

Addendum to Review of Landscape and Visual Impacts

Waterbeach Waste Recovery Facility, Ely Road, Cambridge

Prepared by Michelle Bolger Expert Landscape Consultancy (MBELC)

For Cambridge Without Incineration (CBWIN)

September 2018

1. Following the submission of the above Review of Landscape and Visual Impacts. Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) forwarded the *Visualisation Methodology* submitted by the applicants which had not previously been available on CCC's website. The MBELC Review had criticised certain aspects of the photomontages, in particular that the photomontages needed to be printed at a larger size in order to give a realistic impression of how the Proposed Development would appear within the landscape.
2. In section 5 *Presentation and Viewing*, the *Visualisation Methodology* sets out the approach to how the photomontages should be viewed in paragraphs 1.5.3-1.5.5. It refers to the use of a 'viewing distance' and describes a method of viewing the photomontages which it is claimed will reflect '*the actual real-world perspective at the location the photograph was taken from*'¹.
3. However, the methodology itself accepts that the proposed viewing distance and method set out in 1.5.5 is '*both difficult and impractical*'² and recommends that it should be abandoned and the images '*simply viewed held flat at a comfortable arms distance*'³.
4. Scottish Natural Heritage (2017). *Visual Representation of Wind Farms. Version 2.2* is listed in the *Visualisation Methodology* as relevant good practice guidance. The SNH guidance identifies that the viewing distance method recommended in older guidance (such as that reference in this methodology at 1.5.3) does not achieve '*a realistic impression of how the Proposed Development would appear within the landscape*'⁴ which is the objective for a photomontage.

¹ *Visualisation Methodology* Paragraph 1.5.3

² *Visualisation Methodology* Paragraph 1.5.5

³ *Visualisation Methodology* Paragraph 1.5.6

⁴ *Visualisation Methodology* Paragraph 1.4.1

5. *Visual Representation of Wind Farms. Version 2.2* sets out the issues as follows:

‘Viewing distance

102. *In the previous (2006) version of this guidance it was recommended that images should be viewed at a correct “viewing distance” to recreate the correct perspective geometry of the view. However, viewing printed images at a ‘correct viewing distance’ is not easy, especially when provided as a cylindrical projection (which should be viewed curved). **More importantly, experience has shown that geometrically correct printed images, viewed at a theoretical viewing distance, do not necessarily portray the view as experienced by people in reality.***
103. *The method described below **results in significantly larger images**, for which an accurate viewing distance is less important. **The images are enlarged and this provides a better representation of the real view, at a comfortable viewing distance.***
104. *As a result, it is recommended that photomontages are simply viewed at a comfortable arm’s length. This will vary depending on the length of the viewer’s arms and their eyesight. However, the difference in viewing distance which results will have little impact on the impression of scale / depth in the image **due to the increased size of the images**. An instruction to view images at a ‘comfortable arm’s length’ should be included on all visualisations produced. They should also be viewed flat as they are in planar projection. (Emphasis added)⁵*
6. In summary, our criticisms as set out in the MBELC Review are confirmed by the *Visualisation Methodology* which acknowledges that the approach it advocates is *‘difficult and impractical’⁶*. There is a simple solution to the *‘difficult and impractical’* viewing distance method, identified in the SNH Guidance, which is to increase the size of the image.
7. If panoramas are considered necessary, they should be presented on paper that is wider than A3. A3 pages are however, capable of accommodating single frame images. Single Frame Photomontages would have been sufficient to illustrate the current *Proposed Development* and would have given a more accurate impression of how the development *‘would be experienced by people in reality’⁷*.

Michelle Bolger
11th September 2018

⁵ *Visual Representation of Wind Farms. Version 2.2 Paragraphs 102-104*

⁶ *Visualisation Methodology Paragraph 1.5.1*

⁷ *Visual Representation of Wind Farms. Version 2.2 Paragraph 102*