

Appendix 6.4 Residential Visual Amenity Study (RVAS)

Contents

Introduction	1
Discussion of Residential Visual Amenity in Relation to Wind Farms	1
Assessment Methodology	3
Properties within 2 km of the Proposed Turbines	6
Assessment of Effects	7

Figures

A6.4.1 RVAS Property Locations Within 2km

A6.4.2 Explanatory Illustration of terminology used to describe Angles of View

A6.4.3- 13 Plans showing Aerial Mapping of the Property Locations within 2km, with Measurements and Angles to turbines

Annexes

Annex A – 90 degree Wireframes of the Proposed Development from each property or group

Annex B – Photographic Record of Property Locations

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX 6.4 Residential Visual Amenity Study (RVAS)

Introduction

1. This appendix to the LVIA presents a detailed Residential Visual Amenity Study (RVAS) of the Proposed Development. It considers the potential visual effects of the Proposed Development experienced by residents of the nearest properties to the site (i.e. within 2 km of the proposed turbines locations). The RVAS identifies if any of these residents would experience a significant effect on any view from their property (the dwelling or its curtilage) during the operational period of the Proposed Development, and specifically details which views would be affected.
2. It is important to stress that this appendix solely considers the visual component of residential amenity and that any consideration of residential amenity in the broader sense must also take account of any noise and shadow flicker effects, which are addressed elsewhere within the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIA Report) (Chapters 9 and 15 respectively). Therefore, this RVAS does not comment on the acceptability of the Proposed Development: it does however provide a reasoned professional opinion on the likely visual effect on living conditions of the nearest residents.
3. It should be noted that this study is limited to a consideration of the potential visual impacts that residents might experience within their property, i.e. their dwelling and its curtilage. It is acknowledged that the occupiers of most dwellings experience the wider landscape in passing on a regular basis as they go about their day to day activities and that the components of this wider landscape also influence their broader sense of amenity. Residents of certain properties considered within this RVAS would most likely have views of the Proposed Development on a regular basis as they leave and approach their properties through the wider landscape.
4. It was beyond the scope of this study to determine trends in the day to day activities of the residents in the study area, or to define the features and qualities of the surrounding landscape which influence residents' broader amenity. Whilst not discounting this issue, based on previous wind farm appeal decisions, it appears that greatest weight is usually given to impacts on views from the dwelling itself and its curtilage, as these impacts are likely to have the greatest influence on living conditions. Beyond their property, residents are considered to experience visual effects as users of local roads, footpaths etc. These effects are assessed as such within the main Landscape and Visual Chapter.

Discussion of Residential Visual Amenity in Relation to Wind Farms

5. It is a long-held planning principle that there is no right to a view. However, it has been established through several previous wind farm appeal decisions that in certain circumstances wind turbines can have an overbearing, overwhelming or oppressive effect on residential visual amenity such that a property would become widely regarded to be an unattractive place in which to live. In these circumstances wind turbines can have a detrimental effect on living conditions which may not be in the public interest.
6. In Scotland, potentially due to the settlement pattern and encouragement towards wind farm developments in less populated areas, issues relating to wind farms and residential properties have not been as prominent as elsewhere in the UK. However, with the considered "exhaustion" of many of the most suitable wind farm sites, this issue is becoming increasingly relevant.

7. While the “Lavender Test” is not enshrined in any planning guidance in England or Wales, it has become a useful approach by inspectors there. Similarly, there is no reference to such a test in Scottish policy. Equally, there is no general practice in Scotland of describing other Reporters’ decisions in creating “tests”. The approach in Scotland is to identify factors which are not described as a “test”, and these factors have to be applied based on the particular circumstances of the case.

8. In his report on the St John’s Hill wind farm in Aberdeenshire, the Reporter, Malcolm Mahony, noted that there were 106 properties located within 1km of the nearest turbines, and concluded:

“Because views from within the site and from outside it tends to be of a panoramic nature, the windfarm, even though it spreads over a length of some 3km, would occupy only a restricted part of those views and not dominate them.”

9. With regard to visual impacts from residential properties he stated:

“I have looked carefully at the visual impact of the scheme from individual properties in the vicinity and I am not persuaded that it is unacceptable due to the factors which I have already outlined.” (APP/2004/4666)

10. In the Achany decision in Highland, the Reporter, Janet McNair, stated that although a significant impact on the residential amenity of residential properties may be experienced ***“Deciding whether these impacts are significantly detrimental is a matter of judgement”*** and she went on to state that although the properties in question were located within 3km of the proposed *development* ***“the turbines would be far enough away from houses not to be overbearing or dominant”*** concluding that ***“the appeal proposal would have a significant impact on some views from some properties. However, significant impacts are not necessarily unacceptable and I conclude that its impacts on residential amenity overall would not be significantly detrimental.” (PPA/270/438)***

11. The Scottish Ministers’ decision letter for Afton wind farm contains the following statement:

“With regards to impacts on residential properties, Ministers agree with the assessment in the ES and subsequent SEI3 and consider that that the Development would not result in any overbearing visual effects on residential amenity to a degree that any property might be considered an unattractive place in which to live.”

12. This decision letter of the Scottish Ministers has a higher status than an individual Reporter’s decision and represents a position of government rather than an individual Reporter.

13. The application for the Harelaw Renewable Energy Park was another Section 36 application. Although it was refused, the Reporter at paragraph 8.51 made the following statement:

“I have used ‘locations’ rather than ‘properties’ in the preceding paragraph because I note from the Residential Visual Assessment and also from information provided by Mr and Mrs McGeoch’s landscape consultant that some locations contain more than one property. These are 42 East Hareshaw – three, 55 Pebblebank – two, 64 Corsehouse Farm – two and 36 not named – a terrace, number unknown. Furthermore, in the assessment of whether there would be a significant impact the Residential Visual Assessment includes as ‘significant’ properties that are lived in by people who are financially involved in the proposed development (16 Townhead of Floak, 18 Mid Floak, 66 Driffenbeg, 75 Gabroc Hill). I have disregarded properties which have a financial involvement, as I consider residents in those properties would be willing to suffer a diminution in their residential amenity because of the financial benefit they would gain.”

14. Again, this report was adopted by the Scottish Ministers.

15. More recently, in August 2018, in relation to the proposed Lurgiescleuch Wind Farm near Hawick, a reporter stated the following in allowing the appeal for 7 turbines up to 149.9m to blade tip:
- “Whilst planning law is not intended to protect the view from individual properties, it is generally accepted that it would not be in the public interest for a development to create unacceptable living conditions at a dwelling. Various tests have been applied in these circumstances, but my attention has been drawn, in particular, to that accepted by the Scottish Ministers with regard to their decision on a section 36 application at Afton Wind Farm in East Ayrshire in 2014. Here the Ministers considered whether the development would result in “overbearing visual effects on residential amenity to a degree that any property might be considered an unattractive place in which to live.” With this test in mind, I have looked at those dwellings within two kilometres of the appeal site, other than those which would have limited or no visibility of the turbines... I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not result in a situation where the above test would be failed at any of those properties”.*

Assessment Methodology

16. There is no specific guidance for the production of residential visual amenity studies. The study has therefore been undertaken using a methodology developed by Pegasus Group under the overarching guidelines for LVIA namely *The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition* (2013) Landscape Institute and the Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment.
17. In accordance with the above guidelines, and in common with the assessment criteria presented at Appendix 6.1 of the LVIA, the level of visual effect experienced in any given view is ascertained by considering in tandem the sensitivity of the baseline visual receptor and magnitude of change in the view as a result of the Proposed Development. Professional judgement is then employed to determine whether the effect is significant or not, although this is still based within a recognised framework in line with existing LVIA guidance.
18. The LVIA assessment criteria used by Pegasus Group acknowledges that different receptor groups (e.g. residents, users of public rights of way, people at their place of work) have varying degrees of sensitivity to change in the view. It is generally accepted that residents are of high sensitivity to change in their view. However, this is an over simplification of a more complex issue as residents are generally considered to be more sensitive to changes in the views from certain rooms such as the primary day time living rooms (e.g. lounge, dining room, kitchen or conservatory) than rooms such as bedrooms, bathrooms or utility rooms. Similarly, residents are usually more sensitive to changes in the view from certain parts of their garden or curtilage than others.
19. For the purposes of this residential visual amenity study the sensitivity of residential receptors is further clarified as follows:

Low Sensitivity

- Views from utility rooms, bathrooms etc.
- Views from parts of a curtilage with a purely functional purpose (e.g. storage areas, parking areas) and land worked as part of a business.

Medium Sensitivity

- Views from hallways, stairwells, bedrooms and study/office rooms.

- Views from part of a curtilage used less frequently (e.g. distant parts of a large garden) or where the activity is focussed on a gardening activity rather than its surroundings (e.g. vegetable plots).

High Sensitivity

- Views from primary living rooms of a property such as a lounge, dining room, kitchen or conservatory.
- Views from heavily frequented parts of a garden where an appreciation of the surroundings is fundamental to an enjoyment of the space (e.g. patio, seating areas, lawn areas immediately surrounding a house).

20. The LVIA assessment criteria presented in Appendix 6.1 of the LVIA acknowledges that certain visual receptors may also be regarded to be of very high or very low sensitivity to change in outlook. However, in this RVAS it is considered that residential receptors are never deemed as being of very high nor very low sensitivity irrespective of their location within their property or its curtilage.
21. Visual impacts are caused by the introduction of new elements into the views of a landscape or the removal of elements in the existing view.
22. Professional judgement, justified and clearly set out, has been used to determine the magnitude of change using the following criteria as guidance only:

Very Low Magnitude of Change

- No change or negligible change in views;

Low Magnitude of Change

- Some change in the view that is not prominent but visible to some visual receptors;

Medium Magnitude of Change

- Some change in the view that is clearly notable in the view and forms an easily identifiable component in the view;

High Magnitude of Change

- A major change in the view that is highly prominent and has a strong influence on the overall view;

Very High Magnitude of Change

- A change in the view that has a dominating or overbearing influence on the overall view.

23. In general, the magnitude of visual change on residential properties is likely to be greater with closer proximity to the turbines. However, distance from the nearest proposed turbine is only one of the factors that needs to be taken into account when determining the magnitude of visual change on any given view from a residential property. Other modifying factors include:

- Whether the view of the turbines is in a direct or oblique angle from the primary orientation of the view (as explained illustratively in Figure A6.4.2);
- The extent to which the view is obstructed or filtered by vegetation, landform or built structures;
- The extent to which the current view is influenced by existing built structures (e.g. buildings, roads, pylons);

- The difference in elevation between the property and the base of the nearest turbine;
 - The horizontal and vertical field of view which is occupied by turbines;
 - The spacing or relative clustering of the turbines in the view;
 - The scale and openness of the receiving landscape; and
 - The availability of other features in the view, which provide a comparison of scale and perspective.
24. As previously indicated, the level of the visual effect experienced in any given view is determined by considering in tandem the sensitivity of the view with the magnitude of change. In this RVAS, a professional judgement is then provided as to whether the level of effect identified is significant or not.
25. The level of effect is described as either ‘**major**’, ‘**major/moderate**’, ‘**moderate**’, ‘**moderate/minor**’, ‘**minor**’ or ‘**minor/no effect**’. ‘No effect’ may be recorded where the effect is negligible.
26. In this RVAS, those effects described as major, major/moderate and in some cases moderate, are identified as ‘significant’ effects as required by the *Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017*.
27. The assessment presented within this RVAS is based on information Pegasus has been able to gather from aerial photographs and from publicly accessible locations in the surrounding landscape.
28. For each property, or group of properties, within 2 km, the following information was gathered through a combination of desk study and site visits:
- Name of property;
 - Approximate grid reference of property;
 - General direction of views from the property to the nearest turbine;
 - Distance from the house to the turbines;
 - Elevation of property (AOD);
 - Elevation at base of the nearest turbine to the property (AOD);
 - Number of floors within the property;
 - Orientation of the main elevations of the property;
 - Angle of the turbines in the view from each facade or part of the curtilage with a view of the development (as explained illustratively in Annex 1);
 - A record of any intervening obstructions (e.g. screening from vegetation, landform or built structures);
 - A record of any built structures which influence the outlook;
 - A record of any other features in the foreground view which provide a comparison of scale; and
 - The availability of other views from the property that are not affected by the development.
29. Where a distance between a residential property and a turbine is provided in the RVAS, the figure given is an approximate measurement between the centre point of the turbine tower and the closest part of the building in question, and not the closest part of the curtilage, which in many cases would be difficult to define.

30. Defining the limits of private gardens can be subjective, and considering the view from all corners of any individual garden is not possible. Therefore, this assessment records what is considered to be the worst-case scenario from gardens. Where a property is set back from the public road along an access track that extends beyond the curtilage of the property, views on approach and departure from the property are also assessed.
31. In the case of each property, once the potential for significant visual effects to arise has been considered, an overall judgement has been reached about whether the residents of the property would experience such an overbearing effect on visual amenity that the property would be regarded to be an unattractive place to live when considered 'in the round'.
32. When considering the overall effect of the development on the visual amenity of residents of any given property 'in the round' it is also necessary to take into account the availability of other views from the property which would not be affected by the Proposed Development.

Properties within 2km of the Proposed Turbines

33. Table A6.4.1 below identifies the residential properties which lie within 2km of the proposed turbine locations of the Proposed Development, or in some cases just over 2km, where the properties lies close to the detailed study area boundary. Each of the properties or property groups has been assigned a property reference number as indicated in Table A6.4.1. The location of these properties is illustrated in Figure A6.4.1 while a Photographic Record of each property is presented in Annex B.

Table A6.4.1 - Properties within 2 km of the Proposed Turbines

ID:	Property/Group Name:	Nearest Turbine	Approx. Distance to Nearest Turbine	Approx. Direction to Wind Farm
1	<i>Monkshead Farm*</i>	-	-	-
2	Debog Farm	T1	1,985m	North-east
3	Shielpark	T1	1,955m	North-east
4	Monksfoot	T1	1,040m	North
5	The Shieling	T1	1,131m	North
6	Inches Cottage	T1	1,131m	North
7	<i>Low Broomerside*</i>	-	-	-
8	Carmacoup Farm Cottage	T2	1,800m	North
9	Carmacoup Farm	T2	1,868m	North
10	Viaduct Cottage	T2	1,766m	North
11	Bungalow Cottage	T3	1,989m	North
12	Longhouse Cottage	T3	1,750m	North
13	2 Braeface Cottage	T3	1,694m	North
14	1 Braeface Cottage	T3	1,694m	North

ID:	Property/Group Name:	Nearest Turbine	Approx. Distance to Nearest Turbine	Approx. Direction to Wind Farm
15	Properties on Driverholm Terrace	T3	1,673m	North
16	Properties on Ayr Road	T3	1,687m	North-west
17	Properties on Hillview Crescent	T3	1,663m	North-west
18	Tablestone	T3	1,736m	North-west
19	<i>Properties at Hazelside Farm**</i>	T6	2,044m	North-west
20	<i>Hazelside**</i>	T6	2,082m	North-west
21	<i>Hazelside Lodge**</i>	T6	2,230m	North-west
22	Station House	T6	2,239m	South-west
23	<i>Blackwood Cottage**</i>	T6	2,191m	South-west

**It is understood that Property 1 Monkshead Farm is abandoned and no longer forms a residential property and that Property 7 Low Broomerside is owned by the Applicant and will be taken out of residential use.*

***It is acknowledged that Properties 19-21 and 23 are owned by the Applicant and have an involvement in the scheme. However, for the purposes of this RVAS all properties have been assessed in the same manner irrespective of any involvement or otherwise.*

Assessment of Effects

34. The following section presents the information gathered through field survey and desktop study, and provides detailed analysis and discussion of the effects on visual amenity likely to be experienced during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, for each property or group of properties, within 2 km.
35. The assessment of effects states the worst-case scenario (winter views) unless otherwise stated but vegetative screening is discussed when it is likely that this will make a considerable difference to the visual effect between seasons. Figures A6.4.3 to A6.4.13 illustrate aerial imagery alongside the horizontal extent and various distances between each property and the proposed wind turbines.

Property 1 - Monkshead Farm

36. Monkshead Farm lies to the west of the wind farm site, accessed via a long track running adjacent to Monks Water. It is understood that the farm is abandoned and no longer forms a residential property. There would therefore be no effect on residential amenity at this location.

Properties 2 and 3 - Debog Farm and Shielpark

37. Debog Farm and Shielpark lie adjacent to each other in a small steading, just off the A70 to the south-west of the site, around 2km from the nearest Proposed Development turbine. The properties lie on the lower slopes of Sheil Hill, towards the foot of the Douglas Water valley through which the A70 runs in an east-west orientation. The properties are aligned such that their primary orientation faces southwards, across the valley and away from the Proposed Development. Any potential for views of the turbines from windows which do allow views towards the north-east, would be partly obscured by the

topography of Sheil Hill and also Strawberry Hill (on which part of the operational Galawhistle Wind Farm is located) which lie between the properties and the site.

38. As demonstrated in the wireframes included at Annex A, there would be the potential for views of no more than a few blade tips of the proposed turbines, lying beyond the existing Galawhistle turbines, the nearest of which would lie towards the summit of Strawberry Hill. It is therefore considered there would be no more than a minor effect on the visual amenity of the properties.

Property 4 - Monksfoot

39. Monksfoot lies just to the north of the A70, adjacent to the Monks Water, south of Strawberry Hill. It is located south-west of the site, with the nearest turbine just over 1km away. The primary orientation of the property faces south-east away from the site towards the A70, with the rear elevation is oriented in the direction of a number of the existing Galawhistle turbines. There is one small window on the north-eastern orientation of the property which would have a direct view towards the proposed turbines, with one turbine (T1) a notable feature in the view, alongside the existing Galawhistle turbines, as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A. In the context of the primary orientation of the property being away from the site and the existing views of the Galawhistle turbines it is therefore considered there would be no more than a moderate effect on the visual amenity of the property, which would not be significant.

Properties 5 and 6 - The Shieling and Inches Cottage

40. The Shieling and Inches Cottage are two properties within one building, just to the north of the A70 where it crosses the Monks Water, to the south of the site. The properties are orientated on a north-south alignment, with their garden areas to the rear. The front facing aspect looks across a flat open area at the base of Strawberry Hill, periodically used for grazing sheep and until relatively recently the location of a set of rugby posts. Three existing Galawhistle turbines, at the top of Strawberry Hill, form a notable element of the view from the properties, with further Galawhistle turbines visible more obliquely to the north-west of Hareshaw Hill.
41. The nearest Proposed Development turbine lies around 1.1km away and would also lie above the lower slopes of Strawberry Hill which run down into the foreground of the view. As demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, the turbines would form a notable element of the view, but in the context of the existing Galawhistle turbines, would not introduce a new feature which was not already an existing element of the experience from the properties. Given the orientation of the front of the properties is towards the site it is considered there would be a major effect on the visual amenity of the properties, which would be significant. However, in the context of the distance of the properties from the nearest turbine and as the turbines would appear to clearly relate to the landscape beyond the foreground, which screens out much of the development from view, it is not considered that there would be such a degree of effect that could be considered to be overbearing on the amenity of the residents.

Property 7 - Low Broomerside

42. Low Broomerside lies to the south of the Proposed Development site, accessed via a long track running north-east from the A70. It is understood that the property is owned by the Applicant and will be taken out of residential use prior to commencement of the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no effect on residential amenity at this location.

Properties 8 and 9 - Carmacoup Farm Cottage and Carmacoup Farm

43. Carmacoup Farm Cottage and Carmacoup Farm lie a short distance apart to the south of the A70 alongside the Douglas Water. The primary orientation of both properties is to the north across the valley bottom and beyond towards Longhouse Hill. Carmacoup Farm Cottage is a smaller, single storey

dwelling, whilst Carmacoup Farm is a larger two story property. The views towards the site from Carmacoup Farm Cottage would be from the front doorway and two windows, with the views from Carmacoup Farm being from two windows on each floor, the doorway not being on the front aspect of the property. The Proposed Development turbines would be partly visible from the two properties, with the nearest lying around 1.8km away. As demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, the tops of the turbines (including some hubs and the tower of T1) would be seen above and partly screened by Longhouse Hill and would form a notable element of the view.

44. Given the orientation of the properties is towards the site it is considered there would be a major/moderate effect on the visual amenity of the properties, which would be significant. However, in the context of the distance of the properties from the nearest turbine and as the landscape in the foreground screens out much of the Proposed Development from view, it is not considered that there would be such a degree of effect that could be considered to be overbearing on the amenity of the residents.

Property 10 - Viaduct Cottage

45. Viaduct Cottage is a small single storey dwelling located immediately adjacent to the A70, 1.7km to the south of the site. The property lies at the foot of the steep southern slope of Longhouse Hill which serves to fully screen any potential views of the turbines. There would therefore be no effect on residential amenity at this location.

Property 11 - Bungalow Cottage

46. Bungalow Cottage lies just to the south of the A70, near to the entrance to the former Glentaggart Opencast coal site, around 1km to the west of Glespin. The single storey property is orientated northwards towards the site, however as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, the topography of Longhouse Hill, which lies between the property and the site, serves to screen all but the very ends of the blade tips of three turbines, which in practice would be highly unlikely to be noticeable during day to day use of the property. There would therefore be a negligible effect on residential amenity at this location.

Property 12 - Longhouse Cottage

47. Longhouse Cottage is a single storey dwelling located at the westernmost extent of Glespin, immediately to the north of the A70. The property lies towards the foot of the south-eastern slope of Longhouse Hill which, as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, would serve to fully screen any potential views of the turbines. There would therefore be no effect on residential amenity at this location.

Properties 13 and 14 - 1 and 2 Braeface Cottage

48. Numbers 1 and 2 Braeface Cottage are two semi-detached properties, located on the northside of the A70, towards the western end of Glespin. The properties are orientated on a north-south alignment such that, their front aspect faces south, away from the turbines, with the rear and garden areas to the north. The properties lie on the south-eastern slope of Longhouse Hill, which rises sharply to the rear and would serve to screen the majority of the turbines, which lie around 1.7km to the north west. As demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframes included at Annex A, there would be no more than the end of the blade tips of a small number of turbines visible from either property and these may be screened in reality by vegetation in the rear gardens. There would therefore be no more than a minor effect on residential amenity at these properties.

15 - Properties on Driverholm Terrace

49. Driverholm Terrace is the name given to the western extent of the A70 as it passes through Glespin. The area currently includes a small number of properties, to south of the road with a previously consented development site which is currently unbuilt out, to the north. The former primary school lies adjacent on the northside of the road, where approval was granted for residential use in 2017. This area of Glespin lies towards the south-eastern slope of Longhouse Hill, which rises sharply to the north. This landform would serve to screen the majority of the turbines, which lie around 1.7km to the north west, as is demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A. There would be no more than the end of the blade tips of a small number of turbines visible from the small number of properties in this area and these may be screened in reality by other buildings or vegetation in the foreground. There would therefore be no more than a minor effect on residential amenity at these properties.

16 - Properties on Ayr Road

50. Ayr Road, is the name given to the A70 as it runs through Glespin and Group 16 represents a collection of around 15 properties located on the north side of the road towards the centre of the settlement. The landform to the rear of the properties, in the direction of the site, rises sharply which serves to limit the potential for views of the turbines. As is demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, views of the turbines would generally be limited to the blade tips of a small number of turbines, with no turbine hubs or towers visible. It is acknowledged that from the upper storey of the rear of the properties, there would be slightly greater visibility, but at a distance of around 1.7km from the properties and mostly screened by existing landform, the turbines would be a notable element of the view, but not one which was dominant.
51. Given there would be no view from the front aspect of the properties and views from rear gardens and ground floor windows are likely to be screened by rear garden fencing and vegetation, it is considered there would be no more than a minor effect on the visual amenity of these properties which would not be significant.

17 - Properties on Hillview Crescent

52. Hillview Crescent lies to the north of the A70, Ayr Road, at the eastern end of Glespin. As suggested by its name the road faces directly on to the sharply sloping hillside which lies between the settlement and the site and which serves to severely limit the potential for views of the turbines. As demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, there would be no more than the end of the blade tips of a small number of turbines visible from any windows within the properties which face northwards. There would therefore be no more than a minor effect on residential amenity at these properties. It is understood that three of the properties on Hillview Crescent which are under the ownership of South Lanarkshire Council are also due to be demolished in the near future.

Property 18 - Tablestone

53. Tablestone is a one and half storey dwelling, access directly off the A70, Ayr Road, at the eastern end of Glespin. The primary orientation of the property is to the south, across the Douglas Water valley, away from the proposed turbines. Views towards the site would be from rear facing windows, which look through the gaps between the properties on the adjacent Hillview Crescent and then towards the sharply sloping hillside beyond. As demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, there would be no more than the end of the blade tips of a small number of turbines visible from the property. There would therefore be no more than a minor effect on residential amenity at this location.

19-21 - Properties at Hazelside Farm and Hazelside Lodge

54. The Hazelside Farm cluster of properties, lie off a private access track to the north of the A70, around 1km to the east of Glespin. In addition to the properties in the farm complex, there is one further property, Hazelside Lodge, which lies at the entrance adjacent to the A70.
55. Hazelside Lodge is orientated such that its primary views are across the Douglas Water valley, away from the proposed turbines. To the rear of the property, in the direction of the site, are mature trees which prevent any potential visibility of the turbines. There would be no effects on the visual amenity of this property.
56. Hazelside is a large dwelling, adjacent to the farm steading. The primary orientation of the property is also across the Douglas Water valley, away from the proposed turbines and like Hazelside Lodge is bounded by mature vegetation which would limit the potential for views of the proposed turbines. Where glimpsed views were possible, the existing Hagshaw Hill Extension turbines would already be an existing feature of the view, but as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, the proposed turbines would be clearly apparent on the hillside at a distance of around 2km. Given the primary orientation of the property is away from the site, and with regard to the vegetation screening to the rear, it is considered there would be no more than a moderate effect on the visual amenity of the properties, which would not be significant.
57. The other residential property at Hazelside Farm has less vegetation screening between it and the site, although views would be partly screened by other farm buildings within the steading. Where views of the proposed turbines would be available from the property the existing Hagshaw Hill Extension turbines would already be an existing feature of the view, however as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A, the proposed turbines would be clearly apparent on the hillside at a distance of around 2km. It is considered there would be a 'worst-case' major effect on the visual amenity of the property, which would be significant. However, in the context of the distance of the property from the nearest turbine, and the broad open landscape between the turbines and the property, it is not considered that there would be such a degree of effect that could be considered to be overbearing on the amenity of the residents.
58. It is also acknowledged that the properties at Hazelside Farm and Hazelside Lodge are all owned by the Applicant and have an involvement in the scheme.

22 - Station House

59. This property is a bungalow, with all windows located on the ground floor. Existing vegetation currently provides screening of a number of the Hagshaw Hill Extension turbines, but as demonstrated in the bare-earth wireframe included at Annex A it is acknowledged that there would be the potential for views of the majority of the proposed turbines from those windows which allow a view to the west. The conservatory which provides views in a north north-easterly direction would however have no views of the Proposed Development.
60. It is considered there would be a 'worst-case' major effect on the visual amenity of the property, which would be significant. However, in the context of the distance of the properties from the nearest turbine, and the broad open landscape between the turbines and the property, it is not considered that there would be such a degree of effect that could be considered to be overbearing on the amenity of the residents.

23 - Blackwood Cottage

61. This property is a two storey cottage with a conservatory. The primary orientation is to the north-west, such that any views towards the site from the front facing aspect would be oblique. The conservatory, lies on the north and northwest corner of the property such that the site would not be visible. Vegetation to the west of the property would offer substantial screening of views towards the turbines

such that there would be no potential for any more than a minor effect of the visual amenity of the residents.

62. It is also acknowledged that the property is owned by the Applicant and has an involvement in the scheme.

Summary and Conclusion

63. Table A6.4.2 summarises the predicted worst-case level of effect on visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development, from any view from the house and curtilage of each assessed property or group within 2 km of the nearest proposed turbine. The table also indicates if any of these effects are considered to be significant.

Table A6.4.2: Summary of Effects on Visual Amenity

ID:	Property Name:	Worst case effect from Within the Property	Worst case effect from Curtilage	Significant	Overbearing
1	Monkshead Farm*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	Debog Farm	Minor	Minor	No	No
3	Shielpark	Minor	Minor	No	No
4	Monksfoot	Moderate	Moderate	No	No
5	The Shieling	Major	Major	Yes	No
6	Inches Cottage	Major	Major	Yes	No
7	Low Broomerside*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8	Carmacoup Farm Cottage	Major/moderate	Major/moderate	Yes	No
9	Carmacoup Farm	Major/moderate	Major/moderate	Yes	No
10	Viaduct Cottage	No effect	No effect	No	No
11	Bungalow Cottage	Negligible	Negligible	No	No
12	Longhouse Cottage	No effect	No effect	No	No
13	2 Braeface Cottage	Minor	Minor	No	No
14	1 Braeface Cottage	Minor	Minor	No	No
15	Properties on Driverholm Terrace	Minor	Minor	No	No

ID:	Property Name:	Worst case effect from Within the Property	Worst case effect from Curtilage	Significant	Overbearing
16	Properties on Ayr Road	Minor	Minor	No	No
17	Properties on Hillview Crescent	Minor	Minor	No	No
18	Tablestone	Minor	Minor	No	No
19	<i>Property at Hazelside Farm**</i>	Major	Major	Yes	No
20	<i>Hazelside**</i>	Moderate	Moderate	No	No
21	<i>Hazelside Lodge**</i>	No effect	No effect	No	No
22	Station House	Major	Major	Yes	No
23	<i>Blackwood Cottage**</i>	Minor	Minor	No	No

**It is understood that Property 1 Monkshead Farm is abandoned and no longer forms a residential property and that Property 7 Low Broomerside is owned by the Applicant and will be taken out of residential use.*

***It is acknowledged that Properties 19-21 and 23 are owned by the Applicant and have an involvement in the scheme. However, for the purposes of this RVAS all properties have been assessed in the same manner irrespective of any involvement or otherwise.*

64. Having undertaken a thorough assessment of the relationship between the Proposed Development and the residential properties located within, or just over, 2km of the proposed wind turbine locations, it is concluded that when the experience from each property is considered in the round, the residents of no occupied property would experience such an overbearing or overwhelming effect on their visual amenity that their properties would become unattractive places in which to live. The views available from the properties would remain such that the turbines would not prevent an appreciation or understanding of the underlying landscape context.