atmos CONSULTING

10th June 2025

Technical Report

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Yardley Road Solar Farm Limited

Yardley Road Solar Farm

your project our expertise

Contents

Document Prepared For

Harry Whittaker
harry.whittaker@solar2.co.uk

Document Prepared By

Andy Jones
Landscape Architect
jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk

Document Approved By

Anna Bloor
Principal Consultant
planning@atmosconsulting.com

Version	Date	Reason
1	28/04/2025	Original Issue
2	01/05/2025	Amendments following client review
3	27/05/2025	Further amendments
4	10/06/2025	Final Issue

URS is a member of Registrar of Standards (Holdings) Ltd.

1. Introduction

This Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) provides an assessment of the likely effects on landscape character and visual receptors arising from the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment development (the 'Proposed Development'), which is located in a rural location to the northwest of Milton Keynes, in Northamptonshire (the 'Site') as illustrated on **Figure 1** in **Appendix A**.

Landscape and visual effects are separate, but closely related and interlinked issues. For the purposes of this LVIA a distinction is drawn between landscape and visual effects as follows:

- **Landscape effects** relate to changes to the landscape as a resource, including physical changes to the fabric or individual elements of the landscape and the wider patterns of land use, land cover and the arrangement of landscape features which determine the character of the landscape including its aesthetic or perceptual qualities; and
- **Visual effects** relate to changes to existing views of identified visual receptors from the loss or addition of features within their view due to the Proposed Development.

The potential for effect interactions, combined with other developments are discussed at the end of this report within the cumulative effects section.

1.1 The Proposed Development and the Basis for Assessment

The Proposed Development comprises the installation and operation of up to 40 megawatts (MW) ground-mounted solar farm, over an area of approximately 89.60hectares (ha).

It would include a series of linear rows of single axis tracker photovoltaic (PV) solar modules, mounted on steel frames and set into the ground by direct piling or screw piling. The arrays would be arranged in north-south rows and utilise a single axis tracking system that uses an east/west system (facing a 90 degree orientation in the morning and 270 degrees in the evening) with the panels tilting at angles of up to +/- 60 degrees from horizontal.

The panels include bifacial modules made of double glass structures. They have an anti-reflective coating to ensure maximum absorption of solar radiation and reduction of reflections and have a varied height above ground as they tilt, reaching a maximum height of approximately 3.1m above level ground.

The panels and frames can be completely removed when the Proposed Development ceases operation. The lower edge of the array varies in height above ground, with a minimum clearance of approximately 0.5m.

Within the Proposed Development are other small structures namely a customer cabin, transformer/inverter, Distribution Network Operator (DNO) substation and control room which are of a similar height to the solar panels and typically below 3m tall except for the DNO substation which would be 3.2m tall and the customer station at 4m tall.

A fence up to 2.15m high is required around the perimeter of the solar farm. The fence would be welded mesh with wood posts. Infra-red security cameras would be located around the Proposed Development. No permanent lighting is proposed. Manually operated lights may be attached to the DNO substation and control room in the event of an emergency maintenance visit being required in the hours of darkness.

The Proposed Development would be operational for a temporary period of 40 years. When it ceases to be operational, all elements would be removed and the Site reinstated to its former condition.

Further details of the Proposed Development are described in the accompanying Planning, Access and Design Statement and the proposals are shown on the Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) on **Figure 5** in **Appendix A**.

2. Methodology and Approach

The assessment was undertaken in accordance with the following:

- Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2013), *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Third Edition*;
- LI review document Technical Guidance note 1/20 "Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs)
- Natural England (2014), *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment*; and
- The Building Research Establishment (BRE) (2013), *Planning guidance for the development of large-scale ground mounted solar PV systems: Appendix A.*

The LVIA methodology for this assessment is presented in **Appendix B** to this report.

The asserted 'degrees of effect' grades used within this LVIA are classified by considering the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change using a matrix as provided in **Table 1**, below, which is used to achieve consistency when judging ratings. However, this is only a guide and final classifications will be based on professional judgement.

These degrees indicate a gradation between categories and a 'sliding scale' of the relative importance of the effect, with Major being the most important. Effects that are towards the higher level of the scale (Major) are those judged to be most important, whilst those towards the bottom of the scale are *"of lesser concern"* (GLVIA, 3rd edition, para 3.35). Intermediate or transitional categories are sometimes used within the sliding scale where effects fall between categories in the matrix.

Table 1: Degrees of Landscape and Visual Effect

Sensitivity (Susceptibility & Value)	Magnitude of Change				
	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	None
High	Major	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	No Change
Medium	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	No Change
Low	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	No Change
Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	Negligible	No Change

2.1 Study Area and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

The LVIA is based on an initial 5km study zone and detailed 2km study area (study area) for both the landscape and visual assessments (see **Figures 1 to 5** in **Appendix A**). This study area has been determined through fieldwork and desk study with the detailed study area in proportion with the zone in which the principal landscape or visual effects could arise.

To assist with defining the study area, a bare earth and screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (**Figures 3 and 4** in **Appendix A**) were used during both the desk study and fieldwork as part of the baseline appraisal.

All ZTVs were generated in ArcGIS 10.6 using the Viewshed tool located in the 3D/Spatial Analyst extension. ZTVs that incorporated the screening effects of obstacles above the bare earth Digital Terrain Model (DTM) used woodland and building obstacles derived from Ordnance Survey (OS) OpenMapLocal data at fixed heights.

It was identified onsite that the potential for notable adverse landscape and visual effects were unlikely to be experienced beyond 2km given the low height of the Proposed Development and screening by localised undulations in landform and existing features including buildings and vegetation.

2.1.1 Principal Zones of Theoretical Visibility

The ZTV studies shown in **Figures 3 and 4** indicate the principal areas of visibility.

Over bare ground the potential theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and the greatest potential for visibility, extends across the immediate Site context and surrounding claylands landscape between Yardley and Potterspury. This includes areas up to 1km to the south, 0.8km to the north and to circa 1.8km to the southeast. It is then more restricted to the east/northeast between 0.2km and 1.8km but another zone of more extended visibility stretches over intermittent areas between 2-5km.

The screened ZTV indicates that notable areas of woodland (modelled using layers from OS Open-Map Local data) typically combine with local landform variations to reduce the extent of visibility. It shows that views are more restricted from surrounding points beyond principal zones up to circa 0.5km to the north, 0.2km to the northeast and south, and up to circa 1.8km to the southeast.

The screened ZTV also shows that there is still potential for some more extended views from intermittent points to the northeast but is limited elsewhere from the lower lying valley to the northeast and around settlement areas. In both cases site work established that visibility would be limited by further tiers of vegetation not shown on the ZTV model. The limited nature of views from these locations are indicated by the illustrative viewpoints (VPs) in **Appendix C**.

Site work then confirmed that intervening tiers of characteristic mature vegetated field boundaries would restrict clear views further from within these areas. These locations are covered in the representative viewpoint assessment in **Section 6** of this report.

Beyond these principal areas the nature of intervening landcover and settlement would restrict visibility towards the Proposed Development and the potential for effect is considered to be reduced.

2.2 Landscape Figures and Photopanels

Topographical modelling is based on the 5m resolution OS Terrain 5 DTM, available for the whole of the UK mainland. OS Terrain 5 data has a typical accuracy level greater than 2m Route Mean Square Error (RMSE).

Landscape photography and visualisations have been produced in accordance with the LI Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals.

Site photography for landscape VPs was captured using a full frame (Canon 6D Mk II) digital camera with a 50mm lens. The camera was mounted and levelled on a Manfrotto panoramic tripod head at 1.5m – 1.7m above the ground (depending on any foreground obstacles such as vegetation), which itself is mounted on a sturdy tripod.

2.3 Consultation

The scope and extent of work for the LVIA, including the study area radius, methodology and the proposed number and location of representative VPs was consulted and agreed upon via emails and subsequent phone calls with the case officer, Chris Burton, at West Northamptonshire Council on 05/06/2024.

During this consultation the officer agreed to the proposed scope and VPs and requested a further VP from the playing fields / parish hall at Yardley Gobion. See **Appendix D** for details.

The scope of work is considered to be appropriate to cover all potentially material landscape and visual impacts. The extent of the study area is shown on **Figures 1-4 and Figure A**.

2.4 Assumptions and limitations

The following assumptions and limitations were used during the assessment:

- The assessment draws upon landscape and visual surveys undertaken in January 2023 and April 2025. All fieldwork has been undertaken from publicly accessible locations and as such professional judgement has been used to assess residents' views, aided by aerial photography and fieldwork observations from the surrounding area;
- Where appropriate, visual receptors were grouped rather than identified individually for the purposes of the assessment;
- The assessment uses a range of representative VPs across the study area as the scope of the study does not allow for all potential visual receptors to be assessed individually;
- ZTV studies (**Figures 3 and 4**) have been produced and used as a tool to inform the professional judgements made in this LVIA during the iterative plan process. The ZTV study has been modelled on the maximum development parameters available at the time of assessment but does not take into account smaller scaled, local screening features such as hedgerows, individual trees or micro topography; and
- This assessment only considers the Proposed Development as per the layout indicated in Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) in **Figure 5.**
- The assessment also considers the grid connection cable route beyond the Site, which is shown in the Figure 1: Site Location Figure. This LVIA includes an assessment of the preferred grid route option at the time of writing. There is an alternative grid route option (see Section 4.1) which deviates only slightly from the preferred grid route option, and therefore has not had a separate assessment conducted for it.

3. Planning Policy and Guidance

National and local planning authority policies of relevance to landscape and visual issues associate with the Proposed Development are outlined below.

3.1 National Planning Policy

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2025) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Section 2). It also notes that design (Section 12), and effects on the natural environment (Section 15) are important components of this*"*

Paragraph 11 sets out that in determining applications for sustainable development this means that developments which accord with an up-to-date development plan should be approved. Paragraph 11 also directs that permission should be granted unless *"any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole"* or "*the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan*". The areas or assets of particular importance in respect of landscape and visual matters referred to within the relevant footnote 7 are:

- A National Landscape;
- A National Park (or within the Broads Authority); or
- Defined as Heritage Coast.

The list also includes important habitats sites, irreplaceable habitats and / or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, land designated as Green Belt or Local Green Space, designated heritage assets or heritage assets of archaeological interest, and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

Section 11 sets out considerations in 'Making Effective Use of Land' and notes in Paragraph 124 that in respect of development density the considerations should include whether a place is well-designed and *"the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting … or of promoting regeneration and change".*

In section 12, 'Achieving well-designed places', Paragraph 135 sets out policies and decisions for achieving well designed places, ensuring that [inter alia] developments:

> *"a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
>
> *b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
>
> *c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
>
> *d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; and*
>
> *e) optimise the potential of the Site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks."*

In section 15, 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment', Paragraph 187 sets out [inter alia] that, *"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*

a] protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;"

In respect of valued landscapes, Paragraph 188 states that planning policy should *"distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework ; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries."*

Paragraphs 189-190 require that:

> *"189. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated area.*
>
> *190. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:*
>
> *(a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
>
> *(b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and*
>
> *(c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated."*

Footnote 67 notes that *"whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined."*

Paragraph 198 requires decisions to ensure that *"… new development is appropriate for its location … including by limiting the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation."*

The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, November 2023 (read with the overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) includes objectives and policies aimed at the understanding, protecting, managing and planning of the landscape and visual impact of proposals.

Paragraph 2.5.2 notes that *"Proposals for renewable energy infrastructure should demonstrate good design, particularly in respect of landscape and visual amenity, opportunities for co-existence/co-location with other marine and terrestrial uses, and in the design of the project to mitigate impacts such as noise and effects on ecology and heritage."*

3.2 Local Landscape Planning Policy

The Site and study area lie within the administrative area of West Northamptonshire Council.

3.2.1 The West Northamptonshire Council Joint Core Strategy

The West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) Local Plan (Part 1), was produced by West Northamptonshire Council and adopted in December 2014. It sets out the long-term vision and objectives for the whole of the area covered by the former Daventry District, Northampton Borough and South Northamptonshire Councils for the plan period up to 2029, including strategic policies for steering and shaping development. It guides future development and use of land in the district and contains the following policies which are relevant to this LVIA:

POLICY BN1 - GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE CONNECTIONS notes that;

"*Green infrastructure corridors of sub-regional and local importance as set out in figure 6 of the joint core strategy will be recognised for their important contribution to sense of place and conserved, managed and enhanced by:*

1) incorporating existing and identified future networks into new development proposals;

2) securing contributions from development or other sources for the creation of and future management of the green infrastructure networks;

3) delivering long term management strategies for the sub-regional and local network.

Measures to enhance existing and provide new green infrastructure provision will:

a) be designed and delivered sustainably with prudent use of natural resources;

b) mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change including through improved flood risk management and as a carbon store;

c) be designed to the highest quality in terms of appearance, access provision and biodiversity enhancement and protection;

d) reflect local character through the planting of native and other climate appropriate species and consideration of natural and cultural heritage features;

*e) be supported by a long-term management strategy***."**

Policy BN3 - WOODLAND ENHANCEMENT AND CREATION notes that;

"Measures to enhance and manage existing woodlands and create new woodlands in West Northamptonshire will be supported. opportunities will be sought to create new woodland to buffer, extend and relink areas of ancient woodland which have become fragmented. the protection of aged or veteran trees outside ancient woodlands will also be supported. development that would lead to further fragmentation or result in a loss of ancient woodland, aged and veteran trees will not be permitted unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.

Woodland enhancement and creation along the Yardley Whittlewood ridge from the village of Yardley hastings towards Towcester and Brackley will be prioritised in recognition of its importance to the character and biodiversity of West Northamptonshire."

Policy BN5 - THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE notes that;

"*Designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings and landscapes will be conserved and enhanced in recognition of their individual and cumulative significance and contribution to west Northamptonshire's local distinctiveness and sense of place.*

In environments where valued heritage assets are at risk, the asset and its setting will be appropriately conserved and managed.

In order to secure and enhance the significance of the area's heritage assets and their settings and landscapes, development in areas of landscape sensitivity and/ or known historic or heritage significance will be required to:

1. Sustain and enhance the heritage and landscape features which contribute to the character of the area including:

a) Conservation Areas;

b) Significant historic landscapes including historic parkland (…);

c) The skyline and landscape settings of towns and villages;

d) Sites of known or potential heritage or historic significance;

e) Locally and nationally important buildings, structures and monuments

2. Demonstrate an appreciation and understanding of the impact of development on surrounding heritage assets and their setting in order to minimise harm to these assets; where loss of historic features or archaeological remains is unavoidable and justified, provision should be made for recording and the production of a suitable archive and report.

3. Be sympathetic to locally distinctive landscape features, design styles and materials in order to contribute to a sense of place.

The retention and sensitive re-use of disused or underused heritage assets and structures is encouraged in order to retain and reflect the distinctiveness of the environment, contribute to the sense of place and promote the sustainable and prudent use of natural resources.

Proposals to sustain and enhance the area's understanding of heritage assets, for tourism and historic interest as part of cultural, leisure and green networks will be supported."

3.2.2 The South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2)

The South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2) is also relevant to the policy background. It was adopted in July 2020. Building on the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS), it was prepared to help further guide planning decisions in areas and forms part of the Development Plan for the South Area of West Northamptonshire along with the WNJCS, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and any "made" Neighbourhood Plans. Policies of note for this LVIA include:

POLICY NE2: SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS notes that;

1. "*Within Special Landscape Areas development related to unallocated site and sites outside of settlement confines should avoid harmful impacts to the character and appearance of the area.*
2. *Proposals for development within a Special Landscape Area should:*
    a. *pay particular regards to design, materials, siting of buildings and the use of land; and*
    b. *make best use of the land available; and*
    c. *be informed by, the qualities of the special landscape area as set out in South Northamptonshire: A Review of Special Landscape Areas 2017 or any successor document(s); and*
    d. *contribute, where appropriate, to the conservation, restoration or enhancement, or restoration of the area's character and appearance.*

3. *Dependent on scale and context development proposals within the SLA may require a full landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) where required, the LVIA should inform the design of the proposal to minimise negative landscape impacts including the incorporation of mitigation and compensatory measures."*

POLICY NE3: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE CORRIDORS notes that;

1. *"Development proposals which would undermine the integrity of green infrastructure corridors identified on the proposals map will not be permitted unless the benefits of development clearly outweigh the adverse impacts and adequate mitigation or compensation measures can be provided.*
2. *Development proposals which accord with the development plan will be permitted where they contribute to the delivery of green infrastructure that meets the needs of communities both within and beyond the boundaries of the district, including the establishment of new infrastructure and improvements to the quality, use and provision of existing infrastructure."*

POLICY NE4: TREES, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS notes that;

"1.Proposals for development should seek to integrate existing trees, woodland and hedgerows.

2.Development that results in the loss of ancient woodland or aged and veteran trees or other protected trees will rarely be acceptable. Proposals that would result in the loss or deterioration of these specimens will be refused unless the need for, and benefit of the development in that location clearly and demonstrably outweighs the loss.

3.Proposals for felling or pruning will not be permitted to a tree in a conservation area or to a tree subject to a tree preservation order except where the proposal is justified in the interests of good arboricultural practice or other clear environmental benefits.

4.Where the loss of existing trees, woodland or hedgerows is unavoidable ,suitable replacement planting will be required within the development site, or secured via planning obligation to be provided at another location with direct links to the development site.

5.Planting schemes should, where possible, use native or similar species and varieties, and maximise the benefits to the local landscape and wildlife."

Also of note for this LVIA are Policies for Heritage which are dealt with in detail in other technical reports. They include;

POLICY HE3: HISTORIC PARKSAND GARDENS notes (inter alia) that;

"1*.Applications must seek to protect original or significant designed landscapes, their components, built features and those aspects of setting that contribute to significance. Proposals which seek to restore or reinstate historic landscape features to original designs must be supported by appropriate evidence. Such proposals and those to better reveal the setting of historic parks or gardens will be supported.*

2.Proposals which are considered to cause harm to an historic park or garden require clear and convincing justification and will not be supported unless clear public benefits can be demonstrated that outweigh that harm. Where harm is considered to be substantial those benefits must be exceptional."

POLICY HE6: CONSERVATION AREAS notes (inter alia) that;

"*3.Where harm would be caused, including through development proposals outside of a conservation area which have an adverse effect on the setting of the conservation area or any views into or out of the area such harm will need to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals*."

3.2.3 Neighbourhood Plans

The Yardley Gobion Neighbourhood Plan area has been designated but the qualifying body has not yet prepared a plan at the Pre-submission stage for this area.

3.3 Local Guidance

In addition to the policy documents above, there are several local guidance documents with policies and guidance relevant to this LVIA, which are as follows:

- South Northamptonshire (SN) Design Guide, chapter 3 (2017) (South Northamptonshire Council);
- Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment (NCLCA) (2008) (South Northamptonshire Council);
- East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment (2010) (East Midlands Landscape Partnership;
- South Northamptonshire: A Review of Special Landscape Areas (2017) (South Northamptonshire Council); and
- Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment (2016)(Milton Keynes Council).

These documents form part of the documented baseline and are considered in the assessment.

4. Baseline Conditions

This section provides a review of the key local guidance documents and identifies those landscape and visual receptors which merit detailed consideration in the assessment of effects and those which are scoped out from further assessment as effects have been "*judged unlikely to occur or so insignificant that it is not essential to consider them further*" in line with GLVIA, Paragraph 3.19.

4.1 The Site Context and Landscape Fabric

The Site is centred at approximate National Grid Reference (NGR) 476431, 243982 and covers a total area of c. 77 hectares. It comprises up to 13 arable fields, dispersed on relatively flat, sloping land between Yardley Gobion and Potterspury, at approximately 4km northwest of the built up fringes of Milton Keynes.

The grid connection route extends up to c.10km from the Site at Yardley Road, heading south though farmland, to and along the A5 and outer ring roads to the north of Old Stratford and Stoney Stratford, to connect to the Bradwell Abbey substation. This is the preferred grid connection route, and is the route assessed in this LVIA.

There is an alternative grid connection route which is shown on the Site Location Figure in which instead of the grid route following Grafton Close to Furtho Lane, the grid route forks south east following a minor track which passes by Laser Tag at Special Ops MK. At approximately grid reference SP 76791 42541, the alternative grid route heads southwest rejoining Watling Street.

The Site context embraces a flat to gently sloping, lowland plateau farmland area defined and enclosed by a pattern of vegetated field boundaries with occasional field boundary trees and tree groups. These vegetated boundaries are strong characteristics of the host landscape and contribute

to a historic landscape pattern but elsewhere across the Site where farm intensification has removed some field boundary hedgerows, some Site boundaries are open.

The Site elevation lies at c. 100m above ordnance datum (AOD) with the western and central sections remaining at or around that height. Within the eastern sections of the Site the land slopes down to around 80m AOD. Landform continues to gently undulate to the north and northwest but falls away to the north, south and east, with elevations falling away towards the Tove River valley at circa 65m AOD. To the south it falls away to c. 75m AOD on the north side of Potterspury but then rises through the settlement to the south back up to c. 95m AOD.

The Site is not bound by any major roads, but the A508 runs adjacent to a small section of the Site to the northeast, while the A5 runs at 0.65km to the south. The Site is dissected by a minor lane running from Potterspury to the A508 and Yardley Gobion at Yardley Road.

The Site is also traversed by a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) including the long-distance route the Grafton Way within the western sections of the Site. These PRoW then continue to connect with a wider network of PRoW with a strong focus connecting the two nearest settlements of Yardley Gobion and Potterspury and then on from Yardley to further recreational routes and long-distance paths to the north along the Grand Union Canal Walk and west from Potterspury to the Registered Historic Park and Garden (RPG) at Wakefield Lodge Park.

There are isolated residential farmstead dwellings adjacent to the Site at Beech House, but elsewhere there are no other properties within the boundary. The nearest settlements lie at Yardley Gobion at c. 0.3km to the north and Potterspury at 0.3km to the south.

The Site does not lie within a National Landscape (NL) formerly, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), nor any locally defined landscapes such as Area of Great Landscape Value.

The elements and features of the Site would have varying value and susceptibility to change, with the field boundaries being more sensitive to change than the areas of farmland.

Together these elements contribute to the Site having a **Medium** sensitivity to this Proposed Development type. i.e., a landscape of moderately valued characteristics with a moderate level of susceptibility to change from the Proposed Development.

4.2 Landscape Character

The following section provides a summary of Landscape Character Areas (LCA) and Landscape Character Types (LCT) identified in published landscape character assessments, which are likely to be affected by the Proposed Development. It also includes published assessments, undertaken at national, and district scales.

4.2.1 National Character Areas

The area that has potential to be affected by the Proposed Development, is defined at the national level within National Character Area (NCA) Profile: 88 - Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands, defined by Natural England as shown on **Figure 2** in **Appendix A**.

The NCA 88 covers the immediate setting of the Proposed Development. It extends in a broad band up to 10km wide, running from northeast to southwest and covers the principal zones of visibility from this Proposed Development. The NCA Profile, summarises the wider area of the NCA (inter alia) as:

> *"…a broad, gently undulating, lowland plateau dissected by shallow river valleys that gradually widen as they approach The Fens. ".*

Statements of Environmental Opportunity (SEO) are included within the NCA88 profile. For this LVIA they include (inter alia);

- *"SEO 1- Maintain and manage a sustainable and productive claylands arable landscape, while managing, expanding and linking woodlands, hedgerows and other semi-natural habitats to benefit biodiversity";*
- *"SEO 3- Plan and create high-quality green infrastructure to help accommodate growth and expansion, linking and enhancing existing semi-natural habitats"*; and
- *"SEO 4- Protect, conserve and enhance the cultural heritage and tranquillity of the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands NCA, including its important geodiversity, archaeology, historic houses, parkland, and Second World War and industrial heritage, by improving interpretation and educational opportunities to increase people's enjoyment and understanding of the landscape."*

4.2.2 Regional Character Assessments

In the hierarchy of published character assessments, the East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment (EMRLCA), by the East Midlands Landscape Partnership (2010) sits between the National Character Assessment and the county/district level assessment, which examines landscape character at a relatively finer grain. It is useful for projects which are based at a regional level such as strategic planning projects. The EMRLCA identifies 31 regional LCT.

Within this regional context the Site lies within the '*Undulating Mixed Farmlands'* LCT. This LCT notes overall character (inter alia) as;

"The Undulating Mixed Farmlands Landscape Character Type forms an extensive landscape stretching from the Oxfordshire and Warwickshire borders, through Northamptonshire and into the heart of Leicestershire. Despite its scale, varied underlying geology and complex draining patterns that have created a landscape of hills, ridges and valleys, the landscape has a strong visual unity."

Of particular importance to creating this visual unity is the undulating nature of the landform, interspersed with relatively high hills and ridges, a mixed agricultural regime and areas of permanent pasture preserving widespread ridge and furrow, occasional woodlands and spinneys, and a network of well treed hedgerows…."

4.2.3 County and District Landscape Character Assessments

At the county level, the Site and study area lies within the West Northamptonshire Council administrative area, which includes the South Northamptonshire district. Within this area, the most recent published character study is included within the South Northamptonshire (SN) Design Guide, chapter 3, South Northamptonshire Council (2017).

This Design Guide supplements and updates existing guidance on issues regarding design, heritage, landscape and the built environment. This is in order to make sure that all new development protects and reinforces the distinctive character of the local area. It utilises information from the previous Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment (NCLCA), Northamptonshire County Council(2005, updated 2008). The relevant LCTs and sub areas are summarised below.

The Site and study area lies within the 'Undulating Claylands LCT 6' and sub area '6a The Tove Catchment' (**Figure 2**). The host character area 6a covers the Site and immediate setting between Yardley Gobion and Potterspury and the key areas around the Site where there is potential for clearer visibility.

It therefore provides the key focus of landscape character across the Site and setting and covers most of the principal zones of visibility from key points around the Site (**Figure 3 and 4**).

The SN Design Guide notes that area 6a "*…is characterised by a combination of both arable and pasture farming with improved pasture largely located around village settlements bordering the River Tove and its tributaries, and also on sloping valley sides*."

The overarching key characteristics of LCT 6 are defined in the NCLCA. Those relevant to the Site include (inter alia):

- Boulder Clay deposits overlie almost the entire landscape, revealing little surface expression of the varying underlying solid geology
- Broad, elevated undulating landscape that is more elevated to the west shelving eastwards and drained by numerous broad, gentle convex sloped valleys;
- Wide panoramic views across elevated areas, though the undulating landform creates more contained and intimate areas;
- A productive rural landscape with an equal balance of arable and pastoral farming with the former predominating on more elevated land and often larger in scale (…);
- Large woodlands are not a characteristic feature, although woodland in surrounding landscape types, small deciduous copses and hedgerow trees can together create the sense of a well-wooded character;
- Concentrations of small woodlands apparent around designed parklands;
- Hedgerows are often low and well clipped emphasising the undulating character of the landscape with scattered hedgerow oak and ash trees
- Post and wire fencing frequently reinforces gappy hedgerows, in particular where pasture is the current land use;
- Numerous villages located throughout the landscape with varying morphology;
- Settlement beyond the villages include scattered enclosure age farmsteads and isolated dwellings, located at the end of short access tracks and adjacent to the roadside;
- A long settled landscape with evidence dating back to the Bronze Age and evidence of Roman occupation;
- Many historic remnants evocative of the medieval period, including rural villages, moated sites, and extensive areas of ridge and furrow;
- Historic parklands provide important landscape features along with remnants of the industrial age, including disused railways and canals;
- Minor roads located on interfluves avoiding river valleys and emphasising the natural grain of the landscape; main routes take a direct course from the northwest to southeast; and
- Recreational opportunities are diverse, including listed manors and parkland estates, canal trips, llama trekking and numerous national trails.

The NCLCA also notes for LCA 6a that the area forms the catchment of the River Tove. Associated streams have eroded broad, gentle, convex sloped valleys, resulting in the distinctive undulating landform. Whilst woodland is not a prominent feature on the Undulating Claylands, there are a number of moderately sized woodland blocks. These create a more localised woodland character in places that contain views, and result in a more intimate landscape.

The LVIA has reviewed the host LCT and LCA from the published documents above and in light of further sitework and desktop review, appraised baseline sensitivity below.

4.2.4 Landscape Value

The landscape surrounding the Site is representative of some of the defined characteristics noted in the NCLCA descriptions with a patchwork of medium to large scale, arable fields delineated by a network of clipped and mature hedgerows. At this location, the Site sits within a more elevated section of land and often larger in scale. Beyond Site boundaries broad, gentle, convex slopes descend to more intimate areas such as the settled areas around Potterspury to the south and heritage features such as Registered Parks and Gardens and Medieval Villages.

There are several PRoW that cross the Site including a Long Distance Route, the Grafton Way. Only one minor lane bisects the Site otherwise there are no other access opportunities within the immediate Site setting, which contribute to value at a community level. As such, the landscape value is assessed as Medium.

4.2.5 Landscape Susceptibility

The LCA is dominated by medium scale agriculture with a strong rural character at this point. The area 6a is considered to be of Medium susceptibility with moderate potential to accommodate the Proposed Development.

4.2.6 Landscape Sensitivity

The combination of the medium value and medium susceptibility results in a **Medium** sensitivity to the Proposed Development.

4.2.7 Surrounding LCTs

Within the 2km study area and principal areas of visibility, there are two further character areas where there is some potential for theoretical visibility as noted in the ZTVs (**Figures 2-3**). These include the 'Low wooded Clay Ridge LCT 8' and sub area '8a Whittlewood Plateau' to the west and the 'River Valley Floodplain LCT 17' and sub area '17b River Tove Floodplain'. It also includes the western fringes of the 'LCT5 Undulating Clay Farmland', from the Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment, Milton Keynes council (2016).

These three areas cover separate sections of the landscape with different orientations, aspects and focus, with a higher and orientation to the northwest and within Milton Keynes to the east and 1b lower and contained within the river floodplain area.

While the ZTVs in **Figures 3-4** indicate some visibility from the nearest fringes of these LCT's from higher land at c. 1.1-5km to the west and beyond 2km to the east the actual visibility would be reduced slightly due to the presence of further intervening tiers of wooded vegetation. This was evidenced through site survey and photography from a range of publicly accessible locations as indicated by the illustrative viewpoints in **Appendix C**.

From these locations the Proposed Development would be barely visible where it sits substantially to the rear of intervening vegetation patterns and also at points in the mid to far distance views outwith these LCTs. The Proposed Development would also be seen in a separate landscape separated to the east by the low lying Tover Valley and to the west by the settled areas around Potterspury and thus away from the setting of these areas.

As a result the Proposed Development would therefore have limited potential to affect the characteristics of these surrounding LCTs and is not considered further within this assessment.

4.3 Landscape Designations

Landscape designations are landscapes which are attributed special protection at national (legislative) to local (Local Development Plan) level, to protect against inappropriate development. These are outlined in this report and are indicated on **Figure 1** in **Appendix A**. These include a review of the landscape designations within the West Northamptonshire Council and South Northamptonshire Council areas.

Designations for Cultural Heritage and Ecology can also contribute to the overall landscape character. The key areas are noted below but these are considered in detail within the respective Technical Reports.

The Site is not covered by any national or local landscape designations. There are, however, local designated areas at adjacent points within the study area. The nearest areas are defined as Special Landscape Areas (SLA) and they lie at points to the east and west. To the east the River Tove SLA covers sloping land down to the east between the A508 and the River Tove in a band c. 1-2km wide in a north-south orientation. It lies at c. 50m to the east at its nearest point but is separated from the site by the A508 trunk road.

At a separate point to the west a second SLA at Whittlewood Forest and Hazelborough Forest, covers land to the west of the A5 around the RPG at Wakefield Lodge Park extending west along Whittlewood Forest at c. 0.8km at its nearest point alongside the A5.

As part of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2) a review of the landscape of the district was carried out in the South Northamptonshire Review of Special Landscape Areas South Northamptonshire Council (2017). This review considered a number of factors including the distinctiveness of landscapes, their scenic quality, natural and cultural character and function. It notes the Statement of Significance for the Tove Valley (*inter alia*) as:

> "*The Tove Valley is a ribbon of distinctive broad landscape plateau rich in scenic quality surrounded by hilltop settlements and woodland features. The watercourses and land feature of the Grand Union Canal, River Tove and its tributaries meander through the landform whilst forming the feature point of the landscape and giving the local landscape its character. The strong landscape views filter down towards the developed Towcester where the landform begins to change and become more undulating. This landscape enhances in historic value and the change gives residence to the distinctive parkland landscape of Easton Neston and the iconic Grade II grounds that accompanies it and the Towcester Racecourse. As the landscape changes towards Towcester the introduction of more dense woodland features form providing strong ecological and visual attraction as well as public recreation through the gardens and grounds of Easton Neston*."

The study also notes the Statement of Significance for the Whittlewood Forest and Hazelborough Forest (*inter alia*) as:

> *"Whittlewood and Hazelborough Forest are remnants of the 13th Century Royal Hunting Forest which forms part of the Whittlewood Ridge. The diverse landscape lends itself to a variety of viewpoints and experiences through the landscape providing broad open views of the landscape to the intimate enclosed views with pockets of undulating landscape. Divided by the intrusion of the A43, it has strong views south over the Stowe landscape. A small network of SSSI meadows towards Syresham give biodiversity quality."*

Although the ZTVs indicate some potential for visibility from the nearest sections of these areas visibility would be reduced by intervening screening features such as the roadside vegetation along the A508 and A5. Given their location and local importance these areas are assessed in more detail in **Section 6** of this report.

In addition to the landscape designations above there are several heritage and historic landscape features such as Conservation Areas (CA) and RPG which can contribute to landscape character and be important in terms of their landscapes and landscape settings.

The nearest CA lies within the central northern sections of Yardley Gobion but this would be beyond the principal zones of visibility as demonstrated by the screened ZTV (**Figure 4**). This would largely be the case for the nearest sections of the Grand union Canal CA to the north. Although the screened ZTV indicates some low visibility further intervening features would limit the potential for open clear views as shown by the Illustrative photo panoramas in **Appendix C**, and as such no further assessment is considered necessary. With regard to RPG's the nearest lies at 1.25km to the west Wakefield Lodge Park. This also lies on the fringes of the screened ZTV and indicated by the photo panoramas in **Appendix C** and as such visibility would be limited from this area.

Refer to the Heritage Statement for full details of these areas.

4.4 Visual Baseline

As defined in GLVIA 3, the purpose of the visual assessment is "*to establish the area in which the development may be visible, the different groups of people who may experience views of the development, the places where they will be affected and the nature of the views and visual amenity at those points*" (Paragraph 3.15).

The extent of visibility is firstly considered within the ZTV and subsequently from a number of representative viewpoints that cover a broad range of sensitive receptors to represent different types of view and different types of viewer (i.e., visual receptors). Integral to this process is the need to define the visual value and susceptibility to change, against which the assessment of effects can be made.

4.4.1 Extent of Visibility

As noted above in defining the study area, the ZTVs (**Figures 3** and **4**) and fieldwork confirmed the following principal patterns of visibility:

- The Site is potentially visible over bare ground from adjacent areas of farmland up to up to 1km to the south, 0.8km to the north and to c. 1.8km to the southeast. It is then more restricted to the east/northeast between 0.2km and 1.8km but another zone of more extended visibility stretches over intermittent areas between 2-5km, as evidenced by the ZTV in **Figure 3**;
- With intervening surface features such as field boundary and woodland vegetation and buildings (**Figure 4**), clear views where larger sections of the site are likely to be visible (red and orange areas on the ZTV) are more restricted and typically limited from most points beyond principal zones up to circa 0.5km to the north. 0.2km to the east and south and up to c. 1.2km at isolated points to the southeast;
- **Figure 4** also shows some potential for more extended views from intermittent high points between 2-4km to the northeast but is limited elsewhere from the lower lying valley to the northeast and around settlement areas (blues and pale yellow tones on **Figure 4**). The limited nature of views from these locations are indicated by the illustrative viewpoints in **Appendix C**;
- Fieldwork confirmed that visibility of the Site would be further reduced from the surrounding area due to tiers of characteristic vegetated field boundaries not shown on the ZTVs. As such the Site would only visible in heavily filtered views from most points to the north, south and west beyond the Site boundaries and only the edges of outer sections likely to be visible from such points. Site work also showed that there would be some potential for more visibility to the southeast within the farmland area up to approximately 0.9km as shown by VP 5;

- Beyond the Site boundaries, the nearest views towards the Site from publicly accessible locations lie along the PRoW to the north and south sides and the minor road that dissects the Site; and
- Environmental mitigation and enhancements of field boundaries within the Site allowing field boundary hedgerows to grow out and mature would further screen clear views of the panels from most surrounding points in the medium to long term.

Beyond these principal areas the nature of intervening landform, landcover and settlement would restrict visibility towards the Proposed Development and the potential for effect is considered to be reduced. This includes most areas within settlement beyond the immediate settlement edges of Yardley Gobion, with views from the lower lying settlement areas at Potterspury more restricted by rising landform and field boundaries as shown by an illustrative VP in **Appendix C**.

4.4.2 Key Visual Receptor Groups

A range of visual receptors and receptor groups can be expected to be affected by the development from both static and sequential points. These receptors would include, but are not limited to residents, road users and those visiting the area for recreational, amenity and tourism purposes.

The extent of the effect upon certain groups would vary according to their level of susceptibility and sensitivity to the nature of development. For the purpose of this assessment three key groups are identified:

- Local residents of nearby properties and settlement;
- The travelling public / road users; and
- Recreational visitors / users of Public Rights of Way (PROW) and tourists to the area.

The baseline sensitivity of these groups is summarised in the methodology in Tables A-1 and A-2 of Appendix B.

4.4.3 Representative Viewpoint Appraisal

The representative VP appraisal has been undertaken from five viewpoints as shown on Figures 1-4. These VPs were issued to the officer at West Northamptonshire Council in May 2024 and were subsequently agreed in email on 05/06/2024. During this consultation the officer agreed to the proposed scope and viewpoints and requested a further viewpoint from the playing fields / parish hall at Yardley (see **Appendix D**).

The viewpoints represent a range of visual receptors and view types and were selected following the GLVIA 3 guidance and further LI guidance for the Visual Representation of Development Proposals. They are used as ‘samples’ on which to base judgements and will help establish how visible the Proposed Development would be from specific locations and help to gauge the anticipated effects upon visual amenity.

The photographs have also been taken from a range of ‘publicly accessible’ points, to cover a representative range of viewing distances, elevations and orientations, with different viewing experiences, in line with GLVIA.

The VPs are defined in **Table 2** below and the Viewpoint Panoramas are shown in **Figures 5-11** and supported by the illustrative photo panoramas in **Appendix C**.

Table 2: Representative VP Baseline

VP	Location	Grid Ref	Approx. Distance	Key Receptor Group	Sensitivity to change
1	PRoW south edge of Yardley Gobion off Hesketh Road	E476545, N244395	0.2km	PROW users and nearest residents to the northeast	High-Medium
2	PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path on eastern Site boundary	E476340, N244140	0.03km	PROW users on the eastern Site boundary	High-Medium
3	Yardley Road, northeast of Potterspury	E476328, N243642	0.03km	Road users	Medium-Low
4	PROW, south of Yardley Road, south of Yardley Gobion	E452519, N244079	0.0km	Recreation users to the north	High-Medium
5	PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path west side of the A508	E478076, N243018	0.9km	Road and recreation users to the east	High-Medium
6	PRoW to the south side of the playing fields/ parish hall at Yardley Gobion	E476175, N244533	0.26km	PROW and recreation users to the north	High-Medium
Illustrative Photo locations – refer to Appendix C					
A	PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path east of Potterspury				
B	PRoW north of Potterspury playing fields				
C	Moorend Road				
D	Meadow View / High Street junction, Potterspury				
E	PROW Thrupp Wharf Grand Union Canal				
F	Minor Road north of Castle Thorpe				
G	PRoW west side of Hanslope				
H	PROW east side of Wakefield Lodge RPG				
Grid Connection photos					

5. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

The main features of the Proposed Development which could potentially result in landscape and visual impacts are:

- Changes to land use and pattern;
- New infrastructure elements such as solar PV panels, transformers, battery storage, substation, fencing and CCTV cameras;
- Access arrangement;
- Hard surface areas;
- Loss of existing vegetation; and
- New planting areas.

It is noted that the solar panels would be 3.1m or less in height and other structures and substation up to 3.25m, with a meteo mast up to 2m. As such the Proposed Development can be screened by a combination of woodland, scrub and/or hedgerows from most near and middle-distance views at points where views and the Site context are at similar elevations.

5.1 Landscape Mitigation Measures

Landscape mitigation proposals are incorporated into the Proposed Development design and are illustrated on the LEMP in **Figure 5**. The landscape mitigation proposals include measures that aim to avoid, reduce, or remedy adverse impacts on the landscape by ensuring that the scheme has a good fit within the landscape setting.

It also includes measures that would reduce the visual prominence of the solar arrays in local views by enhancing the condition of key field boundaries on the perimeter of the Site or more exposed sections of the Site.

Measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development to reduce potential impacts and improve the layout of the Proposed Development, including:

- Setting back of panels adjacent to the PRoW that traverse the Site and inclusion of new characteristic hedgerows with field boundary trees along development edges, to retain and enhance the amenity from the footway;
- Management of existing field boundaries allowing vegetation to grow out to mature heights of 5-6m and inclusion of infill planting and gapping up to maximize screening potential of these boundaries;
- Screening elements of the Proposed Development from key receptor locations, e.g., users of the PRoW and residential properties adjacent to the Site boundaries; and
- Reflecting existing landscape elements and character in new mitigation planting.

The key landscape and mitigation measures are as follows:

- Gap up and reinforce field boundary hedgerows, on all Site boundaries as indicated on **Figure 5.** This would comprise native mix species hedgerows of local provenance which would be allowed to mature up to heights of 6m to screen views from the PRoW and residential properties;
- Additional field boundary hedgerows with field boundary trees to be provided on isolated Site boundaries to the northeast and southwest as indicted on **Figure 5.** This would comprise native mix species hedgerows of local provenance which would be allowed to mature up to heights of 6m to screen views from the PRoW and residential properties;
- Additional field boundary hedgerows with field boundary trees to be provided adjacent to PROW that run through the Site as indicted on **Figure 5.** This would comprise native mix species hedgerows of local provenance which would be allowed to mature up to heights of 6m to screen views from the PRoW and residential properties;
- Close further small gaps of the existing field boundaries and allow hedgerows to grow out and mature up to 6m along boundaries (comprising native species of local provenance); and
- Proposed species-rich native wildflower meadow with additional tree planting to perimeter buffer areas within the Site fields and the offset areas. This would be maintained mechanically twice per year as a hay meadow.

The proposed landscape management would produce landscape features of varied heights to provide robust and effective screening towards the Proposed Development within 3-5 years given the existing nature of the landcover around the Site (i.e. short to medium term, in line with the methodology in **Appendix B**).

The proposed elements would also enhance the local landscape character and provide additional screening towards the Proposed Development.

6. Landscape and Visual Effects

6.1 Landscape Effects

The following section assesses the magnitude of effects that the Proposed Development would have on the landscape character and the physical features of the baseline landscape.

These effects would be combined with the value attached to the landscape and the landscape's susceptibility and sensitivity to the Proposed Development, as mentioned in the baseline section above, to determine the extent of effects.

The assessment firstly considers the effects of construction on the Site and then assesses the operational effects at completion and in the long term when mitigation measures have established as well as the decommissioning phase. Further details of assessment timescales can be found in the Methodology section within Appendix B.

6.1.1 Construction Effects

The construction works would require a temporary disturbance to the Site's arable fields to install the Proposed Development and its associated infrastructure including the access point. The work would be phased and would last approximately 12 months.

Any disturbed ground resulting from the movement of machinery and installation of the various structures and underground cabling trenches would be gently graded back and reseeded with grass upon completion. No notable tree removal is anticipated to construct these elements of the Proposed Development.

The underground cabling trenches for the grid connection route would also be graded back and resurfaced to original surface level and finish. The route has also been selected to minimise direct effects on landscape fabric elements and visual amenity. With that in mind the route generally follows road corridors with wider verges such as by-pass, ring roads around Stoney Stratford and Wolverton to avoid more heavily developed, residential streets and areas wherever feasible. See **Appendix C** for photos at intermittent points along the cable route corridor.

The design of the Proposed Development and its structures would be offset by 5m from the nearest existing hedgerows, woodland, drainage ditches and surface water. Surrounding tiers of field boundary vegetation would help to screen these features and help to minimise any disturbance to the existing landscape elements and features found across the Site.

The retained field boundary hedgerows and trees around the Site boundaries would be gapped up and managed to provide robust, mature field boundaries. In addition, further measures for mitigation include new field boundaries on exposed Site edges and along PRoW that run through the Site. New wildflower meadows would be planted within the offsets areas within the fields.

During the temporary construction phase, there would be a notable increase of activity within the limits of the Site with access to the Site and activity at the construction compound. The works would have a localised temporary disturbance to a small portion of the landscape within the 'Undulating Claylands LCT 6' and sub area '6a The Tove Catchment'. This would relate to the flatter or gently sloping section of arable farmland of larger scale rather than the higher valued features such as the boundary vegetation, hedgerows, trees and woodland or the more undulating convex sloped outer edges of the area. Much of the Site area is also reasonably well contained from points beyond immediate Site boundaries.

Movement of construction traffic to and from the Site and along the cable corridor would result in some temporary disturbance along local a short section of the A508 and A5 before dissipating. Traffic would be quickly absorbed across the wider road network.

The direct effects upon the Site during the construction phase would be temporary and short-term lasting for the construction period. They would have a **Medium** magnitude of change, which together with the Site's **Medium** sensitivity, would result in a **Moderate Adverse** effect temporarily during construction.

6.1.2 Operational Effects

Landscape Character

During operation, direct landscape effects would include replacing the prevailing arable land use within the Site with energy infrastructure elements with the potential for dual use with grazing. The energy infrastructure principally contains rows of single axis tracker solar panels together with low intensity grazing.

The solar PV panel layout would sit within a cluster of fields that are reasonable well contained and screened from much of the surrounding landscape beyond Site boundaries. This is on account of the field boundary hedgerows and slightly flatter to gently sloping terrain across the Site which lies away from more notable outward facing slopes. The layout has also been set back from field boundaries to retain existing vegetation within and around the outer edges of the Site as far as possible. As such no notable tree or hedgerow sections would be removed and the overall field scale that is characteristic of the Site would remain.

The developable area has also been pulled back from Site boundaries to allow for suitable field boundary margins and mitigation planting where access, PRoW and residential properties are present. In addition, existing field boundaries which interface with publicly accessible points would be reinforced and elsewhere managed and gapped up. This includes field boundaries alongside Yardley Road and along the Grafton Way long distance path.

The proposed landscape mitigation and enhancement planting would help to gap up and screen the Proposed Development from most near and middle-distance views, as well as integrating the development into the surrounding landscape with a more resilient landcover pattern, in the longer term.

In respect of the characteristics for the 'Undulating Claylands LCT 6' and sub area '6a The Tove Catchment' and the sensitivities of this host landscape outlined in the baseline, particular considerations for the Proposed Development would include:

- Integration with the scale and pattern of larger arable fields and avoid more open sections of the landscape and wider or longer distance views which occur on the edges of the area and in the context of surrounding villages such as Potterspury;
- Integrate with the rural and historic countryside character and its valued features and surrounding settlement pattern; and
- Consider opportunities to manage historic hedgerows, trees and woodland and provide soft edges and buffer zones to screen the layouts and provide positive contributions to the farmland character. This would strengthen landscape pattern, visual integrity and improve other semi-natural habitats to benefit biodiversity.

The Proposed Development primarily involves the addition of elements rather than removal of notable existing features. The solar farm would create a temporary new land use for renewable

energy generation, within the existing framework of fields and field boundary vegetation. The Site would also sit within a reasonably well contained section of the landscape surrounded by hedgerows with trees.

The elements of the Proposed Development would be in keeping with the vertical scale of existing features in and around the Site (such as hedgerows and trees) and lower in height than many features such as trees, farmstead outbuildings and overhead power lines in the surrounding context.

Other effects would be effects on views from areas of landscape outside the Site. From close distances and typically up to approximately up to c. 0.5km to the north, 0.2km to the east and south and up to c. 1.2km at isolated points to the southeast**,** individual elements of the solar farm (such as fencing, solar arrays or small buildings) would be partially discernible from intermittent points at completion and in the short term. This is due to the mature pattern of hedgerows and trees on Site boundaries which would filter and screen the majority of view with the exception of just the tips of the tallest features such as the CCTV masts (2.4m) and top of fencing. Buildings would be located within a central section of the Site adjacent to Yardley Road but filtered and screened from most points beyond a localised stretch of this road.

At these points the height and regularity of the solar panels, would more often be heavily filtered and screened to the rear of tiers of vegetation and where visible would provide a low horizontal feature and textural change between intervening landcover patterns and within the pattern of arable. In general views would be maintained over the Site to existing boundary vegetation and to surrounding features in the wider landscape where views permit.

Over time the establishment of reinforcement hedge planting along the boundaries combined with the management of other existing field boundaries to allow hedgerows to grow out, would help to reduce these effects and integrate the proposals into the landscape to a greater extent and to reduce perception of the Proposed Development in the surrounding landscape.

In turn this would help to fit with the key considerations noted above in the context of the ‘Undulating Claylands LCT 6’ and sub area ‘6a The Tove Catchment’**.**

As a result, the Proposed Development would not fundamentally change the wider character of the landscape. The magnitude of effect on landscape character within the ‘Undulating Claylands LCT 6’ and sub area ‘6a The Tove Catchment’ would be Medium - on completion and in the short term, reducing to Medium - Low in the medium to long-term as the mitigation planting matures and the Site is more heavily screened from the surrounding landscape.

Given the Medium sensitivity of the LCT 6, sub area 6a The Tove Catchment LCA, the extent of effect would be on balance **Moderate Adverse** on completion in the short term and **Moderate – Minor Adverse** in the medium to long-term.

All relevant direct and indirect effects would arise within a localised section of the **‘**Undulating Claylands LCT 6’ and sub area ‘6a The Tove Catchment’. This would be a very small proportion of the LCT, with the remaining LCA and key sensitivities, unaffected. As noted in the baseline, no adjacent LCAs or LCTs would be affected to any notable extent given the levels of enclosure and intervening tiers of screening.

Decommissioning Effects

During the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development, there would be some localised disturbance to the rural landscape while structures are dismantled and removed from the Site. However, at the end of decommissioning, the land would be reinstated to its former full agricultural use, aiding the reversal of any effects on the landscape character.

By this stage, the retained field hedgerows and new mitigation field boundaries would have filled out and have an improved condition. Where new field boundaries are provided these features would be left in situ.

The direct effects upon the Site during the decommissioning phase would be temporary and short-term lasting. They would have a **Low** magnitude of change which together with the Site's **Medium** sensitivity, would result in a **Moderate to Minor Adverse** effect during decommissioning.

Landscape Designations

The Site is located between two locally designated SLAs which cover sloping land away from the Site to the east and within wooded landscapes to the west.

As noted above in the baseline, while the ZTV of the Proposed Development indicates some potential for views from the higher western slopes of the Tove Valley SLA, the nature of intervening landform, landcover and settlement particularly associated with the A508 road corridor, which runs along the boundary of this area, would restrict clear visibility towards most of the Proposed Development from the nearest sections.

This is evidenced by the visuals from VPs 4 and 5 (**Figures 9** and **10**), which show the nature of enclosures to the eastern Site boundaries and by a further VP photo E from Thrupp Wharf in **Appendix C** where these elements act to screen and break up views towards the Site considerably.

At other high points to the east, where views are gained across the Tove Valley from more distant elevated points to the east the Site would also be barely discernible where it would sit substantially to the rear of intervening vegetation and in heavily filtered views at a separate point to the rear of the A508 (as shown by the illustrative VPss F and G in **Appendix C**).

Visibility would also be restricted from the eastern fringes of the Whittlewood Forest and Hazelborough Forest SLA as evidenced by the visuals from illustrative VP H in **Appendix C**

Effects would not therefore exceed **Very Low to None**, leading to effects that would be no more than **Minor to Negligible Adverse**.

6.2 Visual Effects

The following sections consider the potential effects of the Proposed Development during the construction phase of the Proposed Development; on completion (at year 1 / short term) and in the long term (by year 15), upon existing views and visual amenity. It is anticipated that decommissioning effects would be similar to construction effects.

The analysis refers to the seven representative VPs outlined in the baseline (**Table 1**) and summarises effects on key visual receptor groups within the study area and within the ZTV.

Each of the representative VPs provides a 'sample' of the potential effects, representing a wide range of receptors – including not only those actually at the VP, but also those nearby, at a similar distance and/or direction.

An assessment of potential glint and glare effects from the Proposed Development upon the nearest receptors has been undertaken as a separate report within this planning submission.

6.2.1 Viewpoint 1: PRoW south edge of Yardley Gobion off Hesketh Road

Existing View: From this section of a PRoW to the east side of Yardley, a broad, flat view southwest stretches across relatively flat farmland (**Figure 6**). This view extends from northwest to southeast and is contained and broken up in the near and mid distance, by tiers of clipped vegetated field

boundaries with occasional field boundary trees. This view gives way to a slightly raised woodland area to the west at Whittlewood which adds to the vegetated character of the view. Further to the east the view extends along the edges of the settlement of Yardley Gobion.

Predicted Change: In this context, construction activity would be partially visible within filtered views through field boundary vegetation to Field 1 and 4 and behind or through gaps in foreground vegetation in field 2, during construction of the northern sections of the Site.

On completion the Proposed Development would be discernible in a mix of filtered and channelled views to the southwest where it would sit mostly to the rear of intervening field boundary vegetation and in winter, in filtered views, through vegetation with just sections of the panels in field 2 visible in gaps in the vegetation and for field 1 and 4 at the nearest points just above the height of the nearest hedgerows along the eastern boundaries, as shown on **Figure 6**.

The remaining sections of the Proposed Development and majority of the solar array and other buildings and substation which would be within the middle of the array would not be visible as it would sit to the rear of vegetated field boundaries and behind the nearest sections of the Site. The nearest sections of the Site would be seen in oblique views across the nearest rows to the west and along rows to the south. This would be in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation screening to the east side for field 2, blocks the view more fully.

At this point, the nature of the proposed tracking system would provide some variation in the partial view of the panels above and between vegetation, with the front and rear side of the panels visible at different times of the day. At this location the panels would be seen with the tops of front face of the panels in field 1 facing towards the heavily filtered view during the first part of the day and the panels in field 2 and 4 tilting to the east. By the middle of the day they would be seen as flat panels, with some partial views to the supporting structures in a small section of field 2 in the short term. Later in the day they would be seen with the rear of the panel facing towards the viewer in field 1 and with panels tilted west in fields 2 and 4.

This view would be available during construction and on completion in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation is established to provide an enhanced vegetated edge and substantial screen to the panels along eastern and northern boundaries of Fields 1, 2 and 4. This includes measures for gapping up and bolstering of existing hedgerows to maintain a field boundary at 5m height with characteristic intermittent trees, to allow extended views to the wooded features beyond to be retained, as shown on **Figure 6**.

Assessment: This would represent a **Medium to Low** magnitude of visual change *(partial to slight change to the existing view where the development or a part of it, would be perceptible)* in a mid-distance view. On balance this would result in a **Moderate Adverse** visual effect in the short term, when combined with the baseline sensitivity for users of the PRoW and residents away from property curtilages and private views.

Although there would also be some views from adjacent houses in the region of 12-15 dwellings along Hesketh Road where it merges with Eastfield Road, the views would be further screened by further field boundaries and vegetation within domestic enclosures and as such views would be limited to rooms upstairs and on balance a similar level and duration of effect.

This view would be available on completion and in the short term beyond which the management of the vegetated field boundaries with proposed gapping up planting would act to screen views of the Proposed Development and assimilate it within the landscape fabric.

In the longer term, once mitigation has established the magnitude of visual effect would reduce to **Very Low** by Year 15, with barely perceptible changes and reduced exposure through more heavily filtered field boundaries. This would result in a **Minor Adverse** visual effect in the long term.

6.2.2 Viewpoint 2: PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path on eastern Site boundary

Existing View: From a section of a PRoW on the eastern Site boundary, a series of short level views extend across relatively large arable fields bounded by clipped hedgerows. These hedgerows define, break up and enclose views at a range of points to the near distant to the west, but in the near-mid distance to the south and east. Given the relatively flat, slightly elevated nature on the view these hedgerows also define much of the near-mid distance skyline to the south and east except for infrequent glimpsed views to distant ridgeline at through the hedgerows. To the west a channelled view across field 1 extends to slightly higher ground and areas of woodland at Whittlewood. Beyond this view the land falls away to the west and south towards Potterpury.

This low lying settlement is just evident above the field boundary vegetation with views to more elevated housing and the church tower in a small section of the view across field 2 (**Figure 7**). An overhead power line on timber poles also traverses the mid distance view.

The view then extends further to the north and east across flat farmland towards the settlement edge of Yardley Gobion and to further vegetated boundaries.

Predicted Change: From this location on the Site boundary construction activity would be visible within the channelled views between field boundary vegetation which activities in fields 1-4 evident during construction of the northern sections of the Site.

On completion the Proposed Development would be discernible in a mix of filtered and channelled views to the west, south and southeast where it would sit partially to the rear of intervening field boundary vegetation to the west, southwest and southeast but visible within the view across the arable field to the south. At this point the panels would be seen at similar heights to the clipped hedgerows along the eastern and northern boundaries of fields 1, 2 and 4, as shown on **Figure 7**. The remaining sections of the Proposed Development and majority of the solar array and other buildings and substation which would not be visible as it would sit to the rear of vegetated field boundaries and behind the nearest sections of solar panels. The nearest sections of the Site would be seen in direct views across the nearest rows to the west but these would be set back from the PRoW by up to 15m to allow for retention of access and amenity mitigation and enhancements.

Further to the south and southeast views would be gained along the north to south rows. This would be in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation screening to the east side for field 2, blocks the view more fully.

At this point, the nature of the proposed tracking system would provide some variation in the partial view of the panels above and between vegetation, with the front and rear side of the panels visible at different times of the day. At this location the panels would be seen with the front face of the panels in field 1 facing towards the view during the first part of the day. The panels in field 2 would then tilting to the east and in field 4 to the rear of the hedgerows the tips of the back face of the panels would facing towards the view. By the middle of the day the panels would be seen as flat panels, with some views to the supporting structures in fields 1 and 2 in the short term. Later in the day they would be seen with the rear of the panel facing towards the viewer in field 1, panels tilted west in field 2 and with the tips of the front face to the rear of hedgerows in field 4.

This view would be available during construction and on completion in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation is established to provide an enhanced vegetated edge and substantial screen to the panels along the PROW within field 1 and the eastern

and northern boundaries of Fields 1, 2 and 4. This includes measures for gapping up and bolstering of existing hedgerows to maintain a field boundary at 5m height with characteristic intermittent trees, to allow extended views to the wooded features beyond to be retained, as shown on **Figure 7**.

Assessment: This would represent a **High to Medium** magnitude of visual change *(extensive to partial change to the existing view where the development or a part of it, would become a clear feature)* in a near and mid-distance view. This would result in a short term **Major to Moderate Adverse** visual effect, when combined with the baseline sensitivity for users of this section of the PRoW running through field 1.

Beyond the short term and once the proposed mitigation establishes the proposed development would be more notably screened and integrated within the landscape. This would reduce the magnitude to a more subtle or slight change and more heavily screened or glimpsed views through new mitigation, and some enhancement along the PRoW and effects would be reduced to **Moderate to Minor Adverse** in the medium to long term.

6.2.3 Viewpoint 3: Yardley Road, northeast of Potterspury

Existing View: From this section of Yardley Road to the south side of field 3, views to the north and east are defined by gently sloping arable farmland which rises from the west up to the north and east. The arable fields are bound by tiers of low clipped hedgerows and field boundary trees which break up the view and define a relatively flat near to mid distance skyline given the slightly rising ground across the view. The clipped hedgerows also line the road and extend to the south side of the road to provide a fairly regular influence across the raised farmland area.

To the northeast the settlement edge of Yardley Gobion is just evident with the top of roof pitches just visible through gaps in vegetation and rising to the same height as the field boundaries in the view as shown on **Figure 8.** At other points to the west the views stretch across the falling terrain and further farmland to the raised wooded ridge areas woodland at Whittlewood. Occasional agricultural outbuildings punctuate the view along with overhead power lines on timber poles. Further to the southwest the views extends down to the low lying settlement of Potterspury.

Predicted Change: From this point the construction activity in fields 2-4 would be clearly visible within a large section of the view to the north and within other fields to the south just the taller elements of construction would be visible.

On completion the Proposed Development would be clearly visible within the rising, arable fields to the north in fields 2-4, where the solar panels would stretch across a large section of the view to the north within the near to mid distance view. At this point they would be seen with view along a series of linear rows of panels with spacing between them, stretching north across the simple scaled farmland between existing field boundaries within the view directly to the north. At other points further to the northeast these rows would been seen at a slightly oblique angle as they diverge to the south and merge to the north. The views of panels in field 3 would largely prevent clear views to panels within further sections of fields to the north and east. To the south of the road the Proposed Development would not be that discernible as shown on **Figure 8**.

Given the proposed nature of the tracking system, there would be some variation in the view of the panels at different times of the day. During the first part of the day the panels would be seen tilted to the east but with some front faces and some rear faces visible. By the middle of the day, they would be seen as flat panels, with some views of the supporting structures. Later in the day they would be seen tilting to the west with some front faces of the panels and some rear faces visible.

As such the Proposed Development would be perceived as a series of similar elements which vary throughout the day and although they cover a large section of the view to the north from this point

the overriding emphasis, scale and regularity of the field pattern with gentle terrain would help reduce potential effects on more intricate sections of the view to the southwest.

This view would be available on completion and in the short term. Once established the proposed field boundary reinforcement and mitigation planting along the southern boundaries of fields 3 and 4 and western boundaries of field 3, would act to break up and filter or screen views of the Proposed Development and assimilate it within the landscape fabric as it matures. These features would be managed to different heights allowing new features to grow out along the southern boundary to provide a mix of landscape fabric elements with different heights and structure to add some diversity to the simple scaled focus of the view. This would help to filter and reduce visibility from this distance and orientation.

Assessment: This would represent a **High to Medium** magnitude of visual change *(extensive to partial change to the existing view where the development or a part of it, would become a clear feature)* in a near and mid-distance view. This would result in a short term **Moderate Adverse** visual effect, when combined with the baseline sensitivity for road users as they move through the landscape and with more filtered ad screened views from other points of the road to the east and west.

With mitigation and enhancement planting established in the medium to long term the effect would be reduced to a more partial, change to the existing view which would include an enhanced landscape structure in the view. While this would foreshorten the view across the arable fields directly to the north, it would provide a more diverse and varied mix of landscape features within the intervening view. This would also tie in with the character of the roadside vegetation patterns to the east and reduce the magnitude of effect to **Medium to Low** with heavily filtered and glimpsed views through a more diverse landscape structure. This would reduce the effect on balance to **Moderate to Minor Adverse** in the medium to long term with the development heavily screened and views enhanced with a mix of new landscape features.

6.2.4 Viewpoint 4: PROW, south of Yardley Road, south of Yardley Gobion

Existing View: From this section of a PRoW to the south side of Yardley Road, to the south of Yardley Gobion, a flat view extends across a large arable field boundary consistently by field boundary hedgerows with field boundary trees. These elements enclose the view to the north and west.

At further points to the south, they also form layers of further vegetation to partially filter further views across the arable farmland. To the south land rises slightly across further areas of farmland enclosed by hedgerows, trees and woodland to low ridges also defined by woodland which forms a low flat skyline. This wider landscape pattern is punctuated by occasional farmstead buildings and at further points to the southeast by more notable built elements and industrial buildings associated with the urban fringes of Milton Keynes, as shown on **Figure 9**.

Predicted Change: From this location on the development edges of field 6 construction activity would stretch across the view south within the foreground field. Views to other sections would be heavily filtered by the nature of the robust field boundary vegetation.

On completion the Proposed Development would be clearly visible in the foreground view to the south where it would sit within the arable field to the east side the existing PROW. At other points the solar panels in field 5 would be evident in heavily filtered views to the west through intervening field boundary vegetation. The remaining sections of the Proposed Development would not be that visible from this point as it would sit to the rear of vegetated field boundaries and behind the nearest sections of solar panels. The nearest sections of the Site would be seen in direct views across the

nearest rows to the south but these would be set back from the PRoW by up to 15m to allow for retention of access, amenity and mitigation and enhancements.

At this point, the nature of the proposed tracking system would provide some variation in the partial view of the panels above and between vegetation, with the front and rear side of the panels visible at different times of the day. At this location the panels would be seen with the back face of the panels in field 6 facing towards the view during the first part of the day. The front face of the panels in field 5 would then tilt towards the view in heavily filtered views through the hedgerow. By the middle of the day the panels would be seen as flat panels, with some views to the supporting structures in field 6. Later in the day they would be seen with the front of the panels facing towards the viewer in field 6, and the rear of panels in heavily filtered views in field 5.

This view would be available during construction and on completion in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation is established to provide an enhanced vegetated edge and substantial screen to the panels along the PROW within field 6. This includes measures for gapping up and bolstering of existing hedgerows to maintain a field boundary at 6m height with characteristic intermittent trees.

Assessment: This would represent a **High to Medium** magnitude of visual change *(extensive to partial change to the existing view where the development or a part of it, would become a clear feature)* in a near and mid-distance view to the south but heavily filtered and screened elsewhere. This would result in a short term **Major to Moderate Adverse** visual effect, when combined with the baseline sensitivity for users of this section of the PRoW running through field 6.

Beyond the short term and once the proposed mitigation establishes the proposed development would be more notably screened and integrated within the landscape. This would reduce the magnitude to a more subtle or slight change and more heavily screened or glimpsed views through new mitigation, and some enhancement along the PRoW and effects would be reduced to **Moderate to Minor Adverse** in the medium to long term with more contained but visually enhanced views along a PROW with vegetation on both sides and trees planted into a buffer area to the Proposed Development.

6.2.5 Viewpoint 5: PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path west side of the A508

Existing View: From this elevated section of a PRoW adjacent to the A508, at ~0.7km to the southeast, a broad, gently undulating view extends between field boundaries to the northwest. This view is channelled across arable fields of medium to large scale which are defined by tiers of managed fields boundary hedgerows with field boundary trees as shown on **Figure 10**. It extends to a relatively flat to slightly stepped, mostly wooded skyline in the mid to far distance. To the north there is evidence of settlement edges at Yardley Gobion which are interspersed with tiers of vegetation. Further settlement at Potterspury is less discernible in the view. To the east the A508 borders the view and is evident sweeping up into the distant view.

Predicted View: In this context, construction activity would be visible, principally within the nearest sections of the Site at fields 7, 8 and 10. Activity to the rear of these fields would be partial and mostly to just the taller elements of construction. Some views would be in filtered views through tiers of mature field boundary vegetation.

On completion the Proposed Development would be visible in a mid to distant section of the view. This would also be in a section of the view that lies within the raised arable farmland landscape rather than in front of any wider views to other surrounding landscapes. This would include panels and fencing principally within the lower lying undulating southern sections of the Site within fields 7, 8 and 10, with the remaining sections of the Proposed Development sitting substantially to the rear

of these nearest sections and behind other intervening tiers of vegetation and barely discernible, in the view.

From this distance and orientation the solar panels would be seen in views obliquely across the north to south rows and perceived as a series of rows or panels with textured context within the field pattern with views extending across the southern rows of panels.

At this point, the nature of the proposed tracking system would provide some variation in the view of the panels, with the front and rear side of the panels visible at different times of the day. At this location the panels would be seen with the front face of the panels facing towards the view during the first part of the day. By the middle of the day they would be seen as flat panels, with clearer views to the supporting structures and at a slightly lower height. Later in the day they would be seen with the rear of the panel facing towards the viewer.

This view would be available during construction and on completion in the short term before management of existing field boundaries and mitigation features are established to provide an enhanced vegetated structure to reduce visibility towards the Site. This includes measures to maintain a field boundary up to 6m height with intermittent trees which would reduce views to just partial intermittent sections of the Site within the Southern fields.

Assessment: This would represent a **Medium to Low** magnitude of visual change in the short term *(partial change to the existing view where the development or a part of it, would be noticeable or perceptible)* but low 'glimpsed' exposure to the *view* in an isolated section of the PRoW with the rest of the route behind hedgerows and at a lower elevation. On balance this would result in a short-term **Moderate Adverse** visual effect, when combined with the baseline sensitivity for PRoW users, given the proximity and exposure to the view and extent of development present.

Beyond the short term and once the proposed management of existing hedgerows and mitigation establishes within and around the edges of the Site the Proposed Development would be more notably screened and integrated within the landscape. This would reduce effects to no more than **Moderate to Minor Adverse** in the medium to long term.

6.2.6 Viewpoint 6: PRoW to the south side of the playing fields/ parish hall at Yardley Gobion

Existing View: From this section of a PRoW to the west side of Yardley Gobion, a short, level view extends across a flat pasture field to mature vegetated field boundaries. These boundaries also form the skyline to the west and south and heavily filter and contain further views in these directions (**Figure 11**). At isolated points further arable fields and tiers of field boundary vegetation are just evident. Further to the east the view is also contained by further mature field boundaries which prevent views to the settlement edges of Yardley Gobion.

Predicted Change: From this point the Proposed Development would not be discernible in the view. It would sit to the rear of tiers of field boundary vegetation within the flat to gently sloping arable farmland areas. These tiers of intervening vegetation, act in conjunction to build up screening and even during winter months the views to low lying elements beyond the foreground are very heavily filtered and screened.

During construction there may be some potential for views to some of the taller machinery but the majority of the construction activity would be screened. This view would also be present on completion and for the duration of the Proposed Development and would also be the case for other sections of the PRoW to the north and from the settled northwestern edges of Yardley Gobion.

Assessment: This would represent a magnitude of **None** and there would **No Change** to the views at this location and direction to the east. This would include other sections of the PROoW within this field next to the parish hall and play area and from the north-western edges of Yardley Gobion. From the field to the south, heavily filtered views would be gained through a single tier of field boundary to the Site in field 1, those types of views are represented by viewpoints 1 and 2.

6.2.7 Summary of Visual Effects on Receptor Groups and Illustrative viewpoints

The visual assessment above, supported by the illustrative VPs (A-H in **Appendix C**) shows that, geographically, the extent of notable visual effect would be confirmed to the immediate Site context. It would be restricted principally to sections of PRoW within the Site and at adjacent Site boundaries to the north and west and from points along Yardley Road including the allotment area to the north. Beyond these points views are generally more partial and mostly filtered or screened by intervening tiers of field boundary vegetation. The visual change would, therefore, be experienced across a relatively small area. This is summarised below.

From the representative viewpoints it can be seen that:

- The extent of **Moderate to Major Adverse** visual effects, where the Proposed Development would form a noticeable to extensive change to the composition of the existing view such that the baseline would be fundamentally changed, would be limited to points within or on, Site boundaries where there is public access. It is likely to include users principally on the Grafton Way through and adjacent to field 1 and PRoW through fields 6,8 and 10. However, this would be in the short term before mitigation planting has established within the new buffer areas to screen and heavily filter the proposals in views whilst adding enhanced landscape structure and biodiversity to the view. This would reduce effects to **Moderate to Minor Adverse** in the medium to long term at these points;
- Beyond this area, the extent of **Moderate** effects would relate to other Site boundary points such as short sections of Yardley Road to the south of field 3 and other close-range points within the immediate Site context and include other sections of the wider PRoW network to the west side of Yardley Gobion and some views from adjacent houses in the region of 12-15 dwellings along Hesketh Road where it merges with Eastfield Road. There is also potential for very isolated points of **Moderate** effect on other elevated PRoW including points within the host farmland area to the southeast where views are generally glimpsed over short sections of footways. This is likely to be in the short term before mitigation planting has established to screen potential views and reduce effects;
- Beyond these points, the scale of effects reduces to **Moderate to Minor Adverse**, particularly once the mitigation planting along the less well vegetated sections of boundaries is established and gapping up and management of vegetation on other boundaries has matured, filtering and screening views of the proposals. This is likely to include others settlement areas from the lower lying settlement areas of Potterspury where the quickly rising landform and hedged ridgeline would heavily filter and screen the Proposed Development and only a very small part of the Proposed Development on the western edges of field 3 is likely to be partially visible from higher points of the settlement to the west where there are channelled views between and across buildings. This is evidenced by the illustrative VP D **Appendix C**; and
- Outside these areas, the Proposed Development would either be largely screened or heavily filtered from visual receptors by vegetation and local landform variations within the wider landscape, or the Proposed Development would form a very limited change in more distant isolated views from the north (as evidenced further on illustrative VPs A-H), being seen in the context of a relatively strong and well vegetated landscape comprising a mix of landcover.

7. Cumulative Assessment

Cumulative effects are defined in GLVIA3, which notes that they;

"Result from additional changes to the landscape or visual amenity caused by the Development in conjunction with other developments (associated with or separate to it), actions that occurred in the past, present or are likely to occur in the foreseeable future."

Cumulative landscape effects may occur to the landscape components e.g. loss of hedgerows or landscape characteristics by introducing new features.

Cumulative visual effects may occur where one development is viewed in combination (static views of up to 90-degree arc), successively (turning around on the spot) or sequentially where the user moves along routes, roads or paths with one or more development evident.

Developments that are subject to a valid planning application are normally included within such an assessment, where specific circumstances indicate there is potential for cumulative effects to occur, with progressively decreasing emphasis placed on those which are less certain to proceed.

Typically, operational and consented developments are treated as being part of the landscape and visual baseline. i.e. it is assumed that consented schemes would be built except for occasional exceptions where there is good reason to assume that they would not be constructed. Schemes that are at earlier stages such as scoping are not usually considered within such an assessment unless specifically requested by the planning authority.

Within the detailed 2km study area for this assessment, there are no operational solar farm developments requiring consideration within the main LVIA or other solar farms 'in planning' requiring cumulative assessment. While there are two operational solar farms beyond the detailed 2km study area at c. 2.2km to the northwest at Grafton Solar Farm and Homestead farm these two schemes lie a notable distance from the ZTV of the Proposed Development and away from sensitive landscape and visual receptors noted within the main assessment.

8. Summary

The Proposed Development would introduce a new vertically low, medium-scale renewable energy feature into the arable farmland to the southwest of Yardley within the 'Undulating Claylands LCT 6' and sub area '6a The Tove Catchment'. At this point the landscape is defined by relatively flat to gently sloping landform and a mix of mature field boundaries and trees to provide localised variations and containment to large parts of the Site. This is at a point away from the more notable outward facing convex slopes and more intricate low lying sections of the surrounding landscape.

The area is reasonably typical of the defined character detailed within the published landscape character assessments of the area with a patchwork of medium to large scale, arable fields delineated by a network of clipped and mature hedgerows. At this location, the Site sits within a more elevated section of land and often larger in scale. Beyond the Site boundaries broad, gentle, convex slopes descend to more intimate areas such as the settled areas around Potterspury to the south and heritage features such as RPGs and Medieval Villages.

The overall design of the Proposed Development has considered landscape and visual effects within the confines of the Site to ensure the effects upon the landscape and visual receptors have been minimised. To this end the Proposed Development would be set back from key sections of the Site where receptors are likely to gain some views, including PRoW through the Site and isolate residential properties on the southern edge of Yardley Gobion to retain and enhance the amenity at these points with mitigation planting.

The proposed mitigation and enhancement measures at these buffer areas and boundary points, combined with management of other existing field boundaries, would also assist in reducing the duration of effects and aid in retaining and improving the field boundaries and woodland character, in keeping with the character of this landscape.

Direct landscape effects would include changing the prevailing arable land use to a dual use, renewable energy generation with potential for grazing and with landscape character and biodiversity enhancements. The solar PV panel layout has been designed to retain existing vegetation within the Site as far as possible and no notable tree or hedgerow sections would be removed.

The overall field scale that is characteristic of the Site and the surrounding landscape would remain and views to surrounding features including hedgerows and wooded skylines would be retained. Further to this, new field boundaries would be provided with open sections to fully enclose the Site within characteristic field boundaries.

LVIA effects are considered to be relatively localised to points within or adjacent to the Site and to a small section of the nearest settlement edges at Yardley, with intermittent visibility likely. Most other views would be limited and heavily filtered to small sections of the Site. Clear and open views where largely sections of the Site are visible are likely to be restricted.

The Solar array would sit in contained views often framed by surrounding field boundaries and below more distant skylines and in views interspersed by large areas of vegetation. This would allow views to the landscape beyond the Site. In the medium to long term the proposed mitigation would mature. This would screen views towards the Proposed Development.

The Site lies to the west of a locally defined SLA designation and at a further point to the east side of another SLA. However, the nature of the Site setting and surrounding character of the designated areas including lower lying farmland to the east an extensive woodland to the west, would help to reduce views and effects on the character and value of the designation and on its immediate setting.

In the medium to long-term, the proposed landscape mitigation planting along various boundaries combined with management of other existing field boundaries along other boundaries would help to screen the large majority of the Proposed Development from most near and middle-distance views, as well as integrating the Proposed Development into the surrounding landscape.

At the end of the Proposed Development's lifespan, the predicted effects are reversible as the land would be returned to its former agricultural use, similar in form to its current state.

In terms of compliance with the relevant landscape policies of the adopted WJCS, the LVIA concludes that the Proposed Development has been designed in a sensitive and appropriate manner. Where adverse effects arise, mitigation has been used to reduce the degree of harm and to provide a characteristic scheme that assimilates into the landscape in accordance with Policy principally in BN1 and BN5.

Overall, the site represents a suitable location for development and the proposed scheme parameters with the embedded landscape mitigation results in limited and localised effects. The scheme complies with policy aspirations and the LVIA process confirms the acceptability of the proposals

9. References

Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (2023), *National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure* (Available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47856/1940-nps-renewable-energy-en3.pdf .

Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (2011), *National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*, (Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf).

East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment (2010). Available at. https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5635681403535360

Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2013), Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Third Edition

Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance note 1/20 "Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs). (Available at https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstitute-org/2020/01/20-1-Reviewing-LVIAs-and-LVAs-Final.pdf)

Landscape Institute (LI) Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Technical Guidance note 06/19 (Available at https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/visualisation/)

Milton Keynes City Council, Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment (2016). Available at https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/milton-keynes-landscape-character-assessment

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2025), *National Planning Policy Framework* (Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2)

Natural England (2014), An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment

Natural England (2013), *National Character Area (NCA) Profile NCA: 88: Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands* (Available at: https://nationalcharacterareas.co.uk/Bedfordshire-and-Cambridgeshire-Claylands/

Northamptonshire County Council, Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment (NCLCA), 2005, updated 2008. https://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/neighbourhood-planning/sources-evidence

South Northamptonshire Council, South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2). Available at https://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/south-northamptonshire-local-plan-part-2

South Northamptonshire Council South Northamptonshire (SN) Design Guide, chapter 3 (2017). Available at https://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/new-local-plan-west-northamptonshire

South Northamptonshire: A Review of Special Landscape Areas 2017: Available at https://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/new-local-plan-west-northamptonshire

The Building Research Establishment (BRE) (2013), *Planning guidance for the development of large-scale ground mounted solar PV systems: Appendix A (At: https://www.bre.co.uk/filelibrary/pdf/other_pdfs/KN5524_Planning_Guidance_reduced.pdf*

West Northamptonshire Council,West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (Part 1), December 2014. Available at: https://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/west-northamptonshire-joint-core-strategy/west-northamptonshire-joint-core-strategy-local-plan-part

Appendices

Appendix A. Figures

See Appendix C for Illustrative viewpoint photos A-H and Grid Connection

Appendix B. LVIA Assessment Criteria

B.1. Assessment Criteria

Receptor Sensitivity

GLVIA 3 notes that Landscape receptors are 'defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.' This can mean the landscape as whole, or to individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape.'

Visual receptors are; 'individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal.'

GLVIA3 notes that the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors should consider the receptor value and susceptibility to harm due to the development proposal. This includes any relevant landscape designations which recognise value, and the value of elements or characteristics of notable aesthetic, perceptual or experiential quality.

For visual receptors it includes the value attached to views, for example in relation to assets or planning designations and the occupation or activity of people experiencing that view and the degree to which their attention is focussed on the view.

The sensitivities can be determined using a combination of typical indicators as noted in the following table. These are appraised using professional judgement.

Table B-1: Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Indicators

Sensitivity	Receptor	Typical Indicators
High	Landscape	Landscape of national or regional value with distinctive elements and characteristics, highly susceptible to small changes of the type of development proposed without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. Typically, these include high quality with distinctive elements Likely to be designated, but the aspects which underpin such value may also be present outside designated areas; Areas of special recognised value through use, perception or historic and cultural associations. Likely to contain features and elements that are rare and could not be replaced
	Visual	Activity resulting in a particular interest or appreciation of the view (e.g. residents with principal private views, or people engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is focused on the landscape and where people might visit purely to experience the view, such as promoted / scenic VPs) and/or a view of national value (e.g. within/towards a designated landscape).
Medium	Landscape	Landscape of local or community value, with mostly common elements and characteristics, which by nature of their character would be able to partly accommodate change of the type proposed without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. Typically, these would be mostly commonplace elements but may include some rarer elements and with some sense of place. Locally designated, or value may be expressed through non-statutory local publications. Likely to contain some features and elements that could not be replaced
	Visual	Activity resulting in a general interest or appreciation of the view (e.g. residents or people engaged in outdoor recreation that does not focus on an appreciation of the landscape, outdoor workers, people in schools or other institutional buildings and hotels and people passing through the landscape on defined scenic routes) and/or a view of local or community value (e.g. suburban residential areas, or agricultural land or urban areas).
Low	Landscape	Landscape of community or limited value and relatively inconsequential elements and characteristics, the nature of which is potentially tolerant of substantial change of the type proposed. Typically, these would be some features and elements that

Sensitivity	Receptor	Typical Indicators
		are discordant, derelict or in decline, resulting in indistinct character with little or no sense of place; Not designated. Containing few, if any, features of value. Likely to contain few, if any, features that could not be replaced
	Visual	Activity where interest or appreciation of the view is secondary to the activity or the period of exposure to the view is limited (e.g. people at work, motorists travelling through the area or people engaged in outdoor recreation that does not focus on an appreciation of the landscape) and/or a view of limited value (e.g. featureless agricultural landscape, poor quality urban fringe)
Very Low	Landscape	Landscape of very low or limited value, which is damaged, degraded or a substantially modified landscape pattern with few or no natural or original features remaining, such that it is tolerant of change
	Visual	Activity where interest or appreciation of the view is inconsequential (e.g. people at work with limited views out, or drivers of vehicles in cutting) and/or very low value of existing view (e.g. industrial areas or derelict land).

Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of change (the change brought about by the development proposal), is defined within GLVIA as *"a combination of the scale, extent and duration of an effect"* and can be categorised using typical indicators as noted in the table below or by a combination of these categories.

Effects can be direct, where they involve a physical change to a defined element or characteristic of the landscape, or indirect, where effects are secondary and perceived on the wider pattern of elements or on visual amenity, away from the proposed site.

Table B-2: Magnitude of Effect

Magnitude	Receptor	Definition
High	Landscape	Total loss or large-scale damage to key characteristics or distinctive features, and/or the addition of new features or components affecting the majority of the key characteristics and defining the experience of the landscape which will substantially alter the character or setting of the wider landscape
	Visual	Extensive change to the composition of the existing view (e.g. widespread loss of characteristic features or the widespread addition of new features within the view) and/or high degree of exposure to view (e.g. close, direct or open views). Where the development or a part of it, would become the dominant feature or focal point of the view
Medium	Landscape	Partial loss or noticeable damage to existing landscape character or distinctive features or elements; and/or addition of new uncharacteristic, noticeable features or elements affecting some key characteristics and the experience of the wider landscape
	Visual	Partial change to the composition of the existing view (e.g. loss of some characteristic features or the addition of new features within the view) and/or medium degree of exposure to view (e.g. middle-distance or partially screened views) where the development or a part of it, would form a noticeable feature or element of the view which is readily apparent to the receptor.
Low	Landscape	Limited loss or damage to key characteristics or alteration of common features, and/or the addition of new features such that post development the change would be discernible, but the underlying pattern of characteristics would remain similar to the baseline condition
	Visual	Slight or Subtle change to existing view (e.g. limited loss of characteristic features or the addition of new features within the view) and/or low degree of exposure to view (e.g. long-distance, substantially screened or glimpsed views) where the development or a part of it, would be perceptible but not alter the overall balance of features and elements that comprise the existing view
Very Low	Landscape	Barely noticeable loss, damage or alteration to key characteristics or features. The change would not influence the wider character and would be barely discernible or legible, approximating to a "no change" situation

	Visual	Barely perceptible change to the existing view and/or very brief exposure to view. where only a very small part of the Scheme would be discernible, or it is at such a distance that it would form a barely noticeable feature or element of the view
None	Landscape	No change to the character or setting of the area.
	Visual	No change to the view

B.2. Degrees of Landscape and Visual Effects

Landscape and visual effects will be classified by considering the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change using a matrix as shown in the Matrix Table below.

These degrees indicate a gradation between categories and a 'sliding scale' of the relative importance of the effect, with Major being the most important and Negligible or No Change being the least. Effects that are towards the higher level of the scale (Major) are those judged to be most important, whilst those towards the bottom of the scale are *"of lesser concern"* (GLVIA, 3rd edition, para 3.35).

Table B-3: Degrees of Landscape and Visual Effect

Sensitivity (Susceptibility & Value)	Magnitude of Change				
	High	**Medium**	**Low**	**Very Low**	**None**
High	Major	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	No Change
Medium	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	No Change
Low	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	No Change
Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	Negligible	No Change

GLVIA notes that for both landscape and visual receptors; '*there cannot be a standard approach since circumstances vary with the local and landscape context and with the type of proposal*'.

As such, this matrix approach, while helpful, is not a prescriptive tool, as at times the table may not provide a clear correlated value which is where professional judgment plays an important role in determining the gradation in the overall degree of effect and the subtle variations between these categories. Where intermediate ratings are noted, e.g. "Moderate-Minor", this indicates an effect that is both less than Moderate and more than Minor, rather than one which varies across the range.

B.3. The Nature of Landscape and Visual Effects

Direct and Indirect Effects

The landscape and visual resource of an area can be affected both directly and indirectly. Visual impacts are always direct because an object needs to be seen for a visual impact to arise. Landscape impacts on the other hand can be either direct or indirect. Change which affects on-site physical features (i.e. vegetation, buildings and landform), or the character area in which the Site is located,

is direct, whereas an impact on the character of surrounding landscape character areas is indirect. Indirect impacts tend to be less substantial than direct ones.

In general, the scope of this LVIA is:

- Direct (primary) effects on landscape features, the character of the Site, and views; and
- Indirect (secondary) effects on the surrounding landscape character.

B.4. Valency of Effects and Objective Assessment

Landscape and Visual effects can be assessed objectively and quantitatively as either adverse, i.e. loss of valuable elements, degradation of landscape character or loss of integrity in terms of designated landscapes); beneficial, i.e. removal of inappropriate or damaging elements, enhancement of key landscape elements and landscape character, introduction of positive landscape elements.

Neutral effects would occur where there is a balance of beneficial and adverse impacts.

Whether the landscape and visual effects are adverse, beneficial, or neutral, is influenced by a variety of issues including personal preference, interests, and exposure to similar developments. As such judgements on the valency of effects are made separately from the main assessment in this LVIA, to retain objectivity in the assessment.

B.5. Mitigation of landscape and visual effects

The identification of potential landscape and visual effects is an important part of the iterative design process because it can help designers avoid or minimise potential adverse effects of a development and, where appropriate, can help to identify opportunities for mitigation measures. Mitigation measures can be:

- Primary measures developed through the iterative design process and embedded into the project design;
- Standard construction and operational management practices for avoiding or reducing environmental effects; or
- Secondary measures to address any residual effects remaining after the primary measures and standard construction/operational practices have been incorporated into the scheme.

B.6. Assessment Timescales

In this assessment, potential effects are considered according to the following timescales, which allow an understanding of the changes which may occur in the landscape as a result of the development over time, and judgements to be made about the duration and reversibility of effects (see also the section on ‘Magnitude’ above):

- During construction: focussing on specific construction-related effects.
- On completion: the effects when the construction phase is complete and the operational phase of the project starts.
- Short Term: taken to be up to 3-7 years post completion as the mitigation vegetation becomes established, with heights up to approximately 6m
- Long-term, taken to be 15-40 years post completion and for the duration of the Proposal.

B.7. Residual effects

Residual effects are changes to landscape or visual amenity caused by the Proposed Development after all mitigation has been considered.

Appendix C. Illustrative Viewpoint Photos A-H and Grid Connection

Viewpoint A PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path east of Potterspury

Viewpoint B PRoW north of Potterspury playing fields

Viewpoint C Moorend Road

Viewpoint D Meadow View / High Street junction, Potterspury

Viewpoint E PRoW Thrupp Wharf Grand Union Canal

Viewpoint F Minor Road north of Castle Thorpe

Viewpoint G PRoW west side of Hanslope

Viewpoint H Access road east side of Wakefield Lodge RPG

Grid Connection photos

Appendix D. LVIA Scoping Consultations

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Scope Consultations

From: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Sent: 05 June 2024 11:17
To: jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk <jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

HI Andy,

It's Yardley Gobian he's referring to, when I spoke to him he said that while it's not really a clear view of the site, it is the spot where any visit from committee members would view the site – they would likely park there and have a look in the first instance.

Did you have photography from there already? I think just an illustrative view from that location would suffice, not a full visualisation.

What are your thoughts about photomontages? He hasn't mentioned them in his response, but we had discussed the need for a couple as committee are unlikely to read in depth text, but can easily look at an image. Is it worth including a couple from the 'worst case' viewpoints?

Cheers,

David

David Wilkinson

Senior Consultant

Atmos Consulting Ltd

M 07881 917 634

W www.atmosconsulting.com

From: Andy Jones <jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 11:12 AM
To: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: Fw: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

Hi David,

Do you know if Chris means the playing fields and parish hall at Potterspury or Yardley Gobion?

Otherwise looking ok

Regards

Andy

From: Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 June 2024 10:59
To: David Wilkinson

<David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>; jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk <jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk>
Cc: Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

David

Apologies (as always) for the tardiness.

Happy with the scope, my only suggestion to David was re. the playing fields/ parish hall. Accept it is a bit of a non view but I felt it is probably how most residents would appreciate the site.

Kind regards

Chris

From: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Sent: 05 June 2024 10:35
To: jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk; Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Cc: Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

Hi Andy,

Thanks for following up, @Chris Burton do you have an update on the scope we proposed for Yardley Road in the email below?

Cheers,

David

David Wilkinson

Senior Consultant

Atmos Consulting Ltd

M 07881 917 634

W www.atmosconsulting.com

From: Andy Jones <jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:33 AM
To: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>; Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Cc: Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: Re: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

Hi David,

Did you hear back on this scope for Yardley ?

It would be good to get this report going if possible (knowing how busy summer / autumn is looking)...

Regards

Andy

From: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Sent: 31 May 2024 10:23
To: Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Cc: jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk <jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk>; Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

Hi Chris,

Did you manage to review the proposed LVIA scope? We are coming into a very busy period for LVIA and visuals production so I need to get the Yardley visuals scheduled in. Can you please confirm what visuals you would expect to see? Or whether our proposed visuals will be acceptable.

I appreciate that we discussed this over the phone, but if you could please respond to this email what your expectations are so we can instruct the work appropriately and have record of the discussion.

Cheers,

David

David Wilkinson

From: Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 7:18 AM
To: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Cc: jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk; Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope [Filed 22 May 2024 09:39]

David

I will get this back to you tomorrow – you will also get the pre-app on Friday. I apologies for the delay but both APP/W2845/W/23/3314266 (Gayton) and APP/W2845/W/23/3315771 (Land at Halse Road) have been judicially reviewed. These appeals, especially Halse Rd, are the basis of the LPA's interpretation of solar policy.

Following a lengthy legal discussion we are now in a position were we are comfortable with our interpretation of the principle (caveated that the JR judgements may change this again).

My pre-app is still written in support of the application.

Kind regards

Chris

From: David Wilkinson <David.Wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com>
Sent: 21 May 2024 15:58
To: Chris Burton <Chris.Burton@westnorthants.gov.uk>
Cc: jonah.j@hotmail.co.uk; Freena Garcia <Freena.Garcia@atmosconsulting.com>
Subject: Yardley Road Proposed LVIA Scope

Hi Chris,

I hope you are well.

In the absence of the pre-app, we are seeking to confirm the scope of our proposed Landscape and visual assessment of the Yardley Road Solar Farm.

I have attached the Landscape and Visual note which was provided within the screening request for context of the proposed LVIA, I have also attached an updated ZTV plan showing the screened theoretical visibility alongside the proposed viewpoint locations.

For the assessment we are proposing the following scope:

Assessment of the following Representative Viewpoints for Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA para 6.19)

Viewpoint	Location	Rationale
Representative Viewpoints for detailed Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3 para 6.19)		
1	PRoW east edge of Yardley Gobion off Hesketh Road	PROW users and nearest residents to the northeast
2	PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path on eastern Site boundary	PROW users on the eastern Site boundary
3	Yardley Road, northeast of Potterspury, next to bench	Road and recreation users to the south
4	PROW, Yardley Road, east of Yardley Gobion	Recreation users to the north
5	PRoW Grafton Way Long Distance Path west side of the A508	Road and recreation users to the east

The key points we seek to confirm in terms of the scope are as follows:

- We propose that annotated Photopanels (**Type 1 Visualisations**) will be provided for each viewpoint to current guidance
- We propose Representative Viewpoints with photopanles from **5 viewpoints** where views of proposed development are likely
    - These will be supported by a further **3 illustrative photopanels**
- Cumulative Developments
    - A desk top review of potential developments within 2km of the Proposed Development. Can you please confirm any new committed cumulative developments that should be considered?

If you can please confirm that the above scope is acceptable, or if you have any input on the proposed scope that would be much appreciated.

Cheers,

David

David Wilkinson

Senior Consultant

CBC House

24 Canning Street

Edinburgh

EH3 8EG

M 07881 917 634

E david.wilkinson@atmosconsulting.com

W www.atmosconsulting.com