users of the WCP to the north and west of Crown Wharf (as demonstrated by RVs 1, 2, 3, & 7)	Varies from moderate to negligible adverse	YES In isolated locations (where users of the WCP pass adjacent to TCA1) users would experience moderate adverse

Effect	Receptor	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
			effects which are considered to be significant. Adverse effects elsewhere are considered not significant.
Changes to Landscape components within the Site	Vegetation on Site	Moderate adverse	YES

References

¹ European Council (2007) European Landscape Convention

² Technical Advice Note 12: Design (Welsh Government, March 2016).

³ Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA), 3rd Edition

⁴ Christine Tudor, Natural England (2014) An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment

⁵ Landscape Institute (2016) Landscape Character Assessment: Technical Information Note 08/2015.

Available at: https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstitute-org/2016/01/Landscape-Character-Assessment-TIN-08_15-20160216.pdf [Date accessed: 13.07.2023]

⁶ Landscape Institute (2019) Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Available at: https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstitute-org/2019/09/LI_TGN-06-19_Visual_Representation.pdf. [Date accessed: 13.07.2023]

⁷ Landscape Institute (2016) Landscape Character Assessment: Technical Information Note 08/2015. Available at: https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstitute-org/2016/01/Landscape-Character-Assessment-TIN-08_15-20160216.pdf [Date accessed: 13.07.2023]