

**APPEAL IN RESPECT OF:
FARM VIEW
LANGLEY VALE
EPSOM
SURREY KT18 6AP**

**ON BEHALF OF EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH
COUNCIL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

**LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**Prepared by:
Graeme Drummond BSc(Hons), DipLA, CMLI,
FArborA**

Planning Inspectorate Appeal:

PINS Ref: 6006971

LPA Ref: 25/00846/OUT

Date August 2026

The erection of up to 110 dwellings including affordable homes (all matters reserved except access from Langley Vale Road) at appeal at Farm View, Langley Vale, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 6AP.

Landscape and Visual Proof of Evidence

On behalf of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Planning Authority

Contents

1. Introduction

Witness Qualification and Experience

Scope and Purpose of Evidence

2. Landscape Context and Planning

3. Scheme Proposals – Landscape

4. The Effect of the Development in Terms of Landscape and Visual Impact

Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)

Landscape Character

Visual Effect

5. Landscape Mitigation

6. Summary of Conclusions

Appendix A Landscape Character Assessment

Appendix B Visual Impact Assessment

Appendix C Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Policies Map

1. INTRODUCTION

Witness Qualification and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Graeme Drummond. I am a Landscape Architect, a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute and a Fellow of the Arboricultural Association. I have been in professional practice for over 25 years. I am a founding Director and owner of Open Spaces Landscape and Arboricultural Consultants Limited (**Open Spaces**), a private multi-discipline practice specialising in Landscape Architecture, Arboriculture and Ecology. Open Spaces is a Registered Practice with the Landscape Institute.
- 1.2 I hold the following qualifications:
- BSc(Hons): Landscape Design and Plant Sciences
BSc(Hons): Arboriculture
Dip LA: Post Graduate Diploma in Landscape Architecture
- 1.3 I also hold the National Diploma in Amenity Horticulture from Cannington College, Somerset.
- 1.4 I am the Principal Landscape Architect at Open Spaces and I am responsible for large development project management, including University campus master-planning and design, urban regeneration, housing, Landscape and Visual Assessments. I have experience of Planning Appeals including Hearings and Public Inquiries. I am fully conversant with the assessment of visual and landscape effects of built development within urban, urban fringe and countryside environments.
- 1.5 I am also the Principal Arboricultural Consultant at Open Spaces and have considerable experience of trees growing within and adjacent to development sites, production of arboricultural reports in relation to planning applications and appeals.
- 1.6 Between 2000-2012, I was employed as a Lecturer at Writtle College, now part of Anglia Ruskin University where I taught Landscape Design, Construction Detailing, Arboriculture and Landscape Planning to both undergraduate and post-graduate students.

- 1.7 I confirm that the evidence I have prepared is given in accordance with the guidance from my professional institute and is my true and professional opinion.

Scope and Purpose of Evidence

- 1.8 Open Spaces have been appointed by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Planning Authority to present specialist landscape evidence on their behalf in support of the refusal to grant permission for the application to develop land at Farm View, Langley Vale Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 6AP (**the Site**) to:

The erection of up to 110 dwellings including affordable homes (all matters reserved except access from Langley Vale Road) at appeal at Farm View, Langley Vale, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 6AP.

- 1.9 The application was refused for 4 reasons. My Proof of Evidence addresses the landscape and visual matters in relation to Reason for Refusal (**RfR**) 3:

Harm to the landscape character of the area

The proposal will have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape setting of the Area of Landscape Value and of the wider landscape character of the countryside and Green Belt, contrary to Sections 13 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007 and Policy DM9, DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.

- 1.10 I have considered the following Appellant's documents:

- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) – July 2025 Fabrik (**CD1.7**)
- Design and Access Statement Rev C (**CD1.6**)
- Landscape Statement July 2025 – Fabrik (**CD1.8**)
- Parameters Plan - 2503/PL.03 Rev C (**CD1.23**)

2 LANDSCAPE CONTEXT AND PLANNING

2.1 The Appeal site is approximately 5.2 hectares in size. It abuts the residential development of Langley Vale along its northeast/eastern boundary and falls towards its western and southern edges. The Site sits along the eastern valley side with rising land to the west. There are numerous PRowS across the local area including footpaths, bridleways and byways. A 'Centenary Woodland' is proposed to the rising land to the west of the Site which will include public access.

2.2 The whole of the Site sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

2.3 The Site also sits within an Area of Great Landscape Value (**AGLV**).

2.4 The key policies to consider within a landscape and/or visual context that my evidence will address are:

National Planning Policy Framework (**NPPF**)

- Section GB2: Assessing Green Belt land
Relevant paragraphs:
 - 1c Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- Section GB6: Control of Development in the Green Belt
Relevant paragraph:
 - 2
- Section N2: Improving the Natural Environment
Relevant paragraphs:
 - 1a, 1d

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Core Strategy 2007 (**CD4.1**): Policy - CS5

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies (**CD4.2**):
DM9, DM10

3. SCHEME PROPOSALS - LANDSCAPE

- 3.1 The proposed development and associated landscape including landscape mitigation for potential landscape and visual harm is set out on the Landscape Masterplan - DAS Figure 16 (**CD1.6**) and the Parameters Plan (**CD1.23**) – drawing No: 2503/PL.03C.
- 3.2 Existing 'embedded' site vegetation will be retained, however this vegetation should not be considered as part of the proposed mitigation measures as it is already growing within the site and forms an intrinsic part of the baseline character of the Site. This existing landscape planting includes a mixture of scrub plants and occasional trees mainly growing to the upper slope of the Site adjacent to the rear gardens of Beaconsfield Road, refer to the Landscape Masterplan – page 11 of the Landscape Statement (CD1.8).
- 3.3 As the proposal is for outline with all matters reserved except for access from Langley Vale Road, it is likely that important, detailed landscape design will be approved at officer level thereby taking the decision making away from the Inspector.

4. THE EFFECT OF THE DEVELOPMENT IN TERMS OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

- 4.1 The existing site comprises the northern/northwestern part of an extensive single agricultural field and an adjoining small parcel of land adjacent to Langley Vale Road. The Site is open with clear views of it from the proposed access along Langley Vale Road to the northern edge of the Site, the PRoW following Ebbisham Lane to the west of the Site, the PRoW on rising land to the west of the Site beyond Ebbisham Lane, the Langley Vale Centenary Wood and Bridleway 127 to the south of the Site. There are clear views of the Site from a number of viewpoints as identified within the LVIA (**CD1.7**), these include: Viewpoints: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16.
- 4.2 Visible detractors within the Site are absent, although beyond the Site's northern and northeastern edge, a number of houses forming part of the Langley Vale settlement are visible as is the small pumping station to the Site's northwestern corner.

Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)

- 4.3 The AGLV is identified within the Appellants LVIA (**CD1.7**): Figure 2.1 – Local designations (page 6). The full extent of the AGLV is set out within the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Policies Map – Draft Local Plan 2022-2040 – Refer also to Appendix C of this Proof.
- 4.4 The AGLV is a County designation for an area of land considered to be of high landscape quality with distinctive characteristics which make them sensitive to development. The AGLV is not a protected landscape (previously valued landscape prior to NPPF 2026), as set out within the NPPF, however within the Appellant's LVIA (**CD1.7**) - Table 8.3 -Transient from Langley Vale Road: it is stated and I agree with:
- “... AGLV which is a designation of regional importance and therefore of medium value.”*

The Assessment of medium value is set out within the Appellants LVIA, Table 1.1 – Landscape Value Criteria, within the column headed 'medium' and where it is stated under 'Distinctiveness':

“Some components that are unique and contribute positively to landscape character. Recognised locally, including designations such as Special Landscape areas, Areas of Great Landscape Value, Strategic or Local Gaps”

It is my opinion that the Appellant regards the AGLV as having a positive landscape character and therefore it is also my opinion, that this character is found across the AGLV. It therefore stands to reason that the Site, which sits within the AGLV must also share these same positive characteristics.

4.5 The AGLV is not a single area of land but a number of areas, all linked to the Surrey Hills National Landscape.

4.6 It is my opinion the AGLV, of which the Site and surrounding land sits within, has a consistent and identifiable character and this character is defined by the key characteristics as set out within the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment - UE3 Epsom Downs Landscape Character Area in which the Site also sits within and that this character is supportive of the nearby Surrey Hills National Landscape.

Landscape Character

4.7 The site sits entirely within National Landscape Character Area (NCA) 119: North Downs. Due to the scale of this NCA, I make no further comment.

4.8 Surrey Landscape Character Assessment identifies the Site as sitting within UE3 Epsom Downs Landscape Character Area. The Landscape Character Assessment – page 57, of which I agree with, makes the following evaluation in relation to the Type UE areas:

“Although varied, all these character areas provide pockets of quality landscape, of historic importance or importance for existing biodiversity and biodiversity potential, adjoining Built Up Areas or settlements. They provide open areas, often intensively managed for public access, recreation or sport, but still remain rural or natural in character. They provide a natural landscape setting to the adjoining settlements or Built Up Areas. They also provide a visual link or physical bridge to the wider landscape, and share many of the key characteristics of their respective surrounding

landscapes. The natural character is in direct contrast to the adjoining dense urban areas of the adjoining settlements”.

The assessment specifically evaluates the UE3 Epsom Downs Landscape Character Area:

“UE 3: Although intensively managed for the racing industry this area combines with adjacent Areas CD1 and CF3 to provide large open area of farmed downs landscape between settlements, with views out to the wider landscape. Fragments of a chalk grassland exist on the perimeter of the racecourse”.

The assessment offers the following Key Characteristics for the UE3 Character Type – page 54 states inter alia;

- *Consists of open, large scale, relatively exposed fields used for Epsom Race Course and associated gallops, paddocks etc., along with irregular shaped blocks of woodland. Large grandstand buildings are located outside the character area to the north.*
- *Open across the majority of the character area with long distance views of London from high ground, but occasional blocks of woodland result in some localised enclosure.*
- *Abuts the roads on three sides, but access is limited to tracks and rights of way within the main body of the character area.*
- *The character area surrounds Langley Vale to the south-west, and abuts development to the east, but the character area is largely unsettled within.*
- *Includes enclosure scheduled as an ancient monument at South Tadworth Farm, at the west of the character area.*
- *The racecourse allows an open aspect to the character area, with views to the wider landscape to the south although the sense of remoteness is reduced due to human influence within and surrounding the character area.*

4.9 The Appellants LVIA (**CD1.7**) para 5.1 states:

“The Site relates well to the existing built form of the settlement edge to the north ...”

The Appellant’s LVIA para 3.3 – ‘Site Setting and Overall, Character’ states:

“The Site itself sits on the lower slopes of the valley side, beneath the visual horizon created by Langley Vale’s housing. As a result, the Site maintains a strong visual connection with the settlement and integrates well with the existing built fabric”

The Appellant’s LVIA para 3.3 – ‘Summary of Site and its immediate context’ states:

“... Although the Site sits within a broader rural landscape, it lacks distinctive features and is visually and functionally connected to the settlement”

The Appellant is of the view that the Site relates well with the existing built form of Langley Vale. This view is not commensurate with the comments, as set out within the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment and which I have set out within para 4.8 of this Proof. It is my opinion that the Site identifies well with the wider landscape and adjacent Landscape Character Areas and does not relate to or identify with the existing built form of Langley Vale. My opinion is further strengthened with the designation, albeit at a county level, of AGLV for the Site and surrounding landscape. This designation clearly links the Site character with the wider landscape and adjacent Landscape Character Areas (**LCA**).

From the Site and the wider landscape to the west and southwest of the Site, it is only the houses which form the western edge of Langley Vale and which backs onto the Site that are visible. The majority of the Langley Vale residential development is situated to the east of these properties and are not visible. There are no direct pedestrian links between the Site and Langley Vale and therefore the Site does not relate well nor integrate well to the existing built form of Langley Vale.

Although some houses to the western edge of Langley Vale are visible from the Site and the wider landscape to the west and southwest of the Site, it is my opinion that these houses and associated rear garden areas act more as a visual detractor rather than maintaining a strong visual connection.

- 4.10 The Appellant's LVIA (**CD1.7**) Methodology page 6, Table 1.13, assesses the nature of effects and states:

Adverse :

"An effect that will on balance result in damage to the condition, integrity or key characteristics/composition of the landscape receptor or viewing experience".

It is my opinion that where Nature of Effect is assessed as Adverse, it would be highly unlikely that the Significance of Effect would then be assessed as negligible. It is my opinion that Magnitude Judgement, Significance of Effect and Nature of Effect have been under assessed and therefore, using the same methodology as set out within the LVIA, I have included within Appendix A, my assessment of landscape effects.

- 4.11 Para 8 of the Appellant's LVIA assesses a number of Landscape Receptors, although I am generally in agreement with the assessments in relation to landscape sensitivity. I do not agree with the assessment of 'Magnitude Judgement' or 'Significance of Effect' for year 1 or year 15 for 'UE3 Epsom Downs LCA' and 'Langley Vale Centenary Wood and its setting'. Refer to appendix A for my assessment, using the same methodology as set out within the Appellant's LVIA.

- 4.12. It is my opinion that the adjacent Landscape Character Area: CF3 'Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland' should also have been included as part of the landscape assessment. This LCA has a clear relationship with the Site as it includes the western valley side opposite the Site. Using the Appellant's methodology, I have assessed this LCA within my Appendix A as a moderate effect and adverse for year 1 which, in my opinion, is considered significant, thereby requiring mitigation to limit this significant harm.

Visual Effect

- 4.13 The Appellant has identified a number of Viewpoints situated across the surrounding landscape. Photographs taken from each viewpoint are also included within the LVIA Paragraph 4. (**CD1.7**).

- 4.14 The Appellants Viewpoints 1-16 include photographs but these are simple non-annotated photographs. The Landscape Institute states within its Technical Guidance Note (TGN 06/19) - para 4 - Type 1 Annotated Viewpoint Photograph:

“Reproduced at a size which aids clear understanding of the view and context, these simply show the extent of the site within the view and annotate any key features within the view.”

It is my opinion that not including Type 1 photographs will likely lead to confusion.

- 4.15 Where there are clear views of the Site such as from Viewpoint 1, 3, 4, and 5, I would have expected photomontages of the proposed development to be included within the LVIA. These photomontages would show how the proposed development will impact Viewpoint Receptors and provide visual information, for example, in relation to scale, massing, development context.

The Landscape Institute states with its Technical Guidance Note (TGN 06/19) - para 4 - Type 3 Photomontage / Photowire:

“This Type encompasses photomontages and photowires which will commonly be produced to accompany planning applications, LVAs and LVIAs. They provide a reasonable level of locational and photographic accuracy ...”.

- 4.16 The Appellant's LVIA (**CD1.7**) contains 16 viewpoints pages 23-39, however, these do not appear to have been assessed for effect or level of harm. Instead, a short description of the view, in relation to the proposed development is included with each photograph. It is my opinion that, without this assessment for effect, the Appellant is unable fully assess harm.

- 4.17 6. No Visual Receptors have been assessed within the LVIA and this assessment is set out within Table 8.3 of the Appellant's LVIA. The locations of these Visual Receptors are loosely described but their locations are not identified on any plan. Where these Visual Receptors cover a stretch of PRoW or the Centenary Woodland, numerous viewpoints have also been included refer to paragraph 7.2 of the Appellant's LVIA. I do not agree with the Appellant's assessment for harm caused by the proposed development and it is my opinion, the Appellant has understated the

level of harm. Using the Appellants methodology, I have assessed four Visual Receptors and set out my findings in Appendix B of this Proof. It is my opinion that the level of harm for many of the Visual Receptors is significant and will require substantial mitigation to limit this harm. It is also my opinion that the available space to the western edge of the proposed development is insufficient to fully mitigate for landscape and visual harm. It is my opinion that a minimum of 7-10 metres will be required to introduce an adequate native tree belt along the Site's western edge. The proposed SuDS and grass meadow should not be included within this 7-10 metre distance. This tree belt should be sufficient to allow for a multilayered planting to include native scrub tree species and up to large growing trees such as Oak. The available space should allow for adequate space to allow trees to grow optimally, without the need to carry out extensive crown management in the future whilst providing visual mitigation through winter months.

5. LANDSCAPE MITIGATION

- 5.1 Landscape mitigation is normally employed to limit visual harm caused by the proposed development on Visual Receptors.
- 5.2 The Landscape Masterplan identifies a limited amount of landscape mitigation – identified as “7” on the Landscape Masterplan and which is limited to the southeast corner of the Site. As identified within ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition) (**GLVIA3**) para 4.35 (**CD13.1**): makes clear that mitigation is linked to significant adverse landscape and visual effects whereas enhancements seek to improve the landscape resource and the visual amenity of the proposed development site and its wider setting, over and above its baseline condition”
- 5.3 The proposed landscaping to the western edge of the Site has not been identified as mitigation. I can therefore presume that the Appellant is of the opinion that the proposed development will not cause landscape or visual harm to Landscape and Visual Receptors to the west of the Site and therefore only landscape enhancements are proposed rather than mitigation. The Appellant’s LVIA does not address the requirements for mitigation in relation to landscape or visual harm.
- 5.4 The Landscape Masterplan and Parameters Plan (**CD1.23**) identifies a narrow strip of proposed landscaping to the Site’s lower, western edge. Within this landscape strip are proposed a number of enhancement features including boundary tree and native scrub planting, species rich meadow and SuDS basins. It is my opinion that landscape mitigation is required to compensate for landscape and visual harm to the Landscape and Visual Receptors to the west of the Site and that there is insufficient room on site to achieve this mitigation, which, in my opinion will need to be in the form of a 7-10 metre deep, dense native woodland tree belt. The Appellant has not identified sufficient space along the Site’s western edge to accommodate suitable mitigation requirements when also taking into account the requirements for housing and associated infrastructure as well as the requirements for landscape features such as SuDS and other landscape enhancements.

6. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The appeal site relates to the erection of up to 110 dwellings together with associated infrastructure including roadways, SuDS requirements and landscaping.
- 6.2 The appeal site is approximately 5.2 hectares in size and sits wholly within the Green Belt and an Area of Great Landscape Value.
- 6.3 My evidence addresses the effect of the development on landscape character, visual effect and landscape mitigation.
- 6.4 When considering levels of assessed harm, i.e. Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible, it is my opinion that both Major and Moderate are considered significant harm and will likely require substantial mitigation to limit this harm. It is also my opinion that some harms cannot be mitigated for.
- 6.5 I have considered a number of documents and plans produced by the Appellant including the LVIA (**CD1.7**), DAS (**CD1.6**), Landscape Statement Landscape Masterplan (**CD1.8**), and Parameters Plan (**CD1.23**). I also found that the Appellant had not produced a detailed landscape proposal to support the landscape mitigation and therefore it was not possible to fully assess the landscape mitigation in relation to harm.
- 6.6 Using the same methodology as set out within the LVIA (**CD1.7**), I assessed the proposed development at year 1 as causing significant harm requiring suitable mitigation measures to: UE3 Epsom Downs LCA, Langley Vale Centenary Woodland and its setting and CF3 Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland LCA.
- 6.7 Existing landscape features, including hedgerows, trees and native scrub growing adjacent to the upper slope of the Site and adjacent to the existing Langley Vale development will be retained on site, however, I do not consider those elements as contributing to landscape mitigation as they are already part of the landscape baseline and already contribute to landscape character. Proposed landscape enhancements and mitigation will introduce new features into an agrarian landscape which will detract from the existing landscape character.

- 6.8 When considering Landscape effect at year 15 and using the same methodology as set out within the LVIA (**CD1.7**), I assessed the proposed development, as causing significant harm to: 'UE3 Epsom Downs' LCA 'Site Setting and Overall Character' and 'CF3 Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland'
- 6.9 There are clear views across the site from the numerous PRowS situated to the west of the Site. Many of the views help to define the agrarian character of the site and that of the surrounding 'UE3 Epsom Downs Landscape Character Area', the adjacent CF3 'Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland' and the wider Area of Great Landscape Value.
- 6.10 The Appellant has identified 16 No. viewpoints, each accompanied with a panoramic photograph. These photographs are not annotated which would normally be expected for "Type 1" photographs, to give context to the viewer. The Appellant did not appear to fully assess their own Visual Receptors situated at the viewpoints on an individual basis.
- 6.11 The Appellant has identified 6 No. Visual Receptors which have been assessed for harm. The locations for these Visual Receptors have not been identified on any plan but described within the text associated with each Visual Receptor. Some of the Visual Receptors include a number of viewpoints which adds to confusion when assessing harm.
- 6.12 When considering Visual effect at year 1 and using the same methodology as set out within the LVIA (**CD1.7**), I assessed the proposed development as causing significant harm requiring suitable mitigation measures to the following Visual Receptors:
- Transient from Langley Vale Road to include Viewpoint 1
 - Transient from Bridleway 146 to include Viewpoint 3, 12
 - Transient from Bridleway 33 and Footpath 32 to include Viewpoints 4, 5, 6
 - Visitors of Langley Vale Centenary Wood
- 6.13 When considering Visual effect at year 15 and using the same methodology as set out within the LVIA (**CD1.7**), I assessed the proposed development as causing significant harm to the following Visual Receptors:

- Transient from Langley Vale Road to include Viewpoint 1
- Transient from Bridleway 146 to include Viewpoint 3, 12
- Transient from Bridleway 33 and Footpath 32 to include Viewpoints 4, 5, 6.

- 6.14 An outline landscape proposal is identified on the Appellant's Landscape Masterplan and Parameters Plan (**CD1.23**). A small area of landscape mitigation is proposed to the Site's southern edge. No further mitigation is included on any plan or identified within the LVIA. Landscape enhancements are proposed across the Site including the Site's western edge but landscape enhancements are not to be confused with landscape mitigation.
- 6.15 The Appellant has proposed landscape enhancements including tree planting, SuDS features and meadow along the Site's western edge. When assessing the Visual Receptors to the west of the Site for harm, it is my opinion that there is insufficient available space to mitigate for this harm.
- 6.16 There are currently clear views across the Site from PRow's to the north, west and south of the Site as well as from the Centenary Woodland to the west of the Site. The Site sits within the Green Belt and the proposed development would therefore impact the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.17 It is my opinion that as the proposed development will cause significant harm to the landscape character of the surrounding 'UE3 Epsom Downs' LCA, 'Langley Vale Centenary Wood and its setting' 'CF3 Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland' LCA and 'Site Setting and Overall Character' the proposed development will also cause significant harm to the surrounding Area of Great Landscape Value.

APPENDIX A: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT

Landscape Receptor	Sensitivity Judgement	Magnitude of Change				Significance			Mitigation Required
		Scale	Duration and Reversibility	Magnitude Judgement		Significance of Effect		Nature of Effect	
UE3 Epsom Downs LCA	Medium	Modest	Long	Year 1	Medium	Year 1	Moderate	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	Medium	Year 15	Moderate	Adverse	
Langley Vale Centenary Wood and its setting	Medium	Modest	Long	Year 1	Medium	Year 1	Moderate	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	Low	Year 15	Minor	Adverse	
Site Setting and Overall Character	High	Substantial	Long	Year 1	High	Year 1	Major	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	High	Year 15	Major	Adverse	
CF3 Leatherhead to Epsom Downs Open Chalk Farmland	Medium	Modest	Long	Year 1	Medium	Year 1	Moderate	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	Medium	Year 15	Moderate	Adverse	

APPENDIX B: VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Visual Receptor	Sensitivity Judgement	Magnitude of Change				Significance			Mitigation Required
		Scale	Duration and Reversibility	Magnitude Judgement		Significance of Effect		Nature of Effect	
Transient from Langley Vale Road to include Viewpoint 1	Medium-low	Substantial	Long	Year 1	High	Year 1	Major	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	High	Year 15	Major	Adverse	
Transient from Bridleway 146 to include Viewpoint 3, 12	Medium-high	Substantial	Long	Year 1	High	Year 1	Major	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	High	Year 15	Major	Adverse	
Transient from Bridleway 33 and Footpath 32 to include Viewpoints 4, 5, 6	Medium-high	Substantial	Long	Year 1	High	Year 1	Major	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	Moderate	Year 15	Moderate	Adverse	
Visitors of Langley Vale Centenary Wood	Medium-high	Sizeable	Long	Year 1	High	Year 1	Moderate	Adverse	Required
				Year 15	Medium	Year 15	Minor	Adverse	

APPENDIX C: EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH COUNCIL POLICIES MAP



Policies Map

