



www.landuse.co.uk

West Sussex Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study: Annex 1 Waste Sites

Prepared for West Sussex County Council by LUC

October 2011

LUC SERVICES

Environmental Planning
Landscape Design
Landscape Management
Masterplanning
Landscape Planning
Ecology
Environmental Assessment
Rural Futures
Digital Design
Urban Regeneration
Urban Design

43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
Tel: 020 7383 5784
Fax: 020 7383 4798
london@landuse.co.uk

14 Great George Street
Bristol BS1 5RH
Tel: 0117 929 1997
Fax: 0117 929 1998
bristol@landuse.co.uk

37 Otago Street
Glasgow G12 8JJ
Tel: 0141 334 9595
Fax: 0141 334 7789
glasgow@landuse.co.uk

28 Stafford Street
Edinburgh EH3 7BD
Tel: 0131 202 1616
edinburgh@landuse.co.uk

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

[illegible]

CONTENTS

ANNEX I: WASTE SITES

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Report Structure	1
2	METHODOLOGY	3
	Waste Development and Sensitivity Indicators	4
	Assessment Criteria	4
	Desk Studies	7
	Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Analysis	8
	Field Survey	9
3	SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT	10
4	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	13
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17

TABLES

Table 2.1 Sites Assessed and Waste Facility Typologies.....	4
Table 2.2 Sensitivity Matrix.....	5
Table 3.1: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 1.....	10
Table 3.2: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 2.....	11
Table 3.3: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 3.....	11
Table 3.4: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 4.....	12
Table 4.1: Summary of Evaluation of Landscape Capacity	13

1 Introduction

- A1.1 Land Use Consultants (LUC) was commissioned by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in April 2011 to undertake a landscape sensitivity study for potential waste sites to be allocated through the West Sussex County Council's Waste Plan. The report forms an annex to the West Sussex Sensitivity Study for Minerals and Waste Sites prepared by LUC in August 2011.
- A1.2 The purpose of the study is to:
- Provide an assessment of the sensitivity and capacity of the landscape of proposed sites and the potential of each to accommodate waste facilities without having significant detrimental impacts on the character of the area or on that of its setting; and
 - Provide guidance on the mitigation and restoration measures which would be appropriate for each site.
- A1.3 A key consideration is the need for the study to meet the Tests of Soundness identified in PPS12 and provide a transparent, robust and defensible evidence base for the MWDF. The method of approach to this study is set out in **Section 2** and draws on key guidance and best practice as set out in the following:
- Scottish Natural Heritage and the Countryside Agency (2002a) *Landscape Character Assessment*;
 - Scottish Natural Heritage and the Countryside Agency (2002b) *Topic Paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity*; and
 - The Landscape Institute (2002) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*.

Report Structure

- A1.4 Annex I is structured as follows:
- **Section 2:** Methodology;
 - **Section 3:** Sensitivity Assessment;
 - **Section 4:** Summary of Findings;
 - **Section 5:** Conclusions and Recommendations.
- A1.5 The report is supported by the following figures:
- **Figure 10** Site Locations;
 - **Figure 11** Topography;
 - **Figure 12** National Character Areas;
 - **Figure 13** West Sussex Landscape Character Areas;
 - **Figure 14** Landscape Designations;
 - **Figure 15** Cultural Heritage Designations;

- **Figure I6** Conservation Designations;
- **Figure I7** Tranquillity;
- **Figure I8** Intrusion.

2 Methodology

- A2.1 The approach used in this study to evaluate the sensitivity of the landscape to built waste facilities is set out in the main report *West Sussex Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study for Potential Mineral and Waste Sites*¹, to which this report forms an annex. It builds on current thinking on techniques and criteria for judging landscape sensitivity and capacity as documented in *Topic Paper 6*² which accompanies the guidance published by the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage³. The methodology follows that used in the landscape sensitivity study for potential mineral sites, details of which are provided in the **Section 2 Methodology** of the main report.
- A2.2 The term “built waste facilities” covers a range of waste management types. It is therefore important to note that this study considers the sensitivity of the landscape to the development of a range of potential types of waste facilities. These including the following, as identified the project brief;
- In-vessel Composting;
 - Anaerobic Digestion;
 - Processing Recyclables eg. Waste Transfer Station/Materials Recycling Facility;
 - Mixed Waste Processing/Mechanical Biological Treatment;
 - Energy from Waste;
 - Advanced Thermal Treatment; and
 - Non Inert Landfill.
- A2.3 The corresponding **Stage 1** of the assessment process for this study, as set out in **Diagram 1 Project Stages** of the main report, therefore involved the identification of the key features and attributes for each of the potential waste facilities. This was informed by *Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study* published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister⁴. The types of waste facilities were grouped into four typologies broadly according to the scale are used in this assessment, maximum height and structures, such as stacks, associated with them. The grouping of the waste facilities into types is set out in **Appendix 2 Site Assessment Sheets**.
- A2.4 A list of the potential waste facilities considered, as they were grouped into each of the four typologies, together with the sites assessed for their sensitivity to each is provided in **Table 2.1** below.

¹ Land Use Consultants report prepared for West Sussex County Council (2011) *West Sussex Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study for Potential Mineral and Waste Sites*

² The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage (2002) *Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland. Topic Paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity*

³ Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage (2002) *Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland* CAX 84

⁴ Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2004) *Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study*

Table 2.1 Sites Assessed and Waste Facility Typologies

Type	Waste Facility	Sites Assessed
Type 1: Small-medium scale, low-level development (building height up to 12m)	In-vessel Composting	M/CH/1C Fuel Depot Bognor Road
	Anaerobic Digestion	
Type 2: Large scale processing (building height up to 20m)	Mixed Waste Processing	W/MS/3A Land Rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate
	Processing Recyclables	W/MS/3B Land at Hickstead
Type 3: Large scale processing (stacks up to 80m)	Energy from Waste	W/MS/5A Land adjacent to Goddards Green Wastewater Treatment Works
	Advanced Thermal Treatment	
Type 4	Non-inert Landfill	W/HO/3B Langhurst Quarry

Waste Development and Sensitivity Indicators

- A2.5 The key features, or attributes, of each type of waste facility were established, in terms of their potential effects on the landscape. Based on these attributes, a number of landscape characteristics were identified, which act as corresponding indicators of potential landscape sensitivity. Key potential impacts for each of the different types of development are listed in **Appendix 2 Site Assessment Sheets**.

Assessment Criteria

- A2.6 Criteria for determining landscape sensitivity were established based on the attributes of the landscape identified as being most likely to be affected by development. A five point scale, setting out the criteria indicating higher to lower sensitivity, was used against which the attributes of each individual site could be set out.

Table 2.2 Sensitivity Matrix

LOWER SENSITIVITY ←-----→ HIGHER SENSITIVITY					
LANDSCAPE CRITERIA					
Landform	Absence of topographical variety	Predominantly flat, simple	Smooth, regular	Complex	Distinctive topographic features. Presence of strong topographical variety
Land cover	Simple and predictable	Generally simple and consistent	Some variety, a degree of consistency in pattern of landuse & landcover	Varied pattern with some intricacy	Complex and irregular
Scale	Large scale	Large to medium scale	Medium scale	Small scale landform and landcover	Intimate scale, predominance of human scale indicators
Enclosure	Exposed	Mostly enclosed, some open areas	Semi-enclosed	Generally open, enclosed in places	Enclosed
Condition	Modified	Fragmented/weak pattern	Partly modified	Intact and elements in good state of repair	Intact with strong pattern, high level of intactness
Typicality and rarity	No rare features or weak association with key characteristics of the landscape	Few rare features or some association with key characteristics of the landscape	Some rare features and attributes or largely corresponding to key characteristics	Rare features and attributes, strong correspondence with key qualities	Rare features of regional importance or representative of key characteristics and qualities
Tranquillity including noise and lighting	Busy, movement of traffic	Close to audible signs of human activity and development	Some human activity reducing sense of tranquillity, some lighting	Still, with limited or no visual or audible intrusion	Busy, movement of traffic
Remoteness	Close to visible signs of human activity and development. Presence of contemporary structures eg utility, infrastructure or industrial elements	Close to some visible signs of human activity and modern development	Some sense of distance and remoteness, human activity and modern development largely absent	Perception of remoteness, sense of distance from human influences	Physically or perceptually remote. Absence of modern development
VISUAL CRITERIA					
LOWER SENSITIVITY ←-----→ HIGHER SENSITIVITY					
Skylines	Broken, interrupted with modern development present	Presence of existing vertical features	Partly interrupted, with few vertical structures	Largely uninterrupted and undeveloped	Uninterrupted horizons undeveloped

Table 2.2 Sensitivity Matrix

Views and landmarks	Obscured landmarks, views towards/ from landmarks, absence of vistas	Indistinctive or industrial settings	Some locally important landmarks or views	Distinctive settings or public viewpoints	Prominent key landmarks, views towards/ from landmarks or key vistas
Intervisibility	Limited views into and out of landscape. Weak connections, self contained area and views	Simple large scale backdrops	Some intervisibility with neighbouring landscapes of low sensitivity	Intervisibility and strong links to neighbouring landscapes of medium to high sensitivity	Prospects into and out from high ground or open landscapes to neighbouring landscapes of high sensitivity/ contributes to wider landscape
Visual Receptors	Few, no sensitive receptors apparent	Limited numbers of receptors	Some sensitive features apparent	A number of sensitive receptors frequently apparent	High number of sensitive receptors in close proximity
LANDSCAPE VALUE CRITERIA					
LOWER SENSITIVITY ←-----→ HIGHER SENSITIVITY					
Landscape designations	No or limited intervisibility or relationship with a locally or nationally designated landscape	Some intervisibility and relationship with a locally or nationally designated landscape	Located in close proximity to a designated landscape with some intervisibility and relationship with it	Located within or in close proximity to a designated landscape, some significant intervisibility and association with the wider designated area	Located within a nationally or locally designated landscape with a strong association with the wider designated area
Natural heritage	No landscape conservation designations	Limited extent of nature conservation areas and areas of ancient woodland	Some nature conservation designations	Nature conservation designations over a significant area	Statutory nature conservation designations over an extensive area
Historic environment and settings	No significant historic features	Historic features but not relating to landscape	Some historic features relate to landscape	Some prominent historic features	Historic features are prominent in the landscape
Recreation	Little or no recreational use	Low level informal or local recreational use	Locally significant recreational use or attraction	Well used for recreation, greater than local attraction	Important for recreation for locals and visitors

A2.7 It should be noted that for each site the relevant importance of the criteria varies and the assessment does not consist of a rigid scoring system, rather the sensitivity of each site was assessed through professional judgement guided by performance against the criteria. As the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* note in discussions about effects on the landscape “the analysis of criteria involves considerable judgement in balancing the

complex relationships between the different components of the landscape".⁵ For different sites, falling within different landscape character areas with a range of specific issues, different criteria are considered more or less important. Those criteria which relate to the 'key qualities' in the designated landscapes (ie the South Downs National Park and the two AONBs), are afforded greater weight.

- A2.8 This study has used a five point scale to record sensitivity, outlined in **Table 2.2** of the main report.

Desk Studies

Desk based review of sensitivity

- A2.9 An initial desk-based assessment of sensitivity was undertaken, informed by other relevant studies including landscape assessments particularly where these included analysis of landscape sensitivity. Landscape characterisation underpins the approach to landscape sensitivity assessment. The landscape character of the wider study area within which each site fell was considered, drawing on the existing landscape character assessment for the WSCC *Landscape Strategy*⁶ and the *West Sussex and Land Management Guidance Sheets*. Where relevant this was supplemented with information from the *South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment*⁷, the *High Weald AONB Management plan*, the *Chichester Harbour AONB Landscape Character Assessment*⁸, *The Future Growth of Chichester: Landscape and Visual Amenity Considerations*⁹. A number of district level landscape character assessments were also reviewed as part of the desk-based study, including *Arun Landscape Study*¹⁰, *A Landscape Character Assessment for Mid Sussex*¹¹. These were not however included in the detailed site characterisation or assessment where the analysis and recommendations directly informed the West Sussex management guidelines.
- A2.10 The West Sussex Character Project divides the county into 42 landscape character areas within the National Character Area framework. **Figure 12** shows the sites assessed in relation to the location of landscape character areas.
- A2.11 The initial review also identified what was important and why in relation to designated landscapes through drawing on information contained within the

⁵ Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (2002) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Second Edition*. Section 7.45

⁶ *A Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape, Consultant's Technical Report* (2003) by Chris Blandford Associates

⁶ West Sussex County Council (2003) *A Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape, Consultant's Technical Report*

⁷ Land Use Consultants for the South Downs Joint Committee (2005) *South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment*

⁸ Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Countryside Agency (2005) *Chichester Harbour AONB landscape character assessment*

⁹ Land Use Consultants for Chichester District Council (2005) *The Future Growth of Chichester: Landscape and Visual Amenity Considerations*

¹⁰ Arun District Council (2005) *Arun Landscape Study*

¹¹ Mid Sussex District Council (2005) *A Landscape Character Study for Mid Sussex*

*Management Plan for South Downs, Chichester Harbour AONB and the High Weald AONB Management Plans and the relevant parts of the South Downs National Park Planning Guidelines*¹². **Figure 14** shows the designated landscapes across the study area. The assessment also draws on information contained within the protected area landscape character assessments and management plans¹³.

- A2.12 The desk top research exercise also included a review of GIS data and map studies, including topography (**Figure 11**), cultural heritage features (**Figure 15**), national and international conservation designations (**Figure 16**), tranquillity (**Figure 17**) and intrusion (**Figure 18**).

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Analysis

- A2.13 Evaluation of the theoretical extent to which the individual sites will be visible across the study area was undertaken by establishing a 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility' (ZTV), as detailed in **Section 2 Methodology** of the main report. ReSoft Windfarm and Arcmap GIS computer software was used to generate the ZTV, calculating the theoretical intervisibility between the development and its surroundings. These maps indicate theoretical visibility only, that is, areas from within which there may in theory be a line of sight to the development. They provide information on the extent and pattern of visibility but do not indicate the nature or significance of potential visual impacts. Actually visibility in the field is often reduced by local screening (by local topography and vegetation).
- A2.14 For this study, the ZTV produced for each site was calculated at a range of height intervals corresponding to the maximum height of buildings and structures associated with each of the waste facility typologies. Height intervals of up to 15m, up to 20m and up to 30m were calculated to correspond to Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 respectively. Stacks associated with Type 2 and Type 3, up to 80m in height, were not modelled in the ZTVs, as the narrow dimensions of the stacks were considered to be of relatively lower visibility and visual prominence across the wider landscape than the other elements of the development. A ZTV modelling the stacks would therefore over-emphasise the extent of visibility of these types of development.
- A2.15 To allow for ease of comparison, the ZTVs of each of the three height intervals have been superimposed on one another within the map figures, and colour bands used to differentiate the potential extent of visibility of the three different typologies. For example, the orange overlay illustrated potential extent of potential visibility of Type 1. Within this area structures above 15m (therefore Type 2 and 3) will also be visible. The blue and magenta overlays represent the maximum extent of 20m and 30m structures respectively.
- A2.16 For Type 4: Non-Inert Landfill the ZTV was calculated to a height of 75m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD), to bring the maximum height of the

¹² South Downs Joint Committee (2007) *South Downs Planning Guidelines*

¹³ High Weald AONB Joint Advisory Committee (2009), *The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2004: a 20-year strategy*

potential landfill area level with the contours of the land to the west of site W/HO/3B Langhurstwood Quarry (the only site assessed in relation to this type of waste facility).

A2.17 The ZTVs for each site are presented in **Appendix 4** of the main report.

Field Survey

A2.18 Field survey work was carried out in April 2011 by a landscape architect and an environmental planner. Each site and the surrounding area was visited, including key viewpoints identified through consultation with the South Downs National Park Authority, the High Weald AONB and West Sussex County Council.

A2.19 Field survey forms were used, comprising three main sections:

- consideration of key features and characteristics of the landscape of the site and immediate surroundings;
- analysis of the landscape in terms of the characteristics and qualities with a bearing on its sensitivity to each waste facility typology, including intervisibility with surrounding areas and sensitive features present within the site;
- a brief assessment of potential mitigation measures appropriate to the site and its location in the wider landscape.

A2.20 The site survey forms, together with the information and analysis from the desk based work, formed the basis of the assessment, where the sensitivity criteria were applied to each site. Completed assessment sheets are presented in full in the main report **Appendix 2 Site Assessment Sheets**.

3 Sensitivity Assessment

A3.1 The assessment tables are included in full in **Appendix 2** of the main report and include detailed maps and photographs taken during site surveys. Each table includes a summary of the key qualities of the landscape character area within which the site falls, drawing on the key qualities and guidance set out in the *Landscape Strategy for West Sussex*, the *South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment* and the *High Weald AONB* where appropriate. For each site, an assessment table summarises:

- Landscape sensitivity;
- Visual sensitivity;
- Landscape value;
- Overall landscape capacity (also taking account of cumulative issues);
- Mitigation opportunities; and
- Options for restoration following extraction.

A3.2 The following tables detail the findings of the sensitivity assessment of sites to Type I: Small to medium scale, low level development. The five point scale used to record sensitivity is outlined in **Table 2.2 Definitions of Sensitivity** in the main report.

Table 3.1: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type I

	Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Value	Overall Sensitivity
M/CH/IC Fuel Depot Bognor Road	Low	Medium	Low	Low-medium
W/MS/3A Land Rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate	Low-medium	Low	Low	Low-medium
W/MS/3B Land at Hickstead	Low-medium	Low-medium	Low	Low-medium
W/MS/5A Land adjacent to Goddards Green Wastewater Treatment Works	Low-medium	Low-medium	Low	Low-medium

A3.3 The following tables detail the findings of the sensitivity assessment of sites to Type 2: Large Scale Processing.

Table 3.2: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 2

	Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Value	Overall Sensitivity
M/CH/IC Fuel Depot Bognor Road	Low	Medium	Low	Medium
W/MS/3A Land Rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate	Medium	Low - med	Low	Medium
W/MS/3B Land at Hickstead	Low-medium	Medium	Low	Low-medium
W/MS/5A Land adjacent to Goddards Green Wastewater Treatment Works	Low-medium	Medium	Low	Medium

A3.4 The following tables detail the findings of the sensitivity assessment of sites to Type 3: Large Scale Processing with stacks up to 80m.

Table 3.3: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 3

	Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Value	Overall Sensitivity
M/CH/IC Fuel Depot Bognor Road	Low-medium	High	Low	Medium-high
W/MS/3A Land Rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
W/MS/3B Land at Hickstead	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
W/MS/5A Land adjacent to Goddards Green Wastewater Treatment Works	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium

A3.5 The following tables detail the findings of the sensitivity assessment of sites to Type 4: Non-inert Landfill.

Table 3.4: Summary of Sensitivity Assessment to Type 4

	Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Value	Overall Sensitivity
W/HO/3B Langhurstwood Quarry	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium

4 Summary of Findings

- A4.1 The following table provides a summary of the results of the assessment of landscape and visual issues at each of the 5 sites. The five-point scale used is outlined in **Table 2.2** in **Section 2 Methodology** of the main report.
- A4.2 A summary of the key constraints and judgement of the overall capacity of each site to accommodate each type of waste management facility is provided in the table below. These are provided in full in **Appendix 2** of the main report, with details of the mitigation and landscape opportunities identified for each site.

Table 4.1: Summary of Evaluation of Landscape Capacity

Site	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
M/CH/IC Fuel Depot Bognor Road	Moderate-high	Moderate	Moderate-Low	N/a
	<p>Given the relatively flat landform, there is potential for providing appropriate screening around the site, to reduce low level views into the site from the surrounding area. There is also some scope within the site to locate buildings and storage areas to limit impacts on views and character of the wider area and to tie in with existing light industrial development at the fringes of Chichester. It is therefore judged that the site has a moderate-high capacity for accommodating Type 1 and moderate capacity for accommodating Type 2 developments. There is however limited capacity for the scale of Type 3 of development due to the size potential visual prominence of the tall buildings and stack associated with this type of development without adverse effects on the surrounding landscape and urban context, including views from the South Downs National Park. It is judged that the site has a moderate to low capacity overall for this scale and type of development.</p>			
W/MS/3A Land Rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate	Moderate-high	Moderate	Moderate	N/a
	<p>The relatively flat landform, and existing small scale industrial units and buildings to the east of the site allow some scope for providing appropriate screening around the site and to locate and mass buildings so that the development is assimilated into the surrounding area. It is therefore judged that the site has a moderate to high capacity overall for accommodating type 1 development. There is some limited capacity for the scale and type of development associated with Type 2 and Type 3 due to the size and potential visual prominence of the tall buildings and stacks, which is likely to</p>			

Site	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
	<p>be significantly larger than the existing development to the east. There is the potential for adverse effects on the surrounding landscape in relation to Type 3 development, particularly for the buildings and for activities on site to visually and audibly intrude on the more rural and peaceful area of farmland to the west of the site. It is therefore judged that the site has a moderate capacity to accommodate Type 2 and a moderate to low capacity overall to accommodate Type 3 development.</p>			
W/MS/3B Land at Hickstead	Moderate-high	Moderate	Moderate	N/a
	<p>There is some scope within the site to locate buildings and storage areas to limit impacts on views and character of the wider area and to tie in with existing light industrial development to the east and with Hickstead to the south. The site is therefore considered to have moderate - high capacity to accommodate Type 1 development. However, the scale and height of stacks associated with Type 2 and Type 3 development is likely to be more visually intrusive than the existing development, and views to the southern parts of the site from the wooded slopes of the High Weald to the north would potentially still be possible even with screening. It is judged that the site has a moderate capacity overall for Type 2 and Type 3 development overall, with scope for the improvement of the current condition and structure of landscape features, and habitat value in conjunction with the development of this site.</p>			
W/MS/5A Land adjacent to Goddards Green Wastewater Treatment Works	Moderate-high	Moderate	Moderate	N/a
	<p>The low-lying, enclosed nature of the landscape immediately surrounding the site, and the existing sewage works to the east, provides some scope for appropriate screening around the site and to locate and mass buildings so that the development is assimilated into the surrounding area. It is judged therefore overall to have a moderate - high capacity to accommodate Type 1 development. Where buildings breach the tree line of the surrounding vegetation, however, there is likely to be greater visibility across a wider area than the existing development. Views from the wooded slopes of the High Weald to the north would potentially still be possible even with screening, although any tall structures would be likely to be seen in the context of existing development centred on Burgess Hill. It is judged that the site has a moderate capacity to accommodate Type 2 and Type 3 development overall.</p>			

Site	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
W/HO/3B Langhurstwood Quarry	N/a	N/a	N/a	Moderate
	<p>The site is of some recreational value although it does not fall within a designated landscape. The contained and well wooded nature of the site provides containment of views. The presence of ancient woodland, the SSSI and SNCI areas and the water courses reduces the capacity of the site to accommodate development without adverse impacts on the habitat value of the surrounding area. In addition, the proximity of the properties and estate to the south is also likely to limit the capacity of the site. The site is therefore considered to have a moderate capacity overall, with scope to limit potential visual impacts. Care would need to be taken to ensure effects on the habitat and properties to the south are minimised.</p>			

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

- A5.1 The study assessed four sites in relation to the landscape sensitivity and capacity to the development of Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 waste facilities and a single site to Type 4. Sites W/MS/1C, W/MS/3A, W/MS/3B and W/MS/5A were considered to have a moderate to high capacity to accommodate Type 1 (small to medium scale, relatively low-level development) and moderate capacity to accommodate Type 2 (large scale processing development). W/MS/3A, W/MS/3B and W/MS/5A were considered to have a moderate capacity to accommodate Type 3 development, with the relatively low landscape and visual sensitivities of each site and potential to mitigate against visual impacts the predominant determining factors. The overall landscape capacity for M/CH/1C Fuel Depot Bognor to Type 3 waste sites is considered to be moderate to low due to the relatively high visual sensitivity of the wider landscape to this size and scale of development, particularly in relation to the potential for impacts on Chichester and the South Downs National Park. It should be noted that an appropriate level of landscape and visual impact assessment detailing impacts on the setting of Chichester is likely to be required for this site.
- A5.2 There are however site-specific sensitivities and constraints for each of the sites assessed and these are detailed in **Appendix 2: Site Assessment Sheets**. Recommendations have been made as to the most appropriate mitigation measures for the individual areas on the basis of the landscape and visual sensitivities identified. Guidelines for mitigation are provided in **Appendix 2: Site Assessment Sheets** of the main report. They are broadly based on the relevant landscape guidelines and managements plans, where these highlight specific aims for particular areas. The recommendations made for the individual sites are closely linked to their location, the presence of existing woodland, buildings and industrial land uses in the immediate surroundings. Where possible improved access and recreational opportunities should be sought.

