

FIELDS OS 6700 6722 AND 5200 MUSTON LANE, EASTHORPE -

LPA ref: 22/00537/FUL

PINS ref: APP/Y2430/W/24/3340258

Appendix 1 to Proof of Evidence of
Simon Higson BA (Hons), MA, CMLI

Prepared for Melton Borough Council
and



August 2024

Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk Web: www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk

Registered Office: 3 Princes Court, Royal Way, Loughborough, LE11 5XR. Company Registration Number: 14177017

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REPORT	2
2	LANDSCAPE-RELATED PLANNING CONTEXT	10
3	ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS	20
4	ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS	32
5	MATTERS IN DISPUTE	42

TABLES

Table SH-1 - Summary Schedule of Proposed Solar Farm Equipment and Infrastructure

Table SH-2 – Landscape Value (using the Landscape Institute’s TGN 02/21 factors)

Table SH-3 – Landscape Sensitivity

Table SH-4 – Magnitude of Landscape Change

Table SH-5 – Overall Landscape Effect of the Proposed Development

Table SH-6 – Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Table SH-7 – Magnitude of Visual Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint

Table SH-8 – Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors

Table SH-9 – Overall Visual Effect of the Proposed Development

1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REPORT

1.1 Scope of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

1.1.1 This appendix sets out my summary re-assessment of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment included with the planning application, produced by Pegasus Group ('Pegasus' LVIA') in January 2022 (CD 1.31, CD1.32 and CD1.33) and Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted as supplementary environmental information, produced by Pegasus Group ('Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment') in November 2022 (CD 1.38) and consideration of the matters in dispute in the Statement of Common of Ground and reasons for refusal in the Decision Notice of 11th September 2023 (CD 3.3).

1.1.2 My landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) is carried out in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3, CD 8.1), produced by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment in 2013.

1.1.3 My considerations relating to landscape value also use Technical Guidance Note 02/21– "Assessing Landscape Value outside National Designations", published by the Landscape Institute in May 2021 (CD 8.3).

1.1.4 I have also reviewed the Landscape Statement of Case prepared by Pegasus (CD 9.2).

1.1.5 This appendix is structured as follows:

- Landscape-related Planning Context;
- Assessment of Landscape Effects; and
- Assessment of Visual Effects; and
- Matters in Dispute.

1.2 Definitions

1.2.1 The European Landscape Convention (ELC) defines landscape as "*an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors*" (see GLVIA3, paragraph 2.2). As GLVIA3 states, the ELC definition of landscape is inclusive, in that it covers "*natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas*", as

well as *“inland water and marine areas”*.

- 1.2.2 In accordance with ELC and GLVIA3 the definition of landscape within this proof therefore includes natural, rural, urban and peri-urban (‘urban fringe’) areas.
- 1.2.3 Paragraph 1.1 of GLVIA 3 states that *“Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is a tool used to identify and assess the significance of and the effects of change resulting from development on both the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people’s views and visual amenity”*.
- 1.2.4 Paragraph 5.1 of GLVIA3 describes how landscape effects are concerned with *“how the proposal will affect the elements that make up the landscape, the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape and its distinctive character”*.
- 1.2.5 Allied to this, paragraph 6.1 of GLVIA3 describes how visual effects are concerned with *“assessing how the surroundings of individuals or groups of people may be specifically affected by changes in the content and character of views as a result of the change or loss of existing elements of the landscape and/or introduction of new elements”*.
- 1.2.6 Paragraph 7.1 of GLVIA3 defines cumulative effects in a broad generic sense as *“impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project”*.
- 1.2.7 This assessment considers landscape and visual effects separately, although where relevant and appropriate, cross references may be made to the same features or elements.
- 1.2.8 The determination of potential landscape and visual effects follows a step-by-step process based on the combination of the sensitivity of the receptor (susceptibility to type of change proposed and value) and the magnitude of effect (size/scale, geographical extent, duration and reversibility).
- 1.2.9 Paragraph 3.23 of GLVIA3 describes how LVIA *“is an evidence-based process combined with professional judgement. It is important that the basis of such judgements is transparent and understandable, so that the underlying assumptions and reasoning can be understood by others.”*

1.3 Methodology

- 1.3.1 I have followed the methodology which is set out in Pegasus’ LVIA and Cumulative

Assessment to facilitate consistency in approach.

- 1.3.2 I have carried out a desk top review of relevant landscape-related planning policies and guidance, other appeal decisions, relevant character assessments for the Appeal Site and its context, materials submitted as part of the planning application and sequent correspondence, as described in more detail below.
- 1.3.3 I was instructed to act as landscape expert witness for the Appeal on 15th April 2024. As part of my assessment, I visited the Appeal Site and surrounding area on 29th April, 8th May and 4th July, 24th July and 26th July 2024. Appendix 2 to my proof of evidence includes my LVIA figures and Appendix 3 are my context photographs taken during my fieldwork. Appendix 4 is Cornwall Environmental Consultant's Review of Pegasus Group's Landscape Rebuttal on CEC's Review of the Submitted LVIA for Easthorpe (16th March 2023).
- 1.3.4 During the site visits, the weather conditions were suitable for assessing all views for this assessment. Visual effects vary depending on light and weather conditions and also the time of day and year. Accordingly, this assessment takes account of the conditions in the photographs but also considers alternative conditions within the written assessment, where relevant.

1.4 The Study Area

- 1.4.1 The Study Area for my re-assessment of landscape and visual effects is based on the 5km radius identified in Pegasus' LVIA (under paragraph 2.2.4). However, I have made references to either landscape or visual receptors in the wider area, where this is relevant and provides context to the assessment (e.g. characteristics of the Vale of Belvoir and / or sequential views for users of certain routes).

1.5 Development Proposal

- 1.5.1 The development proposal is a *"full planning application for the construction of a solar farm together with all associated work, equipment and necessary infrastructure."*
- 1.5.2 The Appeal Site is located to the west of the settlement of Muston and south-east of Bottesford. The Appellant's Statement of Case (paragraph 3.3) states that *"Of the overall Appeal Site which extends to 99.95 hectares, the Proposed Development will occupy approximately 81 ha of this area, with the remaining land being utilised for biodiversity improvements, landscaping and planting"*.

- 1.5.3 An Amended Scheme Site Layout and Landscape Strategy, drawing number P19- 20 22_24 Revision C, dated 29/02/2024, prepared by Pegasus Group, was included with the Appeal Submission (CD 2.2). This included a reduction in the area of solar panels in the refused scheme by 2.2ha. The development will have an export capacity of up to 49.9MW.
- 1.5.4 Table 1 below is a summary schedule of the solar farm equipment and infrastructure which includes proposed access tracks with adjacent swales / filter trenches, security fencing and CCTV poles, as well as the solar panel modules, tracker tables, inverters and spares containers. The proposals include for a point of connection mast, communications and weather mast, customer switchgear and 132kv substation, with cables / cable trenches.

Summary Schedule of Solar Farm Equipment and Infrastructure at Appeal Site
81.1 ha Proposed Development area of Solar Panels Modules / Tracker Tables (3m maximum height) placed on metal arrays arranged in rows, using a north-south system.
c9.7 km Security Fence (2m high), 13 Internal Access Road Gates (5m wide)
c147 No. CCTV Poles (3m high)
4.4 km of Internal Access Road (4m wide) crushed aggregate, with swales / filter trenches adjacent. New access onto Castle View Road.
20 No. Inverter Stations (3.4m high, 12.2m x 2.4m)
2 No. Spares Containers (3m high, 12.2m x 2.4m)
Customer Switchgear / 132kv substation (2.5m high, 12m x 2.4m wide)
Point of Connection mast, adjacent to the existing pylon tower (and a similar height)
Communications and weather station mast (up to 5m high)
Cables / cable trench (linking modules to inverter stations and then to main substation)
c5,600 m2 Construction compound by site access onto Castle View Road (including portacabins, containers, parking)
c900 m2 Construction compound by pylon / point of connection (including road entrance)

Table 1 Summary Schedule of Proposed Solar Farm Equipment and Infrastructure

- 1.5.5 There would be a temporary construction compound by the site access onto Castle View Road and a compound by the pylon, with 1,750 Two-way Vehicle Movements (875 Singular Movement) during construction period (in total) (based on a six-day working week).
- 1.5.6 Once installed, the Solar Farm would require infrequent visits for the purposes of maintenance or cleaning of the site. Such work typically requires around 1 visit per month.
- 1.5.7 In addition to the equipment and infrastructure, there would also be landscaping treatments, such as:
1. The establishment of grassland beneath and between the solar panels and around other standoff areas within the Appeal Site;
 2. c3.8km of new hedgerow planting;
 3. Tree planting, including an orchard with c21 no. trees, 2,400m² strip of buffer planting and over c132 no. native hedgerow trees; and
 4. Other elements such as the installation of information boards and picnic areas.
- 1.5.8 Photomontages prepared were included with Pegasus' LVIA, Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment, Pegasus' Appendix 3.1 Heritage Statement (CD 1.33-7) and as part of the Appeal Submission (CD 2.4).
- 1.5.9 The construction phase would take place over approximately six to nine months. The operational lifespan of the proposed development is 40 years.
- 1.5.10 The decommissioning of the Appeal Site and its restoration would be addressed by the imposition of planning conditions. At this stage it is understood that most of the Appeal Site would be restored back to agricultural use, although the substation would be retained as a permanent feature. It is assumed that this would also include security fencing and access track. It is envisaged that the decommissioning of the Solar Farm would take approximately six to nine months, with the restored elements on the site then being permanent.
- 1.5.11 Any new landscape planting would develop over time, with young trees and shrubs

anticipated to grow and mature. The likely heights will vary based on species, ground conditions and planting techniques / establishment success. The additional hedgerow and tree planting is assumed to be permanent.

1.5.12 The height of proposed and existing hedges will be dependent on the management regime and the frequency of cutting. I am aware of the correspondence during the application stage between Pegasus and the local authorities' technical advisors Cornwall Environmental Consultants in March 2023 (CD 7.19 C and Appendix 4), and disagreements about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation, including:

1. Paragraph 2.10 *"The Rebuttal states that the maintenance of the hedges to an 'increased height' was to 'alleviate potential significant visual effects' created by the panels. However this increased height means the existing and proposed hedges would then be un-characteristic of the local landscape character."*
2. Paragraph 2.11 *"The Layout and Landscape Strategy drawing P19-2022_10 shows that all the existing and proposed hedges on the site boundary and within the development are to be 'maintained' at 3m. The site covers 15 fields and measures 2.25km from north to south and 1km at its widest point, which is a significant linear metrage of hedges which would then not reflect the local landscape character."*

1.5.13 During my visits to the Appeal Site in April 2024, I noted that the hedgerows had been maintained at c1.5-2m in height, which provided for long distance views over the expansive and gently undulating vale as well as towards historic landmarks (refer to my context photographs in Appendix 3).

1.6 Potential Sources of Landscape and Visual Effect

1.6.1 The main landscape and visual components of the proposed development include:

1. site preparation of highways access, construction compounds and soil stripping, with associated materials and plant (including stocking and loading areas and vehicle movements);
2. construction of solar farm equipment and infrastructure;
3. operation of solar farm equipment and infrastructure; and

4. landscaping and planting treatments, including management of hedgerow heights and increase in tree cover.
- 1.6.2 These components would result in direct effects upon landscape elements and features within the Appeal Site itself. The above changes would also influence the Appeal Site's appearance, aesthetic and perceptual aspects and therefore may also have potential effects on landscape character and the visual amenity of offsite receptors in the surrounding area.
- 1.6.3 The main indirect effects would be from traffic generated from the development, as this would have a general impact on the scenic quality of local views (and receptors such as local residents, pedestrians, cyclists and other road users). This would be low after the initial construction period, to allow for maintenance visits, as noted above. It is also assumed that there would also be a short-term increase in traffic during decommissioning.
- 1.6.4 Pegasus' LVIA described Potential Effects under paragraph 2.5.2 as *"Examples of potential landscape effects arising from solar PV developments considered within the assessment of effects include:*
1. *Field-scale solar PV developments may be particularly visible in open landscapes or on upper hill slopes;*
 2. *Large grouping of solar panels tends to reflect the sky, this can make them stand out from their landscape context;*
 3. *The perceived industrial character of large-scale solar PV developments could detract from the intrinsically rural character, including landscapes that form a setting to heritage assets;*
 4. *Ancillary buildings and security requirements (such as fencing and/or CCTV) may introduce new and unfamiliar features into the rural landscape;*
 5. *Solar PV developments can change the land use and appearance of a field or fields, affecting land cover patterns;*
 6. *The regular edges of solar PV developments may be conspicuous in more irregular landscapes (particularly where they do not follow contours or where field boundaries are irregular in form);*

7. *The height of racks (up to 3m) means that they may overtop typical hedgerow field boundaries;*
8. *Screen planting around solar PV development, or management changes such as allowing hedges to grow higher, can change the sense of enclosure of a landscape;*
9. *Construction of the solar PV development may result in loss or damage to landscape features such as hedgerow field boundaries; and*
10. *Access tracks may be highly visible, particularly in open or undeveloped landscapes that currently may not contain such infrastructure."*

2 LANDSCAPE-RELATED PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 In this section of my Assessment I have reviewed the landscape-related planning context, including relevant designations, planning policy and evidence base. I have also reviewed the consultation responses as part of the planning application and other relevant appeal decisions.

2.1.2 A full consideration of planning policy and history is included within the evidence of Mr Bond. This section is my review of those aspects relevant to the effects of the proposed development upon landscape character and views.

2.2 Landscape-related Designations

2.2.1 The Appeal Site is not located within, nor is it adjacent to a nationally designated landscape, such as a National Landscape (formerly AONB) or National Park. As such the landscape does not benefit from statutory status.

2.2.2 Muston Meadows is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) for its biological interest as neutral ridge and furrow grassland and is also a National Nature Reserve with public access. The SSSI designation boundary is adjacent to the south-eastern boundary of the Appeal Site. Whilst I am not giving evidence on the effect on ecology, I note that the landscape of the Appeal Site has a connection to Muston Meadows, including via public rights of way.

2.2.3 There are several Listed Buildings within 5km of the Appeal Site, including Belvoir Castle (Grade I), St Marys Church (Grade I) and Church of St John the Baptist (Grade II*) and a Registered Park and Garden at Belvoir Castle (Grade II*). These are considered as designated 'Heritage Assets' under the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Whilst I am not giving evidence on the effect on designated heritage assets, I note that the landscape of the Appeal Site has a connection to these landmarks, which feature in views.

2.2.4 Figure SH-1 presents a screenshot from Multi-Agency Geographic Information (MAGIC) website, with SSSI, Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monument layers, as well as my mark up of the Appeal Site location.

2.2.5 There is a network of rights of way within and around the Appeal site. Footpaths F82 and F90 and byway open to all traffic F85B are within the site.

2.2.6 National Cycle Route 15 extends through the area, with Sustrans describing the following sections as open and signed:

- 2. Bingham to Bottesford *“The section between Bingham to Bottesford is open and runs from the A46 using cycle lanes and shared-use paths through Bingham and along the A52 to Whatton, where it leaves the A52 and runs on lightly trafficked roads through to Bottesford.”*
- 3. Muston to Grantham *“Grantham to Muston is open along the Grantham Canal and is entirely traffic-free.”*

2.3 Relevant Planning Policy

2.3.1 The relevant planning policy context is referenced in the Decision Notice of 11th September 2023.

2.3.2 Paragraph 180 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (CD 4.1) states 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;”*

2.3.3 A definition of ‘Heritage asset’ is also provided within the Glossary of NPPF as *“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”*

2.3.4 The Melton Local Plan 2011-2036 (CD 5.1) was adopted by Full Council on October 10, 2018. Policy SS1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development, states that *“Where there are no policies relevant to the application, or the policies which are most important for determining an application are out of date at the time of making the decision, then the Council will grant permission unless:*

- *i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- *ii) Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the national planning policy framework taken as a whole.”*

2.3.5 Policy EN1 – Landscape, states that *“The character of Melton Borough’s landscape and countryside will be conserved and, where possible, enhanced by:*

- *I. Ensuring new development is sensitive to its landscape setting and that it seeks, where possible, to enhance the distinctive qualities of the landscape character areas (as defined in the Landscape Character Assessment); and*
- *II. Requiring new developments to respect existing landscape character and features. Proposals will be supported where they do not have an unacceptable adverse effect upon important landscape features including:*
 - *1. Distinctive topography;*
 - *2. Important trees, hedges and other vegetation features;*
 - *3. Important ponds, watercourses & other water areas;*
 - *4. Important views, approaches and settings.*
- *In addition, new developments will be supported where they:*
 - *5. Do not have an unacceptable adverse effect upon an area’s sense of place and local distinctiveness; and*
 - *6. Do not have an unacceptable adverse effect upon areas of tranquillity, including those benefiting from dark skies, unless proposals*

can demonstrate how it is intended to contribute towards minimising light pollution.”

2.3.6 Policy D1 – Raising the Standard of Design *“All new developments should be of high quality design. All development proposals will be assessed against all the following criteria:*

- *a) Siting and layout must be sympathetic to the character of the area;”*

2.3.7 Policy EN10 – Energy Generation from Renewable and Low Carbon Sources states that *“Renewable and low carbon energy proposals appropriate for Melton, including biomass power generation, combined heat and power (CHP), hydro, wind, solar and micro generation systems, will be supported and considered in the context of sustainable development and climate change.”* and that *“Proposals for renewable and low carbon energy technology, associated infrastructure and integration of renewable and low carbon technology on existing or proposed structures will be assessed both individually and cumulatively on their merits taking account of the following factors;*

- *1. Siting, so as to gain maximum effect from wind/solar/water sources;*
- *2. The surrounding landscape, townscape and heritage assets;”*

2.3.8 Paragraph 7.20.8 states that *“The Borough Council has prepared evidence on the impact of wind energy on the landscape. The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 indicates the areas which have the most capacity and are the least sensitive for renewable wind energy development.”*

2.3.9 The Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2036 (CD 5.2), Policy 2 states the following:

- *1. The Key Views, (see Maps 9a and 9b) the Areas Of Separation (see Figure 2) and the Significant Green Gaps (see Map 7a, 7b and 7c) contribute to the distinctive landscape character of the Parish. Development proposals should respect these important designations and take account of them in their designs and layouts. Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on the designations will not be supported.*

- *4. As appropriate to the scale, nature and location, development proposals should take account of the cultural sensitivity and historical link and viewpoint between St Mary’s Church from Belvoir Castle. Where it is both necessary and practicable to do*

so, the layout and design of the proposed development should safeguard the existing viewpoint.

- *5. The quality and accessibility of the natural environment in Bottesford Parish is highly valued by local residents. As appropriate to the scale, nature and location development proposals across Bottesford Parish should demonstrate that they are sympathetic to the landscape setting as defined in the Bottesford Parish Design Code 2020 and Table 5.”*

2.3.10 Figure SH-2 shows the views of Borough wide importance across Bottesford Parish from the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2036. The Appeal Site is located to the north of the notable viewpoint at Belvoir Castle , in the land extending towards Bottesford and the Church of St Marys (see my mark up of Appeal Site location).

2.3.11 Paragraph 102 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that *“Belvoir Castle is classed as a primary view and the wide views across the Vale of Belvoir is characterized by a ‘rural patchwork of fields bordered by hedgerows and punctuated by woodlands and historic villages. It is desirable to preserve this expansive and rural patchwork of fields. There are also close historic links between Belvoir Castle and St Marys Church, Bottesford from the 13th C....) and it is desirable to maintain uninterrupted views of the spire of St Mary’s from the castle.’*

2.3.12 Figure SH-3 shows the Key Views from the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2036. As indicated by my mark up, the Appeal Site is located to the west of Key View 6.

2.3.13 Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2036 Policy 9: Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies states that *“4. Development that delivers renewable energy will be supported where it can be demonstrated that it;*

- *a) does not have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenity of residents and visitors (including: noise, vibration, views and vistas, shadow flicker, water pollution, odour, air quality, emissions, sensitivity and character of landscape)”*

2.3.14 The Examiner’s Report into the Bottesford Neighbourhood Development Plan (May 2021) (CD.XX)¹ under paragraph 5.2 stated *inter alia* that *“The neighbourhood area sits in attractive open countryside to the north of Melton Mowbray...The southern part of the parish has a strong functional and visual relationship with the Vale of Belvoir to its*

¹ Core Document reference not available at time of finalising proof

south.”

2.3.15 In commenting on the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, under paragraph 7.32 in the Examiner’s Report it was confirmed that *“It will balance the importance of Bottesford in the local settlement hierarchy on the one hand with its sensitive position in the wider landscape on the other hand.”*

2.4 Reference Documents

2.4.1 I have also referenced the following documents in my research (in chronological order):

1. Natural England – National Character Area Profile (NCA) 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales (CD 8.5). The Appeal Site is located within the southern part of this NCA, close to the boundary with NCA 74 Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds;
2. Melton Borough Council - Landscape and Historic Character Assessment 2006 (CD 8.6). This identifies the Appeal Site as located within the Vale of Belvoir Landscape Character Area (LCA), see my mark up of Figure SH-4;
3. Melton Borough Council - Landscape Character Assessment Update, ADAS, 2011 (CD 8.7); and
4. Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development, LUC, 2014 (CD 8.8). This also identifies the Appeal Site as located within the Vale of Belvoir LCA.

2.4.2 In addition, I have noted that South Kesteven District Council - South Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (2007) (CD 8.10), covers land to the north-east of the Study Area and Rushcliffe Borough Council - Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009) (CD 8.9), covers land to the west of the Study Area. These areas were mapped in Figure 1 in Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment. Newark and Sherwood District – Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character Assessment (CD.XX)² covers land in the north of the Study Area.

2.4.3 The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development, Table 3.4 on page 16, Views of Borough-wide importance, Views from Belvoir Castle, reason for selection and description states *“Belvoir was built to command views of the surrounding countryside (Belvoir means ‘beautiful view’ in French). Today the views*

² Core Document reference not available at time of finalising proof

from publicly accessible areas around the grounds are restricted by mature trees surrounding the castle. However, the main façade of the castle faces north-east and long views are available to the east and northeast from the northeastern terrace. In addition, wide views across the Vale of Belvoir are available from the minor road which passes to the west of the castle, where a car park and main entrance to the castle are located. From here the view over the Vale of Belvoir is characterized by a rural patchwork of fields, bordered by hedgerows and punctuated by woodlands and historic villages. It is desirable to preserve the expansive and rural patchwork character of this view. There are also close historic links between Belvoir Castle and St Mary's Church, Bottesford (from the 13th century the Lords of Belvoir played an important part in the development of St Mary's) and it is desirable to maintain uninterrupted views of the spire of St Mary's from the Castle."

2.5 Consultation on Landscape and Visual Effects

2.5.1 Cornwall Environmental Consultants provided an Independent Landscape Review of the documents submitted as part of the planning application on behalf of Melton Borough Council in December 2022 (CEC Review) (CD 7.19 B). There were several concerns raised in this review including reference *inter alia* to the following:

1. *"The significance of the effect of the Development on landscape character has been downplayed."* (section 3.2); and
2. *"The assessment of significance of visual effects is downplayed"* (section 4.2)

2.5.2 A subsequent review of Pegasus Group's Landscape Rebuttal was provided in March 2023 (CD 7.19 C). Residual concerns included reference *inter alia* to the following:

1. *"Were the overall maximum height of the hedges to not exceed 3m then the hedges would need to be maintained at a much lower level to allow seasonal growth up to the 3m maximum. This would then in turn not reduce the identified Major significant adverse visual effects created by the 103.53 Ha of solar panels."* (Paragraph 3.2)
2. *"It is accepted that some of the PROW in close proximity to the site lie between existing and proposed hedges with up to 12m between these. However if the hedges are allowed to grow on to 3m, then the views of the wider landscape will be lost."* (paragraph 3.3)

3. *“The CEC Review highlighted that the additional Cumulative Assessment had looked at the potential cumulative effects on landscape character by looking at each separate ‘character area’ individually, rather than looking at the local landscape character within the 5km study area as a whole. This was why my email following the telephone discussion explained that it will be for Melton BC to make a judgement as to whether the consented solar farms in conjunction with the Belvior development create a landscape where solar farms become one of the defining characteristics of the Vale landscape, and whether this is acceptable t will be for Melton BC to make a judgement as to whether the consented solar farms in conjunction with the Belvior development create a landscape where solar farms become one of the defining characteristics of the Vale landscape, and whether this is acceptable.”* (paragraph 4.1)

2.6 Cumulative Solar Farm Context

2.6.1 Melton Borough Council Drawing titled “Belvoir Solar Farms”, included as Figure SH-5 in my Appendix 3 shows the location of the Appeal Site (22/00537/FUL, Easthorpe Solar Farm, Muston Lane) in relation to the other permitted and operational solar generation schemes:

1. 20/01182/FUL, 49.9MW Jericho Lane, Barkestone Le Vale a permitted solar farm covering 72.98ha to the west of the Appeal Site (permission expires 40 years from when electrical power is first exported);
2. 13/01609/FUL, 12.4MW Lodge Farm, Longhedge Lane, Orston an operational solar farm covering 25.38ha to the north-west of the Appeal Site (permission expires 35 years after development brought into use);
3. S20/1433, 49.9MW Land South of the A1 Foston Bypass, Foston a permitted solar farm covering 82.98ha to the north-east of the Appeal Site (permission expires 40 years from when electrical power is first exported); and
4. 14/01739/FUL, 10MW Land South of The Railway Line & East of Station Road, Elton an operational solar farm covering 36.01ha to the north-west of the Appeal Site (permission expires 25 years after development brought into use).

2.6.2 These other solar farm projects were initially identified in Melton Borough Council’s EIA

Screening Opinion, May 2021 (CD.XX)³ which referenced potential adverse cumulative impacts resulting from the proposal, due to their position “*within a narrow and linear range of view from Belvoir Castle and Gardens*”.

2.6.3 The total area of the other permitted and operational solar farms is approximately 217ha, based on the Council’s GIS site boundaries. This covers the extent of solar panels and associated equipment and infrastructure at each site, although I note that it excludes the ‘grid yard’ at Jericho Lane which is separate to the main site as depicted by Savills Drawing 20.11_302 “DNO Substation_Site Block Plan_Proposed” (CD.XX)⁴.

2.6.4 The addition of the solar farm at the c100ha Appeal Site would result in a total combined area of approximately 317ha (as above, the extent of solar panels would be lower than this to allow for the associated equipment and infrastructure). This is around 10% of the overall identified Study Area, defined as ‘potential extent of solar farm land’ on the Belvoir Solar Farm Drawing, included as Figure SH-5.

2.7 Reason for Refusal

2.7.1 The scope of this evidence is defined by the second and third Reason for Refusal set out in the Decision Notice of 11th September 2023 which specifically relate to landscape character, views and visual amenity.

2.7.2 The second Reason for Refusal states that:

- *“This proposal when considered cumulatively with other permitted and operational schemes within 30 square kilometres (49.9MW land east of Jericho Covert; 12.4MW Lodge Farm, Longhedge Lane; 49.9MW Land South of the A1 Foston Bypass; 10MW Land South of The Railway Line & East of Station Road, Elton) would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact on the landscape where swathes of panels would be visible within a vista which could not be adequately mitigated. There would be a disproportionate effect of several sites within a small area, with solar panels covering approximately 10% of the identified area. The proposal is therefore considered to have an unacceptable adverse impact on the Vale of Belvoir’s sense of place and local distinctiveness, contrary to policies SS1, EN1 and D1 of the Melton Local Plan, paragraph 174 of the NPPF and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9.”*

³ Core Document reference not available at time of finalising proof

⁴ Core Document reference not available at time of finalising proof

2.7.3 The third Reason for Refusal states that:

- *“In the opinion of the local planning authority, the amenity of the public utilising the many rights of way which run through and adjacent to the site would be harmed by the substantial impact and effect of a large-scale solar installation. The ability of residents and visitors to the area using the footpaths to appreciate and enjoy the landscape character would be diminished and adversely impacted by the proposed development creating corridor effects limiting appreciation of the wider landscape, which also impacts upon key views as defined within the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan. The quality of the natural environment is highly valued by residents and visitors to the area, particularly for the long views and openness. The proposal is therefore contrary to Melton Local Plan Policy EN1, Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2 (parts 1 & 5) and Policy 9 (4.(a)).”*

2.8 Literature Review

2.8.1 I have also carried out a literature review of solar-related landscape studies in other local authorities, and other solar project appeal decisions. I have included references below where relevant to this Appeal, although I appreciate that each project needs to be considered on its individual merits, taking account of local context and other factors.

3 ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 In this section of my Assessment, I consider the potential landscape effects of the proposed development, taking account of cumulative effects with the other permitted and operational solar farm schemes, noted above.

3.2 Landscape Receptors

3.2.1 As described in paragraph 5.34 of GLVIA3, landscape receptors that may be affected by the scheme include the overall character and key characteristics, individual elements or features and specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects.

3.2.2 Pegasus's LVIA within Section 2.3 and 2.4 set out the baseline conditions for the Appeal Site and study area. Whilst the description of existing key features are generally accepted, I have detailed below the aspects that I consider to be of relevance to my assessment.

3.2.3 I note that Pegasus' LVIA did not refer to the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study Wind Energy 2014 or the 'Views of Borough wide Importance' from Belvoir Castle, which is also identified in the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan and I have included below.

3.2.4 Pegasus' LVIA did not refer to the County-level landscape character assessment. I have not included these publications in my assessment.

3.2.5 The following landscape receptors were identified in Pegasus' LVIA (in Appendix 2.2):

1. Topography;
2. Land Use / ground cover;
3. Trees and hedgerows;
4. LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir;
5. LCA 2 Bottesford; and
6. LCA 3 Parkland.

3.2.6 The three LCAs assessed are defined in the Melton Borough Council Landscape

Character Assessment (2006).

3.2.7 The Distinct Characteristics of LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir included in the publication are as follows:

1. *“Expansive vale*
2. *String of nucleated villages*
3. *Strong rectangular field pattern of mixed farming bounded by hedges*
4. *Local stone in houses and churches”*

The ‘Vale’ around Bottesford

3.2.8 The CEC Review raised concerns about the approach in Pegasus’ LVIA and in relation to local landscape character within the 5km Study Area as a whole.

3.2.9 Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment (in their Figure 1) subsequently provided a map of the other solar farm projects overlaid with local landscape character areas from the relevant boroughs and districts.

3.2.10 In addition to the receptors in Pegasus’ LVIA, I have also assessed effects upon the local landscape of the Study Area, which I have called the ‘Vale’ landscape around Bottesford as well as the Appeal Site itself.

3.2.11 The ‘Vale’ landscape around Bottesford covers the northern part of LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir (Melton Borough), the eastern part of Aslockton Village Farmlands and Vale of Belvoir (Rushcliffe Borough), the south-western part of Trent and Belvoir Vales (South Kesteven District) and the southern part of South Nottinghamshire Farmland (Newark and Sherwood District) as depicted in Figure SH-6.

3.2.12 The published key characteristics of the Trent and Belvoir Vales (South Kesteven District) include the following:

1. *“A relatively simple, medium to large-scale, open arable or mixed farming landscape.*
2. *Flat or very gently undulating topography*
3. *Simple regular fields enclosed by hawthorn hedges.*

4. *Relatively few hedgerow trees and virtually no woodland.*

5. *Church towers and spires visible across the landscape.”*

3.2.13 The published characteristic features of Aslockton Farmlands (Rushcliffe Borough) include the following:

1. *“Rural remote and tranquil character comprising arable farmlands and a regular dispersal of small rural settlements*

2. *Land use is mostly arable although pasture is common around village fringes.*

3. *Field boundaries are almost all hedgerows which are of variable condition; they tend to be more intact around pasture fields where left to grow taller whereas in adjacent arable fields are often low and in places quite fragmented*

4. *Expansive long distance views across the landscape to the Belvoir Ridge to the south in Leicestershire”*

3.2.14 The published characteristic features of South Nottinghamshire Farmland (Newark and Sherwood) ‘Village Farmlands’ includes the following:

1. *Gently rolling topography*

2. *Simple pattern of large arable fields*

3. *Neatly trimmed hawthorn hedges*

3.2.15 The published characteristic features of South Nottinghamshire Farmland (Newark and Sherwood) ‘Meadowlands’ includes the following:

1. *“Open, spacious views, sometimes enclosed by rising ground*

2. *Remnant pattern of large hedged fields defined by thorn hedges or ditches*

3. *Absence of farmsteads or other buildings”*

3.2.16 The key characteristics of Vale of Belvoir (Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study) include:

1. *“Predominantly flat low lying landform with very gentle undulations, enclosed by rolling hills such as Belvoir Ridge in Leicestershire to the south;*

2. *A remote rural character across the whole area, with occasional views to scattered villages and individual farms although mostly a remote, tranquil and undeveloped character;*
3. *The majority of land use is arable farmland although closer to the village fringes smaller pasture fields become more apparent, usually used as horse paddocks.*
4. *Field boundaries are predominantly maturing hawthorn hedgerows, up to 1.5m in height, especially around Colston Bassett.*
5. *Extensive views beyond the vale towards the Belvoir Ridgeline in Leicestershire with Belvoir Castle prominent on the wooded ridgeline”*

3.2.17 I have carried out desk and field work and have identified that the defined area of the ‘Vale’ around Bottesford displays the landscape characteristics as those identified in the published studies (such as gently undulating topography, simple pattern of farmland, neatly trimmed hedgerows), whilst also recognising the two operational solar farms to the north-west of Bottesford and the two permitted solar farms which will be added to the south-west and north-east of Bottesford.

3.2.18 It is relatively remote and tranquil, punctuated by villages with fine stone houses and prominent churches⁵. At the centre of the identified area lies the village of Bottesford and Church of St Mary, surrounded by mixed farming, with the railway to the north and the A52 to the south. Other distracting features include line of pylons / overhead powerlines.

3.2.19 The village of Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist is located to the east of the identified area, the village of Elton on the Hill and the Church of St Michael and All Angels is to the west and the village of Redmile and Church of St Peter is to the south.

3.2.20 There are also isolated properties and farmsteads in the area, such as ‘California’ which is located to the west of the Appeal Site on Castle View Road and Muston Gorse Farm to the south of the Appeal Site (south of Grantham Canal).

3.2.21 The Grantham Canal extends through the southern part of the area and further to the south, the land rises to the escarpment and Belvoir Castle, a primary landmark visible

⁵ Melton Borough Council Landscape and Historic Character Assessment 2006, section 4.1

beyond the extents of the area⁶. The Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden includes the Engine Yard (shopping area), Belvoir Animal Farm and Glamping site, on the slopes to the west of the main car park and entrance, whilst the extensive landscape park and various gardens extend to the south of the Castle. There are residential properties along the minor road to the west of the Castle.

3.2.22 Minor roads, lanes and other rights of way lead to and from the villages, provide views over a patchwork of fields, bounded by hedges. Trees within the landscape are often found as occasional isolated individual specimens within hedges, small copses at field junctions, or small woodlands which are contained by field boundaries. Avian Ecology's Phase 1 Habitat Plan (CD 1.33) indicates c28 standalone trees within the Appeal Site.

3.2.23 Overall, the area has a rural and generally undeveloped character⁷. I have identified the following key characteristics for the 'Vale' landscape around Bottesford, which also apply to the Appeal Site:

1. Gently undulating topography;
2. Predominately mixed farming landcover;
3. Tight clipped hedgerows;
4. Open and expansive rural character; and
5. Views of historic landmarks (Belvoir Castle and Church of St Marys).

National Character Area 48

3.2.24 Pegasus' LVIA stated in paragraph 2.4.4 that "*Due to the scale of the NCA and generality of the descriptions, the NCA are not included within the assessment of landscape character.*"

3.2.25 Due to proportionality, I have also not assessed the effects of the proposals upon NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales. However, I have noted the unique position of the area around the Appeal Site which features in two of the 'character views' included in the publication, as follows:

⁶ Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study Wind Energy 2014, Table 3.4 and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan, Map 8

⁷ Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study Wind Energy 2014, section 7.3 and Table 7.1

6. Figure SH-7 is a Character View which is included on page 12 of NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales (at Longore Bridge); and
7. Figure SH-8 is a Character View which is included on page 15 NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales (looking towards Belvoir Castle from the north).

3.2.26 Under the key characteristics, the third bullet point confirms that *“Agriculture is the dominant land use, with most farmland being used for growing cereals, oilseeds and other arable crops. While much pasture has been converted to arable use over the years, grazing is still significant in places, such as along the Trent and around settlements.”*

3.3 Landscape Effects

Landscape Sensitivity

- 3.3.1 My assessment of landscape value is set out in Table SH-2, using the factors set out in the Landscape Institute’s Technical Guidance Note 02/21– “Assessing Landscape Value outside National Designations”.
- 3.3.2 My assessment of landscape sensitivity is set out in Table SH-3 below, where I take account of the susceptibility of each landscape receptor to the types of changes proposed (i.e. the introduction of a large-scale solar farm) and landscape value.
- 3.3.3 The Appeal Site and its local landscape context has several factors which elevate its landscape value, including offering a sense of time depth (views of heritage assets), good physical condition (intact historic field patterns), distinctiveness (strong sense of identity as part of the Vale of Belvoir), recreational opportunities (good accessibility and forms part of an important view) and scenic qualities (contributes to the appreciation of distinctive views and landmarks).
- 3.3.4 In particular, the role of the Appeal Site in the wider landscape is recognised in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development prepared by LUC, 2014 and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan, due to its position between a notable viewpoint of Borough-wide importance at Belvoir Castle and St Marys Church, Bottesford, where it is desirable to preserve the expansive and rural patchwork of fields.
- 3.3.5 The topography, trees and hedgerows within the Appeal Site are of medium sensitivity to the proposals, whilst the land use / ground cover is medium to high sensitivity.

- 3.3.6 The overall landscape character of the Appeal Site has a high sensitivity to the introduction of a large-scale solar farm and/or additional urbanising features. This takes account of the existing electricity pylons and potential for visual clutter, the more elevated areas (such as footpath F82 west of Muston) and more visible areas (such as the northern field along A52, eastern field adjacent to Muston Meadows or southern field adjacent to Grantham Canal). The Appeal Site is also situated within the angle of view from a notable viewpoint⁸.
- 3.3.7 The Appeal Site is overlooked from higher ground at Belvoir Castle RPG, with Viewpoint 9 at c1.6km from the edge of the Appeal Site and at Beacon Hill, with Viewpoint 15 at c1.5km from edge of Appeal Site, increasing the geographical extent of where people may perceive the changes to character.
- 3.3.8 The Appeal Site is gently undulating (rather than flat), is not well screened by hedgerows and is crossed by c3km of public rights of way and as such makes it a less than ideal site for a solar farm.
- 3.3.9 Melton Borough's LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir and LCA 2 Bottesford are of medium sensitivity, whilst LCA 3 Parkland is of high sensitivity.
- 3.3.10 The local LCA - the 'Vale' around Bottesford has a high sensitivity to the introduction of further large-scale solar farms and/or additional urbanising features, especially in the segment of land to the south-east of Bottesford, which extends to Belvoir Castle and is situated within the angle of view from a notable viewpoint. This takes account of the two operational solar farms to the north-west of Bottesford and the two permitted solar farms which will be added to the south-west and north-east of Bottesford (along with associated grid yard west of Castle View Road) which increase susceptibility.

Magnitude of Landscape Change

- 3.3.11 My assessment of the magnitude of landscape change is set out in the Table SH-4 below, where I have taken account of size or scale of change, geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration for each receptor.
- 3.3.12 I have included the construction phase and decommissioning in my assessment, as per the approach within Pegasus' LVIA. I have split the 40 year operational phases into

⁸ Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study Wind Energy 2014, Fig 5.1 and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan, Map 8

Years 1 to 14 and Years 15 to 40, although this overall duration is effectively permanent in landscape terms (see GLVIA3⁹ and Milton Road Appeal Decision¹⁰). I have also assessed the effects after decommissioning, at restoration.

3.3.13 As described in paragraph 5.56 of GLVIA3, at opposite ends of the spectrum, the following may apply to landscape effects:

- 1. major loss or irreversible negative effects, over an extensive area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that are key to the character of nationally valued landscapes are likely to be of the greatest significance;*
- 2. reversible negative effects of short duration, over a restricted area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key characteristics of the character of landscapes of community value are likely to be of the least significance and may, depending on the circumstances, be judged as not significant.*

3.3.14 The magnitude of landscape change in relation to the LCAs are based on the cumulative effects of the addition of the Appeal Site, with the other operational solar farms and permitted solar farms. I have summarised operational stage changes below.

3.3.15 In summary, there would be a high magnitude of change upon land use / ground cover within the Appeal Site, as well as its overall landscape character. There would be a high cumulative magnitude of change upon the local LCA of the 'Vale' around Bottesford. This is due to the following:

1. the introduction of panels and other infrastructure, including transformers, inverters and fencing at the Appeal Site, would introduce a fundamental change to additional areas of agricultural land¹¹;
2. additional swathes of panels would be visible within vistas from rights of way, lanes and roads, and people's experience of aesthetic and perceptual aspects

⁹ GLVIA3, para 5.51 "*..long term ten to twenty-five years..*", para 5.52 "*reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of the particular effect being reversed in, for example, a generation*"

¹⁰ Appeal Decision Milton Road, para 27 "*...the Secretary of State agrees that little weight should be afforded to the potential reversibility of the proposal in landscape or visual terms.*" (CD 6.27)

¹¹ Appeal Decision Milton Road, para 13 "*the introduction of panels and other infrastructure, including transformers, inverters and fencing, will inevitably introduce a fundamental change to agricultural land. Considering the scale of this proposal, there would also, inevitably, be a degree of change to the landscape and to peoples' experience of the area.*"

of the rural area would be diminished and not adequately mitigated;

3. additional parts of the area would be punctuated by solar farms, forming a circular pattern around Bottesford and this would detract from the existing landmarks of church spires and Belvoir Castle; and
4. the project duration of 40 years would effectively be permanent in landscape terms. The other permitted solar farms are also 40 years in duration, whilst the planning permission for the operational Lodge Farm project expires after 35 years and the Land south of the railway line and East of Station Road is for 25 years.

3.3.16 There are two electricity pylons within the Appeal site and the addition of the proposed development would cumulatively increase the developed character and introduce visual clutter to the area. In addition, a grid yard for the permitted solar farm at Jericho Lane will be constructed to the west of Castle View Road (c200m away from the Appeal Site), adjacent to the existing electricity pylon, which would be replaced by two new pylons to facilitate the loop in loop out connection, along with security fencing around the point of connection compound, customer compound and step up transformer¹².

3.3.17 The addition of c4.4km of stone access tracks in conjunction with 9.7km of perimeter fencing would erode and detract from the field pattern within the Appeal Site.

3.3.18 The nature of the effect for these receptors would be adverse as the addition of the large-scale energy generation facility and enclosing screening treatments, would erode the defined landscape character of the expansive gentle vale and obscure historic landmarks. There would be a noticeable loss of the rural patchwork of fields perceptible from the views of Borough-wide importance associated with Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church, Bottesford. The Appeal Site would be seen in conjunction with other operational and permitted solar farms around Bottesford, including Lodge Farm.

3.3.19 Of the c3.8km of new hedgerow planting, c300m is infilling gaps of existing hedgerows and c600m are reinstating field boundaries, whilst a further c1.2km are new boundaries cutting across the field pattern and c1.7km are creating enclosing 'Green Lanes' along otherwise open sections of public rights of way.

¹² Savills Drawing 20.11_302 "DNO Substation_Site Block Plan_Proposed"

- 3.3.20 All external boundary hedges and all hedges within the site would be maintained at a minimum of 3m. Considering seasonal growth, this would mean that hedges would exceed 3m in height between rotational cuts. This would be contrary to the baseline landscape character where hedges across the Vale of Belvoir are maintained to c1.5-2m by tractor mounted flail and would result in an adverse effects upon aesthetic and perceptual aspects.
- 3.3.21 The tree planting of c132 native hedgerow trees would more than quadruple the current tree cover of c28 stand alone trees on the Appeal Site, leading to an increase in enclosure and obscuring of historic landmarks, as they mature.
- 3.3.22 The proposed conversion of arable land on the Appeal Site to grasslands (i.e. beneath and between the solar panels, or around the standoffs) in the context of the existing character of mixed farming in the Vale, would be neutral in nature.
- 3.3.23 Whilst the mitigation proposals may reduce potentially adverse effects from views of parts of the solar energy facility, it would in turn cause adverse effects through changes to landscape character.
- 3.3.24 The cumulative magnitude of change for the wider local authority character areas of LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir and LCA 2 Bottesford would be medium during construction and operations, with negligible and neutral changes for LCA 3 Parkland. The changes to trees and hedgerows would be medium and topography would be low to negligible.

Summary of Landscape Effects

- 3.3.25 My assessment of the overall landscape effects is set out in the Table SH-5 below, where I have combined my judgements of sensitivity with magnitude of change, for each receptor. I have summarised operational stage effects below.
- 3.3.26 There would be major and adverse effects upon the land use / ground cover within the Appeal Site, as well as its overall landscape character. The changes to trees and hedgerows would be moderate, with a resulting change to the open character and obscuring of views of the 'expansive vale' and landmarks, such as church spires and Belvoir Castle. Changes to topography would be minor during construction and then negligible once operational.
- 3.3.27 There would be major and adverse cumulative effects for the local LCA of the 'Vale' around Bottesford, which I consider to be significant. This is in part due to the size and

scale of the large 100ha project. The combined area of solar farms in the 'Vale' landscape around Bottesford of around 10% would be disproportionate¹³.

3.3.28 With reference to GLVIA3, the proposed development would 'tip the balance' through its additional effects. GLVIA3, paragraph 7.28 states that *"The most significant cumulative landscape effects are likely to be those that would give rise to changes in the landscape character of the study area of such as extent as to have major effects on its key characteristics and even in some case, to transform it into a different landscape type. This may be the case where the project being considered itself tips the balance through its additional effects"*.

3.3.29 Solar farms would now be a key characteristic of this landscape, and this landscape could be described as a landscape with solar farms¹⁴ where:

1. solar farms now influence the character of the local landscape. These additional changes would be of such an extent that solar farms would become a key characteristic of the 'Vale' landscape around Bottesford; and
2. the combination of the 5 separate developments would result in a higher density cluster of solar farms, which would be different to the wider Vale of Belvoir landscape and would therefore transform it to a different landscape sub-type, the 'Vale' landscape around Bottesford.

3.3.30 The cumulative magnitude of change for the wider local authority character areas of LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir and LCA 2 Bottesford would be moderate and adverse, with negligible and neutral effects for LCA 3 Parkland.

Post Decommissioning / Restoration

3.3.31 There would also be residual adverse landscape effects after decommissioning and restoration although they would be minor or lower (and therefore not significant). This is due to the additional hedgerow and tree planting (intended to screen the solar panels) which would reduce how people perceive the expansive vale, increase the

¹³ Solar Energy UK (the Solar Trade Association), in their publication Everything Under the Sun: The Facts About Solar Energy, March 2022 *"To meet the government's net zero target, the Climate Change Committee estimates that we will need between 75-90GW of solar by 2050. Our analysis indicates this would mean solar farms would at most account for approximately 0.4-0.6% of UK land – less than the amount currently used for golf courses."* (CD.XX)

¹⁴ (CEC) Belvoir Solar Farm Independent Landscape Review On behalf of Melton Borough Council 2022 para 5.2.6

sense of enclosure and obscure historic landmark features of Belvoir Castle and church spires (e.g see Pegasus' Heritage Viewpoint 10 at Year 5). There would also be additional visual clutter from the permanent substation and associated fencing and access track, in conjunction with the existing electricity pylons on the Appeal Site, resulting in erosion of the rural undeveloped character.

4 ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 In this section of my Assessment, I consider the potential visual effects of the proposed development, taking account of cumulative effects with the other permitted and operational solar farm schemes, noted above.

4.2 General Extent of Visibility

4.2.1 Pegasus's LVIA included a screened zone of theoretical visibility (in Figure 2.1) for the proposals. This identified visibility extending northwards for 1-2km over parts of A52, edge of Bottesford and Beacon Hill, eastwards for 1-2km over parts of Easthorpe Lane, Woolsthorpe Lane and edge of Muston and with a more distant area at the edge of Barrowby. The zone of theoretical visibility also identified visibility extending southwards for c5km over parts of the Grantham Canal, Belvoir Road and Wood Lane (and around Belvoir Castle) and westwards for c5km over Castle View Road, Belvoir Road and the edge of Sutton and Granby.

4.2.2 Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment included cumulative zone of theoretical visibility mapping (CZTV) of the proposals with the other permitted and operational solar farm schemes (in Figures 2 – 7). This identified visibility of the proposals combined with 4 cumulative solar sites over part of Beacon Hill to the north and the edge of Barrowby to the east. Other parts of the Study Area, such as sections of A52 and Belvoir Road, had 1 cumulative solar site and the proposed development theoretically visible.

4.2.3 Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment confirmed that cumulative visual effects concern the following effects on views and visual amenity enjoyed by people:

- 1. Combined - where two or more cumulative developments are seen together at the same time from the same viewpoint, and in the same field of view. The effects of an extension of an existing development or the positioning of a new development such that it would be seen as extending the presence of built infrastructure.*
- 2. Successive - where two or more developments are present in views from the same location but cannot be seen in the same field of view and the observer must turn to see them.*

3. *Sequential - where two or more cumulative developments are not seen from the same viewpoint, even if the observer turns around to extend his/her perception of the surrounding landscape. The receptor has to move to another location to see cumulative developments. The frequency of occurrence greatly depends on factors such as: distance to developments, distance to another viewpoint and speed of travel.*

4.3 Visual Receptors

- 4.3.1 Paragraph 6.13 of GLVIA3 defines visual receptors as people living in the area; people who work there; people passing through on road, rail or other forms of transport; people visiting promoted landscapes or attractions; and people engaged in recreation of different types.
- 4.3.2 There is over 1.5km of public footpath (F82 and F90) and 1.4km of a byway open to all traffic (F85B) which extend through the Appeal Site and connect to other PRoWs to the west and south-east. These routes, in conjunction with winding rural lanes and Long-Distance Paths, such as Jubilee Way and Viking Way connect to the historic villages of Muston, Bottesford, Redmile, Belvoir and Woolsthorpe-by-Belvoir and offer recreational opportunities where experience of the rural landscape is important.
- 4.3.3 The PRoW which extend from the settlements are well used for recreation by the local residents, as well as forming part of the wider rural rights of way network.
- 4.3.4 The Grantham Canal (off-road cycling route), National Cycling Route 15, Muston Meadows National Nature Reserve and Beacon Hill are also popular destinations to the south and east of the Appeal Site, respectively and will be used by residents and visitors to the area (Beacon Hill also includes a Natural Burial Mound). Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden is a popular visitor attraction with car parking and café facilities, as well as shopping at the Engine Yard and Glamping by the Belvoir Farm Park.
- 4.3.5 The Study Area includes the following visual receptors:
 1. Users of public rights of way (PRoW) within and around the site, including users of the Jubilee Way and Viking Way;
 2. recreational visitors to Muston Meadows Nature Reserve, Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden (including Engine Yard, Park Farm and Glamping) and Beacon Hill;

3. Users of Grantham Canal – off road cycle route and National Cycle Route 15;
 4. Local residents at properties within Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston, as well as at California, off Castle View Road to the west of the Appeal Site; and
 5. Road users travelling along local road network, such as A52, Easthorpe Road, Woolsthorpe Road and Castle View Road and other routes within Study Area.
- 4.3.6 15 Viewpoints were used within Pegasus’ LVIA (in Figure 2.4); however these were located either on the edge of, or outside of the site boundary and did not include any viewpoints within the site. Paragraph 2.4.27 explained this viewpoint selection as follows:
- *“Viewpoints from PRowS within the Proposed Development layout boundary have not been included within the selection of views as it is assumed that there would be a major effect on this high sensitivity group of receptors with such a direct view. Despite any mitigation measures there would still be a high to medium magnitude of change at all stages which would result in major effects.”*
- 4.3.7 16 Viewpoints were included in Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment (in Figure 2.7), some viewpoints are the same as the Pegasus’ LVIA viewpoints, with additional locations on the edge of Barrowby, part of the Viking Way and along several footpaths.
- 4.3.8 A further set of viewpoints and photomontages were presented as part of the Heritage Statement in Appendix 3.1, sheets 2 to 15, which illustrate the effects on character, views and visual amenity for people at each location.
- 4.3.9 The edge of Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden on the Jubilee Way, has wide views across the Vale of Belvoir towards St Mary’s Church which are part of the ‘views of Borough wide importance’ in the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan and the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study. This location is identified as viewpoint 9 in Pegasus’ LVIA and viewpoint 7 in Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment.
- 4.3.10 Key View 6 in the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan, located on National Cycle Route 15 and Easthorpe Lane has views of the Appeal Site, although this was not included as a viewpoint in Pegasus’ LVIA.
- 4.3.11 I have included in Appendix 3, Figure SH-9 which is a location plan to show my mark up of context photographs at 13 viewpoints. This includes from Longore Bridge which is

the Character View included on page 12 of the NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales (refer to Figure SH-7).

4.3.12 I have also reviewed the above viewpoints and the experience of the visual receptors more generally, for example sequential views along sections of footpath or road.

4.4 Visual Effects

4.4.1 I have used the visualisations provided in Pegasus' LVIA, Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment and Pegasus' Heritage Statement as part of my review of visual effects. The quality of the visualisations and their interpretation varies with the following examples:

1. Pegasus' Heritage Viewpoint 10 – incomplete photomontage rendering of solar panels – see Figure SH-10;
2. Pegasus's Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 8D (Beacon Hill) - Incorrect labelling of solar farm projects at Lodge Farm and Land south of Railway Line– see Figure SH-11 and incorrect interpretation in Cumulative Assessment see Section 3, Table (page 17 of the Supplementary Environmental Information November 22) *“The four cumulative sites are/would not be visible therefore there would be no cumulative visual effects with the Proposed Development.”*; and
3. Pegasus's Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 7 (Jubilee Way / Belvoir Castle RPG) - Lodge Farm solar farm project labelled – see Figure SH-12, but incorrect interpretation in Cumulative Assessment - see Section 3, Table (page 17 of the Supplementary Environmental Information November 22) *“The four cumulative sites are/would not be visible therefore there would be no cumulative visual effects with the Proposed Development.”*

4.4.2 My assessment of the visual sensitivity for each receptor category is set out in the Table SH-6 below, where I take account of the susceptibility of each visual receptor to the types of changes proposed (i.e. the introduction of a large-scale solar farm) and value of the views.

4.4.3 In summary, the visual receptors which have a high sensitivity to the proposed changes include users of public rights of way (PRoW) within and around the site, users of the Jubilee Way and Viking Way, and recreational visitors to Muston Meadows Nature Reserve, Grantham Canal, National Cycle Route 15, Beacon Hill and Belvoir Castle

Registered Park and Garden. Local residents and users of the local road network are identified as medium sensitivity.

Magnitude of Visual Effects

- 4.4.4 My assessment of the magnitude of visual change for each viewpoint is set out in the Table SH-7 below, where I have taken account of size or scale of change, geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration.
- 4.4.5 I have included a construction phase and decommissioning in my assessment, as per the approach within Pegasus' LVIA. I have split the 40 year operational into Years 1 to 14 and Years 15 to 40 phase, although this overall duration is effectively permanent in visual terms (see GLVIA3 and Milton Road Appeal Decision, referenced in relation to landscape effects above). I have also assessed the effects after decommissioning, at restoration.
- 4.4.6 The magnitude of visual change also incorporates the cumulative effects of the addition of the Appeal Site, with the other operational and permitted solar farms, where relevant.
- 4.4.7 My summary assessment of the magnitude of visual change for the key visual receptors is then set out in Table SH-6. I have summarised operational stage changes below.
- 4.4.8 The ability of the public to appreciate and enjoy the landscape character of the 'Vale' from many of these PROWs and recreational routes would be diminished and adversely impacted by the proposed development, due to the following:
1. The perceived naturalness and rurality, particularly in relation to the mixed farmland and traditional villages¹⁵, would be reduced by the introduction of panels; and other infrastructure, including transformers, inverters and fencing at the Appeal Site;
 2. Open and expansive views of the wider rural vale and wooded escarpment would be obstructed/ foreshortened either by solar panels and fencing or by higher hedges or belts of tree planting designed for screening. This would create corridor effects or passageways, altering the recreational experience;
 3. Deciduous vegetation generally have reduced or no foliage for 4-6 months of

¹⁵ Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study Wind Energy 2014, Table 7.1

the year and therefore limited screening qualities. There is also a delay from planting to establishment and sufficient growth necessary to provide effective screening;

4. The addition of solar panels and fencing or higher hedges or belts of tree planting designed for screening would either obstruct or detract from the existing landmarks of church spires (such as Church of St Mary, Bottesford) and Belvoir Castle from recreational routes and viewpoints with and around the Appeal Site;
5. The proposed development would be clearly visible from views around Belvoir Castle and interrupt the expansive and rural patchwork character of the view towards the spire of Church of St Mary, Bottesford; and
6. the project duration of 40 years would effectively be permanent in visual terms. There would be an overlap with the durations of the other cumulative solar farm projects, as noted under landscape effects above.

4.4.9 A high degree of change is identified for users of PRow that pass through the site (Footpath F82 and F90 and byway open to all traffic F85B) and around the site (Footpath F74 to the west and F89 to the east), as well as recreational visitors to the western part of Muston Meadows Nature Reserve, during operational phases. Also refer to Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoints 2, 4, 5 and 12 and Cumulative Viewpoint 13 and Heritage Viewpoint 6 and 7, as well as my context photographs 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9.

4.4.10 The introduction of panels and other infrastructure, including transformers, inverters and fencing would reduce the perceived naturalness and rurality of the mixed farmland, with the landscape treatments resulting in the obstruction or foreshortening of open and expansive views, with corridor effects, altering the recreational experience.

4.4.11 Deciduous vegetation generally has reduced or no foliage for 4-6 months of the year and therefore limit screening qualities and there is also a delay from planting to establishment and sufficient growth necessary to provide effective screening.

4.4.12 The magnitude of change for recreational visitors to the western part of Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden, along the Jubilee Way, would be medium. There would be combined visibility of the proposed development with the operational solar project at Lodge Farm. The proposals would not preserve the expansive and rural patchwork of fields extending towards the spire of Church of St Marys, Bottesford. Also refer to

Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 9 and Pegasus' Cumulative Viewpoint 7 and Heritage Viewpoints 8, 9 and 13 and my context photographs 11 and 12.

4.4.13 A medium magnitude of change is identified for recreational visitors to Beacon Hill. There would be successive visibility of the proposed development with the other operational solar farm projects to the west. Intervening vegetation is likely to limit views of the permitted solar farm projects to varying degrees. Also refer to Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 15 and Pegasus' Cumulative Viewpoint 8 and my context photograph 13.

4.4.14 A low overall degree of change is identified for recreational visitors to the Grantham Canal which passes by the southern boundary of the Appeal Site and the permitted solar farm project at Jericho Lane, with cumulative / sequential views. Also refer to Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6 and Pegasus' Cumulative Viewpoint 14 and my context photographs 5, 6 and 7.

4.4.15 The magnitude of change for users of the local road network would be low, including the A52, which passes by the northern part of the site (with clear views of Belvoir Castle) and Castle View Road which passes by the site entrance (see Heritage Viewpoint 10). A low degree of change is identified at Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View 6 from National Cycle Route 15 / Easthorpe Lane (see Heritage Viewpoint 5 and 12 and my context photograph 10).

4.4.16 There would be sequential views of the proposed development with other solar farm project for users of the local road and rights of way network in the Study Area more generally, for example:

1. travellers heading in a north-westerly direction from Bottesford to Alveston, (via Orston Lane and Spa Lane) would pass by the operational solar project at Lodge Farm;
2. travellers heading in a westerly from Bottesford to Elton-on-the-Hill (via Orston Lane and Station Road) would pass by the operational solar project at Land South of The Railway Line & East of Station Road;
3. travellers heading in a south-western direction from Bottesford to Granby (via Barklestone Road and Sutton Lane) would pass by the permitted solar project Jericho Lane;

4. travellers heading along Castle View Road would pass by the grid yard for Jericho Lane; and
5. travellers heading in north-eastern direction from Bottesford to Foston (via A52 and Allington Road) would pass by the permitted solar project at Land south of the A1 Foston By-Pass.

4.4.17 There would be a low degree of visual change for local residents at properties within Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston, as well as at California, off Castle View Road to the west of the Appeal Site and Muston Grange Farm to the south (see Heritage Viewpoint 5).

4.4.18 Changes for visitors to the Viking Way would be negligible, due to the generally limited visibility of the proposals from these locations and the influence of intervening vegetation (or other elements).

Summary of Visual Effects

4.4.19 My assessment of the overall visual effects is set out in the Table SH-8 below, where I have combined my judgements of sensitivity with magnitude of change, for each receptor. I have summarised operational stage effects below.

4.4.20 As described in paragraph 6.44 of GLVIA3, *“There are no hard and fast rules about what makes a significant effect, and there cannot be a standard approach since circumstances vary with the location and context and with the type of proposal. In making a judgement about the significance of visual effects the following points should be noted:*

1. *Effects on people who are particularly sensitive to changes in views and visual amenity are more likely to be significant;*
2. *Effects on people at recognised and important viewpoints or from recognised scenic routes are more likely to be significant; and*
3. *Large-scale changes which introduce new, non-characteristic or discordant or intrusive elements into the view are more likely to be significant than small changes or changes involving features already present in the view.”*

4.4.21 I have identified major and adverse visual effects for users of PRow that pass through the Appeal Site (Footpath F82 and F90 and byway open to all traffic F85B) and around

the Appeal Site (Footpath F74 to the west and F89 to the east), as well as recreational visitors to the western part of Muston Meadows Nature Reserve. These would be significant.

- 4.4.22 Pegasus' LVIA concluded that despite mitigation measures there would be a major effect on viewpoints from public rights of way within the Appeal Site (paragraph 2.8.16) and that the character of these views would be changed from open views to more contained (paragraph 2.8.14).
- 4.4.23 I have also identified that there would also be moderate/major adverse effects for recreational visitors to the north-western part of Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden, along part of the Jubilee Way. There would be combined visibility of the proposed development with the operational solar project at Lodge Farm and these effects would also be significant.
- 4.4.24 A moderate/major adverse effect is also identified for recreational visitors to Beacon Hill, which has elevated views of the proposals in the direction of Belvoir Castle, as well as successive views with the operational solar projects at Lodge Farm and Elton to the west.
- 4.4.25 There would be moderate and adverse effects for recreational visitors to Grantham Canal and National Cycle Route 15, including at the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View 6 (along Easthorpe Lane), which pass by the Appeal Site boundaries.
- 4.4.26 There would be minor and adverse effects for users of the local road network. Although the short section of A52 which passes alongside the northern boundary of the Appeal Site currently has clear views of Belvoir Castle.
- 4.4.27 There would be minor and adverse effects for local residents at properties within Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston as well as at California, off Castle View Road to the west of the Appeal Site and Muston Grange Farm to the south. Although the local residents will move from these properties along the road network and recreational routes and attractions.
- 4.4.28 There would be negligible and neutral effects for recreational visitors to Viking Way.
- 4.4.29 The ability of the public to appreciate and enjoy the landscape character of the 'Vale' from many of the PRoWs and recreational routes and attractions within and around the Appeal Site would be diminished and adversely impacted by the proposed development

and operation of a solar facility.

Post Decommissioning / Restoration

4.4.30 There would also be residual adverse visual effects after decommissioning and restoration, although they would be moderate or lower (and therefore not significant). These effects are due to the additional hedgerow and tree planting (intended to screen the solar panels) which would reduce how people perceive the expansive vale and increase the sense of enclosure along F82, F90 and along F85B. This would also obscure historic landmark features of Belvoir Castle and church spires (e.g see Pegasus' Heritage Viewpoint 7 at Year 15). There would also be the creation of additional visual clutter from the permanent substation and associated fencing and access track, in conjunction with the existing electricity pylons on the Appeal Site.

5 MATTERS IN DISPUTE

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 In this section of my Assessment, I consider the differences with Pegasus' LVIA (Section 2.8 Summary), as these relate to the matters in dispute.

5.2 Landscape Character

5.2.1 Pegasus' LVIA under para 2.8.6 states that *"The effect of the proposed development on the 'Vale of Belvoir' character area would be moderate adverse at year 1 due the intrusion of the proposed development into the 'gentle vale' landscape, disruption to arable field pattern, and loss of small sections of hedgerow, reducing to low at year 15 with the benefit of landscape proposals."*

5.2.2 I agree that the effects of the proposed development on the 'Vale of Belvoir' character area would be moderate adverse at year 1, however I consider that they will remain at moderate and adverse from year 15 onwards, as the intrusion of the proposed development into the 'gentle vale' landscape and disruption to arable field pattern would not be reduced by the proposed mitigation.

5.2.3 I have also identified Major adverse effects upon the character of the 'Vale' around Bottesford and the Appeal Site itself throughout the operational phases.

5.3 Landscape Elements and Features

5.3.1 Pegasus' LVIA under para 2.8.8 states that *"The overall effect of the proposed development on vegetation, land use and topography would range from moderate to minor adverse during construction and at year 1, reducing over time to minor with the implemented landscape strategy."*

5.3.2 I agree that the effect on topography would be minor adverse during construction, reducing to negligible during operations.

5.3.3 However, I have identified major adverse effects upon the land use / ground cover within the Appeal site throughout the operational phases due to the fundamental change from an existing arable land use and field pattern to an energy generation facility.

5.3.4 I have also identified moderate adverse effects upon trees and hedgerows within the

Appeal site throughout the operational phases due to the modification of their neat and well management condition to forming taller belts of vegetation, which alters the existing field pattern / creating new patterns and corridors and is intended to screen the solar farm. As a result, I consider that this would alter the defined characteristics of the area and be adverse in nature.

5.4 Following Decommissioning

5.4.1 Pegasus' LVIA under para 2.8.9 states that *"Following decommissioning at the end of the operational life of the panels, the Application Site can be returned to its current condition. There would be minor long-term benefits to the local landscape character arising from the mitigation measures and the enhancements to landscape features within the Application Site."*

5.4.2 Whilst I agree that parts of the Appeal Site can be returned to its current agricultural use, as noted above, the additional hedgerow and tree planting would reduce how people perceive the expansive vale, increase the sense of enclosure and obscure historic landmark features of Belvoir Castle and church spires. There would also be additional visual clutter from the permanent substation and associated fencing and access track, in conjunction with the existing electricity pylons on the Appeal Site, resulting in erosion of the rural undeveloped character. I consider this to be a moderate and adverse effect upon the Appeal Site.

5.5 Visual Amenity

5.5.1 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.12 states that *"Views of construction works, and the Proposed Development (at year 1) experienced from PRow footpath F80/3 (Viewpoint 1), footpath F82/3 (Viewpoint 2), byway F85b/4 (Viewpoint 3), byway F85b/2 (Viewpoint 4), byway F85b/1 (Viewpoint 5) and footpath F74/1 (Viewpoint 12) would cause adverse effects on these high sensitivity receptors. This is due to the extent of the Proposed Development visible and proximity to the Proposed Development particularly in the case of the PRow which pass through or along the edges of the Site."*

5.5.2 I agree that there would be adverse effects on the users of the PRow which pass through or along the edges of the Appeal Site which are high sensitivity receptors.

5.5.3 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.13 states that *"The landscape measures incorporated into the layout would at Year 15 improve potential effects on views. Proposed hedgerow enhancement and management would reduce the effect on views experienced by these*

footpath users; however, the character of these views would be changed from open views to more contained."

- 5.5.4 I don't agree that the landscape measures would improve potential effects on views at Year 15. I do agree that the character of these views would be changed from open views to more contained. I consider this to be a negative aspect of the proposals and have identified continuing adverse effects throughout the operational phases, beyond year 15.
- 5.5.5 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.14 states that "*Whilst the site is not within a designated landscape, there are views from elevated areas to the south around Belvoir Castle registered park and gardens. The Castle itself is surrounded by substantial mature vegetation limiting views out. There are several footpaths and bridleway routes including the Jubilee Way.*"
- 5.5.6 I agree that the site is not designated landscape, however the elevated viewpoint at Belvoir Castle is identified as 'views of Borough wide importance' and the Appeal Site is located within the view cone in the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study and the Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan. There is some deciduous vegetation around the castle which limits views when in leaf.
- 5.5.7 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.15 states that "*Given the high sensitivity of PRow and Jubilee Way users and receptors close to the Castle and across the elevated ridge, the extent of the long-distance view and the complex landscape character, solar panels within the site have the potential to appear as a noticeable feature. Potential mitigation of views from elevated areas north of this may be less effective during winter months when vegetation is out of leaf increasing visibility due to the topography of the site and elevation of views resulting in a moderate effect on high sensitivity receptors, however over time with maturing intervening vegetation this effect may be reduced further. Photomontage Viewpoint 9 illustrates that on balance the site would represent only a small part of the wider view from this distance.*"
- 5.5.8 I agree that the solar panels within the site will appear as a noticeable feature from the elevated position at Viewpoint 9 and that potential mitigation of views from elevated areas around the Castle will be less effective during winter months when vegetation is out of leaf. I have identified moderate/major and adverse effects on these high sensitivity receptors. However, I don't agree that over time maturing intervening vegetation may reduce this effect. Whilst the Appeal Site would represent only a small

part of the wider view from this location, it is positioned within the specific view cone towards St Mary's Church at Bottesford, where the Neighbourhood Plan states that it is desirable to preserve the rural patchwork of fields.

5.5.9 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.16 states that *"Viewpoints from PRowWs within the Proposed Development layout boundary have not been included within the selection of views as it is assumed that there would be a major effect on this high sensitivity group of receptors with such a direct view. Despite any mitigation measures there would still be a high to medium magnitude of change at all stages which would result in major effects."*

5.5.10 I agree that there would be major effects for users from PRowWs within the Appeal Site throughout operational phases and this is despite the mitigation proposed. This relates to over 1.5km of public footpath (F82 and F90) and 1.4km of byway open to all traffic (F85B).

5.6 Mitigation

5.6.1 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.17 states that *"Proposals include infill of boundary hedgerows, which would reinforce and enhance landscape elements. Opportunities to enhance the local distinctiveness, character and biodiversity of the area have been introduced as part of the proposed mitigation measures and are outlined within the EES which accompanies the application. These will allow for the infill planting of hedgerow and trees with local native species and implementation and management of existing hedgerows and grassland beneath the panels."*

5.6.2 Whilst I agree that infilling boundary hedgerows would reinforce the landscape elements, most of the proposed hedgerow planting is located either alongside PRowWs to form new 'green lanes' or cutting across field parcels and thereby altering the pattern and overall character. Local distinctiveness would not be enhanced by the increase in the sense of enclosure resulting from the taller elements (solar panels, hedgerows and trees) and obscuring of the historic landmark features of Belvoir Castle and church spires.

5.7 Conclusions

5.7.1 Pegasus' LVIA paragraph 2.8.18 states that *"It is concluded that the Proposed Development would have limited harm on the existing positive landscape elements associated with the Application Site. The existing landform of the Application Site would*

remain largely unchanged except possibly at a localised level during the construction and decommissioning period.”

- 5.7.2 As noted above, I agree with the assessment of effects upon landform. However, I disagree on the effects to the existing positive landscape elements associated with the Appeal Site, namely the tightly clipped hedgerows, open and expansive rural character and views of historic landmarks.
- 5.7.3 Pegasus’ LVIA paragraph 2.8.19 states that *“This assessment has demonstrated that the actual area that the Proposed Development would be visible from is considerably smaller than that identified by the SZTV. The visual assessment shows that visibility would be restricted by a combination of the landform, distance from the Application Site and the enclosure provided by intervening vegetation surrounding the Application Site.”*
- 5.7.4 I agree that the actual area that the Proposed Development would be visible from is smaller than that identified by the STZV. Visibility would be restricted by a combination of the landform, distance and enclosure provided by intervening vegetation, to varying degrees.
- 5.7.5 Pegasus’ LVIA paragraph 2.8.20 states that *“The assessment of viewpoints and associated receptors (including high and medium sensitivity receptors) concludes that the Proposed Development would cause limited long-term effects. Effects would be predominantly limited to less than 1km of the Application Site with the visual effects on completion being mostly limited to footpaths within and around the edges of the Site, with direct views of the Proposed Development.”*
- 5.7.6 I agree that major effects would be predominately within 1km of the Appeal Site mostly limited to footpath users within and around the edges, but also including visitors to Muston Meadows Nature Reserve, with moderate effects for users of the Grantham Canal and National Cycle Route 15.
- 5.7.7 However, there would be major/moderate effects beyond this distance, for visitors to the elevated viewpoints of Jubilee Way and Belvoir Castle registered Park and Garden at 1.6km to the south and Beacon Hill at c1.5km to the north.
- 5.7.8 Pegasus’ LVIA paragraph 2.8.21 states that *“This assessment demonstrates that the Proposed Development could be successfully accommodated within the existing landscape pattern and could be assimilated into the surrounding landscape without causing any long-term harm to the landscape character, visual amenity, or existing*

landscape attributes of the area.”

- 5.7.9 I disagree and consider that the Proposed Development would not recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the ‘Vale’ landscape around Bottesford (and would be contrary to paragraph 180(b) of the NPPF), it would not conserve or enhance the Borough’s landscape and countryside (and would not comply with Melton Local Plan policies SS1, EN1 and D1) and would have an unacceptably adverse impacts on the amenity of PRow users, including views and vistas (and would conflict with Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 and 9).

Table SH-2 – Landscape Value (using the Landscape Institute’s TGN 02/21 factors)

Factor	Indicators of Value
Natural Heritage	Physiographical interest from the juxtaposition between the gently undulating vale and the higher escarpment. Muston Meadows SSSI is designated for biological interest.
Cultural Heritage	Landscape offers a sense of time depth (views of heritage assets such as Belvoir Castle and church spires)
Landscape Condition	Good physical condition (intact historic field patterns)
Associations	Painting of 5th Duchess of Belvoir from the castle, depicts St Mary’s Church and expansive rural landscape on the lower lying middle ground through window
Distinctiveness	Landscape has a strong sense of identity as part of the Vale of Belvoir (with features which are characteristic of the place – see Character View included on page 12 of the NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales (at Longore Bridge), reproduced as Figure SH-7)
Recreational	Recreational opportunities (good accessibility via public rights of way, as well as Grantham Canal and National Cycle Route), where experience of the landscape is important (area forms part of a views of Borough wide importance and is part of a Registered Park and Garden, with popular facilities, such as shopping, glamping, refreshments, etc)
Perceptual (Scenic)	Landscape appeals to the senses, primarily the visual sense via the appreciation of distinctive views and landmarks (Belvoir Castle – see Character View included on page 15 of the NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales, reproduced as Figure SH-8) Located within the views of Borough wide importance from Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church and where “ <i>It is desirable to preserve this expansive and rural patchwork of fields.</i> ” (Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan)
Perceptual (Wildness and Tranquillity)	Landscape has strong sense of tranquillity along the Grantham Canal. NCA 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales “ <i>The landscape has a strong rural character, with wide areas retaining a sense of tranquillity and self-containment.</i> ”
Functional	Landscape is primarily mixed farming and the natural soils contribute to the healthy functioning of the area

Table SH-3 – Landscape Sensitivity

Landscape Receptor	Susceptibility (to a large solar farm together with all associated work, equipment and necessary infrastructure)	Landscape Value	Sensitivity
Topography	<p>Medium</p> <p>The gently undulating topography would have a moderate susceptibility to engineering earthworks associated with the new access tracks, compounds, inverters and spares containers and swales.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The gently undulating topography contributes positively to the landscape character / sense of place</p>	Medium
Land use/ground cover	<p>Medium</p> <p>The addition of panels would obscure the ground, whilst the other elements (such as access tracks, compounds, security fencing, etc) would alter the existing mainly arable land use and field pattern. This conflicts with the distinctive characteristic of ‘strong rectangular field pattern of mixed farming bounded by hedges’ identified in the description of Vale of Belvoir LCA.</p>	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>Located within the views of Borough wide importance from Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church and where “<i>It is desirable to preserve this expansive and rural patchwork of fields.</i>” (Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan)</p>	Medium to High
Trees and hedgerows	<p>Medium</p> <p>The hedgerows are managed in a manner compatible with arable uses and are well-trimmed and low growing with some gaps or missing sections. Key characteristics of the Vale of Belvoir in Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study states “<i>Field boundaries are predominantly maturing hawthorn hedgerows, up to 1.5m in height...</i>”</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Field boundaries are generally delineated by well-managed low hedgerows, forming a strong field pattern. There are occasional mature trees which punctuate the skyline. Ecological interest that contributes to sense of place, good physical condition (generally intact historic field patterns) and scenic quality (allowing views to landmarks).</p>	Medium

	The increase in height to achieve the proposed screening of the solar farm would necessitate a change to the open character and obscure views. This may conflict with the distinctive characteristic of <i>'expansive vale'</i> identified in the description of Vale of Belvoir LCA.		
LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir	<p>Medium</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce further urbanising features (in conjunction with permitted Jericho Lane solar farm and overhead powerlines) and contrast with the baseline situation of the area: <i>"An expansive gentle vale landscape with a strong pattern of medium scale rectangular shaped pastoral and arable fields with managed hedgerows and the Grantham canal, punctuated by nucleated villages with prominent church spires."</i></p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Distinctive character area defined by the Local Authority, includes several Listed Buildings, good recreational access and scenic quality. Good quality and condition. Also includes land within the angle of view of views of Borough wide importance from Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church, Bottesford, in the northern part of the character area (although most of character area is to the south of this view cone).</p>	Medium
LCA 2 Bottesford	<p>Medium</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce urbanising features and contrast with the baseline situation in the character areas around the village: <i>"A nucleated townscape, prominent within the Vale, and nearby villages with surrounding pastures, streamsides and transport routes."</i></p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Distinctive character area defined by the Local Authority, includes Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monument. Good quality and condition.</p>	Medium
LCA 9 Parkland	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce urbanising features and contrast with the baseline situation in the adjacent character area to the historic parkland: <i>"Historic parkland landscapes with historic houses/castles and a diverse</i></p>	<p>High</p> <p>Distinctive character area defined by the Local Authority, includes a Registered Park and Garden, several Listed Buildings,</p>	High

	<i>mosaic of ancient, traditional & contemporary agricultural and parkland features and patterns."</i>	good recreational access and scenic quality. Very good quality and condition.	
Local LCA - The 'Vale' around Bottesford	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>Area already includes two operational solar farms to the north-west of Bottesford and the two permitted solar farms which will be added to the south-west and north-east of Bottesford (along with a grid yard west of Castle View Road). Area also includes overhead powerlines / electricity pylons.</p> <p>The proposed solar farm and equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce further urbanising features and contrast with the baseline situation of the area: gently undulating topography, simple pattern of rural farmland, neatly trimmed hedgerows, with historic villages and landmarks (church spires and Belvoir Castle). Includes slightly elevated and visible areas from nearby receptors, such as Registered Park and Garden, Beacon Hill and Grantham Canal all within 2km.</p>	<p>Medium-High</p> <p>Includes several Listed Buildings, good recreational access and scenic quality. Good quality and condition.</p> <p>Includes land within the angle of view of views of Borough wide importance from Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church, Bottesford (but also includes land beyond the church)</p>	High
The overall landscape character of the Appeal Site	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>The proposed solar farm and equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce further urbanising features and contrast with the baseline situation of the area: gently undulating topography, simple pattern of rural farmland, neatly trimmed hedgerows, with views of historic landmarks (church spires and Belvoir Castle).</p>	<p>Medium-High</p> <p>Sense of time depth - views of historic landmarks (church spires and Belvoir Castle), distinctiveness, good recreational access and scenic quality.</p>	High

	<p>Appeal Site already includes overhead powerlines and two pylons and the addition of proposed development could cumulatively increase the developed character and visual clutter.</p> <p>Includes slightly elevated and visible areas from nearby receptors, such as the northern field along A52, eastern field adjacent to Muston Meadows or southern field adjacent to Grantham Canal</p>	<p>The Appeal Site is wholly within the angle of view of views of Borough wide importance from Belvoir Castle towards St Marys Church, Bottesford.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Table SH-4 – Magnitude of Landscape Change

Landscape Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
Topography	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Engineering earthworks associated with the new access tracks, compounds, inverters and spares containers and swales would result in cut and fill of some the gently undulating topography. Construction and decommissioning may have temporary stockpiles, etc. After restoration it is assumed, that the Appeal site would be returned to current state.</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Most of the gently undulating topography within the Appeal Site would remain unchanged, with the panels set above the ground on racks. Internal access tracks extend for over 4km.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Negligible
Land use/ground cover	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>The addition of panels would obscure the ground, whilst the other elements (such as access tracks, compounds, security fencing, etc) would fundamentally alter the existing arable land use and field pattern, to an energy generation facility. Creation of grassland beneath and around the panels would be a neutral change within the mixed farming context of the Vale of Belvoir. After restoration the substation (fencing and tracks) would be adverse.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Most of the farming land use / ground cover within the Appeal Site would be changed during construction and operations. There are 13 fields identified on the Landscape Strategy masterplan.</p> <p>The built elements would be mostly removed during decommissioning, except for the substation which would be retained.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low

Trees and hedgerows	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>No loss of significant trees. Short sections of hedgerow to be removed for access.</p> <p>The increase in height of the neat and well management hedgerows (e.g. from c1.5-2m to 3m), with additional hedgerows and tree planting to achieve the proposed screening of the solar farm. (NB This would change the open character and obscure views of the ‘expansive vale’ and landmarks, such as church spires and Belvoir Castle – see effect on character below). It is assumed that this level of tree cover would continue after restoration. This is considered to be adverse in this local context.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>All of the existing hedgerow boundaries within the Appeal Site would be altered.</p> <p>Additional hedgerows would be planted to form ‘green lanes’ along sections of public right of way (which are currently open), with additional hedgerow trees and tree blocks, and orchard.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Low
LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce further urbanising features and introduce a fundamental change to additional areas of agricultural land (in conjunction with Jericho Lane solar farm). This would contrast with the expansive gentle vale landscape, with arable fields. The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of views.</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Although the Appeal Site extends over a relatively small part of the distinctive character area as defined by the Local Authority, it would form a large-scale element in its own right.</p> <p>Additional parts of the area would be punctuated by solar farms (in addition to Jericho Lane which is also within this LCA). Additional swathes of panels would be visible within vistas from rights of way, lanes</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low

	After restoration, the character would be mostly mixed farming, but with increased tree cover and permanent substation.	and roads, and people’s experience of aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the rural area would be diminished and not adequately mitigated. The built elements would be mostly removed during decommissioning, except for the substation which would be retained.	Restoration	Negligible to Low
LCA 2 Bottesford	Low size or scale of change No direct change to the existing nucleated village, although the solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce urbanising features to the farmland to the south (and extend built development into the adjacent vale landscape).	Negligible geographical extent The Appeal Site is visible in outward views from a very small part of the distinctive character area as defined by the Local Authority.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
LCA 9 Parkland	Negligible size or scale of change No direct change to the historic parkland, although the solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce further urbanising features to the farmland perceived in some outward views (e.g. in conjunction with Jericho Lane solar farm and Lodge Farm solar farm).	Negligible geographical extent The Appeal Site is visible in outward views from a very small part of the distinctive character area as defined by the Local Authority. However additional parts of the surrounding area would be punctuated by solar farms.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible

Local LCA - The 'Vale' around Bottesford	<p>Medium to High size or scale of change</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce further urbanising features and introduce a fundamental change to additional areas of agricultural land (e.g. in conjunction with solar farms at Jericho Lane, Lodge Farm, Land south of A1 and Land south of the railway line and east of Station Road). This would contrast with the expansive gentle vale landscape, with arable fields.</p> <p>The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically neat and well managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of views.</p> <p>After restoration, the character would be mostly mixed farming, but with increased tree cover and permanent substation.</p>	<p>Medium geographical extent</p> <p>Although the Appeal Site extends over a relatively small part of the local character area, it would form a large-scale element in its own right. Additional parts of the area would be punctuated by solar farms, forming a circular pattern around Bottesford and this would detract from the existing landmarks of church spires and Belvoir Castle. Additional swathes of panels would be visible within vistas from rights of way, lanes and roads, and people's experience of aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the rural area would be diminished and not adequately mitigated. The built elements would be mostly removed during decommissioning, except for the substation which would be retained.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium to Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium to Low
			Restoration	Negligible
The overall landscape character of the Appeal Site	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>The solar farm and equipment and infrastructure would introduce urbanising features and introduce a fundamental change to additional areas of agricultural land. This would contrast with the expansive gentle vale landscape, with</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>The character of all of the Appeal Site would be transformed either by the addition of built elements or through landscaping treatments.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High

	<p>arable fields. The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically neat and well managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of views.</p> <p>After restoration, the character would be mostly mixed farming, but with increased tree cover and permanent substation.</p>	<p>The built elements would be mostly removed during decommissioning, except for the substation which would be retained.</p>	Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low

Table SH-5 – Overall Landscape Effect of the Proposed Development

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Sensitivity	Development Phase	Magnitude of Landscape Change	Landscape Effect	Nature of Effect
Topography	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Land use/ground cover	Medium to High	Construction (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Low	Minor	Adverse
Trees and hedgerows	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse

		Restoration	Low	Minor	Adverse
LCA 1 Vale of Belvoir	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Minor	Adverse
LCA 2 Bottesford	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Minor	Neutral
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Minor	Neutral
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
LCA 9 Parkland	High	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral

Local LCA - The 'Vale' around Bottesford	High	Construction (temporary)	Medium to Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium to Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
The overall landscape character of the Appeal Site	High	Construction (temporary)	Medium	Major/Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium	Major/Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Low	Moderate	Adverse

Table SH-6 – Visual Sensitivity

Visual Receptor	Susceptibility (to a large solar farm together with all associated work, equipment and necessary infrastructure)	Value of Views	Sensitivity
<p>Recreational users of public rights of way (PRoW) within and around the site, including Jubilee Way and Viking Way (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 14 and 12, Heritage Viewpoints 6, 7 and 13 and S.Higson Context Photographs 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9)</p> <p>Recreational visitors to Muston Meadows Nature Reserve, Beacon Hill (Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 15), Grantham Canal, National Cycle Route 15 and Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 9 / Cumulative Assessment 7) , Heritage Viewpoints 5, 8 and 9 and S.Higson context photographs 4, 5, 6, 7 10, 11, 12 and 13)</p>	<p>High</p> <p>Recreational visitors, where their attention or interest will be focused on the rural views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.</p> <p>Includes promoted long distance walking routes, cycling routes, promoted attractions and destinations, views of Borough wide importance).</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>Road users travelling along local road network (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoints 6, 7, 9 and 13)</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>General passing travellers, where their attention or interest will be primarily focused on the road corridor, albeit with rural views.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>Local residents at home, such as Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston, as well as isolated properties and farmsteads (e.g. at California to</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>

the west of the Appeal Site and Muston Grange Farm to the south) (e.g. Heritage Viewpoint 5)	People with views from settlement edge / individual properties over countryside which contributes to the landscape setting and enjoyed by residents of the area.	Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.	
--	--	---	--

Table SH-7 – Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint

Viewpoint Number	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 1</p> <p>From footpath F80/3, looking south west</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Upper parts of construction vehicles and equipment in northern parts of site may be glimpsed above the hedgeline (depending on cutting). Views also include Church of St Marys and Church of St John the Baptist at Muston.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management is likely to obscure the development and increase sense of enclosure / obscure longer distance views.</p>	<p>Low</p> <p>Development extends across view at 66m away and in direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 2</p> <p>From footpath F82/3, looking north west</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include St Marys Church.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management would obscure the development and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at c150m away and alongside direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium to Low
			Restoration	Low

<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 3</p> <p>From byway F85b/4, looking south west</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Belvoir Castle and St Marys Church.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting buffer on eastern boundary would likely obscure the development and increase sense of enclosure / obscure longer distance views. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>Medium geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at c150m away and alongside direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Negligible
<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 4</p> <p>From byway F85b/2, looking north west</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting buffer on eastern boundary would obscure the development and historic landmark (village and church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at 0m away (being adjacent) and alongside direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low

<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 5</p> <p>From byway F85b/1, looking north east</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would obscure the development and historic landmark (village and church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at 0m away (being adjacent) and in the direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low
<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6</p> <p>From footpath Wool 18/3, Muston Bridge, looking west</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include St Mary's Church and Belvoir Castle.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting may reduce visibility of parts of the development and increase sense of enclosure, albeit in middle distance.</p>	<p>Medium geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at 746m away and in direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Negligible
<p>Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 7</p> <p>From Sedgebrook Road, looking north west</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 1.5km away from site and not covered by ZTV.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible

Receptors: Road users	would not be visible within the view due to intervening landform.	No other cumulative sites visible.	Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 8 From footpath Wool 9/1, looking north west Receptors: PRow users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the view due to intervening landform and vegetation. Views also include St Mary's Church.	Negligible geographical extent Glimpsed view of Development at 2.5km away. ZTV indicates that Lodge Farm potentially visible at 7.7km away, although not apparent / obscured by intervening vegetation	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 9 From the Jubilee Way and Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden, looking north Receptors: Recreational visitors	Medium size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from elevated position. Views also include St Mary's Church and Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and alter the small hedgerows	Medium geographical extent Elevated view of Development at 1.6km away. Located in the view cone towards the church spire. Cumulative / combined view of operational solar project at Lodge Farm at 7.5km to north.	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low

	with intermittent trees - proposals conflict with Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan <i>"It is desirable to preserve this expansive and rural patchwork of fields."</i> . After restoration, mixed farming would be returned, although with increased tree cover which may erode the perceived patchwork of fields.		Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 10 From footpath G1/2, looking north east Receptors: PRow (footpath G1/2) users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the view, due to intervening vegetation.	Negligible geographical extent Glimpsed view of Development at 1.6km away. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 11 From footpath G2/3, looking north east Receptors: PRow (footpath G2/3) users	Low size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from slightly elevated position. Views also include Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist and Belvoir Castle. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the	Low geographical extent Partial glimpsed view of Development at 1km away. No other cumulative sites apparent.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible

	development and potentially obscure historic landmark (village and church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the middle distance views experienced would be changed. This would continue after restoration.		Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 12 From footpath F74/1, looking south east Receptors: PRow (footpath F74/1) users	High size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Belvoir Castle, St Mary's Church and the Church of St John the Baptist at Muston. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and historic landmark (church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.	Medium geographical extent Development extends across view at 200m away and in direction of travel. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 13 From Barkestone Lane (off A52), looking east	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would not be perceptible within the view.	Negligible geographical extent Viewpoint 1.4km away from site.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible

Receptors: Road (Barkestone Lane and A52) users		No other cumulative sites visible.	Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 14 From footpath F71/2, looking south east Receptors: PRow (footpath F71/2) users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would not be perceptible within the view due to intervening vegetation.	Negligible geographical extent Viewpoint 750m away from site. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 15 From bridleway F86a/2, Beacon Hill, looking south east Receptors: PRow (bridleway F86a/2) users	Medium size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from elevated position (in mid-ground). Views also include Belvoir Castle, St Mary's Church and the Church of St John the Baptist at Muston. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting may reduce visibility of parts of the development and alter the appearance of hedgerows and intermittent trees.	Medium geographical extent Edge of Development is 1.5km away and located in view cone towards Belvoir Castle. Cumulative / successive view with operational Lodge Farm project at 2.8km away and Land south of railway line and east of Station Road at 4km away.	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low

	After restoration, mixed farming would be returned, although with increased tree cover which may erode the perceived patchwork of fields.	ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible in successive views (Jericho Lane 4.8km away, Land south of the A1 Foston By-Pass 4km away), although intervening vegetation likely restricts views	Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 1 From PRoW footpath Barr 12/3 Receptors: PRoW users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation.	Negligible geographical extent Viewpoint 5.1km away from site. ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible, although intervening vegetation likely to restrict views.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 2 From PRoW footpath Barr 12/3 Receptors: PRoW users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation.	Negligible geographical extent Viewpoint 5km away from site. ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible, although intervening vegetation likely to restrict views.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible

<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 3</p> <p>From PRow footpath Barr 12/3</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 5km away from site.</p> <p>ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible, although intervening vegetation likely to restrict views.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 4</p> <p>From PRow footpath Barr 12/3</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 4.9km away from site.</p> <p>ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible, although intervening vegetation likely to restrict views.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 5</p> <p>From the 'Jubilee Way' ('Viking Way' on OS Maps)</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 3km away from site.</p> <p>ZTV indicates other cumulative sites visible in successive views (Lodge Farm 5.5km away and Land south of</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible

		the A1 Foston By-Pass 2km away) although intervening vegetation restricts views	Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 6 From the 'Jubilee Way' ('Viking Way' on OS Maps) Receptors: PRow users	Negligible size or scale of change The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be barely perceptible within the elevated view, due to intervening vegetation	Negligible geographical extent Viewpoint 3km away from site. ZTV indicates other cumulative sites visible in successive views (Lodge Farm 5.5km away and Land south of the A1 Foston By-Pass 2km away) although intervening vegetation restricts views	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 7 (also Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 9) From the 'Jubilee Way'	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 9	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 9	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 9	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 9

<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 8 (also Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 15)</p> <p>From bridleway F86a/2, Beacon Hill viewing point</p>	<p>Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 15</p>	<p>Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 15</p>	<p>Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 15</p>	<p>Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 15</p>
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 9</p> <p>From Bottesford Bypass (A52)</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be obscured from the view, due to intervening vegetation</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 860m away from site</p> <p>ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible in successive views (Jericho Lane 3km away and Land south of railway line and east of Station Road at 4km away) although intervening vegetation restricts views</p>	<p>Construction (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 1 to Year 14</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 15 to Year 40</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Decommissioning (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 10</p> <p>From PRoW footpath G5/1</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p> <p>The Proposed Development and associated construction and decommissioning works would be obscured from the view, due to intervening vegetation and topography.</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 1.2km away from site</p> <p>ZTV indicates no other cumulative sites potentially visible</p>	<p>Construction (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 1 to Year 14</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 15 to Year 40</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Decommissioning (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Negligible</p>

Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 11 From PRoW footpath G2/2 Receptors: PRoW users	Low size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development mostly obscured from elevated position by intervening vegetation along road. Views also include St Marys Church and Belvoir Castle. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting may further reduce visibility of parts of the development.	Negligible geographical extent Glimpsed views of Development at 1.2km away mostly obscured by vegetation. ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible in successive views (Jericho Lane 2.5km away and Lodge Farm 5.4km away) although intervening vegetation restricts views	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 12 (LVIA Viewpoint 11) From PRoW footpath G2/2	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 11	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 11	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 11	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 11
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 13	Medium size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also	Medium geographical extent	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High

<p>(also S.Higson context photograph 3)</p> <p>From PRoW footpath F82/2</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>include Belvoir Castle, St Mary's Church and the Church of St John the Baptist at Muston.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and historic landmark (church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration, along with substation also potentially visible from this location.</p>	<p>Development extends across view at 200m away and in direction of travel.</p> <p>ZTV indicates other cumulative site Lodge Farm potentially visible in successive views at 5km away although intervening vegetation restricts views</p>	Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 14</p> <p>From Grantham Canal traffic free cycle route</p> <p>Receptors: canal users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include St Marys Church.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would obscure the development and historic landmark (church) and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at 0m away (being adjacent) and adjacent to the direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible</p>	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low
<p>Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 15</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible

From Grantham Canal traffic free cycle route Receptors: canal users	Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development obscured by hedgerow.	Development extends across view at 80m away (being adjacent) adjacent to the direction of travel. No other cumulative sites visible	Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 16 (LVIA Viewpoint 8) From footpath Wool 9/1	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 8	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 8	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 8	Refer to LVIA Viewpoint 8
Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View 6 From National Cycle Route 15 / Easthorpe Lane Receptors: Recreational visitors	Low size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and eastern part of completed development visible. Views also include St Marys Church and Church of St Peter spire, Redmile. By year 15 hedgerow management would obscure parts of the development and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging (obscuring views of church spire at Redmile)	Low geographical extent Development extends across view at c150m away and offset to direction of travel. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible

<p>S.Higson Context Photograph 5 and 6 – Viewpoint 4b – Longore Bridge on PRow F85c, by Grantham Canal</p> <p>Receptors: Recreational visitors</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and southern part of completed development visible. Views also include St Marys Church.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management would obscure parts of the development and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>Medium geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at c200-500m away and in direction of travel.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Negligible

Table SH-8 – Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors

Visual Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
Users of PRoWs that pass through the site F82 and F90 and byway open to all traffic F85B (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 2, 3, 4 and 5 and Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 13, Heritage Viewpoints 6, 7 and 13 and S.Higson Context Photographs 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9)	High size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include St Marys Church, Belvoir Castle and Church of St John the Baptist. By year 15 hedgerow management would obscure parts of the development and historic landmarks and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.	High geographical Over 1.5km of F82 and F90 and 1.4km of byway open to all traffic (F85B) pass through the site, with additional visibility beyond the site boundaries. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	High
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	High
			Restoration	Medium
Users of PRoW west of the site F74 from Castle View Road (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 12)	High size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Belvoir Castle, St Mary’s Church and the Church of St John the Baptist at Muston. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and historic landmark (church)	High geographical extent Over 600m of F74 passes close to the west of the site. No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium

	and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.		Restoration	Low
Users of PRoW east of the site Footpath F89 and recreational visitors to western part of Muston Meadows Nature Reserve (e.g. S. Higson Context Photograph 4)	High size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible. Views also include Belvoir Castle and St Mary’s Church. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and historic landmarks and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging.	High geographical extent Over 150m of F80 passes close to and connects with the eastern boundary of the site, which extends around the western part of the Nature Reserve No other cumulative sites visible.	Construction (temporary)	Medium
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium
			Restoration	Low
Recreational Users of Grantham Canal (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 6 and Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 14 and S. Higson Context Photographs 5, 6 and 7)	Low size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development may be visible at certain locations. Sequential views also include St Marys Church and Belvoir Castle. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would potential obscure parts of the development and historic landmarks and	Low geographical extent Proposals perceived from a relatively short section of route (c1-2km). Other permitted cumulative site at Jericho Lane, Barklestone Le Vale also potentially visible along a	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible

	increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging. This would continue after restoration.	relatively short section of route at 3km to the west of Appeal Site.	Restoration	Negligible
Recreational users of National Cycle Route 15 (e.g Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6, Heritage Viewpoint 5 and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View 6 and S.Higson context photographs 10)	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible at certain sections. Sequential views also include St Mary's Church, Belvoir Castle and Church of St Peter spire, Redmile.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management would obscure parts of the development and increase sense of enclosure / character of the views experienced would be changed from open and long ranging (e.g. obscuring views of church spire at Redmile). This would continue after restoration.</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Over 2km of the route passes to the east of the Appeal Site with intermittent views.</p> <p>No other cumulative sites visible.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Recreational visitors to Beacon Hill (e.g. Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 15 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment)	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from elevated position. Views also include Belvoir Castle, St</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint 1.5km away from site.</p>	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium

Viewpoint 8 and S.Higson context photograph 13)	Mary's Church and the Church of St John the Baptist at Muston. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and alter the appearance of hedgerows and intermittent trees.	Cumulative / successive view with operational Lodge Farm project at 2.8km away and Land south of railway line and east of Station Road at 4km away. ZTV indicates other cumulative sites potentially visible in successive views (Jericho Lane 4.8km away, Land south of the A1 Foston By-Pass 4km away), although intervening vegetation likely restricts views	Decommissioning (temporary)	Low
			Restoration	Negligible
Recreational visitors to the north-western part of Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden and part of the Jubilee Way (including the views of Borough wide importance, Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 9 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 7, Heritage Viewpoints 8 and 9 and	Medium size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from elevated position. Views also include St Mary's Church and Muston and the Church of St John the Baptist. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and alter the small hedgerows	Medium geographical extent Elevated views of Development at c2.5km away. Located in the notable view, view cone towards the church spire. (more limited visibility from other parts of the Registered Park and Garden due to vegetation)	Construction (temporary)	Low
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Low

<p>S.Higson context photographs 11 and 12)</p>	<p>with intermittent trees - proposals conflict with Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan <i>“It is desirable to preserve this expansive and rural patchwork of fields.”</i> After restoration, mixed farming would be returned, although with increased tree cover which may erode the perceived patchwork of fields.</p>	<p>Cumulative / combined view of operational solar farm project Lodge Farm at 7.5km to north.</p>	<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Recreational visitors the Viking Way (Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment Viewpoints 5 and 6)</p>	<p>Negligible size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development likely to be mostly obscured by intervening vegetation.</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent Development over 1.5km away at closest point ZTV indicates other cumulative sites at Lodge Farm and Land South of A1 Foston By-Pass visible, although intervening vegetation restricts views</p>	<p>Construction (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 1 to Year 14</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 15 to Year 40</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Decommissioning (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Restoration</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Local residents at home, such as Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston, as well as isolated properties and farmsteads (e.g. at California to the west of the</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development likely to be mostly obscured, except for upstairs windows from</p>	<p>Low geographical extent Properties over 100m away from Appeal Site</p>	<p>Construction (temporary)</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
			<p>Operation Year 1 to Year 14</p>	<p>Low</p>
			<p>Operation Year 15 to Year 40</p>	<p>Low</p>

Appeal Site and Muston Grange Farm to the south (e.g. Heritage Viewpoint 5)	settlements and around curtilage / gardens of California. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would potentially reduce visibility of parts of the development and increase sense of enclosure / character of the middle distance views experienced. This would continue after restoration.	No other cumulative sites visible	Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible
Road users travelling along local road network, such as A52, Castle View Road, Easthorpe Lane and Woolsthorpe Lane and other routes within Study Area (e.g. Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 9)	Low size of scale of change Construction vehicles and equipment and completed development visible from certain positions. Potential views also include Belvoir Castle. By year 15 hedgerow management and new planting would reduce visibility of parts of the development and also historic landmarks. This would continue after restoration – in particular travellers along A52.	Low geographical extent Proposals perceived from a relatively short and/or intermittent sections of routes or. Other cumulative sites visible on a sequential basis at certain sections of routes, to varying degrees	Construction (temporary)	Negligible
			Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low
			Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low
			Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible
			Restoration	Negligible

Table SH-9 – Overall Visual Effect of the Proposed Development

Visual Receptor	Visual Sensitivity	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change	Visual Effect	Nature of Effect
Users of PRoWs that pass through the site F82 and F90 and byway open to all traffic F85B (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 2, 3, 4 and 5, Pegasus’ Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 13, Heritage Viewpoints 6, 7 and 13 and S.Higson Context Photographs 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9)	High	Construction (temporary)	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	High	Major	Adverse
		Restoration	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
Users of PRoW west of the site F74 from Castle View Road (e.g. Pegasus’ LVIA Viewpoint 12)	High	Construction (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Low	Minor	Adverse

Users of PRoW east of the site Footpath F89 and recreational visitors to western part of Muston Meadows Nature Reserve (e.g. S. Higson Context Photograph 4)	High	Construction (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	High	Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	High	Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Medium	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Low	Moderate	Adverse
Recreational Users of Grantham Canal (e.g. Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6 and Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 14 and S. Higson Context Photographs 5, 6 and 7)	High	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
Recreational users of National Cycle Route 15 (e.g Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6, Heritage Viewpoint 5 and Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View	High	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Moderate	Adverse

6 and S.Higson context photograph 10)		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Minor	Adverse
Recreational visitors to Beacon Hill (e.g. Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 15 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 8 and S.Higson context photograph 13)	High	Construction (temporary)	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium	Moderate/Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium	Moderate/Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
Recreational visitors to north-western part of Belvoir Castle Registered Park and Garden, along part of the Jubilee Way (including the views of Borough wide importance, Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 9 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 7, Heritage Viewpoints 8 and 9 and S.Higson context photographs 11 and 12)	High	Construction (temporary)	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Medium	Moderate/Major	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Medium	Moderate/Major	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
	High	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral

Recreational visitors to the Viking Way (Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoints 5 and 6)		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Local residents at home, such as Bottesford, Easthorpe and Muston, as well as isolated properties and farmsteads (e.g. at California to the west of the Appeal Site and Muston Grange Farm to the south) (e.g. Heritage Viewpoint 5)	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Road users travelling along local road network, such as A52, Castle View Road, Easthorpe Lane and Woolsthorpe Lane and other routes within Study Area (e.g. Pegasus' LVIA Viewpoint 6 and Pegasus' Cumulative Assessment Viewpoint 9 and Heritage Viewpoint 10 and 12)	Medium	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse

Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Key View 6 From National Cycle Route 15 / Easthorpe Lane Receptors: Recreational visitors	High	Construction (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Operation Year 1 to Year 14	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Operation Year 15 to Year 40	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Decommissioning (temporary)	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse
		Restoration	Negligible	Negligible	Adverse

FELSTONE
CONSULTING
CHARTERED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk Web: www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk

Registered Office: 3 Princes Court, Royal Way, Loughborough, LE11 5XR. Company Registration Number: 14177017