HELIOS RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT

PINS Document Number:
EN010140/APP/6.1.7

Pursuant to:
APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Landscape and Views

June 2024

7. Landscape and Views

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) reports on the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on the environment with respect to landscape and views that has been undertaken.

7.1.2. This chapter has been prepared by an experienced landscape architect at SLR Consulting Ltd, a registered practice of the UK Landscape Institute. In accordance with best practice, judgements have been reviewed and agreed with another experienced landscape architect.

7.1.3. This chapter describes the planning policy framework relevant to landscape and visual amenity matters; the assessment methodology; the baseline conditions of the Site and its wider surroundings; the likely significant environmental effects; the additional mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant negative (adverse) effects; the likely residual effects after these measures have been employed (both primary and secondary); and the likely cumulative effects with other schemes.

7.1.4. As Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (November 2023) [1] ('NPS EN-1') states at paragraph 5.10.5, *'virtually all national significant energy infrastructure projects will have effects on the landscape'*. Similarly, as paragraph 5.10.13 of EN-1 states, *'all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites'*. It is for these reasons that paragraph 5.10.16 of EN-1 states that *'the applicant should carry out a landscape and visual assessment and report it in the ES'*.

7.1.5. This chapter should be read in conjunction with the following Appendices:

- **Appendix 7.1: LVIA Methodology [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.1] C**riteria and Definitions used in Assessing Landscape and Visual Effects, which sets out the

[1] Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (November 2023) Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) National Infrastructure Planning, Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65bbfbdc709fe1000f637052/overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf. Accessed June 2024

methodology for this assessment;

- **Appendix 7.2: Type 3 Visualisations – Methodology and Survey Data [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.2];**
- **Appendix 7.3: Viewpoint Correspondence [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.3];**
- **Appendix 7.4: Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4];**
- **Appendix 7.5: Site Appraisal Photographs [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.5];**
- **Appendix 7.6 Representative Views [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.6];**
- **Appendix 7.7: Visualisation [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.7];**
- **Appendix 7.8: Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]; and**
- **Appendix 7.9: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9].**

7.1.6. The following Figures support this chapter:

- **Figure 7.1: Context and Designations Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1];**
- **Figure 7.2: Topography Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.2];**
- **Figure 7.3: Landscape Character Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.3];**
- **Figure 7.4: Site Appraisal Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.4];**
- **Figure 7.5: Tranquillity Plan[EN010140/APP/6.2.7.5];**
- **Figure 7.6: Solar Panels ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.6];**
- **Figure 7.7: Substation and BESS ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.7]**
- **Figure 7.8: Solar Panels ZTV – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.8];**
- **Figure 7.9: Substation and BESS ZTV – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.9];**
- **Figure 7.10: Solar Panels and Substation/BESS combined ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.10];**
- **Figure 7.11: Solar Panels and Substation/BESS combined ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.11];**
- **Figure 7.12: Viewpoint Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.12];**

- **Figure 7.13.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Solar Farm on Land South of A645 – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.13.1];**
- **Figure 7.13.2 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Solar Farm on Land South of A645 – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.13.2];**
- **Figure 7.14.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and East Yorkshire Solar Farm – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.14.1];**
- **Figure 7.14.2 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and East Yorkshire Solar Farm – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.14.2];**
- **Figure 7.15.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.15.1];**
- **Figure 7.15.2 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.15.2];**
- **Figure 7.16.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Battery Energy Storage Facility, Drax – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.16.1];**
- **Figure 7.17.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Solar Farm, Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.17.2];**
- **Figure 7.17.2 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Solar Farm, Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.17.1];**
- **Figure 7.18.1 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Converter Station East of New Road, Drax – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.18.1];**
- **Figure 7.18.2 – Cumulative ZTV, Proposed Development and Converter Station East of New Road, Drax – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.18.2];**
- **Figure 7.19: Landscape Strategy – Overall Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.19];**
- **Figure 7.20: Landscape Strategy Plan Sheet 1 of 3; [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.20];**

- **Figure 7.21: Landscape Strategy Plan Sheet 2 of 3; [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.21];**
- **Figure 7.22: Landscape Strategy Plan Sheet 3 of 3: [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.22];**
- **Figure 7.23: Landscape Strategy Schedules and Notes [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.23];**
- **Figure 7.24: Illustrative Landscape Masterplan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.24];**
- **Figure 7.25 - Illustrative Landscape Sections – Section 1: A1041 to Chestercourt Lane, North-West of Camblesforth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.25]; and**
- **Figure 7.26 - Illustrative Landscape Sections – Section 2: South-West Edge of Camblesforth at Mill Lane to Site [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26].**

7.1.7. An initial study area for the purposes of desk studies and field surveys was set at 5km from the Site boundary. This was subsequently refined to the study area for this assessment, which broadly equates to the extents of the landscape shown on **Figure 7.1: Context and Designations Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1]**. Further information is set out in section 7.3 'Assessment Methodology' of the chapter.

7.2. Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policy

Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), (DESNZ, November 2023, designated January 2024)

7.2.1. Paragraph 3.3.63 includes reference to the need to apply the mitigation hierarchy to proposed developments, setting out that *'Subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP Infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP Infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible.'* The mitigation hierarchy has been applied in relation to landscape visual receptors, with this evident in the way in which the site area has evolved to reduce effects on local residents (see **Figure 4.2, Design Evolution Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]**) and the landscape

strategy, which is an integral part of the Proposed Development.

7.2.2. Paragraph 5.10.1 of EN-1 states that *'the landscape and visual effects of energy projects will vary on a case by case basis according to the type of development, its location and the landscape setting of the proposed development. In this context, references to landscape should be taken as covering seascape and townscape where appropriate'*.

7.2.3. Paragraph 5.10.4 set out the need to take account of sensitivity and magnitude of change; *'landscape effects arise not only from the sensitivity of the landscape but also the nature and magnitude of change proposed by the development, whose specific siting and design make the assessment a case-by-case judgement'*. This consideration of sensitivity and magnitude is integral to the approach taken in this assessment.

7.2.4. Paragraph 5.10.5 identifies *'virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation'*. This is reflected in the landscape and visual impact assessment, which recgnises the effects of the Proposed Development, together with the positive contribution resulting from the landscape strategy for the Site.

7.2.5. Paragraph 5.10.6 sets out the need for careful design of proposed development, with specific reference to landscape impacts, identifying that *'Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate'*. This is an integral part of the Proposed Development, reflected in the proposed landscape strategy.

7.2.6. Paragraph 5.10.7 reflects the importance of nationally designated landscapes, setting out that '*National Parks, the Broads and AONBs have been confirmed by the government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and natural beauty. Each of these designated areas has specific statutory purposes. Projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints'*. The Site is not located within or close to any National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (also known as National Landscapes). Therefore, this is not relevant to the Proposed Development.

7.2.7. Paragraph 5.10.12 identifies the potential for locally valued landscapes, stating that *'outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes that may be highly valued locally. Where a local development document in England or a local development plan in Wales has policies based on landscape or waterscape character assessment, these should be paid particular attention. However, locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development'*. Consideration of landscape value is an integral part of the methodology applied in the assessment.

7.2.8. Paragraph 5.10 13 states *'All proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites'*.

7.2.9. Paragraph 5.10.14 goes on to identify that *'the Secretary of State will have to judge whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents, and other receptors, such as visitors to the local area, outweigh the benefits of the project'*.

7.2.10. This chapter of the ES comprises a landscape and visual impact assessment for the Proposed Development, which follows relevant an up to date guidance, meeting the requirement of paragraph 5.10.16: *'the applicant should carry out a landscape and visual impact assessment and report it in the ES, including cumulative effects (see Section 4.3). Several guides have been produced to assist in addressing landscape issues'*.

7.2.11. Published landscape character assessments and consideration of local policies form an integral part of this landscape and visual impact assessment, which follows the approach set out in paragraph 5.10.17: *'the landscape and visual assessment should include reference to any landscape character assessment and associated studies as a means of assessing landscape impacts relevant to the proposed project. The applicant's assessment should also take account of any relevant policies based on these assessments in local development documents in England and local development plans in Wales'*.

7.2.12. Paragraph 5.10.20 states that *'the assessment should include the effects on landscape components and character during construction and operation'*. This chapter includes an assessment of the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the project.

7.2.13. Paragraph 5.10.21 states *'the assessment should include the visibility and*

conspicuousness of the project during construction and of the presence and operation of the project and potential impacts on views and visual amenity. This should include light pollution effects, including on dark skies, local amenity, and nature conservation'. The visibility and potential conspicuousness of the Proposed Development is a key consideration throughout the assessment. No permanent lighting is required as part of the Proposed Development, therefore this has not been a consideration.

7.2.14. Paragraph 5.10.22 identifies that *'the assessment should also address the landscape and visual effects of noise and light pollution, and other emissions (see Section 5.2 and Section 5.7), from construction and operational activities on residential amenity and on sensitive locations, receptors and views, how these will be minimised'*. The Proposed Development does not include permanent lighting, there this has not been considered as part of the assessment. Noise has been factored into the assessment where considered relevant.

7.2.15. Paragraph 5.10.26 states that *'reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design of a proposed energy infrastructure project may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function – for example, electricity generation output. There may, however, be exceptional circumstances, where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in function. In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that the benefits of the mitigation to reduce the landscape and/or visual effects outweigh the marginal loss of function'*. The Applicant has reduced the overall extent of the Proposed Development, including specific consideration of local residents. This is reflected in the **Figure 4.2, Design Evolution Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]** of the ES. In addition, the proposed landscape strategy has been designed to help ingrate the Proposed Development and reduce the perception of the built elements in the local landscape.

7.2.16. Paragraph 5.10.35 identifies that *'the scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project'*. The characteristics of the Proposed Development means it comprises relatively low structures, which limits the extent of the area over which they would be seen. In addition, the flat landform in the local

context, combined with vegetation in the baseline landscape restrict potential visibility. However, the footprint of the Proposed Development is a key consideration of the assessment.

7.2.17. Paragraph 5.10.36 states *'in reaching a judgement, the Secretary of State should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the Secretary of State considers reasonable'*. The landscape and visual effects occurring in relation to each phase of the Proposed Development are temporary and reversible, with it having a defined operation life of 40 years. These factors form part of the judgements made in relation to the predicted landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development.

Renewable Energy Infrastructure NPS EN-3 (DESNZ, November 2023, designated January 2024)[2]

7.2.18. Paragraph 2.1.8 includes reference to the need to apply the mitigation hierarchy to proposed developments, setting out that *'Applicants must show how any likely significant negative effects would be avoided, reduced, mitigated or compensated for, following the mitigation hierarchy'*. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied in relation to landscape visual receptors, with this evident in the way in which the site area has evolved to reduce effects on local residents (see **Figure 4.2, Design Evolution Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]**) and the landscape strategy, which is an integral part of the Proposed Development.

7.2.19. Paragraph 2.3.6 reflects the importance of nationally designated landscapes, setting out that *'when considering applications for CNP Infrastructure in sites with nationally recognised designations (such as SSSIs, National Nature Reserves, National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Registered Parks and Gardens, and World Heritage Sites), the Secretary of State will take as the starting point that the relevant tests in Sections 5.4 and 5.10 of EN-1 have been met, and any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by the urgent need for this type of infrastructure'*. The Site is

[2] Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (November 2023) Overarching National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a7889996a5ec000d731aba/nps-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en3.pdf Accessed June 2024

not located within or close to any National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (also known as National Landscapes). Therefore, this is not relevant to the Proposed Development.

7.2.20. Paragraph 2.10.27 identifies that *'utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence. The two main impact issues that determine distances to sensitive receptors are therefore likely to be visual amenity and glint and glare'*. Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) have been prepared for the Proposed Development, these have informed the assessment of effects on visual amenity.

7.2.21. Paragraph 2.10.30 states that *'whilst the development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, or sites designated for their natural beauty, or recognised for ecological or archaeological importance'*. The Site is not within or close to any site designated for their natural beauty.

7.2.22. Paragraph 2.10.43 States *'applicants are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape'*. Views from public right of way have been a key consideration and Potential effects on the users of public rights of way are assessed throughout the assessment. The mitigation of effects of such receptors has also been an important consideration in the preparation of the landscape strategy for the Site, which forms an integral part of the Proposed Development.

7.2.23. Paragraph 2.10.44 states *'applicants should consider and maximise opportunities to facilitate enhancements to the public rights of way and the inclusion, through site layout and design of access, of new opportunities for the public to access and cross proposed solar development sites (whether via the adoption of new public rights of way or the creation of permissive paths), taking into account, where appropriate, the views of landowners'*. Making connections between existing public rights of way has been a consideration in the site design process, with a new permissive path being created in the south eastern part of the Site, connecting a footpath that extends to the north of Carlton (Ref. 35.18/6/1) with an 'other route with public access' that follows Claypit Lane to the west of Camblesforth.

7.2.24. Paragraph 2.10.46 identifies *'security of the site is a key consideration for*

developers. Applicants may wish to consider not only the availability of natural defences such as steep gradients, hedging and rivers but also perimeter security measures such as fencing, electronic security, CCTV and lighting, with the measures proposed on a site-specific basis'. With paragraph 2.10.47 continuing *'Applicants should assess the visual impact of these security measures, as well as the impacts on local residents, including for example issues relating to intrusion from CCTV and light pollution in the vicinity of the site'*. Paragraph 2.10.48 also states *'Applicants should consider the need to minimise the impact on the landscape and the visual impact of security measures'*. Deer fencing is being used to surround the Proposed Development to limit the intrusion of this element. The Substation and BESS compound will be surrounded by a welded steel wire mesh fence, with this being positioned inside proposed planting to restrict any potential visibility of this element. CCTV will be used for security purposes, but this will comprise a relatively limited element within the site. The cameras will ulilise night vision technology to avoid the need for night-time lighting. In addition, passive infra-red detector ('PID') systems (or similar) will be installed around the perimeter of the solar PV arrays to provide night vision functionality for the CCTV.

7.2.25. Paragraph 2.10.59 states that *'Applicants should consider the criteria for good design set out in EN-1 Section 4.7 at an early stage when developing projects'*. The Applicant has considered the design of the Proposed Development from the outset. Key considerations relevant to effects on landscape and visual receptors have included the the overall extent of the Proposed Development, including specific consideration of local residents. This is reflected in the **Figure 4.2, Design Evolution Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]** of the ES. In addition, the proposed landscape strategy has been designed to help ingrate the Proposed Development and reduce the perception of the built elements in the local landscape

7.2.26. Paragraph 2.10.94 identifies *'the approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impact of large-scale solar farms is likely to be the same as assessing other onshore energy infrastructure. Solar farms are likely to be in low lying areas of good exposure and as such may have a wider zone of visual influence than other types of onshore energy infrastructure'*. The potential cumulative landscape and visual effects are considered in this chapter. Cumulative ZTVs have been prepared to help understand the relationship between the Proposed Development and key cumulative schemes.

7.2.27. Paragraph 2.10.95 identifies that *'whilst it may be the case that the development covers a significant surface area, in the case of ground-mounted solar panels it should be noted that with effective screening and appropriate land topography, the area of a zone of visual influence could be appropriately minimised'*. The site is located within a relatively flat landscape, which limits the extent of visibility and the potential prominence of the built elements. In addition, baseline vegetation will further restrict potential visibility. In addition, the proposed landscape strategy has been prepared to reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development mitigate potential effects on visual amenity and well as complimenting local landscape objectives and strengthening/reinforcing landscape character.

7.2.28. Paragraph 2.10.96 states *'landscape and visual impacts should be considered carefully pre-application. Potential impacts on the statutory purposes of nationally designated landscapes should form a part of the preapplication process'*. Landscape and visual impacts have been considered from an early stage, which is demonstrated by how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved. The site is not located within or close to any nationally designated landscapes.

7.2.29. Paragraph 2.10.97 states *'applicants should carry out a landscape and visual assessment and report it in the ES. Visualisations may be required to demonstrate the effects of a proposed solar farm on the setting of heritage assets and any nearby residential areas or viewpoints'*. This chapter of the ES comprises the landscape and visual assessment for the Proposed Development. Photomontages have been prepared for the Proposed Development and are included in **Appendix 7.7 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.7]**.

7.2.30. Paragraph 2.10.98 states *'applicants should follow the criteria for good design set out in Section 4.7 of EN-1 when developing projects and will be expected to direct considerable effort towards minimising the landscape and visual impact of solar PV arrays especially within nationally designated landscapes'*. Landscape and visual impacts have been a key consideration, which is demonstrated by how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved. The site is not located within or close to any nationally designated landscapes.

7.2.31. Paragraph 2.10.99 states *'whilst there is an acknowledged need to ensure solar PV installations are adequately secured, required security measures such as fencing should consider the need to minimise the impact on the landscape and visual impact'*.

This has been a key consideration for the Proposed Development, as described in relation to paragraphs 2.10.46 – 2.10.48 on EN-3 above.

7.2.32. Paragraph 2.10.100 states *'The applicant should consider as part of the design, layout, construction, and future maintenance plans how to protect and retain, wherever possible, the growth of vegetation on site boundaries, as well as the growth of existing hedges, established vegetation, including mature trees within boundaries. Applicants should also consider opportunities for individual trees within the boundaries to grow on to maturity'*. These factors have been considered as part of the layout and landscape strategy for the Proposed Development. The proposed layout retains and protects the existing vegetation. Suitable set backs or buffers have been applied around the solar PV arrays to allow the vegetation to establish and avoid the need for removal during the operational phase.

7.2.33. Paragraph 2.10.101 states *'the impact of the proposed development on established trees and hedges should be informed by a tree survey and arboricultural/hedge assessment as appropriate'*. An arborboricultural impact assessment has been prepared for the Proposed Development. This has informed the layout of the Proposed Development to ensure trees and hedgerows within the site are retained wherever possible and suitably protected.

Local Planning Policy

Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2013[3]

7.2.34. The Core Strategy is the main document in the Council's suite of planning documents and covers the period from 2011 to 2027. The following policies are relevant to the Site and the Proposed Development.

7.2.35. Policy SP15: Sustainable Development and Climate Change includes the following policy wording under the heading *'Design and Layout of Development'*:

> *'In order to ensure development contributes toward reducing carbon emissions and are resilient to the effects of climate change, schemes should where necessary or appropriate:*

[3] Selby District Council (October 2013), *Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan*, Available at: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/planning-policy/planning-policy-your-local-area/selby-planning-policy/selby-development-plan) Accessed September 2023

d) Protect, enhance and create habitats to both improve biodiversity resilience to climate change and utilise biodiversity to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation;

e) Include tree planting, and new woodlands and hedgerows in landscaping schemes to create habitats, reduce the 'urban heat island effect' and to offset carbon loss;

…'

7.2.36. Policy SP17 – Low-Carbon and Renewable Energy states:

'All development proposals for new sources of renewable energy and low-carbon energy generation and supporting infrastructure must meet the following criteria:

i) are designed and located to protect the environment and local amenity or

ii) can demonstrate that the wider environmental, economic and social benefits outweigh any harm caused to the environment and local amenity, and

iii) impacts on local communities are minimised.'

7.2.37. Policy SP18 – Protecting and Enhancing the Environment states:

'The high quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and man-made environment will be sustained by:

1. Safeguarding and, where possible, enhancing the historic and natural environment including the landscape character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance.

2. Conserving those historic assets which contribute most to the distinct character of the District and realising the potential contribution that they can make towards economic regeneration, tourism, education and quality of life.

3. Promoting effective stewardship of the District's wildlife by:

…

b) Ensuring developments retain, protect and enhance features of biological and geological interest and provide appropriate management of these features and that unavoidable impacts are appropriately mitigated and compensated for, on or off-site.

c) Ensuring development seeks to produce a net gain in biodiversity by designing-in wildlife and retaining the natural interest of a site where appropriate.

…

4. Wherever possible a strategic approach will be taken to increasing connectivity to the District's Green Infrastructure including improving the network of linked open spaces and green corridors and promoting opportunities to increase its multi-functionality. This will be informed by the Leeds City Region Infrastructure Strategy.

5. Identifying, protecting and enhancing locally distinctive landscapes, areas of tranquillity, public rights of way and access, open spaces and playing fields through Development Plan Documents.

6. Encouraging incorporation of positive biodiversity actions, as defined in the local Biodiversity Action Plan, at the design stage of new developments or land uses.

…

7. Steering development to areas of least environmental and agricultural quality.'

7.2.38. Policy SP19 – Design Quality states:

'Proposals for all new development will be expected to contribute to enhancing community cohesion by achieving high quality design and have regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings including historic townscapes, settlement patterns and the open countryside.

Where appropriate schemes should take account of design codes and Neighbourhood Plans to inform good design.

Both residential and non-residential development should meet the following

key requirements:

d) Make the best, most efficient use of land without compromising local distinctiveness, character and form.

…

e) Create rights of way or improve them to make them more attractive to users, and facilitate sustainable access modes, including public transport, cycling and walking which minimise conflicts;

f) Incorporate new and existing landscaping as an integral part of the design of schemes, including off-site landscaping for large sites and sites on the edge of settlements where appropriate;'

Selby District Local Plan 2005[4]

7.2.39. The Selby District Local Plan ('SDLP') was formally adopted on 8th February 2005. The following policies are relevant to the Site and the Proposed Development.

7.2.40. Policy ENV1 – Control of Development states:

'Proposals for development will be permitted provided a good quality of development would be achieved. In considering proposals the District Council will take account of:

1. The effect upon the character of the area or the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

…

5. The potential loss, or adverse effect upon, significant buildings, related spaces, trees, wildlife habitats, archaeological or other features important to the character of the area;

…'

7.2.41. Policy ENV3 relates to the provision of outdoor lighting and states that developments

[4] Selby District Council (February 2005), *Selby District Local Plan* Available at: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/planning-policy/planning-policy-your-local-area/selby-planning-policy/selby-development-plan/selby-district-local-plan-2005 Accessed June 2024

will only be permitted where lighting schemes:

1. *'Represent the minimum level required for security and/or operational purposes;*

2. *Are designed to minimise glare and spillage;*

3. *Would not create conditions prejudicial to highway safety or which would have a significant adverse effect on local amenity; and*

4. *Would not detract significantly from the character of a rural area.*

Proposals for development involving outdoor lighting should incorporate details of lighting schemes as part of applications for development.'

7.2.42. ENV6 Proposals for the development of renewable energy will be permitted provided that:

1. *'The scheme will not have a significant adverse effect on the immediate and wider landscape;*

2. *The scheme is located in close proximity to the electric grid or user buildings in order to keep new power lines to a minimum;*

   …

4. *The proposal would achieve a high standard of design, materials and landscaping; and*

5. *Adequate measures are incorporated to safeguard local amenity and highway safety during construction.*

Where appropriate, planning conditions will be used to secure the restoration of the site in the event of subsequent decommissioning.'

7.2.43. Policy ENV11 – Ancient Woodland states:

'Development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause loss of, or damage to, an ancient woodland, unless the reasons for the development outweigh the nature conservation value of the woodland.'

7.2.44. Policy ENV15 – Conservation and Enhancement of Locally Important Landscape Areas states:

'Within the locally important landscape areas, as defined on the proposals map, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the character and quality of the landscape. Particular attention should be paid to the design, layout, landscaping of development and the use of materials in order to minimise its impact and to enhance the traditional character of buildings and landscape in the area.'

7.2.45. Paragraph 4.104 also notes that the landscape features of Hambleton Hough and Brayton Barff are defined as Locally Important Landscape Areas ('LILAs') due to their vegetative and topographical prominence over the otherwise low-lying landscape. It is also noted that the *'District Council will resist schemes that would be harmful to their character and scenic quality'*.

7.2.46. Policy ENV20 states:

'Where it is necessary because there is inadequate landscaping related to large-scale development or development at the edge of settlements, such proposals will be required to incorporate a substantial element of strategic landscaping (which may be off-site) as an integral part of the scheme.'

7.2.47. Policy ENV21 (A) states:

'Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate landscaping as an integral element in the layout and design, including the retention of existing trees and hedgerows, and planting of native, locally occurring species.'

7.2.48. Policy ENV22 states:

'Development will not be permitted where it would have a detrimental effect on the character, fabric or setting of a listed building.'

Selby District Local Plan Publication Versions (2024)

7.2.49. The Selby District Local Plan, Revised Publication 2024 also forms part of the local policy context.

7.2.50. The Vision for the Area Plan of the form Selby District sets out that *'Change will have been managed to reinforce the elements which make it a distinctive place, including*

the quality and character of its natural and historic environment'. This vision also identifies that *'the former Selby district area will have an improved and integrated network of green and blue infrastructure which has created gains in biodiversity; considered ways to reduce, mitigate or adapt to climate change challenges including meeting targets for net-zero carbon emissions; and created a better environment to live and work with improvements for health and well-being'*.

7.2.51. The Local Plan Objectives include a specific objective that relates to the natural environment. The issues identified is as follows: *'ensure that development pressures do not threaten the green and blue assets of the former Selby district area which contribute to the attractive, tranquil and rural nature of the countryside and the setting of its settlements with benefits to health and well-being, climate change mitigation and flood resilience'*. The objective associated with this issue comprises: *'to protect and enhance the existing network of wildlife sites and priority species; distinctive landscape character; green and blue infrastructure; air and water quality; strategic tree planting to support the ambitions for the White Rose Forest Project, local tree and hedgerow planting; nature recovery networks; and protect against pollution and deliver net gains in biodiversity'*.

7.2.52. Policy SG1 – Achieving Sustainable Development (Strategic Policy) includes, in Part A:

'When considering proposals for new development the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work positively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.'

7.2.53. Policy SG4 – Development in the Countryside (Strategic Policy) includes that:

'The Council will seek to ensure that the former Selby district area remains a special place to live by supporting development which protects and enhances the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, recognising the important role it plays in the local economy, for the health and well-being of local residents and as a biodiversity resource'.

7.2.54. Policy SG10 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy (Strategic Policy) is applicable to the Proposed Development, with Part A, point 1 and points 2 i, ii and vi being particularly relevant to landscape and visual considerations:

'A. Proposals for low-carbon and renewable-energy storage and generation (including hydrogen transportation networks) will be supported where:

1. Planning impacts of the development and associated infrastructure, both individually and cumulatively, are, or can be made, acceptable;

2. Appropriate weight, consideration and mitigation has been given to the following where applicable:

i. Landscape character and sensitivity

ii. Designated nature conservation sites, features, functionally-linked land, protected habitats and species;
vi. Living conditions and amenity including due to noise, odour, dust, vibration, visual intrusion, shadowing or flicker.'

7.2.55. Policy NE2 – Protecting and Enhancing Green and Blue Infrastructure is relevant to landscape considerations, particularly the landscape strategy for the Proposed Development:

'The Council will seek to protect, maintain, enhance and, where possible, restore and extend the Plan Area's green and blue infrastructure assets (GBI) supporting the creation of an integrated network for the benefit of nature, people's health and well-being and the economy including landscapes, ecological networks, natural environment, open spaces, Public Rights of Way, geodiversity, biodiversity, river and waterway assets.'

7.2.56. Whilst Policy NE3 – Biodiversity and Net Gain (Strategic Policy) is focused towards ecological considerations, the principles set out in this policy are relevant to the landscape strategy for the Proposed Development:

'The former Selby district area's natural environment will be enhanced by ensuring that development delivers a net gain in biodiversity for ecological networks in line with government requirements and result in a positive contribution to the protection, creation and enhancement of habitats and species.'

7.2.57. Policy NE4 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character (Strategic Policy) is directly relevant to this assessment. Part A is directly relevant, however Part B relates to development within Locally Important Landscape Areas and the proposed development is not within such an area:

'Development which protects, enhances or restores the landscape character of the former Selby district area and the setting of settlements for its own intrinsic value and benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Plan Area, will be supported.

A. All development must:

1. Promote high-quality designs that respond positively to, and where possible, enhance, the distinctive local landscape character as described in the latest 'Selby Landscape Character Assessment'; and

2. Give particular attention to the design, layout, landscaping of development and the use of materials in order to minimise its impact and to enhance the traditional character of buildings and landscape in the area, reflecting the 17 character areas defined the latest 'Selby Landscape Character Assessment'; and

3. Respect the overall development guidelines in the latest 'Selby Landscape Sensitivity Study'.'

7.2.58. Policy NE6 – Protecting and Enhancing Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows is of relevance, particularly parts A 2, 3 and 8:

'In order to increase and enhance the quality of trees and hedgerows:

A. Developments will be supported where:

2. There has been a suitable assessment of the woodland, trees and hedgerows (where deemed necessary), to a recognised professional standard which is able to demonstrate evaluation of these features for realistic long-term retention, and how this has positively informed the design process.

3. It has been clearly demonstrated how retained and new features will be protected during development.

8. Proposals promote and enhance the rural and urban tree coverage of the Plan

Area in line with the most recent strategies relating to trees, woodland and hedgerows (for example, the White Rose Forest Partnership Scheme and Conservation Area Appraisals).'

Other Relevant Evidence Base

7.2.59. The North Yorkshire and York Local Nature Partnership Strategy5 ('LNPS') was adopted in 2014. It sets out a broad strategic approach to landscape and biodiversity across the North Yorkshire and York area. A series of themes and objectives are set out in the LNPS including the following:

'Habitats and Species

- *Conserve, enhanced and create natural sites (e.g. wetland, woodland, grassland, rivers, geological assets).*
- *Strengthen natural corridors for species movement (e.g. river corridors, hedgerows, field margins, ponds).*

Economy

- *Enhance connections between nature and the local economy …*
- *Improve the quality and use of the area's Green Infrastructure to attract appropriate inward investment.*

People and communities

- *Increase access to nature to improve public health (e.g. footpaths or multi-user trails, accessible natural/green space areas, promote outdoor activity, organised walks).*
- *Increase engagement with local communities on nature projects (e.g. project planning, practical volunteering, training and education).*

Climate change

- *Strengthen climate change mitigation through natural solutions (e.g. carbon storage through habitat work, reduced carbon emissions through*

[5] North Yorkshire and York Local Nature Partnership (June 2014), *North Yorkshire & York Local Nature Partnership Strategy* Available at: https://www.nypartnerships.org.uk/sites/default/files/Partnership%20files/Environment/NYCC%20Local%20nature%20partnership%20strategy.pdf Accessed June 2024

increased walking and cycling).

- *Strengthen climate change adaptation through natural solutions (e.g. flood water management, temperature regulation, habitat corridors).'*

7.2.60. The Yorkshire and the Humber Green Infrastructure Mapping Project[6] was produced to *'help local authorities protect and create green infrastructure through their Local Development Frameworks'*. The mapping project is intended to be used to:

- *'Protect green infrastructure;*
- *be a starting point for more detailed or localised green infrastructure work;*
- *increase awareness of where green infrastructure functions exist and how they complement each other;*
- *establish a baseline of green infrastructure from which change can be measured;*
- *inform planning decisions and development proposals;*
- *provide evidence for policy and strategy creation;*
- *form the basis of subregional delivery projects; and*
- *focus green infrastructure enhancement where gains can be maximised.'*

7.2.61. The mapping project identified strategic areas and networks of green infrastructure as shown on **Figure 7.1 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1]**, the Site is located partially within the regional corridor, R1: Aire, and to the south of regional corridor R9: Ouse. A sub-regional corridor, S22: Selby Central as identified in the mapping project is located to the north-west of the Site. Relevant information on these corridors is set out below:

- R1 Aire: *'much of the corridor is affected by flooding and the river valley bottom is mainly undeveloped as a consequence. This creates greenspaces right into and through several urban areas which connect a large number of significant wildlife sites and are an important feature of the corridor'*.
- R9 Ouse: *'Green infrastructure throughout the corridor could be used to*

[6] Natural England (March 2010), *Yorkshire and the Humber Green Infrastructure Mapping Project*, Available at: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20140605130551mp_/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/gi-mapscore_tcm6-20421.pdf Accessed June 2024

ameliorate flooding'.

- S22 Selby: *'Much of the corridor is made up of farmland, some of which was once marsh land but is now intensively cultivated arable farmland. Small areas of woodland and hedgerows are also prevalent. The main possibility for improved green infrastructure is in the section of the corridor that runs through the Selby Area Action Plan Area.'*

7.3. Assessment Methodology

7.3.1. A summary of the topic specific assessment methodology is outlined below with the full methodology in **Appendix 7.1: Criteria and Definitions used in Assessing Landscape and Visual Effects [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.1]**. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with best practice guidance contained within the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('GLVIA3')7.

7.3.2. In accordance with GLVIA3, this assessment addresses landscape and visual effects as separate issues. Landscape effects relate to both the effect on the physical features of the Site, and on the landscape character of the Site and surrounding area. Visual effects relate to the experience of views of the Proposed Development by visual receptors from publicly accessible vantage points in the study area. Where appropriate, the effects of the Proposed Development on residential receptors have also been assessed.

7.3.3. An initial desktop review of the Site and its context was undertaken, including a review of published landscape character information and relevant landscape and visual related planning policy, and analysis of landscape context, landform, landscape features and landscape designations.

7.3.4. A preliminary Zone of Theoretical Visibility ('ZTV') was prepared to inform field surveys and the initial selection of photographic viewpoints included in the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1 [EN010140/APP/6.3.2.1]**). The preliminary ZTV was issued as part of the EIA Scoping Report.

7.3.5. The preliminary ZTV was based on a more extensive Site area and assumed a

[7] Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment, *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (3rd edn, 2013). London: Routledge.

blanket 3m development height above ground level parameter across the Site. The study area for the preliminary ZTV included an area extending to 5km from the Site's boundaries which was considered appropriate given the anticipated height of the Proposed Development and the flat nature of the landscape.

7.3.6. To determine the extent of visual influence, a landscape and visual appraisal was undertaken of the Site and the preliminary study area to appraise the nature of existing views from publicly accessible viewpoints including roads, Public Rights of Way ('PRoW') and public open space. Consideration was also given to views from private residential properties, however access to private properties was not obtained. The initial field surveys were carried out in January 2022 over a three-day period, with 253 viewpoint locations appraised and photographed.

7.3.7. An initial selection of 37 representative viewpoints was made to demonstrate the character of the Site and its context and to represent the visual experience of visual receptors. Representative views are not intended to be exhaustive and do not cover every possible view of the Site. Rather, they have been selected to proportionately represent the range of views available, taking into account the activity and sensitivity of visual receptors. In accordance with the GLVIA3, the assessment of visual effects has been based on the identified visual receptors.

7.3.8. The initial field survey, carried out in winter conditions, confirmed a substantially reduced visual envelope than that indicated by the preliminary ZTV. Based on field surveys and the selection of viewpoints, and with a focus on the identification of likely significant visual effects, the study area was subsequently refined to the extents shown on **Figure 7.1: Context and Designations Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1].**

7.3.9. The initial selection of 37 viewpoints was included in the EIA Scoping Report and consulted upon with officers of North Yorkshire County Council (now North Yorkshire Council ('NYC'). A number of alternative viewpoints were considered and included through the consultation process, full details of which are included in **Appendix 7.3: Viewpoint Correspondence [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.3].**

7.3.10. Initial landscape and visual design advice was prepared based on the Site boundary submitted at EIA scoping stage. This included areas that were identified as being visually sensitive, for the most part as a result of proximity to existing settlements and individual dwellings. As a result of this process, and constraints identified by other consultants in the project team, the Site boundary was reduced. An updated

ZTV was prepared and included in the PEIR, which was prepared based on the parameters of the Proposed Development, including differentiating between the areas of search for solar arrays and the battery storage and substation components of the scheme. The updated ZTV also accounted for the screening effect of existing vegetation and settlements in order to present a more accurate representation of the potential visual envelope of the Proposed Development.

7.3.11. Based upon the updated ZTV and the confirmed red line boundary for the Proposed Development, the selection of viewpoints to support the LVIA was further refined, with several viewpoints discounted due to a lack of visibility with the reduced extent of the Proposed Development. The study area for the assessment of likely significant landscape and visual effects was confirmed as remaining appropriate. No viewpoints further afield have been identified or requested by consultees through the process to date.

7.3.12. The design of the solar farm has evolved in response to initial assessment findings and consultation feedback. Updated ZTVs, both bare earth ZTVs and ZTVs that take account of surface features have been prepared and are included as **Figures 7.6 to 7.11 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.6- EN010140/APP/6.2.7.11].**

7.3.13. Field surveys were conducted in March 2023 and February 2024 to obtain up-to-date winter viewpoint photography of the Site. As set out in **Appendix 7.3 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.3]**, the updated selection of representative viewpoints was provided to officers of NYC in March 2023, and an updated list of viewpoints as well as the proposals for visualisations was provided in May 2023. However, no further correspondence was received from officers at that time.

7.3.14. Section 42 Consultation comments, together with meeting with NYC identified a need for additional viewpoints on PRoW/routes used for informal recreation within the Site. In response two additional viewpoints were identified and included in the LVIA; one on Brick Lands Lane in the southern part of the Site, and a second View from a Public Right of Way (Ref. 35.14/12/1) near Primrose Hill in the northern part of the Site.

7.3.15. A description of the existing baseline characteristics has been provided and includes reference to existing areas of settlement, transport routes and vegetation cover, as well as national and local landscape designations. These factors combine to underpin an understanding of landscape value and sensitivity and provide an indication of particular key views and viewpoints that are available to visual

receptors.

7.3.16. A description of the visual baseline has been recorded with reference to the selected viewpoints and the ZTV. This includes an appraisal of the Site's visibility in the wider landscape, and the nature of existing views.

7.3.17. A series of landscape and visual receptors have been identified on the basis of the baseline appraisal. The value, susceptibility and resultant sensitivity of receptors have been determined.

7.3.18. Assessments have been carried out to identify the likely significant landscape and visual effects arising from the Proposed Development during construction, and at Years 1 and 15 after completion, the latter taking account of the residual effect with the benefit of established planting mitigation. An assessment of the effects resulting from decommissioning has also been carried out.

7.3.19. The level of potential effects is rated on a scale of negligible to major. This assessment is based upon professional judgement but in broad terms, where a receptor of high sensitivity experiences a substantial magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development, the level of effect is likely to be major. Conversely, where a receptor of low sensitivity experiences a negligible magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development, the level of effect is likely to be negligible.

7.3.20. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, an assessment of whether or not the effect is considered 'significant' is required. In general, Major or Major/Moderate effects, whether adverse or beneficial, are deemed to be 'significant'. However, in accordance with the GLVIA, any judgements on whether effects are 'significant' are subject to professional judgement. Moderate effects are not judged to be significant, but a concentration of moderate effects may have potential to result in significant effects.

Consultation

7.3.21. As set out above and in **Appendix 7.3 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.3]**, consultation was undertaken with officers of NYC in order to agree viewpoints and the approach to the LVIA. This consultation with NYC has also focused on the proposed landscape strategy for the Site. A summary of consultation responses and the way in which these have been addressed in the Environmental Statement are set out in Table 7.1

below:

Table 7.1: Consultation Summary

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
EIA Scoping Opinion				
PINS	EIA Scoping Opinion (14th July 2022)	Effects on night-time landscape and perception of the night sky The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out as the Site is not designated for dark skies, no permanent lighting is required during operation and the lighting during construction and decommissioning is expected to be limited in in extent, intensity and duration. The ES should include a detailed description of the	This matter has been scoped out of the PEIR. A description of the lighting design and measures taken to avoid or minimise lighting impacts is set out in Chapter 3 Site and Development Description of this PEIR.	No change

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		lighting design and the measures taken to avoid or minimise lighting impacts on the night sky, including consideration of effects relating to intermittent lighting sources such as motion activated security lighting.		
PINS	EIA Scoping response (14th July 2022)	The full extent of the preliminary ZTV and subsequent study area is not defined in the Landscape and Views Chapter whereas it is defined in the Cultural Heritage Chapter. **Figures 7.1 and 7.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1 and EN010140/APP/6.2.7.2]** depict the ZTV however,	The preliminary ZTV provided at scoping stage was prepared to inform field surveys and the selection of viewpoints, as well as the proposed study area in accordance with the GLVIA. The extents of the preliminary ZTV drawing equated to an area of land extending to	A study area of 6km from the solar PV arrays has been applied and used for the ZTVs included with the ES. The ZTVs for the Proposed Development are included in **Figures 7.6 to 7.11 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.6 - EN010140/APP/6.2.7.11].**

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		potential visibility of the Site overlaps the edges of the map therefore its full extent is unknown. Additionally, the Scoping Report does not establish the tallest elements of the Proposed Development that influence the ZTV (please see box 2.1.1 above). The ES should ensure that the final extent of the ZTV reflects the maximum parameters of the Proposed Development where relevant. Effort should be made to agree appropriate ZTVs with relevant consultation bodies.	approximately 5km from the Site boundary. Whilst the ZTV was shown extending beyond the edges of the drawing, it was considered highly unlikely that the Proposed Development would result in significant visual effects beyond this distance. Field surveys, carried out on early 2022, confirmed that the Site has a considerably smaller visual envelope than indicated by the ZTV, and no viewpoints were identified (or requested by consultees) with visibility of the Site beyond the	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
			extents of the drawing, with the furthest viewpoint located at Hambleton Hough, approximately 5.2km north-west from the Site, on high ground within a wider landscape that is notably flat and low-lying. A new preliminary ZTV has been prepared based on the revised Site boundary which accounts for the anticipated maximum height of the different elements of the Proposed Development. The revised Preliminary ZTV was provided to officers of NYC as detailed below.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	EIA Scoping response (14th July 2022)	Scoping Report paragraph 7.8.6 states that representative viewpoints will be finalised following consultations with NYCC and their anticipated locations are provided on **Figure 7.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.2]** The ES should explain the process used to determine appropriate viewpoints through the consultation process and should take into account topography, long-distance views and the setting of heritage receptors.	The process by which viewpoints were selected and agreed is set out in section 7.3 above. A record of consultations with NYCC/NYC is set out in **Appendix 7.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.2]**	Further discussion on viewpoints included in the assessment occurred during meetings in February 2024. In response, Viewpoints 30 and 31 are included the assessment. These were discussed with NYC at meetings in February 2024.
	EIA Scoping response (14th July	Scoping Report paragraph 7.8.3 states that *'mitigation planting will be assumed to*	The basis for the assumed growth rate of mitigation planting is set out in	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2022)	*grow approximately 1m in height every 3 years'*. It is not clear on what basis this assumption has been made, i.e. what plant species are proposed. Where assumptions have been made, the ES should explain why these are realistic based on relevant guidance where appropriate.	paragraph 7.3.22 below.	
Long Drax Parish Council	EIA Scoping response (14th July 2022)	The parish of Long Drax includes the land on Wren Hall Lane where the small remote development area is. Some mitigation using screen planting will be required to reduce visual impact.	The areas included in the Site boundary for scoping around Wren Hall Lane have been removed from the Site.	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
National Grid	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	These measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development's landscape scheme. The measures required for the management of vegetation on the Site will be set out in in a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan ('LEMP') and secured as a requirement of the DCO.	No additional response.
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	The quantity and location of representative viewpoints are the subject of ongoing consultation with the Applicant and are not yet	A record of consultation on viewpoint locations is included in **Appendix 7.2. [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.2]** Comments were received	Further discussion on viewpoints included in the assessment occurred during meetings in February 2024. In

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		agreed.	from NYC in August 2022, resulting in a number of changes to the viewpoints. Changes were also made to reflect the revised Site boundary. Updated viewpoint proposals were issued to NYC in 2023. However, no further correspondence was received and the viewpoints are assumed to be agreed for the purposes of the PEIR.	response, two additional viewpoints (Viewpoint 30 and 31) are included the assessment. These were discussed with NYC at meetings in February 2024.
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	In relation to landscape and visual amenity we are generally supportive of an LVIA methodology undertaken to GLVIA3. This should also include	All representative viewpoint photography has been prepared in accordance with the Landscape Institutes TGN 06/19 – 'Visual	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		photography to current LI guidance on 'Visual Representation of Development Proposals',	Representation of Development Proposals'.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	Landscape character and visual amenity of heritage assets should also be considered in the LVIA (contribution of setting to heritage significance would be considered in the **Heritage Chapter [EN010140/APP/6.1.6]** of the EIA).	The assessment of sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors includes consideration of historical or cultural associations in accordance with GLVIA3 and the LVIA Methodology. However, heritage assets are not receptors for the assessment of visual effects. The assessment of visual effects is based on the experience of people who have views of	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
			the Proposed Development. The potential impact on the setting of heritage assets is fully considered in **Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage [EN010140/APP/6.1.6]** of the PEIR.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	We would support the proposal for an initial 5km radius study area for the LVIA, this could be subsequently reduced if appropriate to focus on likely significant effects.	The initial study area of 5km has been refined based on field surveys and the selection of representative viewpoints, in order to focus on the likely significant effects. The approach to the study area identification is set out in section 7.3 above.	A 6km study area has been applied in the assessment and is reflected in the ZTVs **(Figures 7.6 to 7.11 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.6 - EN010140/APP/6.2.7.11])**. However, the assessment focusses on smaller area than this due to the nature and extent of the predicted effects.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	There is potential for the development to adversely affect existing boundary trees and vegetation. This should be reviewed, protected and retained where appropriate. A tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment will be required to BS5837:2012. This is important if boundary vegetation is needed for ongoing screening of the Site.	A tree survey was carried out in accordance with BS5837:2012 and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the Proposed Development is included in the PEIR (**Appendix 8.6 [EN010140/APP/6.3.8.6]**). The design of the Proposed Development includes the wholesale retention and reinforcement of existing field boundary vegetation with minimal hedgerow removal to facilitate access where required.	No additional response.
NYCC (now	EIA Scoping	The operational life of the	Existing and proposed	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYC)	response (4th July 2022)	proposed scheme should also be taken into account. We would wish to see certainty that Site vegetation would be retained during the maintenance management period and not later removed as a consequence of the development	vegetation will be maintained throughout the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. The measures to provide for the long-term successful establishment of proposed planting and existing landscape features will be set out in the LEMP and secured as a requirement of the DCO.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	Temporary access, storage and working areas – these should be taking into account as part of the assessment.	The provision of access, storage and working areas during the construction phase is considered with reference to the parameters as set out in **Chapter 3 Site and Development**	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
			Description [EN010140/APP/6.1.3] and **Chapter 5 Construction & Decommissioning Methodology & Phase [EN010140/APP/6.1.5]** of the PEIR.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	The quantity and location of representative viewpoints are the subject of ongoing consultation with the Applicant and are not yet agreed. Certain viewpoints might benefit adjustment in order to get a clear view of the scheme. We would welcome further discussion to agree	Following confirmation of the Site boundary for the purposes of the PEIR, a refined selection of representative viewpoints has been identified taking into account the extent and nature of the Proposed Development and comments received from NYC. As set out in **Appendix 7.2**	Further discussion on viewpoints included in the assessment occurred during meetings in February 2024. In response, two additional viewpoints, Viewpoints 30 and 31 are included the assessment. These were discussed with NYC at meetings in February 2024.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		final viewpoints. The principle of using representative viewpoints to illustrate the experience of different types of visual receptor is acceptable, however the assessment should aim describe and assess the full effects of the development (not limited to a summary of viewpoints) and to explain the scale and geographical extent of effects	**[EN010140/APP/6.3.7.2],** the refined viewpoints were provided to NYC, however no response has been received and are assumed to be agreed for the purposes of the PEIR.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	We would suggest that for annotated photo-panoramas TGN 06/19 Type 1 or additional wirelines to TGN 06/19 Type 2 are most	All representative viewpoints have been presented as Type 1 annotated panoramas. For those selected to be	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		appropriate. For viewpoints selected for photomontages I would suggest at least Type 3, but Type 4 should be considered where sensitivity of context, scale and proximity of the development warrant it. I would wish to see a realistic impression of scale and detail. We would wish to see photomontages to explain how adverse effects will be mitigated over time. Photographs should include winter views where possible to explain the worst-case scenario.	suitable for presentation of visualisations, Type 3 photomontages have been included. For all visualisations, fully rendered visualisations showing the indicative scheme design have been included. The indicate scheme design is based on the maximum parameters for height and extent. All visualisations include Year 1 and Year 15 views to demonstrate the screening effect of proposed landscape mitigation over time. Due to project timeline constraints, the	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
			visualisations have been based on spring views, however updated winter views will be provided alongside the Environmental Statement ('ES') to be submitted with the DCO application. The assessment of landscape and visual effects has included for the likely seasonal variation in visibility with reference to the Type 1 winter viewpoint photography, and therefore considers the worst-case scenario of visibility.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response	Appendix 3 and 4 in TGN 06/19 should be noted, with	All photography has been presented in accordance	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	(4th July 2022)	camera / tripod height / position in the field adjusted as necessary so that views show the full extent of the Site / development and show the effect it has upon the receptor location. Views of the Site should not be unnecessarily obscured by buildings, roadside hedgerows or other vegetation.	with TGN 06/19. The views have been selected to demonstrate the range of views towards the Site, which in some instances includes intervening vegetation that screens or filters the Site.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	Assessment of Tranquillity – There is potential for significant adverse noise effects associated with construction, decommissioning activities, and operational noise arising from static plant installations	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tranquillity have been considered in relation to the character of the Site. This is in accordance with GLVIA3 which requires consideration of a	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		(inverter stations and energy storage containers). Consideration should be given to assessment of tranquillity and effect on local character and setting, particularly in relation heritage and other local sensitive receptors such as residential properties. PRoW, local farmsteads. We would wish to agree a methodology and approach for this.	landscape receptor's tranquillity in order to assess sensitivity. The overall tranquillity of the Site has also been included as a separate receptor to provide further detailed consideration of this aspect. Noise effects on receptors are assessed in **Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [EN010140/APP/6.1.11]** of the PEIR. Effects on heritage receptors are set out in **Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage [EN010140/APP/6.1.6]** of the PEIR.	
NYCC (now	EIA Scoping	Cumulative Effects – the	A cumulative assessment	No additional response.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYC)	response (4th July 2022)	LVIA should consider cumulative landscape and visual effects in conjunction with other similar developments in the study area including those currently being considered or approved by planning authorities but not yet implemented.	is included in section 7.8 'Cumulative Effects' of this chapter.	
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	Landscape Proposals, Mitigation, Maintenance and Aftercare – We would wish to see mitigation proposals considered as part of a landscape strategy which includes a masterplan and which considers Green Infrastructure in a wider context.	Landscape mitigation proposals are set out in section 7.5 'Likely Significant Effects' of this chapter. This includes a description of the overall objectives for the landscape strategy as well as the evolution of the scheme from first	The landscape mitigation proposals are described in Section 7.5 of this chapter. In addition an Outline LEMP has been prepared and is included in **Appendix 7.9 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9]**.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		Initially, the Landscape Strategy should focus on overarching principles with clear aims and objectives. Objectives should be clear and include landscape, biodiversity and green infrastructure. Landscape and visual mitigation should drive the strategy and be linked through to the management plan (rather than just a maintenance schedule). Landscape proposals and mitigation should have regard for and contribute to the wider landscape character, connectivity of	principles to the detailed mitigation strategy embedded as part of the Proposed Development. A LEMP will be provided alongside the ES to be submitted with the DCO application.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		green infrastructure and sustainable transport (Selby DC policy SP12, SP18, SP19, ENV1). The principles of the European Landscape Convention need to be taken into account. Selby DC policy SP12 states 'In all circumstances opportunities to protect, enhance and better join up existing Green Infrastructure, as well as creating new Green Infrastructure will be strongly encouraged, in addition to the incorporation of other measures to mitigate or minimise the consequences of development'.		

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July 2022)	Proposed screen planting should be sufficient to screen and reduce the overall of visibility of the Proposed Development (e.g. at least 10m wide is usually needed for long-term woodland boundary screen planting incorporating larger trees). Wider areas of woodland may also be needed to reflect local setting and achieve wider GI benefits.	The mitigation strategy includes a number of tree belts that have been proposed to screen key views of the Proposed Development. The width of tree belts varies according to a number of constraints on the Site, including watercourse buffers, utilities and existing field pattern. However, in general, the aim has been to provide 15m wide tree belts wherever possible.	The landscape strategy for the Site has evolved in response to a review of the assessment findings and comments received by NYC. This is explained in Section 7.5
NYCC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (4th July	Long-term maintenance and management should be considered, particularly	Suitable buffers have been included for all existing vegetation, as set	The response provided in the PEIR are applicable. In addition, the importance of

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2022)	where this is needed for ongoing mitigation, screening and biodiversity benefit. Sufficient stand-off distance should be provided from existing trees and vegetation where these are to be retained and protected and to allow maintenance access.	out in **Appendix 8.6 Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010140/APP/6.3.8.6]** of the PEIR. The long-term maintenance measures for the establishment of proposed features and enhancement of existing features will be set out in the LEMP and secured as a requirement of the DCO.	long term maintenance and management is acknowledged and in response and Outline LEMP has been prepared, included in **Appendix 7.9 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9]**.
Statutory Consultation (addressed in the ES)				
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	The comments from the Landscape consultant should be taken into consideration in assessing the projects Landscape and Visual Impacts and a Landscape	Responses provided below and addressed, where relevant, throughout the chapter.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		and Visual Impact assessment and report should be included in the ES including Cumulative effects		
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	There are a number of landscape and visual concerns relating to the overall scale, design and layout of the proposed development including the potential for significant landscape and visual effects within the study area. This includes erosion of the landscape baseline and potential for cumulative landscape and visual effects and overall capacity to	The proposed development is large scale development on green field land and therefore significant adverse effects are inevitable, which is recognised by the relevant National Policy Statements . The assessment judgements have been reviewed throughout Section 7.5. The landscape strategy for the Proposed Development has been reviewed and updated in response to the comment from NYC.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		accommodate land-use change at this landscape scale in a relatively short period of time.		
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology is not agreed. Further information and clarification are recommended in relation to the following: - Explanation of design, layout and site selection, capacity to accommodate large-scale land-use change (including use of BMV agricultural land) - LVIA methodology (terminology, scope of	The methodology used is based on GLVIA3. Best and most versatile land is not an LVIA judgement and is covered by **Chapter 14 Soils and Agricultural Land [EN010140/APP/6.1.14]**. The assessment (Section 7.5) has been reviewed and updated, with amended assessment judgements. Clear connections have been made between these judgements, the mitigation that is proposed (i.e. the landscape strategy) and the influence of this mitigation. An Outline LEMP has been prepared to provide an overview of long term maintenance for the Proposed Development, with an expectation a detailed LEMP would be prepared in response to a DCO Requirement.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		effects to be considered, thresholds for significance, linking adverse effects to mitigation, defining scope of cumulative landscape and visual effects) - Mitigation insufficiently explained; reasonable and proportionate; to reduce adverse landscape and visual effects - Long-term maintenance and management, secured for the operational life of the scheme.		
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th	The LVIA lacks clarity and transparency to communicate a thoroughness and how individual receptors	The assessment within Section 7.5 has been revised and updated. The description of the landscape strategy and its objectives have been expanded (Section 7.5). Clear connections have been made	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	December 2023)	are assessed, the overall geographic scale of those effects, then how this follows through to inform decisions on design and mitigation. The reader is currently left to try and work this out by comparing incomplete assessment tables with mitigation plans rather than being guided by the assessment. There is no explanation or analysis within the landscape strategy plans or text to explain how adverse effects on specific receptors have been considered.	between these judgements, the mitigation that is proposed (i.e. the landscape strategy) and the influence of this mitigation.	
NYC	Statutory Consultation	The landscape assessment seems overly focussed on	The assessment has been reviewed and revised, see Section 7.5.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Response (15th December 2023)	how the scheme affects a proportion of the defined Landscape Character Area's (LCA's), rather than explaining how the character within the scheme's area of influence will be affected and the geographic scale of those effects (the LCA is a character type, not an assessment area). The visual assessment seems overly focussed on individual 'viewpoints' rather than 'receptors', then not explaining the overall geographical scale of those effects.		
NYC	Statutory Consultation	Additionally, the Landscape and Visual Assessment	The assessment judgements throughout chapter 7.5 and the corresponding appendices have been	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Response (15th December 2023)	seems to consistently understate the significance of adverse effects and then overstates the benefits of the proposed mitigation.	reviewed and updated.	
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	While the viewpoint locations for the visual assessment are agreed, the photomontage locations and method for producing these is not agreed.	A methodology for visualisation preparation is included in **Appendix 7.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.2]**. Two additional viewpoints (Viewpoints 30 and 31), with photomontages have been included in response to meetings with NYC in February 2024.	
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	The landscape strategy relies heavily on provision of new boundary hedgerows and improving existing hedgerows in order to screen the proposed development, but this would be a radical shift in current landscape	The landscape strategy has been developed on the basis of published guidance within landscape character assessments as set out in detail in Section 7.5.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		management. It's unclear that the method of landscape screening stated could be achieved within a reasonable timescale, or that this alone would be sufficient to reduce adverse effects.		
NYC	Statutory Consultation Response (15th December 2023)	The long-term maintenance and management of all landscape mitigation and how this is secured is a concern.	An Outline LEMP has been prepared to demonstrate the commitment to long term maintenance and management. It is expected this would be secured by a DCO Requirement, including a provision for a detailed LEMP to be prepared.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory	The landscape and visual assessments previously submitted for the PEIR are flawed because they do not present a balanced and objective view of the likely	The assessment judgements throughout Section 7.5 and the corresponding appendices have been reviewed and updated. Justification is provided regarding moderate effect judgements.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	scale and impacts of the proposed development, including the likely cumulative effects. The assessments do not explain the worst-case scenario and the benefit of proposed mitigation seems over-optimistic, particularly illustrated through the photomontage locations. We do not agree that 'Moderate Negative' effects are 'Not Significant' as is typically concluded in the assessments.		
NYC	Further Information and comment	The LVIA is currently difficult to follow, and the reader is left to try and understand how individual receptors are	The assessment within Section 7.5 has been revised and updated. The description of the landscape strategy and its objectives have been expanded (Section 7.5). Clear connections have been made	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	assessed, the overall geographic scale of those effects, then how this follows through to inform decisions on design and mitigation. In discussion at the recent meeting the Applicant agreed to provide further explanation of this on the supporting plans.	between these judgements, the mitigation that is proposed (i.e. the landscape strategy) and the influence of this mitigation. Updates to the assessment chapter is considered the most appropriate way to explain this detail comprehensively.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February	The Cumulative Assessment within the LVIA is over-simplistic in its approach, with the landscape effects based on a % of wider character areas affected, rather than 'the study area'. Because of the scale of development in the area, sequential views should not	The assessment within Section 7.5 has been revised and updated.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2024)	be dismissed as unimportant and the 'study area' for both landscape and visual cumulative effects should extend beyond the visual envelope of the Helios Application site.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The Cumulative Assessment should consider the number of large long-term schemes around Drax Power Station (the study area) linked to power and mineral extraction (eg Barlow Ash Mound NY/2022/0027/SCO (2022/0107/NYSCO)). There is a need to consider additional arrays assessed with other existing and/or approved projects. These	Section 7.8 explains the schemes included in the cumulative assessment. These are concentrated around Drax Power Station.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		have potential to affect views and the landscape character and setting and with operational effects over long periods of time.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	There is potential for ongoing erosion of the landscape baseline in this area over a number of years, therefore we would recommend that the landscape strategy should consider a landscape framework capable of offsetting the wider cumulative effects.	The landscape strategy has been reviewed and updated to respond to the comments from NYC (see Section 7.5). An overriding aim of the landscape strategy is to provide a robust landscape framework that would mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development.	
NYC	Further Information and	Schedule 4 paragraph 5 of the EIA Regulations requires "A description of the likely	This is presented in Sections 7.5 and 7.8 of the chapter.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from, inter alia: (e)the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources".		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation	Notwithstanding the criteria used by the Applicant within the EIA to determine 'significant effects' other adverse effects should not be ignored particularly where it is reasonable and possible	This is understood and the landscape strategy aims to mitigate adverse effects of the proposed development where possible, notwithstanding the assessment judgements. However, the focus of the landscape strategy has been on the likely significant effects.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Response (16th February 2024)	to reduce these though 'good design'. Overarching National Planning Policy Statement for Energy (EN1) chapter 4.6 sets out criteria for 'good design' and acknowledges the benefits of 'good design' in mitigating the adverse impacts of a project.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February	The overall landscape aims and long-term value set out in the landscape strategy should be clearly explained (not limited to general graphics on a plan or confused with requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain).	The assessment within Section 7.5 has been revised and updated. The description of the landscape strategy and its objectives have been expanded (Section 7.5). Clear connections have been made between these judgements, the mitigation that is proposed (i.e. the landscape strategy) and the influence of this mitigation. Updates to the assessment chapter is considered the most appropriate way to explain this detail comprehensively.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2024)			
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	It is important that the solar PV does not have a defining influence over the overall landscape character; that the development remains in-scale with the landscape in which it is located and that views from nearby settlements are not compromised by solar PV in proximity where settlement could be seen to be enveloped by PV installations.	The landscape strategy has been prepared with the intention of providing effective mitigation of the Proposed Development.	
NYC	Further Information and comment	While the assessment and landscape strategy does list quantities of proposed landscape elements such as	Details are provided in Section 7.5 and on the landscape strategy Figures. Similar information is also provided in the **Outline LEMP, Appendix 7.9 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9]**.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	woodland and hedgerows provided through the scheme, these seem negligible and disproportionately small to make any meaningful difference due the extremely large scale of the scheme (as demonstrated on the landscape strategy plans).		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February	We would wish to see a more a robust landscape framework proportionate to the scale of the development; to include more substantial linked green infrastructure elements such as woodland, footpath improvements, interpretation, open space	The landscape strategy has been reviewed and updated to respond to the comments from NYC (see Section 7.5). An overriding aim of the landscape strategy is to provide a robust landscape framework that would mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. An Outline LEMP has been prepared to demonstrate the commitment to long term maintenance and management. It is expected this would be secured by	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2024)	and amenity improvements to benefit the settlement and communities likely to be affected (aligned with Natural England's Green Infrastructure Principles of 'What', Where' and 'How'. Link to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Principles). There should be a long-term commitment to their maintenance and management, for the life of the scheme.	a DCO Requirement, including a provision for a detailed LEMP to be prepared.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory	We would wish to see better separation and screening between the different areas of solar PV (including other nearby planned installations to the north of the A1041)	This has been delivered as far as practical through the alterations to the landscape strategy.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	and more substantial screening and separation between the solar PV and settlement together with sufficient stand-off from sensitive receptors such as settlement, PROW and local roads in order to maintain important views and a degree of openness.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February	The importance of views from local roads should not be understated in the LVIA since these form the main access and entrance to the adjoining settlement and an important part of the immediate study area.	This point is understood and the landscape strategy has evolved to include additional mitigation in relation to views from local roads.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2024)			
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The landscape strategy should not be overly dependent on establishment of tall new hedgerows for screening as these can look out of context and will take many years to develop through ongoing trimming and laying (typically laying in years 10 or 15). We would expect the landscape mitigation to be based on a mixed strategy to respond to local character and context.	It is proposed to manage the hedgerows at height of approximately 3m, as identified in the **Outline LEMP, Appendix 7.9 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9]**. This is considered realistic and there are examples of hedgerows in the local landscape there comparable with this height. The management of hedgerow can be agreed through detailed landscape proposals for the site and the detailed LEMP.	
NYC	Further Information and comment	Woodland planting should be considered along important boundaries and in key locations where planting can	This is understood and the landscape strategy has been reviewed and updated to respond to these points.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	grow more naturally in height and structure without ongoing intensive trimming. New woodland should be at a size, scale and layout typical of the character area (rather than long linear lines, but at least 20m depth at pinch points) to allow sufficient height and structure for all-year-round screening and with sufficient stand-off from solar PV to allow maintenance access and not to compromise solar efficiency.		
NYC	Further Information and comment	The design should consider the appearance of the development when viewed from all aspects. Generally	This is understood and will be secured through the detailed design of the Proposed Development.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	non-reflective materials and dark recessive colours in neutral tones for all equipment and structures associated with the solar PV are considered to be less visually intrusive (including supporting frames, control cabinets and posts).		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	All related infrastructure such as substations and invertors should be robustly screened and visibility of perimeter security fencing minimised or set behind screen planting. There should be no visible night-time lighting (except occasional maintenance lighting only where	It is intended that the Proposed Development will incorporate these measures, which with be confirmed through the detailed design and secured through a DCO Requirement.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		necessary). Hard surfacing, tall fencing, use and visibility of security cameras and other related equipment should be minimised to avoid the urbanising effect of the development.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	Electricity cables should be buried underground where possible in common cable runs. Electricity cable runs should be located to avoid impact on trees and vegetation to be retained.	This is an embedded part of the Proposed Development i.e. all cable connections will be underground. An arboricultural impact assessment (**Appendix 8.8 [EN010140/APP/6.3.8.8]**) has been prepared and impacts on trees and hedgerows will be avoided wherever possible.	
NYC	Further	Boundary treatments and	Deer fencing is proposed throughout the site. A	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	fencing should be agricultural in form to blend in with the rural area (such as post and wire stock fencing / deer fencing). Tall compound- style fencing should be avoided.	welded steel mesh fence is proposed around the Substation and BESS Compound, with the positioned inside the proposed planting. **Figure 3.11 Fence and Gate [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.11]** provided further detail.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February	The height of solar PV panels should not be taller than the existing hedgerows in the area and panels should be screened as much as possible without compromising efficiency and openness where this is a key characteristic of the area. New hedgerows should be	The solar PV panels would have a maximum height of 3m **(Figure 3.6 Solar PV Panel Elevations [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.6]**), which is a typical height for such structures. The landscape strategy seeks to address the points made in relation to effective screening.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	2024)	established and maintained at a target height relating to local context and scale of development.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The cumulative landscape and visual assessment remain to be completed; "Additional illustrative material will be prepared to support the cumulative assessment in the ES. This will include cumulative ZTVs and cumulative visualisations, where appropriate, to assist in identifying the likely significant cumulative effects.", para. 7.8.3 of the LVIA.	The cumulative assessment in Section 7.8 has been reviewed and updated. Cumulative ZTVs included in **Figures 7.13.1 to 7.18.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.13 - EN010140/APP/6.2.7.18.2]** have been prepared to inform the analysis.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The location and extent of assessment receptors should be clearly shown and labelled on the supporting assessment plans (not solely dependent on trying to link assessment tables to more general viewpoint locations). The assessments plans could also show the scale and geographical extent of effects explained in the text and assessment tables, and the location of proposed mitigation (rather than leaving the reader to try and work this out).	The assessment within Section 7.5 has been revised and updated. The description of the landscape strategy and its objectives have been expanded (Section 7.5). Clear connections have been made between these judgements, the mitigation that is proposed (i.e. the landscape strategy) and the influence of this mitigation. Updates to the assessment chapter is considered the most appropriate way to explain this detail comprehensively.	
NYC	Further Information	There are a number of other large energy projects	Section 7.8 explains the schemes included in the cumulative assessment. These are concentrated	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	planned in the local area utilising the connection to the National Grid Substation at Drax. Collectively this has potential to radically change land use within several km radius of the Grid connection point, for a long-period of time (40+ years). Based on your assessment Magnitude criteria, we would consider this a 'permanent' and 'large' change.	around Drax Power Station. The cumulative assessment has been reviewed and updated as part of the preparation of the ES.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation	The landscape assessment (including the cumulative assessment) seems overly focussed on how the scheme affects a proportion of the defined Landscape Character Area's (LCA's),	The assessment has been reviewed and updated, see Sections 7.5 and 7.8.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	Response (16th February 2024)	rather than explaining how the character within the scheme's area of influence will be affected and the geographic scale of those effects (the LCA is a character type or area of similar characteristics, not an assessment area).		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The assessment should consider the 'study area' rather than just as a % the wider landscape character areas, as this would tend to understate the effects.	The assessment has been reviewed and updated, see Sections 7.5 and 7.8	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	The visual assessment seems overly focussed on individual 'viewpoints' rather than 'receptors', then not explaining the overall geographical scale of those effects (we discussed Viewpoint 10 in the recent meeting as an example).	The description of potential visual effects is Section 7.5 has been revised so the viewpoint assessment informs broader judgements in relation to potential effects on visual amenity.	
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response	Additionally, the Landscape and Visual Assessment seems to consistently understate the significance of adverse effects and then overstates the benefits of the proposed mitigation. Typically, 'Moderate	The assessment judgements throughout Section 7.5 and the corresponding appendices have been reviewed and updated. Justification is provided regarding moderate effect judgements.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	(16th February 2024)	Negative' effects are described as 'Not Significant', seemingly to understate effects, rather than erring on the side of caution.		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	While the viewpoint locations for the visual assessment are agreed, the photomontage locations and method for producing these is not agreed. We have previously provided feedback on photo viewpoints based on a red line boundary plan. These should be reviewed as the design and layout develops to ensure that the LVIA includes 'representative' viewpoints of	A methodology for visualisation preparation is included in **Appendix 7.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.2]**. Two additional viewpoints, with photomontages have been included in response to meetings with NYC in February 2024.	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
		the development, to illustrate the maximum effects of the scheme (worst-case scenario).		
NYC	Further Information and comment following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	We would typically expect photography and photomontages to include winter views and to agree the photomontage location and visualisation type based on guidance set out in LI-TGN-01-19 'Visual Representation of Development Proposals.	The photography and photomontages now comprise winter views.	
NYC	Further Information and comment	It seems likely that relatively open unscreened views of the solar PV would be possible from a range of	This is the case in some locations. Viewpoints 30 and 31 have been included in response to discussions with NYC. In relation to the A1041 cross sections **(Figures 7.25 and 7.26 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.25 and**	

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: PEIR	Response to Consultee: ES
	following Statutory Consultation Response (16th February 2024)	receptors such as PROW, settlement and local roads and we would expect some of these to be included in the photomontage selection (e.g. PROW and local access routes through the development, the A1041 is locally elevated above adjoining fields, affected settlement and residential properties).	**EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26])** have been prepared for locations along this road to help illustrate the relationship between vehicles travelling along this route and the Proposed Development.	

Limitations and Assumptions

7.3.22. In undertaking the Landscape and Visual assessment of the Site and wider surrounding area, there are a number of limitations and constraints affecting the outputs from this work. These include:

- The baseline assessment has been based on information readily available at the time of undertaking the assessment;
- During site visits, weather conditions, the time of day and seasonal factors have influenced the visual assessment and photographic record of the Site. Every effort has been made to ensure that the photographs and their locations are 'representative' of the Site and its surroundings;
- Access to assess the predicted visual effects from private individual properties outside the Site has not been obtained. As a result, the assessment of likely visual effects has been made from vantage points with representative views taken from the nearest available public viewpoint (viewpoints that have been extensively consulted upon with NYC) in combination with the views available from the Site itself;
- The viewpoint photography and visualisations reflect winter conditions. Whilst this reflects a likely worst case there would be seasonal variation in the potential visibility of the Proposed Development;
- Mitigation planting has been assumed to reflect the following heights at year 15: trees and woodland - approximately 7m to 8m, hedgerows - approximately 3m, and scrub - approximately 5m. The growth rate will naturally vary according to species, soil conditions, sunlight, general climate and microclimate, management and maintenance. The assumption is based on detailed technical sources such as the Manual of Woody Landscape Plants[8]. However, information on growth rates of trees and shrubs is freely available from various online sources such as the Woodland Trust[9]. This particular online source demonstrates that the assumed figure for plant growth is at the lower end of the ranges identified for some species included in the proposed landscape

[8] Dirr, M.A. (1990). *Manual of woody landscape plants: their identification, ornamental characteristics, culture, propagation and uses*. Champaign: Stipes Publishing Company

[9] Trust, W. (n.d.). *Fast growing trees for your garden.* [online] Woodland Trust. Available at: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/blog/2018/10/fast-growing-trees/.

scheme (e.g. Hazel (Corylus avellana) – 40-60cm/year; Silver birch (Betula pendula) – 40cm/year); and

- The assessment of landscape and visual effects has been undertaken based on design and technical information available at the time of its preparation for this PEIR stage. The assessment will be finalised in the ES, including consideration of any new or updated material.

7.4. Baseline Conditions

7.4.1. The following descriptions are based on a baseline timeframe of winter (2022, 2023 and 2024), and therefore considers a maximum visibility scenario, in accordance with paragraph 6.28 of the GLVIA3.

Site Context

Location and Land Use

7.4.2. **Figure 7.1: Site Context and Designations Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1]** demonstrates that the Site occupies a broad and extensive cluster of connected parcels defined by the existing agricultural field pattern, with a narrow projection of land to the east that comprises the proposed grid connection route.

7.4.3. The area of the Site not including the Underground Cable Corridor for the connection to the grid in the north-eastern part of the Site shown on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]** of the Environmental Statement (the 'main part of the Site') sits within a wider area of primarily agricultural land bounded to the north-east by the A1041, to the west by the Selby branch of the East Coast Mainline railway and to the south by Hirst Road. This landscape is characterised by large, regular shaped arable fields delineated by partially denuded hedgerows and/or drainage ditches.

7.4.4. The landscape of the study area is predominantly characterised by open agricultural land. However, a number of towns and villages are present, most notably including Selby, the principal settlement within the study area which is located approximately 1.5km north of the Site at its closest point. Several smaller settlements are dispersed throughout, including Camblesforth, Hirst Courtney, Temple Hirst, Carlton, Drax, Barlow and Burn. Farmsteads and clusters of agricultural buildings, some of substantial scale, are also present within the landscape. Of particular note are large greenhouse complexes to the north-east of Camblesforth, and immediately to the

south of the Site near Hirst Courtney.

7.4.5. The study area is strongly influenced by industrial built form and infrastructure, with Drax Power Station a dominant feature in the landscape. The industrial complex occupies an area of approximately 160 hectares ('ha'), lying adjacent to the eastern extent of the Site, and approximately 1.5km north-east of the Site boundary.

7.4.6. There is also large scale industrial built form at the site of Eggborough Power Station, approximately 3km south-west of the Site. However, this facility was in the process of demolition during the baseline appraisal and it is understood that the demolition works are now complete. Planning approval for an industrial and logistics warehouse park in its place has been secured.

7.4.7. Burn Airfield occupies a broad area of land to the west of the Site (approximately 230m away at the nearest point). This site is now primarily used for gliding operations and is operated by Burn Gliding Club.

7.4.8. High voltage power lines are a notable feature in the landscape; one crosses the Site from north-east to south-west linking Drax and Eggborough Power Stations, and the second extends in a south-westerly direction from Drax Power Station towards Carlton to the south of the Site. It is understood that the substation and overhead power lines at Eggborough will be retained even once the plant is decommissioned.

Transport

7.4.9. Transport routes are a notable feature of the Site's context, with the M62 motorway and A63 extending on east-west alignments in the southern and northern extents of the study area, respectively.

7.4.10. The A1041 extends southwards from Selby to Camblesforth, defining the north-eastern limits of the Site, before continuing south to Carlton. The A645 extends eastwards from Camblesforth to Drax (power station and village), with approximately 2km of the road included within the Underground Cable Corridor to the grid connection within the north-eastern part of the Site shown on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]**, while Hirst Road extends to the west from Carlton to Hirst Courtney and Temple Hirst. A network of minor roads and lanes is present throughout the local landscape containing the Site, many of which are also used as connections between PRoWs, with several minor roads marked as 'Other Routes

with Public Access' on Ordnance Survey maps. In addition certain roads, such as Hirst Road and Burn Lane form part of the route of the Trans Pennine Trail.

7.4.11. Railway lines are also a common feature within the study area with the Coast Mainline Selby branch to the east of the Site and the Drax Power Station Railway Connection to the south-east, both passing within approximately 200m of the Site boundary.

Topography and Hydrology

7.4.12. At a regional scale, the Site is located within the Humberhead Levels, an expansive area of flat, low-lying land centered on the headwaters of the Humber Estuary.

7.4.13. The landform of the study area is illustrated on **Figure 7.2: Topography Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1]**, which shows that the Site is virtually flat, lying at approximately 3m – 11m Above Ordnance Datum ('AOD') with an almost imperceptible fall from west to east. The wider landscape is similar, with the only exceptions to the otherwise low-lying level landscape comprising two hills in the north-west of the study area (Hambleton Hough, 46m AOD and Brayton Barff 55m AOD), and a large, partially remediated ash heap to the north of Drax Power Station. This latter feature is not publicly accessible.

7.4.14. The Rivers Aire and Ouse are the dominant hydrological features of the Site's wider context, broadly flowing from east to west across the southern and northern extents of the study area, respectively. At its nearest point, the River Aire passes within approximately 750m of the Site's southern boundary, near Hirst Courtney, while the River Ouse is approximately 2.25km away at its nearest point.

7.4.15. A network of drainage ditches lines the boundaries of many fields throughout the low-lying landscape of the study area.

Vegetation

7.4.16. The vegetation pattern of the study area is generally sparse, typified by large arable fields bounded by hedgerows and tree belts that are often denuded, or in some cases completely open. A limited number of small, often rectilinear shaped areas of woodland are also present throughout the study area, including several which lie adjacent to the main part of the Site. In places, there are also robust tree belts lining transport features, such as road and rail routes.

Public Rights of Way

7.4.17. As demonstrated by **Figure 7.1 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.1]**, the Site and study area are well-served by a network of PRoWs which cross the Site and the wider landscape, often following farm tracks. There are several routes marked as "Other Routes with Public Access" on Ordnance Survey maps following sections of minor roads, such as Race Lane and Stockwith Lane. Of particular note to this assessment are:

- PRoW 35.18/16 and 35.17/U8106/50, a semi-continuous route through the south-eastern part of the Site between Carlton and the western edge of Camblesforth. The middle section of this route is not defined as a PRoW, but appears to be well used by members of the public. The physical path on the northern part of PRoW 35.18/16 does not follow the defined route, instead following the nearest field boundary to the west;
- PRoW 18/U975/70 (Stockwith Lane) and 35.18/U974/70 (Race Lane) which extend towards and through the southern part of the Site from the south-east;
- PRoW 35.38/2/1, which extends across a short section of an arable field within the Site between Old Lane and Brick Lands Lane (no physical route was identified during the site visit and analysis of aerial mapping dating back to 2002 shows this route is unlikely to be used);
- A cluster of PRoW within the Site's north-western extent (14/12/1, 14/20/1, 14/11/3, 14/14/1, 14/13/1, 14/14/2, 14/8/3, 14/11/4 and 17/1/1); and
- PRoW 18/2/2 and 18/14/1, which cross a central point within the main part of the Site.

7.4.18. The Trans Pennine Trail long distance walking and cycling route extends south from Selby and passes through the eastern extent of Burn Airfield, approximately 230m west of the Site boundary. It subsequently extends eastwards and southwards via and then east along Hirst Road to Carlton, typically at a range of 300-400m from the Site boundary. It primarily follows hard-surfaced paths, including local roads, and passes through settlements within the study area.

Designations

7.4.19. The Site is not designated in landscape terms, and there are no national designations for landscape or scenic beauty within the study area. However, the following

designations within the Site's context as shown on **Figure 7.1 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.7]** are of note:

- Kerrick Spring Wood, located adjacent to the Site's south-eastern boundary is designated Ancient Woodland;
- There are several Conservation Areas within the study area, the nearest of which is 2km north within Selby;
- As noted under the policy section, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough, approximately 3.05km and 5.5km north-west of the Site respectively, are designated under local policy as LILAs;
- Listed Buildings are dispersed throughout the study area, including most notably:
  - Carlton Towers (Grade I) located in Carlton, approximately 1.43km from the Site;
  - Camblesforth Hall (Grade I) and an associated Dovecote (Grade II) located within Camblesforth, approximately 385m from the Site at its nearest point; and
  - Manor Farmhouse (Grade II) located in Temple Hirst, approximately 810m from the Site.

Landscape Character

7.4.20. Landscape character assessment is a descriptive approach that seeks to identify and define the distinct character of landscapes that make up the country. It recognises the role of all landscapes, not just 'special' landscapes, as contributing factors in people's quality of life, in accordance with the European Landscape Convention. It also ensures that account is taken of the different roles and character of different areas. The description of each landscape is used as a basis for evaluation in order to make judgements to guide, for example, development or landscape management.

7.4.21. **Figure 7.3: Landscape Character Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.3]** illustrates the extent of landscape character areas in the vicinity of the Site, as featured in published assessments.

National Character Assessment[10]

7.4.22. Natural England has produced a Countryside Character Map of England that defines a series of National Character Areas ('NCAs'): broad areas of consistent landscape character. The Site and study area lie entirely within NCA 39: Humberhead Levels.

NCA Profile 39: Humberhead Levels

7.4.23. NCA 39 is described as *'a flat, low-lying and large scale agricultural landscape bounded to the west by the low ridge of the Southern Magnesian Limestone and to the east by the Yorkshire Wolds (north of the Humber) and the Northern Lincolnshire Edge with Coversands (south of the Humber)'*.

7.4.24. The NCA also comprises several sites of international significance for biodiversity, designated as Special Protection Areas and/or Special Conservation Areas. In addition, 'the whole area is characterised by long views and big open skies.'

7.4.25. The NCA profile identifies the following key characteristics, of relevance to the Site:

- *'A low-lying, predominantly flat landscape, with large, regular and geometric arable fields without hedges but divided by ditches and dykes, many of which form important habitats and key corridors for species movement.*
- *Much of the land is at or below mean high-water mark and maintained by drainage, with fertile soils giving rise to one of the most productive areas for root crops and cereals.*
- *Variations in underlying deposits create differences within the overall flat farmed landscape, including lowland raised mires and lowland heathland, many of which are of international ecological and historical importance.*
- *Sandy deposits give rise to lowland heath, which in places supports remnant birch and oak woodlands, with some conifer plantations.*
- *Heavier soils around Fishlake and Sykehouse result in a smaller scale pastoral landscape, with small, thickly hedged fields, ditches and ponds, and a network of small lanes.*

[10] Natural England (September 2014), National Character Area profiles, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles Accessed September 2023

- *Important historic landscapes include the Isle of Axholme, with evidence of mediaeval open fields, the warps (land enriched by regular silting) near Goole and cables (long thin strip fields) around Thorne.*
- *Widespread evidence of drainage history, in particular the extensive drainage from the 17th century, revealed through canalised rivers, dykes, old river courses, canals, bridges and pumping stations.*
- *Views to distant horizons are often long and unbroken, with big expansive skies, and vertical elements like water towers, power stations and wind turbines are very prominent.*
- *Floodplains, washlands and traditionally grazed alluvial flood meadows (or ings) associated with the major rivers and canals that cross the Levels give rise to important wetland habitats, supporting large numbers of wetland birds and wildfowl, especially over winter.*
- *The waterlogged soils hold internationally important archaeological and palaeo-archaeological deposits.*
- *Despite settlements, motorways and main roads, there is still a sense of remoteness to be experienced on the Levels, in particular on Thorne and Hatfield Moors and along the Lower Derwent Valley'*

County Character Assessment

North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project, 2011[11]

7.4.26. The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project identifies a series of broad scale Primary Landscape Units, which correlate roughly with the Natural England NCAs. The document subsequently breaks down the landscape into smaller Landscape Character Types ('LCTs').

7.4.27. The Site is within the Farmed Lowland and Valley Landscapes Primary Landscape Unit. It is almost entirely contained within LCT 23 Levels Farmland, with a small area of the southern part of the Site lying within LCT 24 River Floodplain. These two LCTs make up the bulk of the study area, with only the settlement area of Selby within a

[11] Chris Blandford Associates (May 2011), *North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project,* Available at: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/environment-and-neighbourhoods/conservation/describing-and-understanding-our-landscape Accessed September 2023

separate LCT (Urban Landscapes).

LCT 23: Levels Farmland LCT

7.4.28. LCT 23 Levels Farmland is described as a *'large-scale farmland landscape'* with the following key characteristics:

- *'Predominantly flat, low-lying landscape which encompasses a patchwork of arable fields;*
- *Large scale, open and rectilinear field pattern;*
- *Dykes or ditches often form field boundaries, with a general absence of hedgerows;*
- *Industrial scale farm buildings, large embankments and drains, and major energy and transport infrastructure contribute human elements;*
- *Historical features, such as windmills, recording past attempts to drain the landscape are key features.'*

7.4.29. A series of definitive attributes are set out for LCT 23, including the following of most relevance to the Site:

- *'Predominantly flat and lies below 10 metres AOD;*
- *Crossed by several rivers running west-east;*
- *Covered by predominantly arable fields, with small patches of improved grassland;*
- *Pockets of suburban land and relatively large areas of deciduous woodland are also scattered throughout this Landscape Character Type*
- *Patches of remaining wetlands*
- *A large proportion of the landscape within this Landscape Character Type is covered by large-scale modern improved fields which are divided by drainage ditches*
- *There are also several modern airfields*
- *Situated amongst the modern fields there are also a couple of areas of planned parliamentary enclosure consisting of medium sized semi-irregular enclosure*

- *Contains several villages and the town of Selby, which is located on a crossing point of the River Ouse*
- *Properties tend to be scattered along minor roads*
- *Contains significant infrastructure developments including two airfields, a major power-station at Drax, several railway lines, including the East Coast Main Line, and several rows of electricity pylons'.*

7.4.30. The analysis also highlights a number of 'Forces for Change' that are relevant to the LCT, including the following:

- *'Agricultural intensification has led to loss of wetland habitats;*
- *Changes in agricultural practices threaten alluvial flood meadows (known as Ings) which are important for their wetland vegetation and as habitats for wintering and migrating birds;*
- *Ongoing management of ditches is important in this landscape;'*

7.4.31. The following sensitivity to change issues are set out for LCT 23:

- *'High visual sensitivity as a result of the predominantly open character and flat landform, which facilitates long distance open views across the landscape and promotes strong intervisibility with adjacent Landscape Character Types;*
- *Low ecological sensitivity, resulting from the fact that much of this Landscape Character Type encompasses improved agricultural land.*
- *Moderate landscape and cultural sensitivity as a result of the presence of a patchwork of historic drainage features (ditches and dykes), moated sites and grange sites.'*

LCT 24: River Floodplain

7.4.32. LCT 24 is described as a series of river corridors, *'often lined with trees and lush, diverse vegetation'* with a relatively enclosed character which is noted as contrasting with *'the open exposed nature of the adjacent flood meadows and lowland landscapes'*. The LCT is also noted for being a *'historically rich habitat is also notable for its considerable nature conservation value including flood meadows, neutral grasslands and floodplain mires'*.

7.4.33. *'Definitive Attributes'* for LCT 24 include the following:

- *'Relatively broad river corridors, containing the river floodplain of several major river courses*
- *Network of drainage ditches are a key landscape feature*
- *A patchwork of small scale arable and improved grassland fields, interspersed with small patches of fen, marsh and swamp, inland bare ground and calcareous grassland*
- *Sinuous belts of modern fields, following the course of the river corridor are features*
- *Interspersed with these are pockets of piecemeal enclosure, parkland, irregular strip fields and lowland meadow'.*

7.4.34. The following key characteristics are identified for LCT 24:

- *'A series of flat, low lying, relatively narrow river corridors which flow through the different types of Vale Farmland Landscape Character Types within the Study Area;*
- *The 'Ings' - flood meadows maintained by traditional hay making activities;*
- *Landscape pattern comprises a mixture of flood meadows, neutral grasslands and floodplain mires;*
- *Halls and manor houses are key landscape features;*
- *River engineering features such as Levees assert a human influence over the landscape;*
- *Power stations, pylons and former collieries are present in parts of this Landscape Character Type;*
- *The A1 (M) introduces a source of noise and visual intrusion in several places.'*

7.4.35. Forces for change for LCT 24 include:

- *'Pasture improvement and arable expansion threaten areas of ridge and furrow and other historic earthworks, as well as the remnants of traditional farming such as grazing meadows;*

- *Lowering of the water table as a result both of drainage and pumping to abstract water for irrigation, has led to loss of habitats and old water courses, and dried out peats, allowing wind erosion and damage to historic features. Warping drains have also been filled in and ploughed over;*
- *Agricultural intensification has led to loss of hedges, trees and small woods, making a traditionally open landscape even more open;*
- *Changes in agricultural practices threaten alluvial flood meadows (known as Ings) which are important for their wetland vegetation and as habitats for wintering and migrating birds'.*

7.4.36. Also highlighted are 'Sensitivity to Change Issues' which include:

- *'High visual sensitivity as a result of the predominantly open character and flat landform, which facilitates long distance open views across the landscape and promotes strong intervisibility with adjacent Landscape Character Types;*
- *High ecological sensitivity as result of the patchwork of fen, flood meadows, floodplain mires, marsh and swamp, inland bare ground and calcareous grassland habitats…*
- *High landscape and cultural sensitivity as a result of the presence numerous historic settlement sites, archaeological sites and designed landscapes, coupled with a dynamic landscape pattern of narrow river corridors.'*

Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019[12]

7.4.37. The Selby Landscape Character Assessment identifies the Site as lying within the following Landscape Character Areas ('LCAs'):

- LCA 7: Aire Valley;
- LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland; and
- LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland.

[12] LUC on behalf of Selby District Council (November 2019), Selby Landscape Character Assessment, Available at: https://www.selby.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Selby%20LCA%20Report%20Combined.pdf Accessed September 2023

LCA 7: Aire Valley

7.4.38. LCA 7 is described as an elongated linear river corridor with the following key characteristics:

- *'Flat, low-lying floodplains to the north and south of the meandering River Aire, which widens further downstream.*
- *High river banks are frequently densely vegetated with shrub, natural grassland and occasional trees, partially isolating the river from view.*
- *Patchwork of fields use primarily for arable farming, defined commonly by ditches, dikes and hedgerows with occasional hedgerow trees.*
- *Areas of wetlands, marshy grasslands and fen located within the floodplain, which offer high nature conservation value.*
- *Power stations and pylons form distinctive human elements visible from within this landscape.*
- *Numerous bridges cross the River Aire, including the A1 in the west.'*

7.4.39. LCA 7 is also characterised as a *'flat landscape with limited tree cover creates a sense of exposure with open views across the landscape. Limited access in places, and the small scale of settlement, contributes to a sense of tranquillity. Power stations and pylons form distinctive human elements visible from within this landscape, having localised effects on rural character and associated tranquillity.*'

7.4.40. A series of 'Key Sensitivities' are identified, including the following:

- The landscape *'may be sensitive to relatively small changes'* due to its flat, open nature;
- Whilst identified as a predominantly intensively farmed landscape, *'locally important water bodies, meadows and woodlands are likely to be more sensitive to change'*;
- The landscape is noted as having limited time depth, with small traditional villages identified as having a '*well-established character'*. Individual heritage assets are noted as being sensitive to change however *'their contribution to landscape character is localised and tend to be within settlements'*;
- Skylines in the LCA are noted as being generally indistinct and of limited sensitivity, albeit *'undeveloped skylines dominated by trees and vegetation are*

likely to be locally more sensitive';

- PRoWs are noted as being scarce in the east, however they are also described as being sensitive to reduced access;
- The LCA is characterised as having *a 'largely rural feel and is quiet and tranquil in most places, and therefore is likely to be more sensitive to new development in the area';* and
- The largely open nature of the landscape is noted as increasing its sensitivity to change as '*new development would be highly visible'*, albeit the eastern and western parts of the LCA are noted as having more ability to absorb development and a lower resultant sensitivity.

7.4.41. Relevant forces for change for LCA 7 are noted as including a lack of maintenance and replacement of hedgerows and trees resulting in further losses of vegetation.

LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland

7.4.42. LCA 13 is identified as an area which in the east *'merges into the farmland surrounding Camblesforth'.* The key characteristics of LCA 13 include:

- *'Flat arable farmland arranged in a patchwork of regularly shaped fields of a large scale, defined predominantly by grassed field margins, and occasional trees.*
- *Distinct lack of hedgerows, creating a vast sense of openness with long distance views and lack of enclosure.*
- *Very sparse settlement pattern, with few isolated properties.*
- *Areas of woodland distributed unevenly through landscape, with significant areas concentrated near Gateforth.*
- *Major energy transmission infrastructure present, with prominent views of power stations, transmission lines and occasional wind turbines.'*

7.4.43. Of further note are Hambleton Hough and Brayton Barff, which are noted as *'key landmarks in northward views from this area'*.

7.4.44. With respect to key relevant sensitivities, the following are noted for LCA 13:

- Whilst the LCA is noted as being potentially sensitivity *to 'relatively small changes, due to its very flat and very open nature in which new features could*

be highly visible', the *'large scale and horizontal aspect may be less sensitive to other development types'*.

- The area is noted as *'an intensively farmed landscape with very few areas of woodland or other semi-natural character' and with 'limited time depth'*.
- Skylines are described as *'frequently indistinct with limited vegetation, and therefore are less sensitive to change',* while long straight roads are noted as providing *'vistas through the landscape, and most of the areas with open visibility would be more sensitive to changes*'.

7.4.45. The LCA is described as having a *'very strong rural character away from the influence of transmission lines, making it more sensitive to new development and change'* while the landscape is noted as *'quiet and tranquil, away from the major roads that have a localised influence'*.

7.4.46. Principal relevant forces for change for LCA 13 include the following:

- *'Potential demolition and redevelopment at Ferrybridge and Eggborough Power Stations may change the skyline of this area, and could have knock on effects on transmission infrastructure.*
- *Re-use or redevelopment of the Burn Airfield.*
- *Extensive removal of hedgerows and field trees has occurred in the past, and while hedges are unlikely to be actively removed during the present, it is likely that further losses may be experienced due to lack of maintenance or reinstatement'.*

LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland

7.4.47. LCA 15 is identified as having the following key characteristics:

- *'Flat arable farmland with a high concentration of small areas of broadleaved woodland and shelterbelts, creating a sense of enclosure.*
- *Medium-large scale rectilinear field pattern, frequently lined by hedgerow trees.*
- *Sparse settlement with very few isolated properties and farmsteads.*
- *Strong human influence from the industrial Drax Power Station, highly visible from throughout the landscape.*

- *Time depth from the juxtaposition of the power station with the historic village of Drax'*

7.4.48. Intensive arable farmland is noted as the primary land use, with *'medium to large scale rectilinear fields'* and *'many small areas of broadleaved woodland'*. Hedgerow trees are noted as *'creating a strong sense of enclosure'* in the east of the LCA.

7.4.49. Numerous listed buildings are noted as being present within the villages of Carlton Camblesforth and Drax, with several scheduled monuments pointing to 'long history of settlement', with the earthwork remains of the medieval Augustinian Priory to the north of Drax Power Station *'presenting a unique conjunction of time depth'*.

7.4.50. Public access to the countryside is described as *'relatively limited, though National Cycle Route 62 passes through Carlton in the southern tip of the area'*.

7.4.51. Drax Power Station is described as a *'major human element which overwrites the landscape of the area between Barlow, Drax and Camblesforth, due to its scale and extent'* with *'transmission lines and railways radiate out from the power station, and lighting can be intrusive'*, while traditional villages and church spires are noted as retaining a rural character.

7.4.52. Key relevant sensitivities, with respect to LCA 15 include:

- *'More open areas of this landscape may be sensitive to relatively small changes, due to the flat nature of the landscape in which new development and change may be easily visible'*. However, it goes on to state that '*the large scale of the landscape is likely to be able to accommodate development which is sympathetically sited and designed, particularly in areas with a stronger presence of vegetation which may limit views'*.
- It is noted that *'whilst it is an intensively farmed landscape which generally has a low sensitivity to change, water bodies and woodland are likely to be more sensitive to change'*. It goes on to state that *'the strong presence of mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees contributes to the natural feel of the landscape, and thus are more sensitive to change and new development'*.
- The published character assessment identifies *'Drax cooling towers and the key landmark features of the area, with Barlow Mound ash disposal providing foreground in some views. Skylines towards the power station are generally*

dominated by the cooling towers, pylons and powerlines'. It also notes that *'views towards the west, south and away from the power station are generally less developed, and therefore likely to have greater sensitivity'*.

- The published character assessment states 'the network of public rights of way is locally valued'.
- In relation to perceptual and experiential qualities it is noted that *'the landscape generally feels more rural in the east, and in the west where there is a greater presence of vegetation and the views of the nearby power station are reduced'*. It continues this theme identifying that *'sensitivity is reduced around the more built up areas, particularly the power station which decreases the sense of rurality and tranquillity'*. The character assessment also notes that *'the sense of tranquillity is reduced closer to the main A1041 road'*.

7.4.53. Principal relevant forces for change for LCA 15 include the following:

- *'Further development pressure is likely to focus on the larger settlements of Carlton and Camblesforth which have potential capacity for new, sensitively sited development.*
- *Potential for commercial development around Drax Power Station.*
- *Redevelopment at Drax may alter the overall appearance of the development.*
- *Changes in generation may require changes in the transmission network.*
- *Lack of maintenance of hedgerows and woodlands leading to loss of tree cover and field boundaries.'*

Published Landscape Guidance

7.4.54. With respect to NCA 39: Humberhead Levels, the following broad guidance, in the form of 'Statements of Environmental Opportunity' ('SEO') is set out:

- *SEO 1: 'Safeguard, manage and expand the wetland habitats, including the internationally important lowland raised bogs, the floodplain grazing marsh, reedbeds, wet pastures and watercourses, to protect and enhance biodiversity, contribute to landscape character, address climate change and reduce flood risks.'*
- *SEO 3: 'Manage the landscape features such as semi-natural habitats*

and historic field patterns that reveal local variations in landscape character, often arising from underlying soils and history of drainage, to enhance people's understanding and enjoyment of the landscape.'

- *SEO 4: 'Protect the open and expansive character of the landscape, its cultural features and sense of remoteness, by ensuring that new development is sensitively located, accommodates green infrastructure, retains long views and makes a positive contribution to biodiversity.'*

7.4.55. At the county level, the following landscape management guidance, of relevance to the Site, is set out:

LCT 23 Levels Farmland:

- *'Use existing hedgerows and biomass planting to integrate built development in the landscape;*
- *Encourage the re-creation of a wider range of habitats in arable areas, including the introduction of permanent grassland field margins, grass buffers along water courses, and linking them where possible to create a grassland habitat network;*
- *Introduce a wide range of arable options to enhance habitats for birds and insects;*
- *Manage watercourses to encourage emergent vegetation, including rare species and to improve habitats for water voles;*
- *Extend natural washlands to increase areas of wetland habitats…'*
- *Plan and site development carefully to maintain the predominantly open character;*
- *Conserve drainage ditches and dykes which enable the landscape to be used for agriculture;*
- *Protect the predominantly open character of this low-lying landscape by maintaining long and unbroken views to distant horizons;*
- *Protect and enhance public enjoyment of the landscape, including appreciation of the sense of escapism it provides, through identifying opportunities to create new circular routes or links to existing public rights of way'*

LCT 24 River Floodplain:

- *'Encourage the creation of new woodland along appropriate riverbanks, which complements the existing woodland pattern;*
- *Conserve valuable floodplain habitats (such as Ings) by encouraging low intensity grazing in the remaining semi-natural habitats (which include mire, fen, flushes, marshy grassland and wet [sic];*
- *Restore and enhance wetland habitats;*
- *Encourage conservation of existing key habitats and landscape features and expand the resource through habitat restoration and recreation guided by ecological networks.*
- *Conserve and enhance the distinct pattern of stone walls and hedgerows delineating field boundaries on order to maintain landscape structure;*
- *Conserve open views along and across the river floodplains towards adjacent Landscape Character Types;*
- *Protect and enhance public enjoyment of the landscape, including appreciation of the sense of escapism it provides, through identifying opportunities to create new circular routes or links to existing public rights of way.'*

7.4.56. With respect to the district level landscape character assessment, the following landscape management guidelines, with relevance to the Site, are set out:

LCA 7: Aire Valley

- *'Encourage planting of shelterbelts and small woodlands to create more naturalistic features in the environment, and provide important habitats for wildlife;*
- *Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and field trees where field boundaries have been lost in the past, particularly along field drains in the west of the area;*
- *Conserve the special character of the river corridor;*
- *Consider colours of new development, favouring colours that are sympathetic to the colour of the surrounding landscape;*
- *Encourage and maintain areas for flood water which could also provide*

valuable wetland environments;…'

LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland

- *'Encourage woodland plantation, including shelterbelts, to increase the perceived naturalness of the character area, and provide valuable habitats and corridors for local biodiversity;*
- *Encourage the restoration and re-establishment of hedgerows and hedgerow trees which have been lost in the past due to field expansion, particularly along roads and field drains in the east;*
- *Seek to secure long-term health of existing woodlands and hedgerows within the area;*
- *The location and design of new development, including temporary works, should be carefully considered as it is likely to be highly visible throughout this flat and open landscape; and*
- *When considering the design of new development, avoid colours that may prominent and attract the eye at long distances in this open landscape.'*

LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland

- *'Seek to secure long-term health of woodlands across the area by promoting appropriate management and natural regeneration, and promote creation of an inter-connected network of green infrastructure;*
- *Encourage continued maintenance of hedgerows and field trees, and where the opportunity arises encourage reinstatement of hedgerows where field boundaries have been lost;*
- *Enhance informal recreational across the landscape by improving public access throughout the area, especially to and within woodlands, and linking settlements with resources; and*
- *New development should be sited to take advantage of the screening offered by the existing woodland and boundary vegetation. In more open areas, encourage the use of soft landscaping techniques.'*

Published Landscape Character Receptors

7.4.57. On the basis of a comprehensive review of published landscape character assessments and analysis of the landscape character of the Site and its context, a number of LCAs have been identified against which effects resulting from the Proposed Development have been assessed.

7.4.58. It is noted that the LCAs identified in the more recent Selby Landscape Character Assessment are broadly consistent with those set out in the older county level assessment. Furthermore, the assessment prepared for the former provides a finer grain of detail with respect to LCAs and as such is considered the most appropriate to form the basis for the assessment of landscape effects.

7.4.59. NCA Humberhead Levels encompasses an extensive area with a variation in land uses, components and features including large areas of settlement. With an area of approximately 169,000ha, the Site occupies approximately 0.28% of the total area of the NCA. On this basis, and considering the relatively limited visual envelope of the Site, significant effects on the NCA are considered unlikely, and as such it has been scoped out of the assessment. It is considered more relevant to focus on the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the local landscape character areas.

7.4.60. The Selby Landscape Character Assessment comprises the finest grain character assessment. Therefore, the following published landscape receptors have been scoped into the assessment:

- *LCA 7: Aire Valley;*
- *LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland*; and
- *LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland*.

7.4.61. The value, susceptibility and sensitivity of these receptors have been assessed. Full details are set out in **Appendix 7.4: Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]** with a summary set out below in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: Summary of Landscape Character Areas and their Sensitivity

Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity
LCA 7: Aire Valley	Community	Low/medium	Low/medium
LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland	Community	Low/medium	Low/medium
LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland	Community	Medium	Medium

Site Appraisal

7.4.62. A landscape appraisal has been undertaken to ascertain the existing character of the Site. This is achieved through recording and analysing the existing landscape features and characteristics, the way the landscape is experienced, and the value or importance of the landscape and visual resources in the vicinity of the Site. The elements of the landscape that contribute to landscape character include the built and natural form, the pattern of features, detailing, scale, planting, land use and human perception. In this regard, landscape character is derived as a result of the perception of, and action and interaction of, natural and human factors.

7.4.63. The character and physical features of the Site are described below with reference to Site Appraisal Photographs ('SAPs') A-H, included in **Appendix 7.5: Site Appraisal Photographs [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.5]**. The locations of photographic viewpoints are illustrated on **Figure 7.4: Site Appraisal Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.4]**.

7.4.64. As demonstrated by **Figure 7.4 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.4]**, the Site encompasses 475ha, predominately comprising agricultural land defined by existing hedgerows, ditches and occasional tree belts, with a sporadic network of lanes and farm tracks following some field boundaries. The fields are large scale and rectilinear with boundaries often partially denuded or entirely unvegetated, leading to a strong sense of openness.

7.4.65. The dominance of extensive open arable fields, and influence of large-scale agricultural buildings around the Site instills a character of an intensively farmed working landscape.

7.4.66. Where present, tree belts and hedgerows define the skyline. However, the fragmented nature of vegetation and often extensive open foregrounds can create limited containment. Vegetation is concentrated along transport routes and edges of settlement, creating some definition to the Site's agricultural context, and creating a degree of enclosure within the edges of surrounding settlements. As a result of this and the sporadic nature of settlement in the study area, the Site is not strongly influenced by residential built forms, albeit there are isolated areas of the Site with intervisibility with more open settlement edges and isolated dwellings.

7.4.67. Notwithstanding the above, the scale of existing built form at Drax Power Station is such that it is the dominant feature on the skyline of the Site and is widely visible throughout the Site and its immediate context. Where present, high-voltage power lines reinforce the influence of infrastructure, while railway lines and roads that define the wider context of the Site are also notable sources of occasional intrusion.

7.4.68. As a result of the above factors, the Site has a simple, open and strongly agricultural character with a strong visual influence of industrial built form. Notwithstanding the visual intrusion of the above, and other built forms and land uses noted above, there is some sense of tranquillity and an overriding rural character.

7.4.69. **Figure 7.5: Tranquillity Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.5]** provides a broad indication of existing tranquillity levels in the study area. The mapping shows that the Site is located within a landscape of varied tranquillity; areas of settlement and large-scale infrastructure are the least tranquil, with notable 'hot spots' of low tranquillity in Selby, Camblesforth, Carlton and Drax. Low to medium levels of tranquillity are also shown broadly following transport routes, including most notably the M62 in the south of the study area, but also the network of lanes and roads that extend through the Site and its context, including the A1041 abutting the Site to the north-east and Hirst Road to the south.

7.4.70. Sporadic patches of the study area, including the south-western part of the Site are shown in light green, indicating relatively high levels of tranquillity. However, these areas are non-contiguous and generally limited in their extent. Furthermore, no part of the study area is identified as being 'most tranquil'.

7.4.71. On this basis, whilst the Site is considered to be strongly agricultural in character with limited areas that are of relative tranquillity. Visual intrusion and, to a lesser degree, audible intrusion from roads, railways, overhead power lines, large scale

agricultural buildings and large scale industrial built form is perceptible to some extent throughout the Site and its context.

Site Level Analysis

7.4.72. On the basis of the Site Appraisal, the Site has been assessed reflecting on its landscape elements and features, aesthetic and perceptual qualities and overall character to reach judgements in relation to its landscape value, susceptibility and sensitivity in relation to the Proposed Development.

7.4.73. Full details of this analysis are set out in **Appendix 7.4: Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]**. The Site is assessed as being of community value, the susceptibility of the Site to the Proposed Development is considered to be medium, and the overall sensitivity of the Site is considered to be medium. A summary of these judgements is provided below.

7.4.74. In terms of landscape value the Site comprises common components and characteristics and is not designated for landscape or scenic qualities. It is strongly agricultural, with limited natural interest. It does not contain any ecological or heritage related designations, which may overlap with landscape value considerations. Hedgerows and canopy trees are common and undesignated elements of the landscape within the Site. Hedgerows are frequently fragmented and in poor condition, limiting their function and contributing to the openness of the landscape. However, they provide a degree of connectivity with woodlands and other hedgerows, contributing to the overall landscape framework and pattern.

7.4.75. Undesignated woodland blocks within and adjacent to the Site assist in providing landscape structure, containment and contrast with the otherwise open landscape within and around limited parts of the Site, however they are often in mixed condition with invasive rhododendron a common feature dominating the understory.

7.4.76. There are opportunities for quiet recreation on the network of lanes and PRoW and these provide a degree of connection between settlements. The dominant and distinctive features that influence the perceptual aspects of the area are Drax Power Station and associated overhead power lines. However, these are primarily located outside the Site itself, which is primarily an undeveloped landscape.

7.4.77. In relation to landscape susceptibility, the landscape of the Site is simple in terms of

pattern and landform, with an open nature that would result in solar farm development within it being perceived by people within the Site and its immediate context. It is a relatively large-scale landscape, with a typically large field pattern. Whilst the blocks of woodland provide visual enclosure in places, the fragmented hedgerow pattern frequently gives rise to open views, which would mean the changes to the Site would be conspicuous from certain locations during and following construction.

7.4.78. The fragmented and denuded landscape structure as a result of human influences, together with objectives for the re-establishment of structure are recurring themes within the published landscape character guidance for the relevant Landscape Character Areas. Key elements that form part of the underlying landscape framework, such as hedgerows, trees and ditches, can and would be retained as part of the Proposed Development. In addition, a landscape strategy for the Site forms an integral part of the Proposed Development, which would help to reduce its potential landscape effects and restore/introduce landscape elements that will contribute to improving the condition of the landscape. This would help to reverse the degradation of the hedgerow pattern and contribute to a framework to help reduce the effects of the solar farm.

7.4.79. The reversibility of the Proposed Development is also a key consideration, allowing the land to return to agricultural use, following decommissioning of the Proposed Development. On balance, and considering the nature of the Proposed Development, the Site is considered to have some ability to accommodate the Proposed Development without transformational Negative effects.

Visual Receptors

7.4.80. ZTVs have been prepared to assist in the selection of viewpoints and inform the assessment of likely visual effects at EIA scoping and PEIR stages. The analysis of predicted visibility has been refined as the design of the Proposed Development has evolved, with ZTVs prepared for the submission layout.

7.4.81. Bare earth ZTVs have been prepared, together with ZTVs that take account of surface features. The relatively flat landform in the context of the Site means the ZTVs that take account of surface features are relevant for the Proposed Development as they help inform the understanding of how visible it is likely to be from locations in the local landscape.

7.4.82. The ZTVs that take account of surface features models the effect of large blocks of vegetation, built form and landform on the potential visibility of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that the ZTV does not take into account the screening effect of smaller areas of vegetation including hedgerows and is therefore only an indication of potential visibility. The findings of the ZTV have been confirmed by field surveys in order to robustly and accurately assess the visual effects of the Proposed Development in accordance with the GLVIA3.

7.4.83. The ZTVs prepared for the Proposed Development comprise:

- **Figure 7.6 – Solar Panels ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.6]**
- **Figure 7.7 – Substation and BESS ZTV – Bare Earth [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.7]**
- **Figure 7.8 - Solar Panels ZTV – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.8]**
- **Figure 7.9 - Substation and BESS ZTV – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.9]**
- **Figure 7.10 - Solar Panels and Substation/BESS combined ZTV – Bare Earth[EN010140/APP/6.2.7.10]**
- **Figure 7.11 - Solar Panels and Substation/BESS combined ZTV – With Surface Features [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.11]**

7.4.84. Each of the above ZTVs shows the location of representative Viewpoints ('VPs') selected for inclusion in the assessment. In addition, **Figure 7.12 – Viewpoint Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.12]**, also shows the detail of the selected viewpoints. Photographs from Viewpoints are presented in **Appendix 7.6 Representative Views [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.6]**, with a description of the baseline visual receptors in relation to the Site set out below.

Visibility Analysis

7.4.85. ZTVs were prepared at EIA Scoping and PEIR stage to inform the viewpoint selection. The layout of the Proposed Development, including the extent of the solar farm zones has evolved between the submission of the PEIR and the preparation of the ES. A series of ZTVs have been prepared for the proposed Solar Farm Zone and the Substation and BESS Compound. For completeness these comprise a

combination of bare earth ZTVs, together with ZTVs that take account of certain surface features.

7.4.86. The ZTVs demonstrate the theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development throughout the Study Area. They are based on a 50m grid of reference points across the solar farm Site and based on the assumption that solar panels would be a maximum height of 3m, the maximum height of structures within the Substation and BESS compound would be 6.48m, and an observer height of 2m.

7.4.87. The bare earth ZTV excludes the screening effect of vegetation and built form and was based on a digital terrain model (DTM) derived from OS Terrain 5 data, whereas the screened ZTV accounted for the screening function of built form and vegetation based on a height value of 8m for buildings and 10m for woodland. It is important to note that the ZTVs that include surface features include larger areas of woodland and buildings, and do not take account of smaller features, such as hedgerows and smaller areas of vegetation. Therefore, the ZTVs that take account of surface features provide an indication of the potential features will have on the visibility of the Proposed Development. The influence of intervening vegetation and the limitations of the ZTVs is demonstrated by certain viewpoints included in the assessment. For instance Viewpoints 22, 23, and 26 all show how vegetation within the landscape between the viewpoint and the Site will restrict visibility of the Proposed Development. The following paragraphs provide an analysis of the ZTVs.

7.4.88. The ZTVs shows a fragmented pattern of theoretical visibility within the study area. The influence of the flat landscape context is clearly evident. The bare earth ZTVs show a relatively extensive, although fragmented pattern of theoretical visibility. The colouring of the ZTV pattern shows the highest number of reference points within an area 2 to 3km from the Site boundary. Beyond this the number of points theoretically visible reduces.

7.4.89. In such a flat landscape, and with reference to a Proposed Development that predominately comprises relatively low-level structures, i.e. solar PV panels with a maximum height of 3m, surface features have a key influence theoretical visibility. This clearly demonstrated by **Figure 7.8 for the Solar Panel Areas [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.8]** and **Figure 7.9 for the Substation** and **BESS [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.9]. Figure 7.8 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.8]** shows visibility would be restricted by surface features in all directions, predominately limited to an area

extending to approximately 2km from the Site boundary.

7.4.90. The differences between the bare earth and surface feature ZTVs (**Figures 7.7 and 7.9 respectively [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.7 and EN010140/APP/6.2.7.9]** for the Substation and BESS is pronounced. These clearly show that the position of the Substation and BESS compound is strongly influenced by the areas of woodland in the local context.

7.4.91. Based on these ZTVs it is predicted visibility of the Proposed Development is likely to be largely limited to an area approximately 2km from the Site boundary. The majority of this landscape comprises agricultural land, crossed by small lanes and PRoW. The key transport route in the vicinity of the Site and within the extent of the ZTV is the A1041. The ZTVs indicate that the key settlements from which the Proposed Development has the potential to be visible from are: Camblesforth and Carlton in the eastern part of the study area, Hirst Courtney and Temple Hirst to the south of the Site, and Burn and Brayton to the west and north west of the Site.

7.4.92. In a wider context, there are few areas of higher ground, which are more likely to afford views towards the Site. However, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough both comprise more elevated areas to the north-west of the Site, both of which lie within Locally Important Landscape Areas. The ZTVs show theoretical visibility from both these locations.

7.4.93. The ZTVs for the Proposed Development confirm that all the viewpoints included in the assessment are relevant. In relation to landscape character, the ZTVs show that key character areas from which the Proposed Development has the potential seen from are LCA 7 Aire Valley, LCA 13 Haddlesey Farmland and LCA 15 Camblesforth Farmland.

Views from the PRoW Network/ Lanes Within and Adjacent to the Site

7.4.94. Open, close-range views of the Site are experienced from the network of PRoW and lanes that traverse across the area. In the south-east, Viewpoint 1 demonstrates views experienced from PRoW 35.18/6. Existing built form in Camblesforth can be seen beyond intervening vegetation on the Site's north-eastern boundary with Drax Power Station and overhead power lines dominating the skyline. Existing trees and field boundary ditches are also a notable feature.

7.4.95. Viewpoints 3a and 3b demonstrate views to the north and south of Chestercourt

Lane, while Viewpoint 4 shows the view south-east into the Site from Jowland Winn Lane, where Drax Power Station is once again a prominent feature at a distance of approximately 2.7km. Similar views to Viewpoint 4 are likely to be experienced by residents of Quosquo Cottages.

7.4.96. Views from Sandwith Lane are demonstrated by Viewpoint 5, where a fragmented hedgerow provides partial filtering of otherwise open views to the south across the southern part of the Site. Views from the north-western extent of Chestercourt Lane are more enclosed by existing hedgerows. Viewpoint 6 shows the view from the road approximately 80m south of the Site boundary, in front of the dwelling identified as The Lodge.

7.4.97. Views from Common Lane on the northern part of the Site boundary are open for approximately 600m, as shown by Viewpoint 7. However, further east, strong vegetation and intervening built form screens the Site, while to the west, dense roadside hedgerows become more prevalent.

7.4.98. Viewpoint 8, Viewpoint 9 and Viewpoint 30 demonstrate open close-range views across the north-western extent of the Site from PRoW 14/13/1,14/8/3 and 14/12/1 respectively, with similar views available from PRoW, 14/20/1, 14/11/3, 14/14/1, 14/14/2, 14/11/4 and 17/1/1.

7.4.99. Views across the southern extent of the Site are represented by Viewpoint 10, located on Old Lane, and Viewpoint 31 on Brick Lands Lane, with similar views experienced northwards from along Moss Green Lane and PRoW 38/2/1. Drax Power Station can be seen at a distance of approximately 4.8km, with the flue punctuating the skyline.

7.4.100. Further east, Viewpoint 11 demonstrates open views that are available from PRoW 18/U975/70 (Stockwith Lane). Large expanses of commercial greenhouses are seen beyond coniferous hedges in the background.

Short to Medium Range Views (0-500m)

7.4.101. Viewpoint 2 shows the view south-west from PRoW 17/U8106/50 at a distance of 50m, where occasional trees provide limited enclosure, and expansive views across the intervening agricultural fields are available. Intervisibility with houses on Hardenshaw Lane is also notable in the view.

7.4.102. The Site is seen from the A1041 in a sequence of open and filtered views over a distance of approximately 4.2km, with substantial intervals where the Site is screened by intervening belts of woodland and built form. From the north, Viewpoints 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 demonstrate close to medium range sequential views of the Site from this route, with Viewpoints 14 and 15 also representative of views from the south-western edge of Camblesforth, including a limited number of residential receptors. Views of the Site from within the settlement area of Camblesforth diminish rapidly due to intervening built form.

7.4.103. Viewpoint 17 (located within the Underground Cable Corridor to the grid connection, as shown on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]** of the ES) shows views that are experienced from the A645, with the main part of the Site strongly filtered and framed by roadside hedgerows.

7.4.104. Viewpoint 18 provides a view towards Drax Power Station from New Road, where existing industrial built form and fencing is a dominant feature in close range views.

7.4.105. To the immediate south of the Site, there are open views across agricultural land towards the Site's southern boundary from PRoW 18/16/1 as shown by Viewpoint 19, with similar views experienced as far south as the Drax Power Station Railway Connection line. Drax Power Station itself is a conspicuous feature on the horizon, with built form in Camblesforth also notable beyond the Site. As set out in paragraph 7.4.17, Viewpoint 19 is located on the physical route that was clearly identifiable during field surveys.

7.4.106. No views of the Site were identified from Carlton to the south of the Site. Viewpoint 20, located on PRoW 18/16/1 on the northern fringe of the settlement, shows that views towards the Site are strongly filtered by intervening woodland and trees adjacent to the Drax Power Station Railway Connection. The slightly elevated nature of the railway line provides additional low-level enclosure. Drax Power Station and associated overhead power lines are a conspicuous feature.

7.4.107. Further west, Viewpoint 21 shows that views towards the Site from Race Lane/Sandwith Lane are expansive, with between 350 and 800m of intervening open agricultural land the dominant feature. The Site's boundaries are occasionally screened by woodland (e.g. Kerrick Spring Wood to the south-west) but are more commonly characterised by remnant hedgerows and occasional canopy trees marking field boundaries. As a result of the flat, expansive nature of the landscape,

the Site's interior is not readily identified, albeit it becomes more apparent with greater proximity.

7.4.108. Views of the Site are generally screened by intervening vegetation and built form from Hirst Road. However, there are views from a 435m section to the east of Hirst Courtney. Viewpoint 22 demonstrates that these views are dominated by open grassland in the foreground, with hedgerows and trees along Moss Green Lane defining the southern edge of the Site at a distance of approximately 350m. Similar views are likely to be available for a limited number of residents on Hirst Road.

7.4.109. Viewpoint 23 presents the view across Hirst Courtney Cricket Ground, on the northern edge of the settlement. The Site's boundary, approximately 400m distant is lined by sporadic trees, with intervening intermittent hedgerows providing strong filtering of the Site. The flue of Drax Power Station is notable on the horizon. Similar views are likely to be experienced by residents on the northern side of Hirst Courtney.

7.4.110. No views of the Site were identified from Temple Hirst. However, further north on Common Lane, there are distant intermittent glimpses of the Site's western boundary seen beyond successive intervening hedgerows. Drax Power Station is also notable on the skyline, at a distance of approximately 4.9km, as shown by Viewpoint 24.

7.4.111. Similar views are experienced further north on PRoW 14/11/4 to the north-west of Fair Oaks as demonstrated by Viewpoint 25, with the Site seen at a distance of 190m with a degree of filtering provided by boundary vegetation.

7.4.112. Viewpoint 26 demonstrates the views that are available from the eastern edge of Burn Airfield, where patches of vegetation along the East Coast Mainline railway, with trees and agricultural buildings beyond, provide a degree of filtering and intermittent enclosure of the Site. Further north on the airfield, the Site is more distant and strongly screened by vegetation.

Long Distance Views (>500m)

7.4.113. Due to the flat landscape and cumulative screening effect of successive hedgerows, tree belts and blocks of woodland, long distance views of the Site have not been identified to the south, east and north of the Site. However, long distance viewpoints have been identified to the north-west as set out below.

7.4.114. However, due to the open nature of Burn Airfield, Viewpoint 27 has been included to

demonstrate views available from Common Lane, the A19 and Burn. However, at a distance in excess of 1.5km, the ground plane of the Site is strongly contained by vegetation along the airfield's eastern perimeter.

7.4.115. As isolated hills with public access, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough have elevated views across the wider landscape. Brayton Barff is generally strongly wooded. However, there are occasional glimpses to the south-east from the southern edge of the feature as shown by Viewpoint 28, at a distance of approximately 3.1km.

7.4.116. More open, elevated views are available from Hambleton Hough as shown by Viewpoint 29. Drax Power Station is a conspicuous feature on the horizon, however the Site, at a distance of approximately 5.7km, is not readily identifiable in expansive views across a strongly treed landscape.

7.4.117. In summary, as an extensive area of open farmland, with a fragmented and denuded vegetation pattern, the Site is inevitably visible in close range views from the network of PRoW and rural lanes that extend across and adjacent to it. However, with increased distance, the combination of a flat landscape and screening provided by successive fragmented field boundaries, occasional woodland blocks and agricultural buildings results in the Site interior being strongly filtered or screened.

7.4.118. The flat landscape also accentuates the effect of foreshortening, with the Site often not forming a large component in middle distance views despite its large extent.

7.4.119. For similar reasons longer distance views are limited. However, sporadic areas of high ground to the north-west provide elevated views across the Humberhead Levels in the direction of the Site. The influence of large scale industrial built form on the area is strong, with Drax a ubiquitous feature in wide ranging views.

7.4.120. A number of residential receptors are likely to have close to medium range views of the Site most notably including residents on the north side of Hirst Courtney and in the south-western fringes of Camblesforth, as well as sporadic individual dwellings and farmsteads located within the broad agricultural context of the Site.

Visual Receptors

7.4.121. On the basis of the visual appraisal, a series of visual receptor groups have been selected against which the effects of the Proposed Development on visual amenity have been assessed.

7.4.122. The value, susceptibility and resultant sensitivity of the visual receptors at each representative viewpoint have been assessed as set out in **Appendix 7.8: Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]** with a summary set out below in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3: Summary of Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity
Users of PRoW	Low	High	Medium
Residents (Hardenshaw Lane; Quosquo Cottages; Rose Hill Farm; Chestercourt Lodge; Primrose Hill; Camblesforth/Carlton/Burn)	Low	High	High/medium - Medium
People travelling in vehicles (country lanes)	Low	Medium	Medium / Low
People travelling in vehicles (A1041/A645/New Road)	Low	Low	Low
Walkers and cyclists (country lanes)	Low	High	Medium
Walkers and Cyclists (A1041/A645/New Road)	Low	Low - Medium	Low - Medium / Low
People travelling in vehicles (Trans Pennine Trail)	Medium	Medium	Medium
Walkers and Cyclists (Trans Pennine Trail)	Medium	High	High/medium
Residents (Hirst Courtney)	Low	High	Medium

Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity
Visitors to Hirst Courtney Cricket Club	Medium	Medium	Medium
Visitors to Brayton Barff	Medium	Medium	Medium
Visitors to Hambleton Hough	Medium	High	High

Future Baseline

7.4.123. The Site is currently in agricultural use and is primarily located within a rural area that is unlikely to be subject to any notable development pressure, albeit there is potential for incremental residential development around Camblesforth and Carlton. Were the Proposed Development not to proceed, it is assumed that the Site would remain predominantly in agricultural use, with little overall change to the landscape baseline in the short term.

7.4.124. In the longer term, it is also likely that the denudement of the vegetation pattern that is evident in recent history would continue. For example, canopy hedgerow trees that are lost as a result of decay or storms are less likely to be replaced due to the sparseness of hedgerow and resultant lack of new trees to establish.

7.4.125. On this basis, the trend for the future is one of growing pressure on the landscape from climate change, and resultant decline of valuable landscape features and habitats. Notwithstanding the above, any resulting changes are unlikely to be perceptible within the timeframe of the future baseline, in 2027.

7.5. Likely Significant Effects

Embedded Mitigation

7.5.1. This section of the chapter sets out the attributes that are included within the design of the Proposed Development and are key elements of primary mitigation which have been taken into account in the assessment of landscape and visual effects. Primary mitigation is defined in GLVIA3 as measures that are *'developed through the iterative design process, which have become integrated or embedded into the project design'*.

Design Evolution and Objectives

7.5.2. The design of the Proposed Development and its integrated landscape strategy have evolved over an 18-month period as part of an iterative, mitigation by design process in accordance with GLVIA3 and the NPSs.

7.5.3. GLVIA3 describes the design process as being integral to EIA. It recommends *'an iterative process, the stages of which feed into the planning and design of the project… Site planning and detailed design, as well as initial appraisal of a development project in the screening and scoping stages, are informed by and respond to the ongoing assessment as the environmental constraints and opportunities are revealed in progressively greater detail and influence each stage of decision making.'* (paragraph 4.6).

7.5.4. Notwithstanding the above, it must be recognised that any development in a countryside location is likely to result in adverse landscape and visual effects of some type. NPS EN-1 reinforces this point, stating:

> *'All proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites'* (paragraph 5.10.12); and
>
> *'The Secretary of State will have to judge whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents, and other receptors, such as visitors to the local area, outweigh the benefits of the project'.* (paragraph 5.10.13)

7.5.5. In considering the overall purposes and aims of the landscape strategy, five broad objectives have been identified:

- To minimise the physical impact of the Proposed Development on the Site's landscape features including vegetation, field pattern and wet features;
- To maximise opportunities to enhance the landscape of the Site by reinforcing and reinstating pattern with extensive new planting that is characteristic to the receiving environment, by introduction of new valuable habitats, and by improved management and custodianship of the landscape resource;
- To visually and physically integrate the Proposed Development into the landscape as much as possible using a variety of natural features;

- To retain and where possible enhance the existing use of the Site for public access; and
- To reduce the visual impact of the Proposed Development on visual receptors, including views from residential properties, local roads and PRoW.

7.5.6. An initial appraisal of the Site within a wider area of search was carried out in January 2022, following which recommendations were made to remove fields from the Site. This included the removal of large areas to reduce potential effects on residential receptors. The **Design Evolution Plan (Figure 4.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]**) illustrates the location and extent of these areas. As a result of the above, and other constraints, the Site extent has been refined to reduce potential visual effects, particularly those on residential receptors.

7.5.7. The proposed parameter area for the Substation/Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) component has also been reduced in order to limit adverse landscape and visual effects.

Measures to be Adopted by the Project

7.5.8. The following applied mitigation measures are proposed for landscape and visual effects relating to the construction and decommissioning phases of the Development. These measures will be implemented through a Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan ('DEMP'). The following measures have been incorporated into the **Appendix 5.1 Outline CEMP ('oCEMP') [EN010140/APP/6.3.5.1]** and will also be included in the **Appendix 5.3 Outline DEMP [EN010140/APP/6.3.5.3]** to be submitted with the ES in support of the DCO application:

- Existing vegetation on and around the Site will be protected from damage in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, this will include established mitigation planting during the decommissioning phase;
- Hours of work on the Site would be limited to 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday; 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays; and no work on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays, thereby limiting the extent to which construction activities will affect receptors on a daily or weekly basis;
- During construction, lighting will be limited to the construction compounds only,

with temporary lighting at the grid connection works. The lighting of the on-Site substation would be in accordance with Health and Safety requirements, particularly around any emergency exits;

- Temporary lighting would be designed to limit any impact on sensitive receptors by directing lighting downward and away from the Site boundary and existing vegetation;
- All unloading/loading of construction/decommissioning materials and equipment would be provided within the Site boundary, limiting adverse effects on character and views due to activities outside of the Site;
- Noise, dirt and dust levels would be kept to a minimum and local roads would be cleaned regularly where dirt is spread by construction traffic, limiting adverse effects on local character due to the perception of construction activities; and
- Litter within and around the Site will be removed and the Site will be kept free from litter throughout construction / decommissioning activities.

Development Characteristics

7.5.9. A full description of the Proposed Development is set out in **Chapter 3 Site and Development Description [EN010140/APP/6.1.3]**. However, the following characteristics are considered to be highly pertinent to landscape and visual effects.

7.5.10. As shown on the Parameter Plan (**Figure 3.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]**), the Proposed Development comprises four main areas:

- Solar Farm Zone;
- Substation and BESS Compound;
- Green Infrastructure; and
- Underground Cable Corridor.

7.5.11. Considering the nature of the Underground Cable Corridor, it is considered highly unlikely to result in significant landscape and visual effects. Therefore, the focus of the mitigation strategy is the Solar Farm Zone and the Substation/BESS Compound. Areas denoted as Green Infrastructure on the **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]** will accommodate proposed landscape and ecological

mitigation, and also access track crossings where required.

7.5.12. The Solar Farm Zone has a restricted height, with solar PV panels limited to a maximum of 3m in height and inverters/transformers of 2.9m height (possibly raised to a maximum of 3.5 if required) above existing ground levels. Proposed security fences around the perimeter of these areas will be to a maximum height of 2.1m above ground level. They will be erected as timber post and wire fences similar in appearance to forestry fencing of a type to protect new planting from deer browsing, and therefore not uncharacteristic in a rural environment. Access tracks and gates will be provided within these areas.

7.5.13. The solar PV panels are trackers which follow the movement of the sun during the day. Their motion is expected to be slow and gradual therefore not immediately apparent for visual receptors with little activity associated with the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

7.5.14. The Substation/BESS Compound is expected to comprise shipping containers to a maximum height of 3.5m and a substation to a maximum height of 6.48m above ground level, this area will also include access tracks, access gates, fencing, earth bunds and attenuation ponds.

7.5.15. Temporary construction compounds will also be created on-Site during the construction and decommissioning phase, comprising two primary compound and up to five secondary compounds.

7.5.16. The Proposed Development is designed to sit within the existing landscape framework, with no impacts on existing trees or woodland proposed. However, there is likely to be limited removal of short sections of hedgerow to accommodate access between fields where unavoidable.

7.5.17. The Proposed Development's modelled operational lifespan of 40 years and the way in which it is to be constructed is such that it predominantly has a temporary character, and the existing baseline, with enhancements to hedgerows, woodlands and fields, is readily reinstated on its removal.

Landscape Strategy

7.5.18. Landscape mitigation measures are set out below and identified on the Landscape Strategy Plans (**Figures 7.19 - 7.26 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.19 -**

EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26]):

- Seeding of existing arable fields under and around the solar PV panels with appropriate native grassland mixes to enhance biodiversity and support grazing;
- Provision of sheep grazing (where possible) within proposed perimeter fences, providing the opportunity to retain agricultural uses on the Site;
- The reinforcement of existing hedgerow field boundaries, particularly where fragmented;
- Re-establishment of historic field boundary hedgerows that have been lost through agricultural intensification;
- Enhancement of wetland/ditch field margins through appropriate native wetland seeding;
- Creation of native woodland shelter belts to reinforce existing woodland habitats and screen views of the Proposed Development;
- Provision of permissive paths within the south-eastern part of the Site to formalise access between PRoW 18/6/1 and U8106/50 to the south of Camblesforth;
- Creation of a series of new habitat areas with a mosaic of native trees, grassland and wetland features to establish new habitats. Wetland features, including habitat ponds and scrapes to be planted with a diverse mix of native aquatic and wetland species; and
- A wide range of species have been specified in planting mixes to promote a varied structure and wider tolerance of conditions, thus making the landscape proposals more resilient as a whole to the changes likely to be brought about by climate change.

7.5.19. In some instances, screening planting has not been provided alongside PRoW routes/lanes to maintain a degree of openness within and/or across the Site. In such locations, the Proposed Development's solar PV arrays have been set back a minimum distance of 15m from the PRoW, and the buffers will be planted with a tussock forming grassland mix that will be allowed to grow to a substantial sward, helping to integrate the Proposed Development within the landscape.

7.5.20. In the case of Bricklands Lane, existing scattered canopy trees along the lane will be reinforced, which will provide some filtering of views.

7.5.21. NYC reviewed the PEIR and provided comments as part of their consultation response. This set out that it was considered revisions to the Proposed Development were required. The detail of these comments are included in Table 7.1 of this chapter. In summary, the key points made are as follows:

- The extent of the planting is disproportionately small in relation to the Proposed Development, and unable to make any meaningful difference in the context of the scale of the proposed solar farm;
- A need for a more robust framework of planting was requested, with more substantial linked green infrastructure elements was requested, together with a long term commitment to their maintenance and management;
- NYC wish to see better separation and screening between the different areas of solar panels, together with other nearby planned installations to the north of the A1041.
- More substantial screening and separation between the solar PV and settlements was requested, together with sufficient stand-off from sensitive receptors such as PROW and local roads in order to maintain important views and a degree of openness;
- NYC consider the importance of views from local roads should not be understated in the LVIA, with these forming the main access routes and entrance to settlement and form an important part of the context of the Site.
- It was identified that the landscape strategy should not be overly dependent on establishment of tall new hedgerows for screening. Identifying that these can look out of context and will take many years to develop through ongoing trimming and laying. NYC stated that they would expect the landscape mitigation to be based on a mixed strategy to respond to local character and context.
- NYC identified that woodland planting should be considered along important boundaries and in key locations. This would enable planting to grow more naturally in height and structure without ongoing intensive trimming. They also set out that new woodland should be at a size, scale and layout typical of the character area to allow sufficient height and structure for all-year-round

screening. In addition, there should be sufficient stand-off from solar PV to allow maintenance access and avoid compromising solar efficiency.

7.5.22. In response to the above comments a review of the landscape strategy for the Proposed Development was undertaken. This review also necessitated alterations to the layout of the areas of solar panels to provide additional land for planting. The alterations to the planting include specific additional measures, but also the incorporation of broader principles. Additional scrub planting has been included to diversify the structure of the landscape proposals. Some of this scrub planting would be located along the Site boundary to add variation to the height of the vegetation. It has also been positioned around the edges of woodland areas to provide a transitional habitat. In places scrub planting has been positioned closer to the areas of solar panels, with the potential that this planting could be coppiced if required to limited any effects of shadowing on the efficiency of the development, whilst maintaining the overall extent of the planting over time.

7.5.23. Overall, when reviewing and altering the landscape strategy for the Site the objectives have been to ensure the areas of proposed woodland are comparable with areas of woodland in the baseline landscape. Diversify the nature and structure of the planting throughout the Site. Ensure good connectivity between the proposed planting and also link this with areas of existing vegetation. Ensuring visual screening of the Proposed Development can be delivered, with a particular focus on settlements and PRoW around the Site, but also with consideration of the A1041 as a key transportation route and gateway to Camblesforth. Cross sections (**Figures 7.25 and 7.26 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.25 and EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26]**) have been prepared for locations along this road to help illustrate the relationship between vehicles travelling along this route, and residents in Cablesforth, and the Proposed Development.

7.5.24. Key specific changes to the landscape strategy for the Site are summarised as follows:

- Additional planting along the north-west boundary of the Site, comprising a series of woodland blocks position close to the Site boundary. These would not be continuous, would be series of separate areas, connected by areas of scrub and hedgerows (with hedgerow trees).
- Along the north-eastern boundary of the Site there would be areas of woodland that link with existing woodlands. In addition, scrub planting is

proposed to restrict potential views from the A1041, noting that the road carriageway is raised slightly relative to the level of the Site;

- In the vicinity of Camblesforth, additional woodland and scrub planting is proposed to provide more comprehensive visual screening of the Proposed Development from the edge of the village and A1041;
- In the vicinity of Hirst Courtney additional tree and scrub planting is proposed. The focus of this planting is to restrict visibility from Old Lane and Moss Green Lane, along the southern boundary of the Site.

7.5.25. Full details of planting types and quantities are set out on **Figure 7.23 Landscape Schedules and Notes [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.23].** However, Table 7.4 below summarises planting quantities for convenience.

Table 7.4 Summary of Landscape Planting Quantities

Landscape Element	Measurement (approx. area / length)	Plant Quantity
Proposed Woodland Planting	13.6ha	32,548
Existing Woodland to be Reinforced	0.6ha	270
Proposed Scrub Mix	2.3ha	10,076
Proposed Hedgerow	12km	49,177
Existing Hedgerow Reinforced	8km	8,122
Proposed Hedgerow Trees	n/n	221
Proposed Canopy Trees	n/a	148
Proposed Grassland within Fence	288.2ha	n/a
Proposed Tussock Grassland outside Perimeter Fence	52.7ha	n/a

Landscape Element	Measurement (approx. area / length)	Plant Quantity
Proposed Wildflower Meadow	1.6ha	n/a
Proposed Wetland Grassland	16.8ha	n/a
Proposed Habitat Ponds	0.4ha	n/a
Proposed Habitat Scrapes	0.3ha	n/a

7.5.26. On the basis of the above, the proposed landscape strategy is considered to be extensive and commensurate with the scale of the Proposed Development. It has the potential to deliver meaningful improvements in landscape structure across the whole Site once established. The guidelines and objectives in the published landscape character assessments have informed the proposed strategy. The approach taken has also responded and evolved in response to the comments received from NYC. The overall intention of the landscape strategy is to improve or strengthen local landscape character, but not fundamentally change it. For instance, areas of existing woodland, in terms of their extent and form, have been used as a reference to inform the detail of the proposals.

7.5.27. **Figure 7.23 Landscape Schedules and Notes [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.23]** includes outline planting specification specifications and management notes that would be implemented to provide for the establishment of proposed planting. In addition, an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) has been prepared and is included in **Appendix 7.9 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.9]**. It is anticipated that the landscape strategy for the Proposed Development will evolve during and after the determination of the DCO application, This would involve consultation with input from key stakeholders, the final landscape strategy and LEMP secured as a requirement of the DCO. **Figure 7.24 Illustrative Landscape Masterplan [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.24]** illustrates the proposed landscape strategy on a Site-wide basis, showing the broad extent and nature of proposed landscape elements with the aid of precedent imagery.

Construction Phase Assessment

7.5.28. An assessment of the likely significant landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development during the construction phase has been carried out. The construction phase is anticipated to take approximately 12 months.

7.5.29. Full commentary on the magnitude and significance of landscape and visual effects is set out in **Appendix 7.4 Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]** and **Appendix 7.8 Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]**. A summary of the effects identified, including key narrative for any significant effects is set out in this section.

7.5.30. The principal changes that will have an effect upon landscape character, landscape features and visual amenity during the construction phase include:

- The loss of openness and alterations to the existing appearance of the Site;
- The introduction of new temporary elements, including temporary access tracks, construction compounds, material stockpiles, welfare facilities, plant and machinery;
- Groundworks, topsoil stripping and excavation for ancillary structures and cables;
- The noise and movement of plant and machinery within the Site and the surrounding landscape, including crane activities and construction traffic on local roads;
- Removal of limited areas of existing hedgerow where access is required;
- Landscape operations (i.e., implementation of the landscape mitigation measures set out in paragraph 7.5.18 above); and
- The building and emergence of new built forms, including panels, ancillary structures and fencing.

Landscape Effects

7.5.31. In overview, the Proposed Development would result in no significant effects in the construction phase, largely due to the short-term duration of this phase combined with the medium or low/medium sensitivity of the landscape of the Site and relevant character areas. The detail of these judgements and the justification is provided in

the following paragraphs.

7.5.32. In relation to the Site itself it is predicted there would be moderate adverse effects on the character of the Site itself, based on a medium sensitivity and medium magnitude of change. The construction activities would principally affect the fields within the Site, which are currently used for intensive arable farming. The landform within the Solar Panel Areas would be unchanged. The existing structure of field boundaries, including hedgerows, hedgerow trees and ditches/watercourses would be retained. There would only limited vegetation loss required to facilitate access or cable routes and alteration of ditches/watercourses would comprise new crossings for access. Any such changes to boundaries would be limited and the associated effects very localised.

7.5.33. The physical impacts on the landscape fabric of the Site would be more than offset by the proposed landscape strategy, which form an integral part of the Proposed Development. The landscape strategy would result in woodland, scrub, hedgerow and grassland establishment across the Site. Whilst this would be in its infancy at the construction phase, it would comprise the first part of creation and restoration of key landscape elements across the Site.

7.5.34. The construction activities would affect perceptual qualities within the Site, resulting from the solar PV panels and other built elements. There would also be the establishment of construction compounds and the movement of construction vehicles. However, the noise and vibration assessment (**Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [EN010140/APP/6.1.11]**) identifies that noise effects during the construction phase are predicted to be negligible. The open and simple character of the Site would be adversely affected by the construction phase. Although, a key consideration is the duration of the works, which would be short term, taking place over a period of 12 months.

7.5.35. The moderate effect on the character of the Site during construction is not considered to be significant. This is principally due to the short term duration of this phase. The limited effects on and protection of field boundary elements is also an important consideration, as is the commitment to improve landscape elements within the Site through the implementation of the landscape strategy. It is also relevant to note that none of the landscape features or elements, or the character of the Site is designated for their landscape value.

7.5.36. In relation to landscape character, the majority of the Site lies within the Camblesforth Farmlands LCA. The points described above are relevant to the Camblesforth Farmland, terms of the nature of the activities, the retention and protection of field boundaries and the short term duration of the phase. A moderate adverse effect on the Camblesforth Farmlands is predicted, but this is not predicted to be significant for the reasons explained in relation to the Site itself.

7.5.37. The potential effects on the other two LCAs in the context of the Site, the Aire Valley and the Haddlesey Farmland are predicted to be less than those assessed in relation to the landscape of the Site and the Camblesforth Farmland. As well as the points made above being relevant (e.g. the retention and protection of field boundaries and the proposed landscape enhancements), the Proposed Development would occupy a relatively small extent of these LCAs. As a consequence, the duration of the construction phase within these LCAs is also expected to be shorter. There would be adverse effects on the character of these LCAs, but these are predicted to be minor/negligible, and not significant, in relation to the Aire Valley (low/medium sensitivity and slight/negligible magnitude of change) and minor, and not significant, in relation to the Haddlesey Farmland (low/medium sensitivity and slight magnitude of change).

Visual Effects

7.5.38. The construction phase of the Proposed Development is not predicted to result in any significant visual effects, the detail of this is set out in **Appendix 7.8 Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]**. This is applicable to all viewpoints that have been assessed, including those that are within and adjacent to the Site boundary. Therefore, it is unlikely that there would be any significant effects in relation to any visual receptors within, or in the local context of the Site.

7.5.39. The effect on visual amenity is not considered to be greater than moderate at any location. Whilst there a number of moderate adverse effects are predicted these are not predicted to be significant, predominately due to the short-term duration of the construction phase. No landscape and visual specific mitigation is proposed during this phase of the Proposed Development and there are locations where the size/scale and extent of the change are predicted to be large. However, no significant effects are predicted due to the short-term duration (12 months) of the construction phase.

7.5.40. These moderate adverse effects relate to the users of PRoW within the Site or close

to the Site boundary, together with walkers and cyclists using local minor roads and the residents of properties close to the Site boundary.

7.5.41. Table 7.5 provides a summary of the viewpoint assessment related to the construction phase. For each effect, the nature of that effect is set out i.e. positive (P), negative (N) and neutral (Nu). As no mitigation is proposed as part of this phase, the effects stated reflect the residual construction effects.

Table 7.5 Summary of Viewpoint Assessment Judgements – Construction Phase

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
1	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium	Moderate (N)
2	Users of PRoW Residents (Hardenshaw Lane)	Medium High/Medium	Slight	Minor (N) Minor (N)
3	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Medium	Minor/moderate (N) Moderate (N)
4	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Quosquo	Medium/low Medium Medium	Medium/slight	Minor (N) Moderate (N) Moderate (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
	Cottages)			
5	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Rose Hill Farm)	Medium/low Medium Medium	Medium	Minor/moderate (N) Moderate (N) Moderate (N)
6	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Chestercourt Lodge)	Medium/low Medium Medium	Slight/ negligible	Minor/negligible (N) Minor (N) Minor (N)
7	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Medium	Minor/moderate (N) Moderate (N)
8	Users of PRoW Residents (Primrose Hill)	Medium Medium	Medium	Moderate (N) Moderate (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
9	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium	Moderate (N)
10	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Medium	Minor/moderate (N) Moderate (N)
11	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium	Moderate (N)
12	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Medium/slight	Minor/negligible (N) Minor/negligible (N)
13	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Medium	Minor (N) Minor (N)
14	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Camblesforth)	Low Medium/low High/medium	Slight	Negligible (N) Minor/negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
				Minor (N)
15	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Camblesforth)	Low Medium/low High/medium	Slight	Negligible (N) Minor/negligible (N) Minor (N)
16	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Medium/low	Slight	Minor/negligible (N) Minor (N)
17	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Slight/negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
18	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Slight/negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
19	Users of PRoW	Medium	Slight	Minor (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
20	Users of PRoW Residents (Carlton)	Medium High/Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor/negligible (N)
21	Users of PRoW	Medium	Negligible	Negligible/minor (N)
22	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Hirst Road)	Medium High/medium High/medium	Slight	Minor (N) Moderate/minor (N) Moderate/minor (N)
23	Visitors to the cricket club Residents (Hirst Courtney)	Medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor/negligible (N)
24	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and	Medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor/negligible

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
	cyclists			(N)
25	Users of PRoW	Medium	Slight	Minor (N)
26	Walkers and cyclists	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
27	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Burn/Common Lane)	Medium/low Medium Medium	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)
28	Visitors to Brayton Barff	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
29	Visitors to Hambleton Hough	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
30	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium	Moderate (N)
31	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Medium	Minor/moderate (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Moderate (N)

Operational Phase Assessment

7.5.42. An assessment of the likely significant landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development at Year 1 of the operational phase has been carried out. i.e. before newly established mitigation measures mature and influence effects.

7.5.43. Full commentary on the magnitude and significance of landscape and visual effects is set out in **Appendix 7.4 Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]** and **Appendix 7.8 Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8].**

7.5.44. In order to support the assessment and identification of visual effects, a series of photomontages has been prepared for selected viewpoints as indicated on **Figure 7.12 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.12]**. The visualisations comprise fully rendered views of the Proposed Development showing the anticipated winter appearance of proposed planting at Year 1 and Year 15. The visualisations are presented in **Appendix 7.7 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.7]** of the ES.

7.5.45. The assessment of visual effects has been carried out with reference to the visualisations and the winter baseline photography included in **Appendix 7.6 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.6]**. Winter views and visualisations have been used for the assessment to ensure the worst-case scenario has been taken into account.

Landscape Effects

7.5.46. In Year 1 of the operational phase, the Proposed Development is expected to give rise to significant landscape effects. Such effects would continue through the early years of the operational phase of the Proposed Development, gradually reducing as the planting that forms part of the landscape strategy establishes and matures. The following section describes how these effects would relate to landscape receptors within the study area. The detailed analysis of potential effects on the Site itself and key landscape character areas in the study area is included in **Appendix 7.4 Landscape Effects Tables [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]**.

7.5.47. There would be a major/moderate and significant effect on the Site and its character (medium sensitivity and substantial magnitude of change). At year 1 of the operational phase structures would have been introduced across the majority of the Site. For the most part, the landform within the Site would be unaltered by the Proposed Development. The exception to this would be within the Substation and BESS Compound, where there would be relatively limited landform alterations to create a level platform for development and create an earth flood defence bund will be raised at least +0.6m above the flood level to protect the equipment from inundation appropriate flood protection. These landform alterations would be limited due to the generally flat nature of the Site. The introduction of the solar PV panels would alter the appearance of the Site and the way in which would be perceived. As described relation to the potential construction effects, the development would take place within the fields and the framework of hedgerows, trees, woodland and ditches/watercourses would be retained. The Proposed Development incorporates an extensive landscape strategy which has been designed to mitigate both potential landscape and visual effects. Whilst this landscape strategy would restore and strengthen key characteristic of the landscape, the planting would be newly instated at this point in the life of the Proposed Development. Therefore, the presence of the planting would be limited, which would restrict its influence on the effects resulting from the built elements of the Proposed Development. Whilst the operational phase of the Proposed Development will be 40 years, and this duration has been taken into account in the assessment judgement. It is also relevant that it will be reversible, with a clear requirement for the structures to be removed at the end of the operational phase.

7.5.48. By year 15 it is expected that the planting that forms part of the landscape strategy will have become sufficiently established to reduce the effects of the Proposed Development on the Site. It is evident that elements of the landscape within the Site have deteriorated in condition. This is most obviously expressed in the fragmented hedgerow pattern, with some hedgerows also having been completely removed or lost. The planting proposals have been designed to not just reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development, but to restore and strengthen landscape character. It is considered that the proposed network of hedgerows, woodland and scrub planting, together with measures, such as grassland and meadow establishment and new ponds would make a meaningful contribution to the local landscape, enhance biodiversity and increase habitat connectivity. The built elements of the Proposed

Development would remain conspicuous elements at year 15. However, the establishment of the landscape strategy, and the way in which this would contribute to the landscape framework within the Site would reduce the effect of the of the Proposed Development to moderate adverse. This is not considered to be a significant effect due to the way in which the planting would contribute to landscape character, whilst also acknowledging the reversible nature of the Proposed Development.

7.5.49. A comparable major/moderate and significant effect would occur in relation to the Camblesforth Farmland (medium sensitivity and substantial magnitude of change), the LCA in which the majority of the Proposed Development will be located. The Proposed Development would occupy a large proportion of this LCA (approximately 11 percent), and the solar PV arrays in particular would result in a large level of landscape change. As stated in relation to the Site itself, the proposed landscape strategy would have a limited influence on the landscape effects of the Proposed Development due its immaturity. The points described above in relation to the duration of the operations phase and the reversibility of the Proposed Development are also relevant.

7.5.50. Once the landscape strategy for the Site has established the effects of the Proposed Development on the Camblesforth Farmland would reduce. As with the potential effects described in the relation to the Site, the effect would reduce to moderate. At this point, the landscape strategy would be sufficient to reduce the adverse effect of the Proposed Development to not significant. The landscape strategy would not influence the footprint of the solar PV arrays, but it would reduce their prominence in the landscape. As described above, the establishment of the landscape strategy would restore and strengthen landscape character relative to its baseline condition. The measures proposed would make a meaningful contribution to the local landscape and would also contribute to a broader role. The Site lies within a regional green infrastructure corridor, identified in the Selby District Core Strategy, October 2013. This which overlaps with the southern part of the Site and the landscape proposals would create a sequence of interconnected hedgerows and woodlands, together with a range of other habitats. Collectively, these measures would make a positive contribution to this regional green infrastructure corridor.

7.5.51. The effects of the Proposed Development on the Aire Valley LCA (medium/low sensitivity and slight magnitude of change) and Haddlesey Farmland LCA

(medium/low sensitivity and medium/slight magnitude of change) are less than the level of effect for the Camblesforth Farmland; minor and moderate respectively. Both these effects are considered to be not significant for these LCAs. The extent of the Proposed Development within these LCAs will be relatively small. In addition, the limited height of the built elements of the Proposed Development, particularly the height of the solar PV arrays with a maximum height of 3m, will also limit the extent of the potential effects. This is a point that is demonstrated by the viewpoints and visualisations, which show that the prominence of the Proposed Development quickly diminishes at relatively short distances from the Site boundary.

7.5.52. The themes described above in relation to the longer term establishment of the landscape strategy would be applicable to the Aire Valley and Haddlesley Farmland LCAs. The effects of the operational phase on these LCAs have been assessed as not significant at year one and, while adverse effects would continue as the landscape strategy establishes, these would reduce by year 15 (negligible in relation to the Aire Valley and minor in relation to the Haddlesley Farmland). The points described in relation to the Site and Camblesforth Farmland would be applicable to the Aire Valley and Haddlesey Farmland, but to a lesser degree due to the relatively small parts of these LCTs that overlap with the Site.

Visual Effects

7.5.53. The initial year within the operational phase of the Proposed Development is expected to give rise to significant effects on a number of visual receptors groups. The early part of the operational phase of the Proposed Development is the key point when significant effects on visual amenity are likely to occur. The visual receptors for which significant effects are predicted to occur are either within or relatively close to the Site. The most distant receptors from the Site, from which significant effects are predicted are located on the edge of Camblesforth, approximately 130m from the Site boundary. For the majority of receptors the predicted effects on visual amenity would gradually reduce as the proposed landscape strategy establishes and matures. The exceptions to this are PRoW within the Site, where the screening potential of proposed planting would be limited.

7.5.54. The viewpoint assessment contained within **Appendix 7.8 [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]** provides a detailed analysis of the potential effects on visual amenity in relation to the representative locations that have been selected within the study area. Table 7.6

provides a summary of the viewpoint assessment for the operational phase. Table 7.6 provides a summary of the viewpoint assessment related to the construction phase. For each effect, the nature of that effect is set out i.e. positive (P), negative (N) and neutral (Nu).

7.5.55. The paragraphs that follow the table provide a description of these effects, for visual receptors within the study area. This description of the effects also takes the landscape strategy into account relating this specifically to visual receptors. Key elements of the landscape strategy are proposed to reduce effects on visual amenity, as well as to reduce potential landscape effects.

Table 7.6 Summary of Viewpoint Assessment Judgements – Construction Phase

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
1	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium / Substantial	Major / Moderate (N)	Medium	Moderate (N)
2	Users of PRoW Residents (Hardenshaw Lane)	Medium High/Medium	Medium	Moderate (N) Major / moderate	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
3	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Substantial	Moderate (N) Major / moderate (N)	Slight	Minor (N) Minor (N)
4	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Quosquo Cottages)	Medium/low Medium Medium	Medium	Minor (N) Moderate (N) Moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor / negligible (N) Minor / negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
5	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Substantial	Moderate (N)	Slight	Minor / Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Major / moderate (N)		Minor (N)
	Residents (Rose Hill Farm)	Medium		Major /moderate (N)		Minor (N)
6	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Slight	Minor (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Minor (N)		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Chestercourt Lodge)	Medium		Minor (N)		Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
7	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Substantial	Moderate (N) Major / moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
8	Users of PRoW Residents (Primrose Hill)	Medium Medium	Substantial	Major / Moderate (N) Major / Moderate (N)	Slight	Minor (N) Minor (N)
9	Users of PRoW	Medium	Substantial	Major/ Moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
10	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Substantial	Moderate (N) Major / moderate (N)	Slight / Negligible	Minor/ Negligible (N) Minor/ Negligible (N)
11	Users of PRoW	Medium	Substantial	Major / Moderate (N)	Substantial	Major / Moderate (N)
12	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Substantial / Medium	Moderate (N) Moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
13	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Medium	Minor(N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Low		Minor (N)		Minor (N)
14	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Medium	Minor(N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Moderate (N)		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Camblesforth)	High/medium		Major / Moderate (N)		Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
15	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Medium	Minor(N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Moderate (N)		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Camblesforth)	High/medium		Major / Moderate (N)		Negligible (N)
16	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Medium / Slight	Minor/ Negligible (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Minor (N)		Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
17	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Slight / Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)
18	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Slight	Minor / Negligible (N) Minor / Negligible (N)	Slight	Minor / Negligible (N) Minor / Negligible (N)
19	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium / Slight	Minor/ Moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
20	Users of PRoW Residents (Carlton)	Medium High/Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor / negligible (N)	No Change	No Effect No Effect
21	Users of PRoW	Medium	Slight	Minor (N)	Negligible	Negligible (Nu)
22	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Hirst Road)	Medium High/medium High/medium	Medium / Slight	Moderate / Minor (N) Moderate (N) Moderate (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N) Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
23	Visitors to the cricket club Residents (Hirst Courtney)	Medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Minor / Negligible (N)	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)
24	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium High/medium	Slight / Negligible	Minor (N) Minor (N)	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
25	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium / Slight	Moderate (N)	Slight / Negligible	Minor / Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
26	Walkers and cyclists	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)	No Change	No Effect
27	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Burn/Common Lane)	Medium/low Medium Medium	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)
28	Visitors to Brayton Barff	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (Negative)	No Change	No Effect

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change – Year 1	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 1	Magnitude of Change – Year 15	Effect on Visual Amenity – Year 15
29	Visitors to Hambleton Hough	High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (Negative)	No Change	Negligible (N)
30	Users of PRoW	Medium	Substantial	Major / Moderate (N)	Substantial	Major / Moderate (N)
31	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Substantial	Moderate (N) Major / Moderate (N)	Substantial	Moderate (N) Major / Moderate (N)

Settlements and residential properties

7.5.56. Key settlements within the landscape surrounding the Site comprise Camblesforth, Carlton, Hirst Courtney and Burn. There are other settlements within the study area including Selby, Brayton, Thorpe Willoughby, Eggborough, Snaith, Rawcliffe, Drax, Hemingbrough and Cliffe. However, the ZTVs, particularly the ZTVs that incorporate surface features, together with a number of the viewpoints located more distant from the Site boundary, demonstrate how visibility, and therefore also potential effects on visual amenity, of the Proposed Development will reduce considerably with distance.

Camblesforth

7.5.57. In relation to Camblesforth, there will be potential views of the Proposed Development from the south west edges of the village. The slightly elevated position of the village and A1041 on the edge of the settlement, together with the relatively open nature of the landscape between Camblesforth and the Site boundary results in views towards the Site. The solar PV arrays would be positioned between approximately 150m and 215, from the core part of the settlement (Viewpoints 14 and 15), with reduced separation from more peripheral residential properties (e.g. Viewpoint 2). The viewpoint assessment identifies a major/moderate and significant adverse effect on visual amenity for residents at Viewpoints 2, 14 and 15 at year 1 of the operational phase.

7.5.58. A key consideration in the preparation of the landscape strategy has been the need for planting to reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development from the edge of Camblesforth. The proposed planting has been reinforced in response to consultation responses from NYC. The planting between Camblesforth and the solar PV arrays would comprise a combination woodland, scrub and hedgerows. This combination is proposed create diversity in the appearance of the planting as it establishes and matures. It also seeks to reflect and complement the layering of vegetation in the baseline landscape, with a mix of hedgerows, trees and woodland across the horizon. A cross section (**Figure 7.26 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26]**) has been prepared for a location on the edge of Camblesforth to help illustrate the relationship between residential properties and the Proposed Development By year 15 of the operational phase it is predicted that the proposed planting would provide effective visual screening of the solar PV arrays would reduce, and potential effect on visual amenity for residents on the south west edge of village would reduce to negligible and not

significant.

Carlton

7.5.59. There will be potential views of the Proposed Development from the northern edge of Carlton, with the closest residential properties comprising a new development on the north west edge of the village. The view from the edge of Carlton is represented by Viewpoint 20, approximately 440m from the Site boundary and approximately 520m from the solar PV arrays. It is predicted that the visibility of the Proposed Development from the edge of Carlton is predicted to be very limited, with a minor/negligible and not significant effect at year 1 and no effect predicted at year 15 due to the screening provided by the proposed planting. There is potential for the solar PV arrays to be more visible from the upper floors of the new properties, but this would only be applicable to houses on the western edge of the new development. A combination on new woodland, scrub and hedgerow planting on the southern edge of the Site would further reduce potential visibility of the Proposed Development.

Hirst Courtney

7.5.60. Hirst Courney is located to the south of the Site. Viewpoints 22 and 23 are positioned in the vicinity of village, approximately 360m and 407m from the Site boundary respectively. Visibility of the Proposed Development at year 1 would be relatively limited due the intervening distance and vegetation. Of the two viewpoints assessed, visibility of the Proposed Development is predicted to greater from the western edge of the village (Viewpoint 22). Significant adverse effects are not predicted Viewpoints 22 and 23 at year 1; moderate and moderate/minor respectively.

7.5.61. Planting has been a key consideration in relation to Hirst Courtney. As well as the settlement, potential views from Old Lane and Moss Green Lane to the north have been important factors. The baseline vegetation to the north of the settlement already provides some restrictions to visibility in the direction of the Site. However, this will be reinforced by the landscape strategy, which comprises narrow woodland and scrub, together with general strengthening of vegetation along the southern boundary of the Site. This is predicted to reduce the potential effects on visual amenity to negligible and not significant at both viewpoints at Hirst Courtney by year 15.

Burn

7.5.62. It is predicted there will be very limited visibility of the Proposed Development from Burn. This is demonstrated by Viewpoint 27, approximately 1.5km from the Site, from which negligible and not significant effects on visual amenity are predicted in relation to the operational phase at year 1. None of the planting proposed as part of the landscape strategy specifically relates to Burn, although planting on the western edge of the Site will further reduce visibility of the solar PV arrays.

Dispersed Residential Properties

7.5.63. There are multiple dispersed residential properties around the Site boundary. These were considered as part of the site design process, and land was excluded from the Proposed Development to reduce potential effects on visual amenity for local residents. This is expressed on the Design Evolution drawing, see **Figure 4.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.4.2]**, which shows the areas of land that have been removed from the Site for this reason.

7.5.64. Views from such properties are illustrated by locations such as Viewpoints 4, Viewpoint 5, Viewpoint 6 and Viewpoint 8. In addition, there are other dispersed properties within the landscape surrounding the Site, including:

- Properties along Hagg Bush Lane to the west of the Site,
- Fair Oaks in the vicinity of the western part of the Site,
- Properties at Quosquo Hall, and in the vicinity of Chestercourt Hall Farm, Keeper's Cottage, Shooting Box Cottage and Rosehill Farm between the solar PV arrays;
- A series of properties at West Bank to the south of the Site; and
- Properties along the A1041 to the north west of Camblesforth.

7.5.65. Major/moderate and significant negative effects have been assessed in relation to Viewpoints 5 and 8 Rosehill Farm and Primrose Hill, reducing to minor and not significant at year 15. At Viewpoints 4 and 6 moderate or minor effects have been assessed. These are not considered to be significant, largely due to a combination of distance and/or the nature of intervening vegetation. These effects would reduce over time with the implementation of the landscape strategy.

7.5.66. The potential effects on visual amenity have not been assessed in relation to each property. However, as described above, there has been a clear aim to provide separation between the houses and the built elements of the Proposed Development. Several properties, such as Shooting Box Cottage and Keeper's Cottage are positioned close to existing vegetation that provide visual enclosure. In addition, the landscape strategy includes planting in the vicinity of the properties to reduce potential adverse effects.

7.5.67. Notable elements of the proposed landscape strategy include blocks of woodland, scrub and hedgerows along the western edge of the Site, which will provide screening in relation to properties along Hagg Bush Lane. Similar applies to the properties along the A1041, where a mix of woodland and scrub is proposed from Camblesforth Common to Camblesforth to limit visibility of the solar PV arrays from locations to the north east of the Site.

Walkers and Cyclists

7.5.68. Users of PRoW within or adjacent to the Site (VP1, VP8, VP9, VP11 and 30) will experience major/moderate, significant negative effects during the operational phase at year 1 due to close range, (within the Site or within approximately 5 metres of the Site boundary),open views of the Proposed Development, seen across an extensive area or proportion of a route (for example, around 400 metres of PRoW 18/16/1, 350 metres of PRoW 14/8/3, 600 metres of PRoW 18/U975/70 and 400m of PRoW 14/12/1).

7.5.69. Where there is more separation between the PRoW and the Site boundary, the potential effect on visual amenity reduces to moderate (negative) and not significant effects due to the intervening distance and filtered/partial views of the Proposed Development. This is demonstrated by Viewpoint 25, which is located approximately 200m from the closest solar PV arrays. As the intervening distance increases further, such as Viewpoints 20 and 26 which are located approximately 500m and 290m from the solar PV arrays to predicted effects on visual amenity reduces further, with negligible negative effects assessed at both these viewpoints.

7.5.70. Walkers and cyclists also use the minor lanes in the local context of the Site, with these providing connectivity with the PRoW. The users of such routes within or adjacent to the Site (Viewpoints 3, 5, 7, 10 and 31) are predicted to experience major/moderate, significant negative effects as a result of close range, open views

of the Proposed Development, seen across an extensive area or proportion of a route.

7.5.71. Where the built elements of the Proposed Development are positioned at greater distance, e.g. Viewpoints 4 (approximately 170m from the Substation and BESS compound, 280m from solar PV arrays) and 22 (approximately 380m from solar PV arrays), the potential effects on walkers and cyclists reduce. At these viewpoints the predicted effects are moderate not significant negative at year 1 during the operational phase.

7.5.72. The potential effects on walkers and cyclists can be readily reduced by the landscape strategy. The proposed combination of woodland, scrub and hedgerow planting will be effective at reducing the potential negative effects of the Proposed Development. This is demonstrated at many of the viewpoints representing walkers and/or cyclists, such as Viewpoints 3, 4, 7, 10 and 22. At these locations, by year 15, it is predicted the effects on visual amenity for walkers and/or cyclists will reduce to between minor and negligible and not significant.

7.5.73. In many instances the proposed planting will strengthen and restore landscape elements that have been in decline, for example hedgerows along Chestercourt Lane. The planting proposals have been prepared to be in keeping with, and make a positive contribution to, local landscape character. Maintaining the hedgerows at a height of approximately 3m may be a departure from some of the close clipped hedgerows in the baseline landscape. However, there are examples of local hedgerows that are maintained at this height.

7.5.74. There are occasions where routes cross the Site, and the potential effect on visual amenity would remain significant, such as Brick Lands Lane and PRoW 14/13/1. This occurs because not all views across the solar PV arrays are proposed to be screened in the landscape strategy. For instance, in the case of Viewpoint 31, it is proposed to plant individual trees along Brick Lands Lane, but not line the road with hedgerows. Therefore, open views to the solar PV arrays would occur throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

People Travelling in Vehicles

7.5.75. People traveling in vehicles on minor roads within or adjacent to the Site, represented by Viewpoints 3, 5, 7, 10 and 31) will experience moderate negative effects

(medium/low sensitivity and substantial magnitude of change) as a result of close range, open views of the Proposed Development, seen across an extensive area or proportion of a route. These effects are not considered to be significant as relatively few people would experience the views due to the way in which the roads are used and such views would be transitory in nature. The implementation of the landscape strategy would gradually reduce the prominence of the built elements of the Proposed Development.

7.5.76. The influence of the landscape strategy would essentially be the same as described in relation to walkers and cyclists, with hedgerows providing effective screening for road users. The exception to this will be Brick Lands Lane where the level of effect is not predicted to decrease due to nature of the planting proposed along this road.

7.5.77. The key primary road within the study area from which the Proposed Development is predicted to be visible is the A1041 between Camblesforth and Selby. The only other primary road from which the Proposed Development is likely to be seen from is the A645 between Camblesforth and Drax. However, the changes that would occur from this route during the operational phase would occur at grid connection point, and would be very limited in the context of the existing power station infrastructure.

7.5.78. The key section of the A1041 from which the Proposed Development would be seen is between Camblesforth and Camblesforth Common. The solar PV arrays would be visible intermittently along this route, with the southern part of this section of road forming part of the entrance to Camblesforth. The road is slightly raised relative to the adjacent landscape, and in places there are open views in the direction of the Site due to a combination of minor height difference and the variable extent/nature of intervening vegetation. Predicted effects associated with year 1 of the operational phase of the Proposed Development for people travelling in vehicles along this road vary between moderate not significant (Viewpoint 12) and minor not significant (Viewpoints 13, 14 and 15).

7.5.79. The recurring visibility of the Site from this road has resulted in specific mitigation being proposed as part of the landscape strategy. This planting has also been proposed in direct response to comments made by NYC and also recognises the number of people that use this route. The measures proposed along the A1041 to mitigate the predicted effects on visual amenity comprises a combination of woodland, scrub and hedgerow planting. This planting also links in with the elements

of the landscape strategy in the vicinity of Camblesforth. Cross sections (**Figures 7.25 and 7.26 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.25 and EN010140/APP/6.2.7.26]**) have been prepared for locations along this road to help illustrate the relationship between vehicles travelling along this route and the Proposed Development It is considered that the extent and depth of the planting will be sufficient to be effective in mitigating the predicted negative effects at year 1, reducing these to negligible by year 15.

Other Features/Focal Points in the Landscape

7.5.80. In a relatively flat landscape, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough stand out as relatively distinctive landmarks. They both comprise areas designated as Locally Important Landscape Areas at a local authority level. Two viewpoints have been selected to represent the nature of views that can be obtained from these low hills, with Viewpoint 28 on Brayton Barff located approximately 3.1km from the Site and Viewpoint 29 on Hambleton Hough located approximately 5.7km from the Site. The assessment for these viewpoints identifies the Proposed Development would result in a Negligible and not significant effect on visual amenity. Whilst no planting is proposed as part of the landscape strategy to reduce the effect at these locations However, the overall extent of proposed planting means it is predicted the built elements of the Proposed Development are predicted to result in no change, compared with the baseline, by year 15.

Decommissioning Phase

7.5.81. An assessment of the likely significant landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development during the decommissioning phase has been carried out.

7.5.82. Full commentary on the magnitude and significance of landscape and visual effects is set out in **Appendix 7.4 Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]** and **Appendix 7.8 Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]**. A summary of the effects identified, including key narrative for any significant effects is set out in this section.

7.5.83. The decommissioning phase is anticipated to be largely similar to the construction phase in terms of landscape and visual effects, with the construction process carried out in reverse over a similar duration, and the landscape subsequently restored to its baseline condition.

7.5.84. It is assumed that the planting that forms part of the landscape strategy will remain in place for the decommissioning phase, such that visibility of decommissioning operations will be reduced where relevant.

Landscape Effects

7.5.85. The Proposed Development is not expected to give rise to a significant effect on any landscape receptor in the decommissioning phase. The key points associated with decommissioning would be relevant to the landscape elements and character of the Site, and the relevant LCAs. The activity levels would increase within the Site as a result of the decommissioning phase. However, in contrast with the construction phase, these activities would take place in the context of the established landscape strategy, with the planting being 40 years old at this point. The decommissioning phase would be short term and would result in the removal of all built elements within the Site.

7.5.86. The predicted landscape effects resulting from the decommissioning phase are summarised as follows:

- The elements and character of the Site – minor negative effect due to physical disturbance and intrusion across the Site;
- LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland – minor negative effect due to physical disturbance and intrusion on a relatively extensive part of the receptor (approximately 11 percent).
- LCA 7: Aire Valley – negligible negative effect due to physical disturbance and intrusion on a very limited part of the receptor; and
- LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland – minor/negligible negative effect due to physical disturbance and intrusion on a small part of the receptor.

Visual Effects

7.5.87. The decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development is not predicted to result in any significant visual effects. This is applicable to all viewpoints that have been assessed, including those that are within and adjacent to the Site boundary. Therefore, it is unlikely that there would be any significant effects in relation to any visual receptors within, or in the local context of the Site.

7.5.88. The effect on visual amenity is not considered to be greater than moderate at any

location. Whilst there a number of moderate adverse effects are predicted these are not predicted to be significant. No landscape and visual specific mitigation is proposed during this phase of the Proposed Development and there are locations where the size/scale and extent of the change are predicted to be large. However, no significant effects are predicted due to the short-term duration (12 months) of the construction phase.

7.5.89. These moderate adverse effects relate to the users of PRoW within the Site or close to the Site boundary, together with walkers and cyclists using local minor roads and the residents of properties close to the Site boundary.

7.5.90. Table 7.7 provides a summary of the viewpoint assessment related to the decommissioning phase. For each effect, the nature of that effect is set out i.e. positive (P), negative (N) and neutral (Nu). As no mitigation is proposed as part of this phase, the effects stated reflect the residual construction effects.

Table 7.7 Summary of Viewpoint Assessment Judgements – Decommissioning Phase

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
1	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium / Slight	Minor / Moderate (N)
2	Users of PRoW Residents (Hardenshaw Lane)	Medium High/Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
3	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
4	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Slight	Minor / Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Minor
	Residents (Quosquo Cottages)	Medium		Minor
5	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Slight	Minor (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Minor (N)
	Residents (Rose Hill Farm)	Medium		Minor (N)
6	People travelling in vehicles	Medium/low	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Chestercourt Lodge)	Medium		Negligible (N)
7	People travelling in	Medium/low	Negligible	Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
	vehicles Walkers and cyclists	 Medium		 Negligible (N)
8	Users of PRoW Residents (Primrose Hill)	Medium High/Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
9	Users of PRoW	Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
10	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
11	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium / slight	Moderate /minor (N)
12	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
13	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
14	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Camblesforth)	High/medium		Negligible (N)
15	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Negligible (N)
	Residents (Camblesforth)	High/medium		Negligible (N)
16	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Slight	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low		Minor / Negligible (N)
17	People travelling in vehicles	Low	Negligible	Negligible (N)
	Walkers and cyclists	Low		Negligible (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
18	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Low Low	Slight/negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
19	Users of PRoW	Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
20	Users of PRoW Residents (Carlton)	Medium High/Medium	No Change	No Effect
21	Users of PRoW	Medium	Negligible	Negligible (Nu)
22	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Hirst Road)	Medium High/medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
23	Visitors to the cricket club Residents (Hirst Courtney)	Medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (Nu) Negligible (Nu)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
24	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium High/medium	Negligible	Negligible (N) Negligible (N)
25	Users of PRoW	Medium	Negligible	Negligible (N)
26	Walkers and cyclists	High/medium	No Change	No Effect
27	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists Residents (Burn/Common Lane)	Medium/low Medium Medium	No Change	No Effect No Effect No Effect
28	Visitors to Brayton Barff	High/medium	No Effect	No Effect
29	Visitors to Hambleton Hough	High/medium	No Effect	No Effect
30	Users of PRoW	Medium	Medium	Moderate (N)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Effect on Visual Amenity
31	People travelling in vehicles Walkers and cyclists	Medium/low Medium	Medium	Minor / moderate (N) Moderate (N)

7.6. Mitigation Measures

Construction and Decommissioning Phase

7.6.1. No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.

Operational Phase

7.6.2. No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

7.6.3. The mitigation that is relevant to potential landscape and visual effects comprises the landscape strategy. This comprises primary mitigation as forms an embedded part of the Proposed Development. It will take time for the planting to establish and be effective in reducing the predicted landscape and visual effects of the proposed development, Therefore, the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, during the operational phase are described at year 1 and year 15.

7.7. Residual Effects

Construction and Decommissioning Phases

7.7.1. As no secondary mitigation is proposed for construction and decommissioning the residual effects are as set out in the assessment above.

Operational Phase (Year 15)

7.7.2. An assessment of the likely significant residual landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development at Year 15 of the operational phase has been carried

out taking into account the growth and establishment of proposed planting. The proposed landscape strategy forms an embedded part of the Proposed Development.

7.7.3. Full explanatory commentary on the magnitude and significance of effects for the receptors is set out in **Appendix 7.4 Landscape Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.4]** and **Appendix 7.8 Visual Effects Table [EN010140/APP/6.3.7.8]**. Description of the potential effects of the Proposed Development as the landscape strategy establishes and matures is described in the main part of the assessment for the operational phase i.e. starting at paragraph 7.5.52. This allows for clear description of the predicted landscape effects and visual effects during the early part of the operational phase, how the landscape strategy responds to these, and how the predicted effects would be influenced by the proposed vegetation. In broad terms the predicted effects of the Proposed Development on landscape and visual receptors would reduce to become not significant. Key exceptions to this include routes across the site where open views of the solar PV arrays would remain, such as Brick Lands Lane and PRoW 14/13/1.

7.7.4. No additional mitigation, beyond the landscape strategy is proposed in relation to potential landscape and visual effects.

7.8. Cumulative Effects

7.8.1. The following section of this chapter provides an assessment of the likely significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development in combination with the cumulative schemes identified in **Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects [EN010140/APP/6.1.15]** of the ES.

7.8.2. Cumulative effects are considered in terms of the additional effects of the Proposed Development in conjunction with the cumulative schemes, where they are judged likely to result in significant effects.

7.8.3. Cumulative ZTVs have been prepared for the key developments considered to have the potential to result in cumulative landscape and visual effect in combination with the Proposed Development. These are included in **Figure 7.13.1to Figure 7.18.2 [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.13 - EN010140/APP/6.2.7.18.2].**

7.8.4. In accordance with GLVIA3 (paragraph 7.21), the study area for the consideration of landscape effects in the ES comprises the LCAs containing the Site (i.e. LCA 7: Aire

Valley; LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland; and LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland). It is within these LCAs that cumulative effects of the Proposed Development together with the cumulative schemes have the potential to significantly change the baseline landscape character. Due to the restricted visual envelope of the Proposed Development in relation to the LCAs, it is considered highly unlikely that significant indirect cumulative effects will arise.

7.8.5. For the assessment of cumulative visual effects, the study area is the same as that set out for the assessment of visual effects for the Proposed Development, as this has been based on the visual envelope of the Proposed Development, and no viewpoints have been identified beyond these limits. Considering the limited height of the Proposed Development and the nature of the landscape, it is highly unlikely that it will contribute to a significant cumulative effect further afield.

7.8.6. A summary table of cumulative effects is included at the end of this section in Table 7.8: Summary of Cumulative Effects.

Cumulative Landscape Effects

7.8.7. On the basis of the above, Table 7.8 below sets out the approach to the inclusion of cumulative schemes for landscape effects:

Table 7.8: Scoping of Cumulative Schemes for Landscape Effects

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Landscape Assessment	Justification
CS1	Solar Farm. Land South of A645, Wade House Lane, Drax (Ref: 2023/0128/EIA)	Scoped in	CS1 is within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland.
CS2	East Yorkshire Solar Farm Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project ('NSIP') (PINS Ref: EN010143)	Scoped out	Whilst the underground cable corridor for the connection to the grid for the Proposed Development overlaps with the grid connection, the distance between proposed solar PV arrays is approximately 8km. Furthermore, the proposed solar PV elements for the scheme are not within the same LCA as the Site. Moreover, the above ground elements proposed for this scheme within LCA 15 are expected to be in be within the existing National Grid Drax Substation. Due to the short duration of construction impacts and limited above ground impact

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Landscape Assessment	Justification
			typical of underground cable routes for solar, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS3	Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage Project NSIP (PINS Ref: EN010120)	Scoped in	The scheme is within LCA 15 – Camblesforth Farmland
CS4	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Off New Road, Drax (Ref: 2020/1357/FULM)	Scoped out	Whilst The scheme is within LCA 15 – Camblesforth Farmland, it is located approximately 2.2km from the Proposed Development's Solar Farm Zone, where its solar PV panels would be located. Furthermore, the limited scale of the facility, and its proximity to existing industrial development at Drax Power Station is such that significant cumulative landscape effects are unlikely to occur.
CS5	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Off Hales Lane, Drax (Ref: 2021/1089/FULM)	Scoped out	Whilst The scheme is within LCA 15 – Camblesforth Farmland, it is located approximately 2.2km from the Proposed Development's Solar Farm Zone, where of the Site where its solar PV panels would be located. Furthermore, the minimal scale of the facility, and its proximity to existing industrial development at Drax Power Station is such that significant cumulative landscape effects are unlikely to occur.
CS6	Solar Farm. Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth (Ref: 2021/0788/EIA)	Scoped in	The scheme is within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland.
CS7	Ash Recovery Scheme. Drax Power Station, Drax (Ref: 2022/0107/NYSCO)	Scoped out	The scheme is within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland. However, the scheme is only at EIA scoping stage and limited information is available.
CS8	Converter Station and underground cable connection. Land to the East of New Road, Drax (Ref: 2022/0711/EIA)	Scoped out	Whilst The scheme is within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland, the majority of the scheme is an underground cable route, and the above ground component is relatively restricted in scale and in close proximity to Drax Power Station. Furthermore, this part of CS8 is located approximately 2.5km from the main part of the Site. Considering the separation distance between the main elements of the developments, and that no significant effects on LCA 15 were recorded in the LVIA for CS8, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Landscape Assessment	Justification
CS9	Land East Of Broadacres, Mill Lane, Carlton (Ref: ZG2023/0732/OUTM)	Scoped out	The scheme comprises residential development on the north west edge of Carlton. The type of development is very different to the Proposed Development and would comprise a comparatively small development in the context of the existing settlement.
CS10	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Adjacent to Barlow Common Road, Barlow, Selby (Ref: 2022/0287/SCN)	Scoped out	Whilst The scheme is within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland, the scheme is relatively limited in scale and located approximately 875m from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative landscape effects are considered unlikely.
CS11	Wind turbines. Newlands Farm, Turnham Lane, Cliffe, Selby (Ref: 2021/0348/SCN)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 2.5km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative landscape effects are considered unlikely.
CS12	Demolition of part of power station, and redevelopment for employment. Eggborough Power Station, Selby Road, Eggborough (Ref: 2019/1343/EIA)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 2.9km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS13	Solar farm. Land near Osgodby Grange, South Duffield Road, Osgodby, Selby (Ref: 2021/0978/FULM)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 7km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS14	Selby Energy Park, Cliffe Common, Cliffe, Selby (Ref: ZG2023/1272/FULM)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 7km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS15	Gascoigne Wood Interchange, Gascoigne Wood Mine, Lennerton Lane, Sherburn-In-Elmet (Ref: 2021/1531/EIA)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 8.5km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS16	Employment Park. Former Kellingley Colliery, Turvers Lane, Kellingley, 14Knottingley (Ref: 2016/1343/OUTM)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 10km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS17	Employment development.	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Landscape Assessment	Justification
	Bradholme Farm, High Levels Bank, Thorne, Doncaster (Ref: 21/00500/OUTA)		and is located approximately 10km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.

7.8.8. Only those landscape receptors considered likely to experience cumulative effects are included within the scope of this assessment. Receptors that are considered unlikely to experience significant effects have been scoped out as follows.

7.8.9. In terms of the landscape features and elements and key characteristics of the Site the effects of the Proposed Development are entirely contained within the Site's boundary and none of the cumulative scheme overlap with the Site area. Therefore, these features and elements within the Site will not be affected by the cumulative schemes.

7.8.10. With respect to landscape character, the cumulative schemes included within the scope of this assessment (CS1, CS3 and CS6) are all within LCA 15 - Camblesforth Farmland and no cumulative schemes are located within LCA 7: Aire Valley or LCA13: Haddlesey Farmland.

7.8.11. On the basis of the above, the cumulative landscape effects of the Proposed Development in combination with cumulative schemes CS1, CS3 and CS6 are most suitably described in the context of LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland. The cumulative effects on this landscape receptor are set out below.

Construction Phase

7.8.12. Should all three cumulative schemes scoped into this assessment (as identified in Table 7.8) and the Proposed Development be constructed at the same time, there will be cumulative construction effects for a period of approximately 12 months across an extensive proportion of the LCA, with associated increased activity, noise and visual intrusion, including construction traffic on roads.

7.8.13. The change in character will be large in size and scale and would apply to a medium/large extent of the receptor as construction activities would become a dominant feature within the LCA albeit for a short term/temporary period. This would

result in a medium/substantial effect magnitude.

7.8.14. In combination with the medium sensitivity for the receptor, this is judged to result in a temporary and reversible moderate and negative cumulative effect (not significant) as a result of the construction phase. The judgement of the effect not being significant is largely based on the limited duration of this phase of the Proposed Development.

Operational Phase

7.8.15. Following completion of the Proposed Development and the cumulative schemes, there would be an increased presence of solar PV development within the LCA as a result of the Proposed Development in combination with cumulative schemes CS1 and CS6.

7.8.16. However, considering the baseline environment of Drax Power Station and the nature of cumulative scheme CS3, which is closely related to the existing footprint of the power station and its associated ash mound, the changes introduced as a result of those schemes once complete are unlikely to appreciably alter the character of their receiving environments. Therefore, it is unlikely that significant cumulative effects will occur as a result of the interaction between these schemes and the Proposed Development. This is supported by the LVIA prepared by WSP UK Ltd[13] for cumulative scheme CS3, which does not identify significant effects on landscape character.

7.8.17. With respect to the Proposed Development in combination with CS1 and CS6 at Year 1, the cumulative schemes would extend to a degree the extent of solar PV development within the LCA. In relation to the potential effects of the Proposed Development alone a large geographic extent has been assessed for the Cambleforth Farmland LCA. The Proposed Development would also extend to the east of Drax Power Station and CS1 and CS6, into the broadly undeveloped farmland. A significant negative effect on landscape character has been assessed for the Proposed Development at year 1. Therefore, the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development on the Camblesforth Farmland LCA, in combination with CS1 and CS6 would be also be significant. However, the Proposed Development will be reversible

[13] Available at: https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010120/documents?page=30. Accessed June 2024.

and the Site will revert to agricultural land following the decommissioning phase.

7.8.18. Following establishment of proposed planting (both that included within the Proposed Development and as part of CS1 and CS6), there will be a notable increase in vegetative cover within the LCA, including new native hedgerows, woodland and scrub, as described throughout this chapter the landscape strategy for the Site has been prepared with reference to published landscape guidelines. Planting proposals also form part of CS1 and CS6. As a result of this planting, the degree to which the Proposed Development and CS1/CS6 will be perceived within the landscape of the LCA will be reduced, albeit changes to the physical fabric as a result of the introduction of built form will remain. Furthermore, the establishment of proposed planting and habitats will improve the biodiversity value of the LCA as a whole. This would result in a reduction in the overall perception of solar farm development. However, given the collective large extent of the solar farms, and their duration, it is considered that a significant effect would remain as a consequence of the Proposed Development in combination with the cumulative schemes. As stated above, the Proposed Development will be reversible following the decommissioning phase.

Decommissioning Phase

7.8.19. The cumulative decommissioning effects on LCA 15: Camblesforth Farmland are likely to be reduced in scale due to the presence of the established planting (for the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes CS1 and CS6). As such, the perception of change during this phase. The decommissioning phase is expected to be medium in scale over a medium extent of the receptor for a temporary and short term period, resulting in a slight effect magnitude. On the basis of the medium sensitivity of the receptor, this will result in a temporary and reversible minor negative effect, which is not considered significant.

Cumulative Visual Effects

7.8.20. Table 7.9 below sets out the approach to the inclusion of cumulative schemes for visual effects.

Table 7.9: Scoping of Cumulative Schemes for Visual Effects

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Visual Assessment	Justification
CS1	Solar Farm. Land South of A645, Wade House Lane, Drax (Ref: 2023/0128/EIA)	Scoped in	There is the potential for intervisibility between the Proposed Development and CS1 in views from the A1041.
CS2	East Yorkshire Solar Farm NSIP (PINS Ref: EN010143)	Scoped in	The proposed Solar PV sites for CS2 are located outside the study area, and it is highly unlikely that significant cumulative visual effects will occur as a result of this part element of CS2. However, views of the above ground element of CS2 are likely to be possible from New Road alongside the Proposed Development's Underground Cable Corridor for the grid connection.
CS3	Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage Project NSIP (PINS Ref: EN010120)	Scoped in	There is the potential for intervisibility between the Proposed Development and CS3 in views from the A1041/New Road.
CS4	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Off New Road, Drax (Ref: 2020/1357/FULM)	Scoped in	There is the potential for intervisibility between the Proposed Development and CS4 in views from New Road.
CS5	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Off Hales Lane, Drax (Ref: 2021/1089/FULM)	Scoped out	There is unlikely to be any notable intervisibility with the Proposed Development. Significant cumulative effects are highly unlikely.
CS6	Solar Farm. Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth (Ref: 2021/0788/EIA)	Scoped in	There is the potential for intervisibility between the Proposed Development and CS6 in views from the A1041.
CS7	Ash Recovery Scheme. Drax Power Station, Drax (Ref: 2022/0107/NYSCO)	Scoped out	There is unlikely to be any notable intervisibility between CS7 and the Proposed Development, with a minimum separation between the cumulative scheme and the Proposed Development's Solar Farm Zone of approximately 1.6km.The scheme is also at EIA scoping stage and limited information is available.
CS8	Converter Station and underground cable connection. Land to the East of New Road, Drax (Ref: 2022/0711/EIA)	Scoped in	There is the potential for intervisibility between the Proposed Development and CS8 in views from New Road.
CS9	Land East Of Broadacres, Mill Lane, Carlton (Ref: ZG2023/0732/OUTM)	Scoped out	The scheme comprises residential development on the north west edge of Carlton. It is anticipated the intervisibility between the scheme and the Site will be limited.

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Visual Assessment	Justification
CS10	Battery Energy Storage Facility. Land Adjacent to Barlow Common Road, Barlow, Selby (Ref: 2022/0287/SCN)	Scoped out	There is no intervisibility between CS9 and the Proposed Development due to intervening vegetation. Due to the limited scale of CS9, significant visual effects in combination with the Proposed Development are considered unlikely.
CS11	Wind turbines. Newlands Farm, Turnham Lane, Cliffe, Selby (Ref: 2021/0348/SCN)	Scoped out	With a maximum height of 150m, there is potential for cumulative visual effects with the Proposed Development. However, at a distance of approximately 2.4km and in the context of a flat, landscape with frequent tall infrastructure and wooded horizons, CS10 is unlikely to appreciably contribute to significant cumulative visual effects.
CS12	Demolition of part of power station, and redevelopment for employment. Eggborough Power Station, Selby Road, Eggborough (Ref: 2019/1343/EIA)	Scoped out	Due to the existing industrial context and presence of built form at the location of CS11, and the distance from the Site (2.9km). Significant cumulative effects in combination with the Proposed Development are considered unlikely.
CS13	Solar farm. Land near Osgodby Grange, South Duffield Road, Osgodby, Selby (Ref: 2021/0978/FULM)	Scoped out	CS12 is beyond the extent of the study area at a distance of approximately 7km from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative visual effects are considered unlikely.
CS14	Selby Energy Park, Cliffe Common, Cliffe, Selby (Ref: ZG2023/1272/FULM)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 7km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS15	Gascoigne Wood Interchange, Gascoigne Wood Mine, Lennerton Lane, Sherburn-In-Elmet (Ref: 2021/1531/EIA)	Scoped out	The scheme is not within the same LCA as the Proposed Development and is located approximately 8.5km away from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative effects are considered unlikely.
CS16	Employment Park. Former Kellingley Colliery, Turvers Lane, Kellingley, 14Knottingley (Ref: 2016/1343/OUTM)	Scoped out	CS13 is beyond the extent of the study area at a distance of approximately 10km from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative visual effects are considered unlikely.
CS17	Employment development. Bradholme Farm, High Levels Bank, Thorne,	Scoped out	CS14 is beyond the extent of the study area at a distance of approximately 10km from the Site. Therefore, significant cumulative

Cumulative Scheme ID	Scheme Description	Approach to Scoping for Visual Assessment	Justification
	Doncaster (Ref: 21/00500/OUTA)		visual effects are considered unlikely.

Construction Phase

7.8.21. The potential cumulative visual effects of the Proposed Development in combination with the above cumulative schemes are set out below. This has been considered on the basis of specific viewpoints and receptor groups.

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 13

7.8.22. Road users are likely to have open, in-succession views from the A1041, with construction activities associated with the Proposed Development visible to the south-west and those related to CS6 seen to the north-east, in the context of existing views of Drax Power Station. It is likely that there will also be distant views of construction activities relating to CS3 at Drax Power Station itself. However, due to the distance and context of existing large-scale built form at the power station, this is will make a relatively limited contribution to the scale of change. There is potential for sequential views of both proposed developments for approximately 1.5km of the road. However, the proposed developments are more likely be seen in conjunction with each other for approximately 200m to 300m of the A1041 in the vicinity of Viewpoint 13.

7.8.23. The combined scale of construction activities will be perceived as medium and seen across a large geographical extent on a short-term basis, resulting in a medium magnitude of change at this location. In combination with the low sensitivity of receptors, the cumulative effect will be minor/moderate and negative, which is considered not significant.

Residents in Camblesforth – Viewpoint 14

7.8.24. Approximately 13 dwellings on the north side of the A1041 are likely to have views of the construction of the Proposed Development to the south and that of cumulative scheme CS6 to the north. However, CS6 is at a distance of over 300m, with substantial intervening field boundary vegetation, with partial views only likely from first floor windows. There may also be views of construction activities related to CS3,

at a distance of approximately 1.8km. However, in the context of existing views of Drax Power Station, they are unlikely to contribute appreciably to a cumulative effect. Views will be sequential rather than in combination.

7.8.25. On this basis, the combined scale of change relating to construction will be small/medium, with a large geographical extent of change for a short, temporary duration, resulting in a slight magnitude of change. Considering the high/medium sensitivity of receptors in this location, the resultant effect is judged to be minor/moderate and negative, which is not significant.

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 16

7.8.26. The LVIA prepared by Liz Lake Associates[14] in support of cumulative scheme CS1 states that *'users of the A1041 Station Road between Camblesforth and Carlton would not receive views of the proposed array until south of the railway line. At this point it would be possible, for glimpsed, transient, long distance oblique views into the western most section of the array'.* This analysis is reflected in the viewpoint photography provided alongside the assessment. The magnitude of change for receptors in this location as a result of the construction of CS1 is identified as negligible.

7.8.27. There may also be distant views of construction activities related to CS3. However, at a distance of 2km and in the context of existing partial views of the power station, these are unlikely to contribute appreciably to a cumulative effect.

7.8.28. On this basis, whilst there are likely to be sequential views of construction activities between the Proposed Development and CS1, due to the negligible predicted magnitude of CS1 on views from the road, and the separation distance between the views, there would be no increase in the effect as a result of the Proposed Development.

Views from the A645 – Viewpoint 17

7.8.29. From the viewpoint itself, no in combination views with the cumulative schemes are expected due to intervening vegetation to the south of the road and the distance of

[14] Available at: https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=5D43C3A4DA5C11EBA5C9005056B348EC. Accessed June 2024.

separation to CS1. This will apply to approximately 600m of the western extent of the road. However, sequential/combined views of construction activities for visual receptors travelling along the road are likely as a result of cumulative schemes CS1, CS3 and the Proposed Development's Underground Cable Corridor to the grid connection. These views are likely particularly as the boundaries for CS1 and the Proposed Development overlap for approximately 800m of the A645.

7.8.30. However, the nature of construction activities relating to the Proposed Development's Underground Cable Corridor to the grid connection is such that the change will be of limited scale. Furthermore, the LVIA prepared by Liz Lake Associates for CS1 identifies a negligible negative magnitude of change as result of construction of the cumulative scheme. Works Plans for CS3 indicate that approximately 375m of the eastern extent of the A645 are included and proposed for 'Works to Facilitate Construction Access'. In the context of the receiving environment (i.e. a main road adjacent to Drax Power Station), the change proposed is likely to be limited in scale.

7.8.31. Considering the combined effect of the construction of the Proposed Development and CS1/CS3 on people travelling on the A645, the scale of change will be small but experienced over a relatively extensive linear route resulting in a medium geographical extent for a short term, temporary period. On this basis, the magnitude of visual change will be slight, which when combined with the low sensitivity of receptors, results in a minor/negligible negative cumulative effect, which is not significant.

Views from New Road – Viewpoint 18

7.8.32. Road users are likely to have close range combined and sequential views of construction activities relating to CS2, CS3, CS4 and CS8, seen in the context of existing close-range views of Drax Power Station, albeit construction will occur both sides of the road. These views may be experienced from approximately 1.6km of the road, but are likely to be intermittent, with only a limited extent of the southern part of the road where combined views including the Proposed Development will be experienced. Construction activities are likely to result in a moderate degree of alteration to the composition of views perceived over a moderate extent for a short-term period, resulting in a slight magnitude of change.

7.8.33. On the basis of the low sensitivity of receptors in this location, the cumulative effect

resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with other proposed developments on people travelling in vehicles and walkers and cyclists is judged to be minor/negligible, negative and not significant.

Operational Phase

7.8.34. Following completion of the Proposed Development and the cumulative schemes the following effects are considered likely:

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 13

7.8.35. Road users are likely to have open, successive views from the A1041, with the Proposed Development visible to the south-west and CS6 seen in close range views to the north-east. It is likely that there will also be distant views of CS3 at Drax Power Station. However, due to the distance and context of existing large-scale built form at the power station, this is unlikely to contribute appreciably to the cumulative effect. Views will be experienced from approximately 200m from the road, with solar PV arrays within the Proposed Development set back approximately 120m from the road. Both schemes will be located behind newly planted woodland/hedgerows,although these will provide limited screening during the early years of the operational phase.

7.8.36. On the above basis, the scale of change at year 1 will be small / medium, and perceived over a large extent, resulting in a medium magnitude of change. In combination with the low sensitivity of receptors, the resultant effect will be minor negative and not significant.

7.8.37. At Year 15, following establishment of proposed planting, only glimpsed partial views of proposed solar PV panels will be experienced in very limited locations along the road. The scale of cumulative change is likely to be barely perceptible from very limited locations of the route, resulting in a negligible scale and negligible geographic extent. In combination with the low sensitivity of receptors in this location, the residual effect will be negligible negative.

Residents in Camblesforth – Viewpoint 14

7.8.38. Approximately 13 dwellings on the north side of the A1041 will have views of the Proposed Development to the south and cumulative scheme CS6 to the north. However, CS6 will be seen at a distance of approximately 300m, with substantial intervening field boundary vegetation, with partial views only likely from first floor

windows. The solar PV arrays will be seen at a distance of approximately 150m. Furthermore, views will not be seen in combination. The planting proposals associated with the Proposed Development will provide limited initial filtering at Year 1.

7.8.39. On this basis, the combined scale of change will be small/medium, experienced over a large extent, resulting in a medium magnitude of change. In combination with the medium sensitivity of receptors, the resultant effect would be major/moderate negative and significant.

7.8.40. Following establishment of 15m woodland belts along the northern edge of the Site, it is predicted there will be very limited views of the Proposed Development and therefore a negligible and not significant cumulative effect at Year 15.

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 16

7.8.41. Due to the separation distance between available views and the negligible impact on views identified as a result of CS1 and set out in the Liz Lake Associates LVIA, there is considered to be no discernible cumulative effect on visual amenity as a result of the Proposed Development's operational phase.

Views from the A645 – Viewpoint 17

7.8.42. From the viewpoint itself, no in combination views with the cumulative schemes and the Proposed Development are expected due to intervening vegetation to the south of the road and the distance of separation to CS1. Views of CS1 from the road are likely to be only partial filtered glimpses of the Proposed Development's Substation beyond intervening vegetation on the A645. The separation distance between this view and where proposed solar PV panels will be visible in glimpsed partial views on the Site is approximately 750m. On this basis, there is judged to be no cumulative effect.

Views from New Road – Viewpoint 18

7.8.43. Road users are likely to have close to medium range views of completed development proposals relating to the Proposed Development, CS2, CS3, CS4 and CS8. New above-ground built form will primarily be seen on the existing Drax Power Station site, where the scale of change will be limited. However, new built form relating to CS4 and CS8 is also likely to be seen to the east of the road, albeit

generally set back from the road. In combination, the impact on views will be partial to moderate perceived over a moderate extent, resulting in a small/medium scale and medium geographical extent, resulting in slight magnitude of change.

7.8.44. At Year 1 of the Proposed Development's operational phase, in combination with the low sensitivity of the visual receptor, the resulting effect will be minor/negligible negative contribution to cumulative effects, which is not significant.

7.8.45. At Year 15, following establishment of proposed landscape screening associated with cumulative scheme CS4, and those anticipated to be provided with CS8[15], the visibility of these schemes from New Road will be reduced, such that only glimpsed or filtered partial views of these schemes will remain. The above ground elements of CS2 and CS3 will be seen within the immediate setting of Drax Power Station, with very little contrast from the receiving environment.

7.8.46. As a result, the scale of change attributable to the Proposed Development will remain small/negligible, perceived over a medium extent, resulting in a slight effect magnitude. In combination with the low sensitivity of receptors, this will result in a minor/negligible and not significant effect, particularly in the context of the baseline large scale industrial built form at Drax Power Station.

Decommissioning Phase

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 13

7.8.47. Decommissioning activities for both the Proposed Development and CS6 are likely to be seen in glimpsed views from limited sections of the road, with a higher scale of change likely to be associated with access points on the A1041. The effects will be for a short duration. The scale of change will be small perceived over a negligible extent resulting in a negligible magnitude of change. In combination with the low sensitivity of receptors, the result effect would be negligible negative, which is not significant.

[15] Outline Landscape Mitigation Plan. Available at: https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=1A2435804758407AB2FEB60EA50CC9A2. Accessed June 2024.

Residents in Camblesforth – Viewpoint 14

7.8.48. Receptors in this location are likely to have limited perception of decommissioning activities due to established woodland planting as part of the Proposed Development. Therefore, a negligible negative not significanr effect is anticipated.

Views from the A1041 – Viewpoint 16

7.8.49. Due to the separation distance between available views and the negligible impact on views identified as a result of CS1 and set out in the Liz Lake Associates LVIA, there is considered to be no cumulative effect as a result of the decommissioning phase.

Views from the A645 – Viewpoint 17

7.8.50. For road users on the A645, cumulative effects related to decommissioning will be no greater than those identified as a result of the construction phase, and therefore minor/negligible negative which is not significant.

Views from New Road – Viewpoint 18

7.8.51. For road users on New Road, cumulative effects related to decommissioning will be no greater than those identified as a result of the construction phase, and therefore minor/negligible negative which is not significant.

Summary of Potential Cumulative Effects

7.8.52. Table 7.10 below provides a summary of the cumulative effects identified.

Table 7.10: Summary of Cumulative Effects

Receptor	Effects			
	Construction	Operation		Decommissioning
		Year 1	Year 15	
LCA 15 Camblesforth Farmland	Moderate negative (**not significant**)	Major/moderate negative (**significant**)	Major/moderate negative (**significant**)	Minor negative (**not significant**)
People travelling in vehicles (A1041 VP 13)	Minor / moderate negative (**not significant**)	Minor negative (**not significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)
Walkers and cyclists (A1041 VP 13)	Minor / moderate negative (**not significant**)	Minor negative (**not significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)
Residents (Camblesforth VP14)	Minor / moderate negative (**not significant**)	Major/moderate negative (**significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)	Negligible negative (**not significant**)

Receptor	Effects			
	Construction	Operation		Decommissioning
		Year 1	Year 15	
People travelling in vehicles (A1041 VP 16)	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect
Walkers and cyclists (A1041 VP 16)	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect
People travelling in vehicles (A645 VP 17)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)
Walkers and cyclists (A645 VP 17)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)	No cumulative effect	No cumulative effect	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)
People travelling in vehicles (New Road VP 18)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)	Minor negative (**not significant**)	Minor / negligible neutral (**not significant**)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)
Walkers and cyclists (New Road VP 18)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)	Minor negative (**not significant**)	Minor / negligible neutral **not significant**)	Minor / negligible negative (**not significant**)

7.9. Summary

7.9.1. An assessment of the likely landscape and visual effects arising from the Proposed Development has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition.

7.9.2. The landscape and visual baseline has been comprehensively reviewed and recorded by way of desktop studies and field surveys, including analysis of relevant policy and evidence base. The baseline with respect to Site context, land-use and pattern, topography, access and designations has been described, as well as the character and physical features of the Site and the visual baseline.

7.9.3. The Site is not designated in landscape terms, and there are no national designations for landscape and scenic beauty within the study area. Local landscape designations are present within the wider area, with two Locally Important Landscape Areas to the west of Brayton, and there are a number of heritage assets dispersed throughout the study area.

7.9.4. Review and analysis of national, county and borough level published landscape character assessments has been carried out. They describe a low-lying, flat drained landscape with a geometric field pattern that is dominated by major energy and transport infrastructure. Land use is predominantly arable, with some commercial

greenhouses.

7.9.5. Guidance for development set out in published character assessments includes:

- Recreation of a wider range of habitats in arable areas, including grassland field margins;
- Restore and enhance wetland habitats;
- Protect the open character;
- Provide links to existing PRoWs; and
- Create new woodland and shelterbelts, and reinstate field boundaries hedgerows.

7.9.6. The Site comprises an extensive area of arable farmland delineated by fragmented hedgerow and ditches with occasional trees and woodland and sub-divided by country lanes. It has a simple, open and strongly agricultural character with a strong visual influence of industrial built form.

7.9.7. In visual terms, as an extensive area of open farmland, with a fragmented and denuded vegetation pattern, the Site is inevitably visible in close range views from the network of PRoW and rural lanes that extend across and adjacent to it. However, with increased distance, the combination of a flat landscape and screening provided by successive fragmented field boundaries, occasional woodland blocks and agricultural buildings results in the Site interior being strongly filtered or screened in longer distance views.

7.9.8. The future baseline of the Site has been considered based on the year 2027

7.9.9. A comprehensive series of mitigation measures has been embedded in the design of the Proposed Development from the outset, with the aim of reducing adverse effects resulting from its introduction. The design of the Proposed Development has evolved as part of an iterative process and has been informed by the findings of initial landscape and visual appraisals and consultation with North Yorkshire Council. The mitigation strategy includes the re-establishment of a strong pattern of hedgerows and tree belts, as well as grassland planting and wetland habitats. These measures have been drawn from published landscape character assessment guidance.

7.9.10. An assessment of the likely landscape and visual effects of the Project has been

undertaken during the construction phase and at Years 1 and 15 of operation. The effects relating to the decommissioning of the Proposed Development have also been assessed.

7.9.11. None of the landscape receptors are anticipated to experience significant negative effects as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Three receptors would experience moderate, and not significant effects. These moderate effects relate to the character of the Site and LCA 15 Camblesforth Farmland. Minor/negligible and minor, not significant, effects are predicted in relation to LCA 7 Aire Valley and Haddlesey Farmland respectively.

7.9.12. No significant negative effects are predicted in relation to visual amenity, although three visual receptor groups are likely to experience moderate negative effects as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. These are users of PRoWs within or adjacent to the Site, walkers and cyclists within or adjacent to the Site, and residents of properties that lie adjacent to the Site (Quosquo Cottages, Rosehill Farm, Primrose Hill). The remainder of receptors will experience effects that are also not significant.

7.9.13. Once operational at Year 1, it is predicted there would be major/moderate significant negative effects on the landscape within the Site and in relation to the character of the Camblesforth Farmland LCA. This results from the extent of the Proposed Development and the influence the built elements will have on the perception of the landscape. Minor and moderate, not significant effects are predicted in relation to LCA 7 Aire Valley and LCA 13 Haddlesey Farmland largely due to the relatively limited footprint of the Proposed Development within these LCAs

7.9.14. At Year 1 of the operational phase, the following significant negative visual effects have been identified: major/moderate effects on users of PRoWs within or adjacent to the Site, reducing to moderate or less at greater distances from the Site; major/moderate negative effects on walkers and cyclists within or adjacent to the Site, reducing to moderate negative or less at greater distances from the Site; major/moderate negative effects on a number of limited number of residents (Primrose Hill) who are located adjacent to the Site, together with residents on the south west edge of Camblesforth.

7.9.15. The proposed landscape strategy will have a strong influence on the predicted effects on the majority of landscape and visual receptors. It is evident that elements of the

landscape within the Site have deteriorated in condition. This is most obviously expressed in the fragmented hedgerow pattern, with some hedgerows also having been completely removed or lost. The planting proposals have been designed to not just reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development, but to restore and strengthen landscape character. It is considered that the proposed network of hedgerows, woodland and scrub planting, together with measures, such as grassland and meadow establishment and new ponds will make a meaningful contribution to the local landscape, enhance biodiversity and increase habitat connectivity. The only receptor that will not experience a reduction in effects as a result of the landscape strategy are occasional routes within the Site where open views of the solar PV arrays would remain, such as Brick Lands Lane.

7.9.16. With respect to decommissioning, there would be no significant effects on any landscape or visual receptors. This is largely a result of the combination of established planting throughout the Site and the temporary, short-term duration of decommissioning activities.

7.9.17. A cumulative landscape and visual assessment has been carried out. This identifies that the key effect relates to LCA 15 Camblesforth Farmland, where a significant adverse effect is predicted for the operational phase of the Proposed Development. This is due to the concentration of development that are proposed within this LCA and the footprint they would occupy. The Proposed Development would make a noticeable contribution to these effects, partly due to the extent of the solar PV panels, and partly due to the way it would extend the footprint of development away from the concentration of development around Drax. Signifiant cumulative effects have also been identified in relation to residents on the western edge of Camblesforth, but these would reduce to become not significant once the planting is sufficient established to screen views of the solar PV arrays. It is also important to recognise that the Proposed Development will have a defined lifespan and the relatively light footprint makes it relatively easy to reverse the changes with will occur. The proposed landscape strategy will also make a tangible contribution to the local landscape as it establishes during the operational phase.

7.9.18. Table 7.11 contains a summary of the assessment of the predicted effects of the Proposed Development.

Table 7.11: Table of Significance – Landscape and Views

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Construction Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)										
Effects on the Landscape of the Site	Temporary, Short Term	Moderate Negative (Not Significant)	No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the construction phase of the Proposed Development						x	Moderate negative (Not Significant)
Effects on Landscape Character	Temporary, Short Term	Minor/ Negligible – Moderate Negative (Not Significant)						x	x	Minor/ Negligible – Moderate Negative (**Not Significant**)
Effects on Visual	Temporary, Short Term	Negligible – Moderate							x	Negligible – Moderate Negative (**Not**

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Receptors		Negative (Not Significant)								**Significant**)
Operational Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)										
Effects on the Landscape of the Site	Temporary, Medium Term	Major/Moderate - Negative (Significant),	No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Landscape and visual mitigation will be delivered through the landscape strategy, which forms						x	Moderate Negative (**Not Significant**), following the establishment of planting
Effects on Landscape Character	Temporary, Medium Term	Major/Moderate - Minor Negative (Significant and Not Significant)						x	x	Moderate – Negligible Negative (**Not Significant**), following the establishment of planting

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Effects on Visual Receptors	Temporary, Long Term	Major/Moderate - Negligible Negative (**Significant and Not Significant**),	an embedded part of the Proposed Development.						x	Minor/Negligible - Negligible Negative (**Not Significant**), reducing following the establishment of planting
Decommissioning Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)										
Effects on the Landscape of the Site	Temporary, Short Term	Minor Negative (Not Significant)	No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development.						x	Minor Negative (**Not Significant**)
Effects on Landscape Character	Temporary, Short Term	Negligible – Minor Negative (Not Significant)						x	x	Negligible – Minor Negative (**Not Significant**)

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Effects on Visual Receptors	Temporary, Short Term	No effect – Moderate Negative (Significant)							x	No effect – Moderate Negative **(Not Significant**)
Cumulative Effects										
Construction Phase										
Effects on the Landscape of the Site	No cumulative schemes are located within the Site's boundaries. Therefore, no cumulative effects will occur and this has been scoped out of the assessment.									
Effects on	Temporary,	Moderate	No secondary						x	Moderate Negative

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Landscape Character	Short Term	Negative (Not Significant)	mitigation measures are proposed for the construction phase of the Proposed Development.					x		(**Not Significant**)
Effects on Visual Receptors	Temporary, Short Term	Moderate/minor Negative to no cumulative effect (Not Significant)							x	Moderate/minor Negative to no cumulative effect (**Not Significant**)
Operational Phase										
Effects on Landscape Features	These receptors are entirely contained within the Site's boundaries. Therefore, no cumulative effects will occur, as these receptors will not be affected by the cumulative schemes and have been scoped out of the assessment.									
Effects on	Temporary,	Major/Moderate	No secondary						x	Major/Moderate

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Landscape Character	Long Term	Negative (Significant)	mitigation measures are proposed for the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Landscape and visual mitigation will be delivered through the landscape strategy, which forms an embedded part of the Proposed Development.					x		Negative (**Significant**)
Effects on Visual Receptors	Temporary, Long Term	Major/moderate effect Negative to no cumulative effect (Significant and Not Significant)							x	Negligible effect Negative to no cumulative effect (**Not Significant**)
Decommissioning Phase										

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Effects on Landscape Features	These receptors are entirely contained within the Site's boundaries. Therefore, no cumulative effects will occur, as these receptors will not be affected by the cumulative schemes and have been scoped out of the assessment.									
Effects on Landscape Character	Temporary, Short Term	Minor Negative (Not Significant)	No secondary mitigation measures are proposed for the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development.					x	x	Minor Negative (**Not Significant**)
Effects on Visual Receptors	Temporary, Short Term	Minor - Negligible Negative (Not Significant)							x	Minor Negative to No Cumulative Effect (**Not Significant**)
Nature of Effect *	Permanent or Temporary Short-term, Medium-term, or Long-term Major/ Moderate/ Minor/ Negligible/Neutral Beneficial/ Adverse									

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Significance ** Geographi-cal Importance *** Residual Effects ****	I = International; UK = United Kingdom; E = England; R = Regional; UA = Unitary Authority; L = Local Major / Moderate / Minor / Negligible / Neutral Positive / Negative									