



LAND WEST OF BRADMORE ROAD AND NORTH OF WYSALL  
ROAD, WYSALL, NOTTINGHAM, NG12 5QZ -

LPA ref: 24/00161/FUL

PINS ref: APP/P3040/W/25/3375110

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

Prepared for Rushcliffe Borough Council  
and



February 2026

Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: [contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk](mailto:contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk) Web: [www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk](http://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 .....	3
2	LANDSCAPE-RELATED PLANNING CONTEXT .....	14
3	ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS .....	27
4	ASSESSMENT OF VISUAL EFFECTS .....	46
5	MATTERS IN DISPUTE .....	56

## 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 (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SH-5 – Magnitude of Landscape Change (Cumulative)

Table SH-6 – Overall Landscape Effects (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SH-7 – Overall Landscape Effects (Cumulative)

Table SH-8 – Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Table SH-9 – Magnitude of Visual Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint  
(Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SH-10 – Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors  
(Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SH-11 – Magnitude of Visual Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint  
(Cumulative)

Table SH-12 – Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors  
(Cumulative)

Table SH-13 – Overall Visual Effects (Proposed Development in Isolation)

Table SH-14 – Overall Visual Effects (Cumulative)

## **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 updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment included with the planning application, produced by Pegasus Group ('Pegasus' updated LVIA') in October 2024 (CD 1.5) and original LVIA ('Pegasus' LVIA') in December 2023 (CD 2.16) and consideration of the matters in dispute in the Statement of Common of Ground and reasons for refusal in the Decision Notice of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2025.

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 5.28), 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 5.30).

1.1.4 I have also reviewed the Appellant's Landscape Hearing Statement prepared by Pegasus (CD 8.2.1).

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 Reason for Refusal**

1.2.1 The scope of this evidence is defined by the second and third Reason for Refusal set out in the Decision Notice of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2025 which specifically relate to landscape character, views and visual amenity.

1.2.2 The first Reason for Refusal states that:

- *“The proposal would result in a significant adverse visual impact upon the landscape character of the area, particularly when the impacts are considered cumulatively with the consented solar farm to the west of the site. The proposal would result in major adverse effects upon users of the Public Rights of Way which run through and near to the site, impacting on their ability to enjoy the rural landscape character which would be diminished and changed by virtue of the industrialisation of the area and the resultant enclosed industrial corridors. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of LPP1 and Policy 1 (Development Requirements), Policy 16 (Renewable Energy), Policy 22 (Development in the Countryside) and Policy 34 (Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assets) of LPP2 as the benefits of the development do not outweigh the adverse effects on the users of the Public Right of Way and the wider landscape character.”*

### **1.3 Definitions**

- 1.3.1 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”*.
- 1.3.2 In accordance with ELC and GLVIA3 the definition of landscape within this proof therefore includes natural, rural, urban and peri-urban (‘urban fringe’) areas.
- 1.3.3 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”*.
- 1.3.4 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”*.
- 1.3.5 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”.*

- 1.3.6 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”.*
- 1.3.7 This assessment considers landscape and visual effects separately, although where relevant and appropriate, cross references may be made to the same features or elements.
- 1.3.8 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).
- 1.3.9 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.”*

## **1.4 Methodology**

- 1.4.1 I have followed the methodology which is set out in Pegasus’ updated LVIA (Appendix 1) to facilitate consistency in approach.
- 1.4.2 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.
- 1.4.3 I was instructed to act as landscape expert witness for the Appeal on 13th November 2025. As part of my assessment, I visited the Appeal Site and surrounding area on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2025, 30<sup>th</sup> November 2025, 8<sup>th</sup> December 2025 and 21<sup>st</sup> January 2026. Appendix 2 to my proof of evidence includes my LVIA figures and Appendix 3 are my context photographs taken during my fieldwork.
- 1.4.4 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.

- 1.4.5 I am aware that the Screening Opinions issued by RBC in June 2023 (CD 4.4.2) and updated in June 2025 (CD 4.5.1) confirmed that the proposed development would not be EIA development and therefore I am not specifically required to address the 'significance' or otherwise of effects.

## **1.5 The Study Area**

- 1.5.1 The Study Area for my re-assessment of landscape and visual effects is based on the focused 1-1.5km radius identified in Pegasus' updated LVIA (under paragraphs 1.46 to 1.52).
- 1.5.2 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, such as the remaining parts of Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps character area, sequential views from PRow to the south (at c. 1.5-2km away) and long-distance elevated views of Charnwood from the Appeal Site (at c. 15km away).

## **1.6 Development Proposal**

- 1.6.1 The development proposal is for the *"Construction, operation and subsequent decommissioning of a renewable energy park comprising ground mounted Solar PV with co-located battery energy storage system (BESS) at the point of connection, together with associated infrastructure, access, landscaping and cabling."*
- 1.6.2 The Appeal Site is located primarily on two parcels of land to the west of Wysall, Nottinghamshire and is connected by a section of public highway which passes through the village (for a buried cable which would be beneath the bound road surface).
- 1.6.3 The Design and Access Statement, prepared by Pegasus in January 2024 (CD 1.3) submitted with the application (paragraph 1.3) states that *"The site measures approximately 100.96ha ha in total. The Northern Parcel, measuring approximately 65 hectares (ha) and bound to the north by a linear woodland, known as Old Wood. Meanwhile, the Southern Parcel, measuring approximately 33 hectares (ha), extends northwards from Wysall Road. The Southern Parcel is situated approximately 325m south of the Northern Parcel and the two are separated by a series of small agricultural*

*fields”.*

- 1.6.4 The Design and Access Statement (DAS), prepared by Pegasus in January 2024 (CD 1.3) submitted with the application (paragraph 7.12) states that *“A total of circa 4,092 two-way vehicle movements are predicted to be made during the full construction phase, 1,578 for the Northern Parcel and 2,514 at the Southern Parcel (excluding construction worker trips to / from the site).”* Once installed, *“It is anticipated that the site will operate predominately by remote access and is only visited on an occasional basis with minimal effect on the surrounding local network, it is anticipated that there could be 12 LGVs accessing the site per month”* (paragraph 7.16).
- 1.6.5 Paragraph 7.2 of the DAS states that *“it is anticipated that the construction of the Development will take approximately six months to complete. This includes the preparation of the site, erection of security fencing, assembly of the PV strings, installation of the inverters/transformers, installation of battery containers and construction of the substation/grid connection.”*
- 1.6.6 As noted in the Planning Statement prepared by Pegasus in January 2024 (CD 1.2) *“The Development would export renewable energy to the grid and provide grid stability services for up to 40 years. After the 40 year period the infrastructure would be decommissioned and the land restored back to its current agricultural use.”* (paragraph 5.86).
- 1.6.7 Landscape Strategy (CD 2.20), drawing number P21-2533\_EN\_06E, dated 10/10/2024, prepared by Pegasus Group, was included with the application. This includes 15 numbered field parcels, which I have referenced below, where relevant.
- 1.6.8 Table SH-1 below is a summary schedule of the solar farm equipment, BESS and infrastructure which includes proposed access tracks with security fencing and CCTV poles, customer switchgear and 132kv substation taken from Design and Access Statement, CD 1.3 and submitted landscape strategy plan.

*Table SH-1 Summary Schedule of Proposed Equipment and Infrastructure*

Measured Area or distance	Summary Schedule of Solar Farm Equipment and Infrastructure at Appeal Site (taken from Design and Access Statement, CD 1.3 and submitted landscape strategy plan)
---------------------------	---



69 ha	<p>Fenced off area for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solar Panels Modules, which are made from photovoltaics which are blue, grey or black placed on galvanised steel frame mounting system (3m maximum height)</li> <li>70no. Battery Units as containers 3m high, painted dark green, sited atop individual concrete plinth foundations;</li> <li>35no. MV inverter units as containers 3m high, painted dark green, sited atop individual concrete plinth foundations (6m x 2.5m);</li> <li>4no. Auxiliary Transformers will be functional in appearance and 2.1m in height, sited on a 3m x 3m concrete foundation;</li> <li>Substation/HV Switchgear building of brick construction. 13.2 m long by 3.9 m wide and 4.1 m high.</li> <li>The transformer measure approximately 5m long by 4.5m wide by 3.9m high.</li> <li>The Control Room and Cable Connection building will measure 15m long by 5m wide and 4.3m high.</li> <li>132kV Substation Compound will be positioned on the western side of the BESS compound and will form the point of connection into the existing 132kV overhead pylon / transmission line, with a DNO control room, 132kV HV Switchgear 6.3m high and one 132kV Transformer 6.1m high and associated equipment</li> <li>4m wide permeable access tracks and vehicle parking within fenced and gated compounds. The tracks will be made to withstand the loads of HGVs and plant and reduce the propensity of debris being taken on to the adjacent highway.</li> <li>During the construction phase, separate construction compounds will be set up within each of the two site parcels to serve the Development. The compounds will be suitable for an articulated vehicle to enter, turn and exit in a forward gear. A temporary car parking area (including spaces for minibuses) will be provided within the compounds. Parking will therefore be contained within the Site and no unnecessary parking will occur on the local highway network. The compounds will also include areas for the storage of plant and equipment, where necessary.</li> </ul>
10.3km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing around the solar farm will comprise 2.5m high deer fencing (wooden post and wire mesh appearance)</li> </ul>
0.67km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing around the BESS and POC compounds would comprise painted dark green palisade fence to a height of 2.4 m</li> </ul>
75 no.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pole mounted infrared CCTV cameras will be installed at a height of 4m around the perimeter of the solar farm enclosures facing</li> </ul>

	inwards, whilst columns circa 4m in height will also be installed within the inside edge of the BESS and substation compounds within the Southern Parcel;
4.67km	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal Access Track (4m wide)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access to Northern Parcel of the site is proposed to be served by a new access track that will extend west from Bradmore Road parallel to the existing Lodge Farm access through the field to its south, retaining the existing farm access for continued farm and residential operation and use as a PRoW. The proposed new access has been designed to be able to accommodate the largest vehicle expected to access the site, a 16.5m articulated lorry. A passing place is provided after the junction and a turning area is also shown on the plans on the eastern extent of the solar development</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access to the Southern Parcel of the site is currently achieved via an existing gated agricultural field entrance on Wysall Road on the parcel's southern boundary. From the field entrance an existing agricultural track and bridge provide vehicular access over Kingston Brook to enable access into the main field enclosures within the Southern Parcel. It is proposed to use the existing gated field entrance off Wysall Road for both construction and operational traffic which will be appropriately widened to the east to accommodate the largest vehicles expected to access the site during construction, a 16.5m articulated lorry.</li> </ul>

1.6.9 The Noise Impact Assessment (CD 1.20), prepared by Metrica Environmental Consulting Ltd assessed the following noise sources: Primary Transformers; Battery Storage Containers, including inverter system; BESS Cooling plant; BESS Auxiliary transformers; and Centralised Inverter / transformer stations distributed throughout the solar panel array in relation to surrounding residential receptors.

1.6.10 Paragraph 5.66 of the planning statement confirms that the *“proposed construction laydown area will be positioned to the north of the new access road from Bradmore Road”*, denoted by a c. 0.6ha rectangular white space on the submitted landscape strategy.

1.6.11 In addition to the equipment and infrastructure, there would also be landscaping treatments, such as:

- The establishment of grassland beneath and between the solar panels and around other standoff areas within the Appeal Site; and
- new hedgerow and tree / woodland block planting.

1.6.12 Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility, Context Baseline Viewpoints and Photoviews and Photomontages of the proposed development were included with Pegasus' updated LVIA (CD 2.16).

1.6.13 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.

1.6.14 The height of proposed and existing hedges will be dependent on the management regime and the frequency of cutting. Paragraph 2.22 of Pegasus' updated LVIA confirms that *"Management and enhancement of all existing field boundary hedgerows to an approximate height of 3.0 m - 3.5 m, where existing hedgerows are lower, and an A-shaped profile to maximise ecological benefits and further reduce any potential to gain views of the Development from the surrounding area."*

## **1.7 Enhanced Landscape Strategy**

1.7.1 As noted in paragraph 1.6 of the Appellants Statement of Case (CD 82) *"Following the refusal of the application by RBC, the Appellant has proposed some limited minor changes to the design of the Appeal Proposal and these changes and associated plans, and technical reports accompany the appeal submission. The proposed changes presented to the Inspector include:*

- *Some micro siting of electrically sensitive equipment in four locations to take account of latest surface water flood data published by the Environment Agency.*
- *Inclusion of 2 above ground fire water storage tanks to supplement the previous fire water provisions, to seek further compliance with National Fire Chief Council. Guidance. (CD 8.9)*
- *Minor track changes to the south of fields 5 and 6 to allow for extra hedgerow*

*planting to the north of the public right of way, alongside some extra hedgerow tree planting to the south of field 3 and other minor hedgerow gapping up as illustrated on the revised Landscape Strategy.*

- *Inclusion of additional retained arable land managed for nesting skylark in fields to the east of fields 6 and 10 towards Bradmore Road.”*

- 1.7.2 As was requested during the Case Management Meeting (CMC) on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2026, I have also considered this alternative plan (CD 3.6) Enhanced Landscape Strategy Drg no. P25-1631\_EN\_O2E as part of my assessment.
- 1.7.3 The Summary Schedule of Proposed Equipment and Infrastructure would have a reduction in the length of the access track by c. 150m and the x2 additional 3.3m high water storage tanks and pumps within the BESS compound.
- 1.7.4 The proposed construction laydown area to the north of the new access road from Bradmore Road is now shown as part of the “*retained arable land managed for nesting skylark introduced through the appeal*” on the enhanced landscape strategy. However, there is no explanation of where the construction compound would be relocated to in the Summary of Changes Document (CD 3.4).
- 1.7.5 CAD versions of the landscape strategy layouts were requested from Pegasus on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2025 (via Heatons) to assist with the preparation of this evidence. However, Pegasus responded on 4<sup>th</sup> December and stated that “*As these were not included in our application or appeal submission, and have not been requested by the council during determination, we must respectfully decline. Andrew Mott has re-sent the document outlining the proposed changes through the appeal (CD3.4), along with a plan comparing the application landscape strategy to the enhanced landscape strategy (CD3.5). We trust these should be sufficient for assessing the changes.*”

## **1.8 Potential Sources of Landscape and Visual Effect**

- 1.8.1 The main landscape and visual components of the proposed development include:
- site preparation of highways access, construction compounds and soil stripping, with associated materials and plant (including stocking and loading areas and vehicle movements);

- construction and operation of solar farm and BESS equipment and infrastructure; and
- landscaping and planting treatments, including management of hedgerow heights and increase in tree cover.

1.8.2 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.

1.8.3 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 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.

## 1.9 Final Restoration

1.9.1 Section 7 of the draft Statement of Common Ground refers to how *"It is agreed that that the Appeal Proposal would generate and export renewable energy to the grid for up to 40 years, and the BESS element would import and export electricity from and to the grid also for a period of up to 40 years, and following this operational period, all solar panels, BESS units, inverters, security fence and associated infrastructure will be decommissioned, and all plant and machinery will be removed from the Site. The extant use of the land would then be restored thereafter."* and that *"A condition would be secured to ensure the decommissioning and restoration of the site."* I have assumed that a suitably wording condition would ensure the decommissioning and restoration of the site.

1.9.2 Pegasus's updated LVIA assesses the *"operational stage of the Development only, as the construction and decommissioning stages would be of short and temporary duration."* I have also adopted this approach in my re-assessment. For clarity I have assumed that this would include the decommissioning and restoration of all elements including BESS units, inverters, security fence, associated infrastructure (substation and

transformer) and access tracks (as well as solar panels).

- 1.9.3 There is no assessment of effects after restoration within Pegasus's updated LVIA and again I have also adopted this approach in my re-assessment.

## **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.

#### Ecology

2.2.2 Old Wood is designated as Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland and is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Appeal Site. Part of this woodland is also Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve referred to as Bunny Old Wood (West) (see my Context Photograph 1 of interpretation board). Whilst I am not giving evidence on the effect on ecology, I note that the landscape of the Appeal Site has a connection to 'Bunny Old Wood', including via public rights of way (PRoW).

#### Cultural Heritage

2.2.3 There are several Listed Buildings within 1-1.5km of the Appeal Site, including Holy Trinity Church (Grade I), Manor Farmhouse, Manor House Farmhouse, The Nook and Rectory Farmhouse (all Grade II) within Wysall, which is also a Conservation Area. Highfields (Grade II) is approximately 400m to the west. 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 from PRoW (for example see my Context Photograph 2 and 3).

- 2.2.4 Figure SH-1 presents a screenshot from Multi-Agency Geographic Information (MAGIC) website, with Listed Buildings and Ancient Woodland.
- 2.2.5 A Townscape Appraisal Map is included in the Wysall Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) (CD 9.4) and is included in Mr Partington's evidence. There are several 'Significant Views' identified including a view from Costock Road, looking along a track to a field gate, with the Appeal Site beyond. This view is not included in the Updated LVIA, however I have reviewed for purposes of this Appeal and included as my context photographs 14 and 16. I have referenced as 'CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road' (and it is also illustrated at Figure 23 in Mr Partington's Heritage Impact Assessment). I also note that there are other views across to the Appeal Site available from the northernmost part of the Conservation Area, along Bradmore Road, on elevated ground near to the Old Vicarage (as illustrated at Figure 22 in Mr Partington's Heritage Impact Assessment).
- 2.2.6 The CAAMP also includes several points of relevance to the landscape and visual context of the village:
- "[2] Wysall Location and Landscape Setting 'The surrounding countryside consists primarily of large arable fields lined with hedgerows'.
  - '[4.3] Open Spaces, Trees and Landscape 'Wysall is surrounded by an open landscape...that is easily accessible by public footpaths...'
  - 'Open Spaces, Trees and Landscape SWOT Analysis 'Threats: ...There is a specific threat from any intervention associated with the industrialisation of the surrounding fields.'
  - '[5.2.3] Key Characteristics: Zone 3 – Entrances to the village from the South - Key Characteristics / Architectural Features: The southwestern entrance to the village is characterised by arable fields framed by hedgerows and grass verges, reflecting its rural setting.'

#### Recreational / PRow

- 2.2.7 There is a network of PRow within and around the Appeal site. Footpaths Wysall FP3, FP4 and Costock FP7 are within the Appeal Site. A PRow waymarker post within the Appeal Site had a 'Notts Wolds Way' badge (see my Context Photograph 4) and OS



Explorer map identifies this route as part of the Midshires Way. Figure SH-13 presents Nottinghamshire Definitive PRoW Map which was provided to Heatons on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025 as part of preparation of this evidence. The definitive route (in black dash) mostly follows the OS and desire line route (grey dashed line), except for PROW Costock FP7 and part of Wysall FP3 at the north of the Appeal Site (Referenced as 3 and 7 on map).

- 2.2.8 There are permissive footpath routes extending west from the edge of Wysall, connecting to the PRoW network to the north and passing adjacent to Field 15 in the southern parcel of the Appeal Site. See my context photographs 15, 16 and 17.

## 2.3 Relevant Planning Policy

### National Policy

- 2.3.1 Paragraph 187 of National Planning Policy Framework, Dec 2024<sup>1</sup> (NPPF) (CD 5.1) 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;”*
- 2.3.2 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).”*
- 2.3.3 Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) 2024 (CD 5.3) under paragraph 4.7.2 states that *“Applying good design to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, including impacts on heritage, efficient in the use of natural resources, including land-use, and energy used in their construction*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Government is currently consulting on draft NPPF from December 16, 2025, until March 10, 2026

*and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible. It is acknowledged, however that the nature of energy infrastructure development will often limit the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area”.*

- 2.3.4 National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (CD 5.4) includes a section on landscape, visual and residential amenity in paragraphs 2.10.85 to 2.10.93 (paragraph references based on Jan 2026 publication).

#### Local Policy

- 2.3.5 The relevant local policy context is referenced in the Decision Notice of 19th June 2025. Rushcliffe Borough Council Adopted the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) on 22 December 2014 (CD 6.1) and Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2) on 8 October 2019 (CD 6.2).

- 2.3.6 LPP1 Policy 10 Design and Enhancing Local Identity states that:

- 1. *“All new development should be designed to make: c) reinforce valued local characteristics”*
- 2. *“Development will be assessed in terms of its treatment of the following elements: h) the potential impact on important views and vistas, including of townscape, landscape, and other individual landmarks, and the potential to create new views”*
- 5. *“Outside of settlements, new development should conserve or where appropriate, enhance or restore landscape character. Proposals will be assessed with reference to the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment.”*

- 2.3.7 I note that there are no individually defined or mapped ‘important views and vistas’ in the Development Plan / relating to LPP1 Policy 10.

- 2.3.8 LPP2 Policy 1 Development Requirements states that *“Planning permission for new development, changes of use, conversions or extensions will be granted provided that, where relevant, the following criteria are met:*

- 7<sup>th</sup> bullet point *“there is no significant adverse effects on landscape character”*

2.3.9 LPP2 Policy 16 Renewable Energy states that *“Proposals for renewable energy schemes will be granted planning permission where they are acceptable in terms of:*

- *b) landscape and visual effects”*

2.3.10 LPP2 Policy 22 Development within the Countryside states that

- *“1. Land beyond the Green Belt and the physical edge of settlements is identified as countryside and will be conserved and enhanced for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources, and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all.*
- *2. Within the countryside development for the following uses will be permitted subject to the requirements set out in (3) below:*
  - *i) renewable energy in accordance with Policy 16.*
- *3. Developments in accordance with (2) above will be permitted where:*
  - *a) the appearance and character of the landscape, including its historic character and features such as habitats, views, settlement pattern, rivers, watercourses, field patterns, industrial heritage and local distinctiveness is conserved and enhanced;”*

2.3.11 LPP2 Policy 34 Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assets Renewable Energy states that *“1. The following Green Infrastructure assets will be protected from development which adversely affects their green infrastructure function (or their contribution to a wider network) unless the need for the asset is proven to no longer exist and the benefits of development, in that location, outweigh the adverse effects on the asset:*

- 10<sup>th</sup> bullet point *“Rights of Way”*

## **2.4 Reference Documents**

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

- Natural England – National Character Area Profiles (NCA) 74 ‘Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds’(CD 5.51) and NCA 48 ‘Trent and Belvoir Vales’. Most of the Appeal Site is located within NCA 74, with part of the northern parcel

within NCA 48;

- Greater Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment, 2009 (GNLCA) (CD 6.9);
- Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development, LUC, 2014 (CD 6.11);
- Rushcliffe Borough Council Solar Farm Development Planning Guidance November 2022; (CD 6.5); and
- Rushcliffe Borough Council Solar Farm Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study, 2024 prepared by Arup (SFLSCS) (CD 6.6).

## 2.5 Consultation on Landscape and Visual Effects

2.5.1 Wynne-Williams Associates provided an independent 'Landscape Review' of the Pegasus' LVIA submitted as part of the planning application on behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council in June 2024 (WWA Review) (CD 4.64). There were several concerns raised in this review including reference *inter alia* to the following in Section 5 Conclusion:

- *"With regards to the value of landscape receptors, it is my opinion that the LVIA, as currently presented, fails to provide an assessment for the individual factors in accordance with GLVIA3 and TGN 02/21, and further fails to provide a judgement regarding overall landscape value"*
- *"although the existing vegetation and proposed mitigation may reduce some visibility to the lower parts of the solar arrays, the loss of longer distance views from the elevated countryside represents a considerable reduction in visual amenity. It also prevents people from appreciating their location within the valley landscape, the enjoyment of recreational activity and the scenic qualities of the undulating hills"*
- *"the site would experience high levels of intervisibility in the long to medium distance views by people using the Public Rights of Way. For example, Public Footpath Costock FP4 which continues from Wysall Lane and adjacent to Public Footpath Rempston FP8 does not appear to have been assessed within the*

LVIA”

- *“the LVIA does not provide commentary pertaining to the assessment of cumulative landscape effects of the proposed scheme in combination with the other solar farm development”*
- *“I would also expect that a cumulative visual assessment be provided and supported up by cumulative wireframes set beneath photographs and / or photomontages prepared from key viewpoints”*

2.5.2 A subsequent review of Pegasus’ updated LVIA was provided by Wynne-Williams Associates in February 2025 on behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council (WWA Response to Updated LVIA) (CD 4.65). There remained several concerns including reference *inter alia* to the following:

- *“It is noted that the original LVIA (5.17) has been updated to show that effects on character of the site were previously “high, with effects major adverse”, whereas the updated LVIA (2024) (5.32) has downgraded this to “medium, with effects moderate adverse, with the residual effects diminishing to minor adverse given the proposed landscaping.”*
- *“We agree with Pegasus’ original conclusions as the solar array will appear as a new feature in the landscape, not in keeping with the current character. In addition, introduced vegetation through the landscape proposals will likely long outlast the solar array itself, these are specific to the scheme and are incongruent with existing field patterns.”*
- *“We do not consider that the planting proposals will have a wholly positive influence on the landscape character”*
- *“It is considered that the mitigation planting will prevent people from appreciating their location within the valley landscape, changing the perceived sense of place and character, as open views would become enclosed and constrained. Again, these concerns still remain.”*
- *“We consider that the introduction of solar arrays and associated infrastructure on the combined scale proposed by the two solar farms would represent a notable change away from baseline landscape character and visual amenity.*

*This would be perceived from the south with limited ability to appreciate the two developments as separate. We therefore conclude that the Pegasus assessment underestimates the cumulative effects."*

## **2.6 Consultation from Conservation Officer**

2.6.1 The consultation response (CD 4.60) from Rushcliffe Borough Council's Conservation Officer, December 2024, stated that:

- *"Wysall Conservation Area is an attractive rural village of which a key characteristic is the connection with the open countryside provided by views to and from the settlement as well as the rural approaches along tree and hedge-lined routes. Furthermore, views along the northern approach are identifiable and deemed a significant contributor to the conservation areas rural character. The villages wider landscape setting is predominantly arable fields."*

## **2.7 Consultation on Rights of Way**

2.7.1 The consultation response (CD 4.10) from Via East Midlands Limited on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, referenced as "Mr Public Rights of Way NCC", in February 2024 stated that *"The applicant has correctly identified the public rights of way (PRoW) that are within the application site - Wysall Footpath nos. 3 & 4 and Costock Footpath no. 7."* and that *"I am pleased to see that the PRoW network has been accommodated on its existing route within wide corridors...Please confirm the width of these areas as it is not clear on the plans and also the maintenance/mowing regime here to ensure the surface is managed suitably for the footpath."*

2.7.2 Overall, it was confirmed in this response to the submitted plans that there were *"No Objections development has maintained RoW in current location to acceptable terms."*

2.7.3 I disagree with this position on the basis that the submitted landscape strategy was incorrectly drawn. With reference to Definitive Map included in Figure SH-13 and Figure SH-14 my Overlay of submitted landscape strategy (PRoW as orange long dash) and enhanced landscape strategy (PRoW as orange dots):

- PRoW Wysall FP4 would be obstructed by security fencing and gates in Field 5/6 on the submitted landscape strategy. This has since been moved from south of the hedge to the north of the hedge in the 'Enhanced Landscape

Strategy’ and the alignment of the security fence and gate also adjusted to avoid an obstruction.

- PRoW Wysall FP3 would be obstructed by mitigation hedge planting in Field 4 although this was not obvious on the submitted landscape strategy due to being incorrectly drawn. However, this route has been redrawn/moved on the ‘Enhanced Landscape Strategy’ with the PRoW orange dotted line now shown as going over the end of the mitigation hedge planting (see screenshot below from summary of changes plan).

## **2.8 Consultation from Ramblers**

- 2.8.1 Consultation response (CD 4.17) from Notts Area Ramblers in March 2024 stated that *“Costock FP7 and Wysall Fp3 form part of the Notts Wolds Way long distance footpath and also provide an footpath alternative for the section of the Midshires Way between Wysall and Bunny. They are very popular footpaths that provide vital access to the countryside for local inhabitants and visitors to the area.”*
- 2.8.2 I note that the Ramblers describe how *“Currently through the northern area of the proposed development, the walker enjoys expansive views, panoramic views of the Nottinghamshire Wolds as the land slopes southwards down to Kingston Brook before rising to the distant horizon”.*
- 2.8.3 Concerns were also expressed about how *“The size of the proposed solar park and its immediate proximity to the PRoWs will be significantly detrimental to the walkers’ enjoyment as the natural characteristic beauty of the Wolds countryside will be irreparably diminished.”* and that *“In conclusion, we note that there are attempts to mitigate the loss of enjoyment for the countryside that this development causes. However, the loss of wider views from the various paths leads us to lodge an objection.”*

## **2.9 Consultation from Wysall and Thrope-in-the-Glebe Parish Council**

- 2.9.1 Consultation response (CD 4.18) from Wysall and Thrope-in-the-Glebe Parish Council in March 2024 included objections, *inter alia*:
- *“1. The proposed site (approximately 100 hectares) is directly adjacent to another solar farm (Highfields Farm Site - approximately 82 hectares). Each site is intended to generate 49.9 MW of electricity, giving a combined generating*

*capacity of 99.8MW. Sites of more than 50 MW are classified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and as such are referred to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy for approval. The cumulative impact of these two developments, which occupy a large swathe of agricultural land between Costock and Wysall, is excessive within this rural community."*

- *"2. The proposed solar farm encompasses Public Rights of Way (PRoW) including a section of The Midshires Way. These footpaths are very popular and are widely used by residents and visitors to the area. Whilst they would be retained under the proposals, they would be set within a 2.4m (minimum) high security-fenced corridor, which would have a seriously detrimental impact on the enjoyment and health benefits of these footpaths. Rushcliffe Borough Councils Solar Farm Development Planning Guidance (November 2022) highlights the importance of PRoWs as local amenities within the Borough that help to promote healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. The loss of amenity here is significant."*

## **2.10 Consultation from Rempstone Parish Council**

2.10.1 Consultation response (CD 4.20) Rempstone Parish Council included objections, *inter alia*:

- *"The scale of the development, this site is immediately adjacent to another solar farm which has just gained planning consent, the two sites combined have a capacity of 99MW this is in excess of the 50MW limit before national government approval is required. As these two sites are adjoining the Council believe the cumulative impact of both together should be considered rather than the Borough Council taking a piecemeal approach."*
- *"The site despoils open countryside including a portion of the midshires way. The topology of the site is such that screening will be ineffective from vantage points anywhere south of the site, it is debatable how effective give any screening will be from other viewpoints."*

## **2.11 Consultation from Natural England**

2.11.1 Whilst I note that the ALC survey provided indicates that the land is Grade 3b or 4 and not best and most versatile land, the consultation response (CD 4.25) from Natural



England's states that *"Natural England would advise that any grant of planning permission should be made subject to conditions to safeguard soil resources, including the provision of soil resource information in line with the Defra guidance Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites."*

- 2.11.2 DEFRA Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites (2009) is included as CD 5.62.

## **2.12 Cumulative Solar Farm Context**

- 2.12.1 Consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm, Bunny Hill, Costock is located immediately to the west of the Appeal Site and shares boundaries with Fields 2, 3, 11 and 13 (of the proposed development).
- 2.12.2 The planning permission documents for 22/00303/FUL are accessed via CD 4.66 refer to the *"Construction of a solar farm and battery stations together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure, together with the formation of a new vehicular access onto Bunny Hill (A60), at land to north-east of Highfields Farm, Bunny Hill, Costock, Nottinghamshire."*
- 2.12.3 The site area of planning permission 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm is c. 81.58ha in size.
- 2.12.4 A landscape strategy plan accompanied the planning permission (Pegasus Drawing P20-1785\_10).
- 2.12.5 It has been agreed with the Council that this is the only other relevant solar scheme for the Appeal (for purposes of assessing cumulative effects).
- 2.12.6 Page 11 of the delegated officers report (2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023) confirmed that *"In terms of landscape character, it is stated that the site is within the 'Nottingham Wolds' landscape area. They acknowledge that the development would result in a temporary but long term loss of arable farmland, but overall, the principal pattern and elements that contribute to the Nottingham Wolds landscape character including field pattern and scale, woodlands, tree cover and hedgerows would remain and would be retaining and strengthening (by gapping up) of existing landscape features (primarily hedgerows). It is also noted that whilst the proposed development would be deemed "long-term" in*

*a human context, it is temporary (40 years) and fully reversible and therefore would have a very limited impact in terms of the underlying landscape context in perpetuity."*

2.12.7 Page 12 of the delegated officers report (2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023) confirmed that *"Overall, the LVIA in respect of landscape character notes that initially that there would be a "moderate adverse" impact to the change in the landscape, but this would be reduced to a "minor adverse" impact at year 15 as a result of moderate beneficial effects that would accrue in relation to water features, trees, scrub/woodland, hedgerows, and land cover. The external landscape advisor agrees with these conclusions but notes that the mitigation measure will only be achievable if the biodiversity management plan is fully implemented (which could be subject to a planning condition)."*

2.12.8 The Highfields LVIA concluded under paragraph 8.6 that *"Changes to the landscape would be moderate to minor and fully reversible on decommissioning"* and in paragraph 8.7 that *"With regard to landscape elements of the Site, overall, temporary (reversible) but long-term changes to land use and built form would be moderate adverse during operation of the solar farm, but this would in part be offset by moderate beneficial effects that would accrue in relation to water features, trees, scrub/woodland, hedgerows, and land cover. Effects upon topography and public rights of way would be neutral."*

2.12.9 The Highfields LVIA was prepared by Pegasus February 2022 and (as confirmed in paragraph 7.54 of the updated LVIA) identified 10 representative viewpoints which were subject to detailed visual assessment.

2.12.10 As confirmed in paragraph 8.9 of the Highfields LVIA, *"Of the viewpoints assessed, one viewpoint (Viewpoint 7) would experience major effects at Year 1, reducing to moderate by year 15. Two viewpoints (Viewpoints 2 and 4) would experience moderate effects at year 1, reducing to negligible by year 15. Four viewpoints (Viewpoints 1, 3, 8 and 9) would experience minor or minor to negligible effects, reducing to negligible by year 15. No change in the view experienced from three viewpoints (Viewpoints 5, 6 and 10) would lead to neutral effects."*

## **2.13 Minutes from the Planning Committee**

2.13.1 I also note the minutes from the Planning Committee, 12<sup>th</sup> June 2025 (CD 411) as follows: *"Members of the Committee expressed concern about the cumulative impact*

*from the proposed application on the landscaping and visual amenity of the area and the impact on the public right of way and thought that it would create an enclosed industrial corridor and would result in an industrialisation of the area. Members of the Committee also expressed concern about the impact on heritage and noted in particular the impact on the twelfth century church and said that the application would change the character of the area. The Committee also noted the potential fire safety risk from the battery storage which could result in contamination and which could require specific fire mitigation measures. The Committee also noted the impact caused by the application upon protected species including Skylarks, would not be outweighed by the benefits of the application.”*

## **2.14 Literature Review**

2.14.1 I have also carried out a literature review of solar-related landscape studies in other local authorities, and other solar project appeal decisions, such as:

- Appeal Decision 13 March 2024 - APP/W2845/W/23/3314266 - Land at Milton Road, Gayton, Northampton NN7 3HE (CD 7.56); and
- Appeal Decision 8 April 2024 - APP/N1920/W/22/3295268 - Land North of Butterfly Lane, Land Surrounding Hilfield Farm and Land West of Hilfield Lane, Aldenham, Hertfordshire (CD 7.57).

2.14.2 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 solar farm scheme, noted above.

#### **3.2 Landscape Baseline and Receptors**

3.2.1 GLVIA3 paragraph 5.4, bullet point 3 *“In rural landscapes, as defined in Chapter 2, Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) is the key tool for understanding the landscape and should be used for baseline studies. There is a well-established and widely used method for LCA, which is set out in current guidance documents. This should be used to identify and describe:*

- *the elements that make up the landscape...*
- *the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape – such as, for example, its scale, complexity, openness, tranquillity or wildness*
- *the overall character of the landscape in the study area.*

3.2.2 GLVIA3 paragraph 5.34, bullet point 2 *“the first step is to identify the components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme, often referred to as landscape receptors, such as overall character and key characteristics, individual elements and features, and specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects”*

3.2.3 Pegasus’s updated LVIA within Section 2.1 to 2.19 describes the baseline conditions for the Appeal Site and study area. Whilst the description of existing elements and features are generally accepted, I have detailed below the aspects of disagreement that I consider to be of relevance to my assessment.

3.2.4 In addition, I have provided my own baseline assessment of aesthetic or perceptual aspects relating to the Appeal Site as this appears to have been omitted from the Pegasus’ updated LVIA.

3.2.5 I have also summarised overall character and key characteristics of the Appeal Site and in relation to the wider areas, as I disagree with the published character assessments

identified in Pegasus' updated LVIA.

#### Landscape elements and features

- 3.2.6 The Appeal Site mainly productive farmland, consisting of arable cropping on the rising valley sides, with a smaller area of grazing pasture on the valley floor alongside the Kingston Brook. Part of the Appeal Site also follows the public highway network from the site access and through Wysall village, for the purposes of the proposed buried cable connection.
- 3.2.7 I note that Pegasus' updated LVIA in paragraph 2.1 suggests that *"the site comprises 2 separate parcels of land located in very close proximity to each other"* and in paragraph 2.4 reiterates the claims of the DAS suggesting that *"Arable fields separate the two parcels."* However, it is clear that as well as a block of woodland (Rough Plantation and Wysall Rough Plantation) being positioned between Field 7 and 11, the eastern extent of the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm would also be located between Fields 3 and 11 of the Appeal Site. This is illustrated by my Figure SH-2 which illustrates the Combined Fenced off Areas from Landscape Strategy Plans for Consented Development 22/00303/FUL and Appeal Site. As such the 2 parcels of land on the Appeal Site would effectively be joined by the consented solar development, once constructed.
- 3.2.8 In paragraph 2.3 of Pegasus' updated LVIA it is suggested that *"The inter-visibility between the Development's northern and southern parcels is limited due to the combination of the sloping landform and intervening hedgerows and woodlands"*. I would dispute this given the visibility of the two parcels from the PRoW (Wysall FP3 and Costock FP7) which extends between Wysall Conservation Area and Bunny Old Wood, as well as from Wysall FP4. For example, refer to Pegasus Baseline Context Viewpoint 8, located within the northern parcel with views over the southern parcel and my Context Photograph 5.
- 3.2.9 Pegasus' updated LVIA in paragraph 2.12 suggests that *"Due to this undulating landform and presence of well managed and relatively tall hedgerows and blocks of woodland, which are characteristic of this landscape, reciprocal views towards and into the interior of the site are limited or are relatively distant and interrupted by tree canopies."* Based on my own fieldwork, review of the Pegasus' LVIA Baseline Context Views (CD 2.16), and Barton Hyett Arboricultural Impact Assessment (CD 1.8), I don't accept that

relatively tall hedgerows are characteristic of the landscape within and around the Appeal Site. Pegasus' baseline photographs clearly show views over the top of hedges and as such, based on the stated camera heights of 1.5m above ground level (AGL), demonstrate relatively low hedgerows (managed in places to c 1.2-1.5m high) being characteristic of this landscape, with reference to following:

- Pegasus Context Viewpoint 1 (a and b), Southern section of Keyworth Road, near Wysall, looking south west. Date & time of photograph- 27/01/2022 Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photograph is looking over a tightly clipped hedge of c.1.2 to 1.5m high;
- Pegasus Context Viewpoint (2 a and b), Southern section of Bradmore Road, near Wysall, looking south west. Date & time of photograph- 27/01/2022 Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photograph is looking over a tightly clipped hedge of c.1.2 to 1.5m high;
- Pegasus Context Viewpoint 3 (a and b) Public Footpath and Rempstone Lane, near Wolds Farm. Date & time of photograph- 22/11/2023. Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photograph is looking over a tightly clipped hedge of c.1.5m high c.1.2 to 1.5m high;
- Pegasus Context Viewpoint 5 (a and b) Junction of Rempstone Lane and Wysall Road, southern edge of the site, looking north west. Date & time of photograph- 27/01/2022 Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photograph is looking over a tightly clipped hedge of c.1.2 to 1.5m high;
- Pegasus Context Viewpoint 6 (a and b) Nottingham Road/ Bunny Hill road, grass verge, looking east. Date & time of photograph- 27/01/2022 Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photograph is looking over a tightly clipped hedge of c.1.2 to 1.5m high; and
- Pegasus Context Viewpoint 8 (a to e) Public Footpath Costock FP7 and Public Footpath Wysall FP3 / Midshires Way within the northern parcel of the site. Date & time of photograph- 27/01/2022 Height of Camera AGL is 1.5m. Photographs include tightly clipped hedges of c.1.2 to 1.5m high.

3.2.10 My Figure SH-5 shows a comparison between Barton Hyatt Arb Survey plan (CD 1.8) and TLP Viewpoint B (existing view):

- H5 extends alongside road on Barton Hyatt plan, report identifies average height 1.75m – TLP Viewpoint B photo shows it below camera height;
- H4 extends north from farm buildings on Barton Hyatt plan, report identifies average height 4m – TLP Viewpoint B photo shows it lower.

3.2.11 Pegasus' updated LVIA in paragraph 2.14 suggests that *"The village of Wysall and Costock both lie in close proximity, but the intervening vegetation prevents from gaining any direct or unrestricted views."* I disagree with this having walked around the Appeal Site and noted views of windows at several dwellings within Wysall, as illustrated by my Context Photographs 6 and 7. Wysall is c. 500m away from the Appeal Site and extends over elevated ground (of 65-85m AOD). In addition, there is a defined Significant View in the Wysall Conservation Area Appraisal from Costock Road, which I consider to be from within the village and has views of the Appeal site, as illustrated by Mr Partington's Figure 23. I agree that intervening vegetation prevents views from Costock, which is c. 900m away to the south-west on lower lying ground (50-55m AOD) south of Kingston Brook.

3.2.12 Although not mentioned in the Pegasus' updated LVIA, as indicated on my Context Photograph 4 there is a waymarker post on PRow Wysall FP3 within the Appeal Site referring to Notts Wolds Way. This route is described in the online booklet published by Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society as *"traverses an area exceptionally rich in the natural and cultural heritage of Nottinghamshire"* (CD. 5.62). I have included an excerpt from this guide covering the Points of Interest and Walk Guide along the section of the route between Bunny Old Wood and Wysall in Figures SH-3 and SH-4, highlighting the following passage:

- *"Turn left and then right to reach a gate and fingerpost at the top of wood. The path crosses a large arable field slightly diagonally left, to reach a foot bridge and marker post. Cross the next field diagonally right to reach a track and marker post at a junction of paths. Bear slightly right across a short stretch of arable field before reaching a field-edge section with hedge left."*

3.2.13 The large arable field at the top of the Appeal Site by Bunny Old Wood (as described in the Notts Wolds Way online booklet) appears on the OS Six Inch 1830s-1880s included in Figure SH-5.

3.2.14 The elevated northern part of the Appeal Site is at c. 85m AOD and around 25m higher than the Kingston Brook at c. 60m AOD along the south of the Appeal Site.

3.2.15 I would also note that Lodge Farm, adjacent to the east of the Appeal Site, has prior approval for the conversion of existing barns into dwellings (Ref. No: 24/01542/PAQ, validated 13<sup>th</sup> September 2024). This is not mentioned in updated LVIA (dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 2024), but would potentially introduce additional residential receptors if work proceeds.

#### Aesthetic and perceptual aspects

3.2.16 Pegasus' updated LVIA only addresses elements that make up the landscape and overall character and appears to be lacking a clear and robust appraisal of the existing aesthetic and perceptual baseline.

3.2.17 For example, a word search of Pegasus' updated LVIA for "aesthetics" and "aesthetic" shows only 1 result and that is a quote from the WWA Review:-

- paragraph 4.19. *"it is not clear whether the proposals would have direct or residual effects on the aesthetic, recreational or perceptual qualities of the Public Rights of Way or the Long Distance Path..."*

3.2.18 A search for the words "perceptual" in Pegasus' updated LVIA gets 8 results, although 1 of those is also from the WWA quote above. A selection is included below:

- paragraph 5.1 – *"This section seeks to establish how the Development would potentially affect the character of the local landscape. The effects on landscape character consider how the introduction of new landscape elements and built form physically alter the landform, landcover, landscape pattern, and perceptual attributes of the site or how visibility of the proposals changes the way in which landscape character is perceived."*
- paragraph 5.17 is a quote from the Council's published Landscape Sensitivity Study, which relates to wind energy schemes, *"A single medium rating has been assigned to Perceptual qualities with a single high rating for Intervisibility factor."*
- paragraph 5.50. *"With regard to the neighbouring NW02 and NW03, the*



*Development is not located within these landscapes. Thus, any effects would be indirect and relate to the perceptual and sensory aspects of these two Draft Policy Zones.”*

- paragraph 7.35. *“In reality, only the perceptual aspect of the local landscape would be affected - i.e., views of the countryside and its appreciation.”*

3.2.19 I have compiled my own assessment of the baseline aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape the Appeal Site below (using the examples from GLIVA3).

#### *Scale*

3.2.20 A word search for “scale” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA identifies several in relation to the baseline landscape:

- paragraph 2.1 *“the northern parcel includes 9 medium to large scale field enclosures with Bradmore Road forming, in parts, its eastern boundary.”*
- paragraph 4.22. *“A single small scale watercourses drains the northern parcel of the site.”*
- paragraph 5.30. is in relation to The Council's published Arup's Study and LAU A 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarp and that *“The LAU has an overarching rural character though agriculture is commonly medium to large scale and of modern pattern”*

3.2.21 Based on my own fieldwork, I conclude that the overall baseline scale of the Appeal Site is currently medium (albeit with some smaller scale elements such as Kingston Brook watercourse and Holy Trinity Church spire and larger scale elements, such as certain fields and adjacent woodland blocks).

#### *Complexity*

3.2.22 A word search for “complexity” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA identifies only 1 mention, with 1 mention of ‘simple’, as follows:

- paragraph 4.12. refers to *“Overall, the prevailing simple and gently sloping, and locally level, landform of the site....”*

- paragraph 7.29. refers to *“The two approved solar farms closest to the site increase the complexity of the host landscape, but its working agricultural character would remain unchanged with the two approved solar farms in place.”*

3.2.23 Based on my own fieldwork, I conclude that the Appeal Site is currently simple (gently sloping topography, muted greens and browns, combination of fields, hedgerows and trees) and that there would be an increase in complexity on the adjacent fields, as a result of the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm, with the addition of solar panels, BESS, tracks and CCTV.

#### *Openness*

3.2.24 A word search for “openness” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA identifies only 4 mentions, as follows:

- paragraph 5.45. under section titled Effect upon the Character of the Site *“...the offset between the proposed panels in the individual field enclosures - for example between Field 1 and Field 2, Field 4, and between Field 8 and Field 9 would help mitigate against the introduced change and preserve a sense of openness.”*
- paragraph 5.45. under section titled Effect upon the Character of the Site *“It is important to reiterate that the proposed layout has sought to provide a considerable separation buffer along PRowS within the site, in order to reduce the adverse effects, whilst retaining the sense of openness experienced along these routes”*
- paragraph 6.39. in section relating to views from the southern part of the study area and Public Footpath Costock FP4, *“...Despite the relative elevation and openness, views towards the site continue to be screened by the intervening linear block of woodland.”*
- paragraph 6.57. *“...new hedgerows and hedgerow trees screening and filtering the views, whilst aiming to retain a degree of visual openness.”*

- 3.2.25 Based on my own fieldwork, I conclude that the Appeal Site currently has an obvious sense of openness (with a range of views over sloping fields, crops and tightly clipped hedgerows).

#### *Tranquillity*

- 3.2.26 A word search for “tranquillity” and “tranquil” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA identifies only 2 mentions, plus one incorrect spelling, as follows:

- paragraph 5.18. Referring to The Council’s published Landscape Sensitivity Study, which relates to wind energy schemes Draft Policy Zone NW01 ‘Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps’. The ‘Summary of Key Sensitive Features and Views’ in the published assessment identifies the following: *“Areas that are more tranquil and remote in character such as hill tops and higher ground.”*
- paragraph 5.45. under section titled Effect upon the Character of the Site *“The proposals would have some limited degree of change upon the perception of relative tranquilly due to the presence of this new built form...”*

- 3.2.27 Based on my own fieldwork, I conclude that the Appeal Site currently has an obvious sense of tranquillity (being a rural area of mainly farmland), albeit with road noise and overhead planes descending to East Midlands Airport perceptible at certain times during my fieldwork. The CPRE’s online Night Lights Mapping shows the Appeal Site as within the Darker category (see my Figure SH-6).

#### *Wildness*

- 3.2.28 A word search for “wildness” and “wild” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA has no results.
- 3.2.29 I consider that the Appeal Site does not currently have any obvious sense of wildness, being in the main managed farmland (albeit with mature trees and adjacent to an area of Ancient Woodland).

#### *Beauty*

- 3.2.30 I am also aware that the study of aesthetics also relates to concepts of beauty more generally and in terms of landscape, within NPPF, paragraph 187 there is reference to *“recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”*.

3.2.31 A word search for “beauty” in Pegasus’ updated LVIA has 2 mentions, both in relation to designations.

- paragraph 5.2. *“The site does not fall within any statutory landscape designations. The review of the Council’s website and Local Plan did not reveal any non-statutory local landscape designations either. Therefore, the site is not constrained by any landscape designations that relate to its value or scenic beauty.”*
- paragraph 7.19. *“The site and established study area for the identified cumulative schemes do not fall within any statutory landscape designations. Therefore, the site and local landscape are not constrained by any landscape designations that relate to its value or scenic beauty.”*

3.2.32 Notwithstanding the absence of designations, I consider that the countryside of the Appeal Site does have intrinsic beauty, not least by virtue of its medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity, resulting from being part of a rural area of mainly farmland, with woodland blocks. This distinctiveness and appeal is enhanced by the views of heritage assets such as Holy Trinity Church spire and Highfields (Listed Buildings), ecological features, such as Bunny Old Wood, as well as long distance views of the Nottinghamshire Wolds and Charnwood from elevated areas.

#### Overall character and key characteristics

##### *National Character Areas*

3.2.33 Pegasus’ updated LVIA in paragraph 5.4 states that *“the site and study area fall within the National Character Area (NCA) 74 ‘Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds’”*.

3.2.34 I have reviewed Natural England’s website and whilst I would agree that most of the Appeal Site and surrounding area are located within the NCA 74, part of the northern parcel (and northern study area beyond) is within NCA 48 ‘Trent and Belvoir Vales’, as illustrated by Figure SH-7.

3.2.35 Nevertheless, I agree that it is not necessary to assess these NCAs as specific landscape receptors for the Appeal due to their large geographical extent.

3.2.36 I would also make reference to Charnwood, NCA 73 which under the summary is described as *“a unique landscape, marked out by its geology and upland qualities, which*

*contrast with the surrounding gentle lowlands. It is formed by a mosaic of heathland, farmland, parkland and woodland. The underlying Precambrian geology has given rise to the distinct area of land characterised by exposures of rugged, rocky outcrops.”* This distinctive elevated land mass<sup>2</sup> is visible in long-distance views from the PRoW in the northern parcel of the Appeal Site, adding to a sense of place and visual amenity.

#### *Local Landscape Assessments*

3.2.37 Pegasus’ updated LVIA in paragraph 5.10 refers to the GNLCA and that *“It appears that the site falls within the ‘Nottinghamshire Wolds’ Regional Character Area, and the eastern most part of Draft Policy Zone NW01 ‘Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps’.*

3.2.38 Paragraph 5.19 Pegasus’ updated LVIA also refers to SFLSCS, with the Appeal Site *“being part of Landscape Assessment Unit LAU A ‘Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps’.*

3.2.39 Pegasus’ updated LVIA 5.50. states that *“With regard to the neighbouring NW02 and NW03, the Development is not located within these landscapes.”*

3.2.40 I have reviewed these documents and whilst I would agree that most of the Appeal Site and surrounding area to the west are located within NW01 / LAU1, a relatively small part of the Appeal Site (relating to the areas around each of the new site access points into each parcel and the buried cable connection between the parcels) is located within the adjacent ‘Widmerpool Clay Wolds’ which is referenced as NW03 / LAUC. This area extends for over 1km to the east and south. This is clearly shown on Site Location & Context Plan in Pegasus’ updated LVIA Drawing Number P21-2533\_EN\_02.

3.2.41 To the immediate north of the Appeal Site is ‘Ruddington Alluvial Farmland’ which is referenced as SN04 / LAU G and also extending for over 1km northwards.

3.2.42 The key characteristics of these published landscape character areas are available within these documents and I have not repeated here, with the exception of the following from the most recent description of LAU A:

- *Prominent hills.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Charnwood Forest’s UNESCO Global Geopark application was submitted to UNESCO in December 2025. ([www.charnwoodforest.org](http://www.charnwoodforest.org))

- *Largely rural character.*
- *Modern field pattern.*
- *Woodland on higher ground.*
- *Channelled views on lower ground and extensive views from higher ground.*

3.2.43 I do also note that the NW01 description referred to how *“Kingston Brook is a localised feature on low ground between hills characterised by riparian woodland and some grazing pasture at its margins”* and that this passes through the Appeal Site.

3.2.44 The NW01 description also referred to how *“Church towers and spires are prominent within a uniform village skyline”*, and I have noted that Holy Trinity Church (Grade I) spire at Wysall is visible on the skyline from locations within and around the Appeal Site.

3.2.45 I have carried out desk and field work and have identified that the Appeal Site and study area broadly displays the landscape characteristics as those identified in the published studies.

3.2.46 I also recognise that the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm will be added to the immediate west of the Appeal Site, introducing a new element. Most of this adjacent solar project will be located within NW01, however a small area of solar arrays and secondary access will be located in NW03.

#### Landscape Receptors

3.2.47 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.

3.2.48 The summary of landscape receptors, identified in Pegasus’ updated LVIA (Sections 4 and 5) is as follows:

- Ground Cover Vegetation;
- Topography;
- Tree and Hedge Resource;

- PRow;
- Water Features;
- Character of the Appeal Site; and
- Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'.

3.2.49 In respect to 'Ground Cover Vegetation', I note that the draft Statement of Common Ground provided by the Appellant renamed this as 'Land cover'. I would consider that this receptor is better referred to as 'Land cover' and as such I have used this in my re-assessment.

3.2.50 In addition, I have added the following landscape receptors, which I consider to be missing from Pegasus' updated LVIA:

- Aesthetic and perceptual aspects (medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity); and
- Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'.

### 3.3 Landscape Effects

#### Landscape Value

3.3.1 Paragraph 5.27 of the updated LVIA states that *"In summary, the value of the local landscape is considered to be medium, being a pleasant working undesignated countryside, and without any demonstrable physical attributes that would take it out of the ordinary."*

3.3.2 My assessment of landscape value for the Appeal 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".

3.3.3 I have concluded that the Appeal Site as a whole should be identified as Medium to High landscape value, although would note the following localised variation:

- the southern parcel of the Appeal Site is Medium, being typical of 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' and 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds';

- the northern parcel of the Appeal Site rises to Medium-High landscape value due to the presence of the PRow which offers recreational opportunities where the experience of the landscape is important and is a promoted route (as both Notts Wolds Way and Midshires Way), connecting the ecological interest of Bunny Old Wood (Ancient Woodland and Nature Reserve) with the cultural interest of Wysall Conservation Area and Holy Trinity Church (Grade I), and with extensive views from higher ground / scenic quality (including towards the distant rugged skyline of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds); and
- the proposed route of the buried cable connection which passes through the Wysall Conservation Area, has a high landscape value.

3.3.4 I also note that the Appeal Site is visible from outwards views from Wysall Conservation Area, including defined 'Significant Views' in the CAAMP and also permissive footpath routes connecting the edge of the village to PRow.

#### Landscape Sensitivity

3.3.5 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.

3.3.6 I broadly accept Pegasus' updated LVIA sensitivity of Medium for land cover and topography at the Appeal Site and of Medium for hedgerows and High for the tree resource. I have also identified Medium-High sensitivity for the PRow and watercourses.

3.3.7 I agree that the Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' is of Medium sensitivity and have also identified Medium sensitivity for 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'.

3.3.8 I note that this has regard to the condition and strength of the area (as identified in the relevant detailed and summary descriptions in the GNLCA),

- 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' - Good Landscape Condition and Strong Landscape Strength; and



- ‘Widmerpool Clay Wolds’ - Good Landscape Condition and Strong Landscape Strength.

3.3.9 I also note that SFLSCS identified character area LAU A as medium sensitivity (as a result of its medium value and medium susceptibility to change). However, I am also aware that *“The landscape does contain areas of larger scale modern fields on lower ground and areas influenced by existing large-scale built form which are more appropriate for solar farm development however, future baseline development 22/00303/FUL utilises a substantial area of land to the east of the LAU and this reduces its overall potential for large scale solar farm development.”*

3.3.10 LAU A: Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps is identified as having a ‘Low’ capacity for large scale solar projects (relating to those of 61 - 100ha). The Appeal Site is within the parameters to be considered as a large scale solar project.

3.3.11 With reference to Table 33 in SFLSCS, which summarises the findings and judgements of the study for each LAU, LAU A: Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps is one of 1 of 8 areas which are identified as having a ‘low’ capacity for large scale solar, whilst 3 areas have ‘moderate’ capacity for large scale solar and 3 areas have a ‘high’ capacity for large scale solar.

3.3.12 In terms of the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity, I have identified these as being of Medium sensitivity.

3.3.13 I disagree with Pegasus’ updated LVIA of Medium sensitivity for the Appeal Site and consider this to be more appropriately described as Medium to High. This is due to the range of factors which increase landscape value, already described above.

#### Magnitude of Landscape Change

3.3.14 My assessment of the magnitude of landscape change for the proposed development in isolation 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.

3.3.15 My assessment of cumulative magnitude of change in relation to local landscape character is set out in the Table SH-5 based on the addition of the Appeal Site, with the

other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm.

- 3.3.16 I have split the 40-year operational phase into Year 1 and Year 15, as per the approach within Pegasus' updated LVIA. Although I note that this overall duration can be considered to be effectively permanent in landscape terms (see GLVIA3<sup>3</sup>, Milton Road Appeal Decision 3314266<sup>4</sup> and Aldenham Appeal Decision 3295268<sup>5</sup>).
- 3.3.17 I have not assessed the effects after decommissioning, as at restoration all structures would be removed and the land returned to agricultural use.
- 3.3.18 There would be a negligible change to water features. There would be negligible magnitude of change upon tree resource in Year 1 rising to low beneficial by Year 15, as there will be a delay for any new tree planting to establish. There would be a low adverse magnitude of change to the hedgerow resource in Year 1 rising to medium magnitude in Year 15. I have identified a low and adverse change to topography and a medium adverse magnitude of change upon the land cover within the Appeal Site.
- 3.3.19 The updated LVIA in paragraph 4.18. states that "*The Development would not have any direct physical or residual effects upon any of the PRowS within the site during its operational stage.*" However, my review of both landscape strategy plans indicate obstructions to the PRow and as such I conclude that there would be a high adverse magnitude of change upon these landscape elements.
- 3.3.20 There would also be high adverse magnitude of change upon aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the Appeal Site as well as its overall landscape character.
- 3.3.21 Taken in isolation the proposed development would result in a low adverse magnitude of change upon the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' and negligible to low change upon 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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"

<sup>4</sup> Appeal Decision 3314266 Land at Milton Road paragraph 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 7.56)

<sup>5</sup> Appeal Decision 3295268 Aldenham - paragraph 262. "Although thirty-five years is not permanent, it is a significant amount of time; it has been recognised in the recent appeals refusing permission for solar farms that even twenty-five years is a significant period of time such that "for a generation of local people it might as well be permanent so that in terms of the weight to be applied to the harm to openness there is little distinction to be made" and that it "comprises a substantial part of the average person's lifetime". (CD 7.57)

- 3.3.22 However, my assessment of the cumulative magnitude of change of the proposals with the other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL upon the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' would be a medium adverse. The cumulative magnitude of change for 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds' would be low and adverse.
- 3.3.23 The proposals would introduce new industrialising elements to the landscape, with the inverters, BESS and substation introducing a fundamental change to agricultural land, experienced from several well-used PRowS that pass through the Appeal Site (also see Milton Road Appeal Decision 3314266<sup>6</sup> and Aldenham Appeal Decision 3295268<sup>7</sup>). The addition of 4km stone access tracks in conjunction with 10km perimeter fencing would erode and detract from the field pattern within the Appeal Site.
- 3.3.24 The existing soils would be stripped from the access tracks and concrete plinths / foundations of the infrastructure and I have assumed that they would need to be stored in distinctive stockpiles to allow for their recovery and later reuse as part of the proposals to restore the Appeal site back to agriculture<sup>8</sup> (although there were no soil bunds indicated on the submitted plans). Refer to my Figure SH-16 showing an example of clearly defined stockpiling of different soil materials and new topographical features.
- 3.3.25 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 diminish the defined largely rural landscape character, with expansive views. There would be a noticeable loss of the rural patchwork of fields perceptible from the PRow.
- 3.3.26 All external boundary hedges and all hedges within the site would be managed and maintained at a minimum of 3m. If cutting is carried out in the winter to avoid birds nesting season (typically February/March to September) then hedges would exceed 3m

---

<sup>6</sup> Appeal Decision 3314266 Land at Milton Road paragraph 10.28 *"The introduction of panels and other infrastructure on the northern parcel would be another element of a more industrial, man-made character than the wider rural context, and the existing fields are in and of themselves valuable as an open and rural element providing some contrast to detractors already within the landscape.."* (CD 7.56)

<sup>7</sup> Appeal Decision 3295268 Aldenham - paragraph 152 *"Several well-used PRowS pass alongside and through the site. The experience of walking these paths will be fundamentally changed. It would cease to be an experience of walking through an open agrarian landscape and would be transformed into an experience of walking alongside or between either mesh fencing or structural planting which would by turns reveal and conceal the industrialising effects of the solar development."* (CD 7.57)

<sup>8</sup> DEFRA Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, page 20 *"Careful management of topsoil and subsoil is an important aspect of sustainable use of materials that are being stripped, whether for sale off-site or for retaining on-site for later landscape preparation. Without a proper Soil Resource Plan there is the risk of losing, damaging or contaminating valuable soil resources.."* (CD 5.62)

in height by the end of summer. This would be contrary to the baseline landscape character where hedges are often maintained to c1.2m- 1.5m by tractor mounted flail and would result in adverse effects upon aesthetic and perceptual aspects (by increasing visual enclosure). There would also be horizontal growth over the summer, with potential for obstructions of footpaths<sup>9</sup>.

- 3.3.27 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 rural character of mixed farming, would be neutral in nature.
- 3.3.28 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.
- 3.3.29 There are views of the distinctive roof of Highfields from along Costock PF7 PRoW within the Appeal Site. See my Context Photographs 2b and 3 taken from near to the overhead cables between Fields 1 and 2. These extensive views from higher ground include the rugged area of Charnwood at 15km away, beyond the Nottinghamshire Wolds. The consented scheme (planning ref: 22/00303/FUL) is beyond the Appeal Site boundary hedge and would not obscure the roof line of the Listed Building (or the wider landscape context of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds). However, the proposed scheme would bring solar panels closer to the footpath (Field 2) and at this location would obscure the distinctive roof line of the Listed Building (and the wider landscape context of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds). The proposed mitigation hedgerows would then be in front of and closer to the PRoW and form a further barrier obscuring views of the heritage asset.
- 3.3.30 Holy Trinity Church (Grade I) spire is also visible in my Context Photograph 2a, looking to the south-east, just to the right of the footpath. It's a relatively small feature and set down amongst vegetation / backgrounded but nevertheless forms part of the rich cultural heritage perceived by users of the footpath. The fencing, solar panels and mitigation planting in the eastern end of Field 2 and around Fields 4 will obscure and/or detract views of this heritage asset for users of the PRoW travelling southwards towards

---

<sup>9</sup> Via Notts Obstructions on Public Rights of Way: Hedges, Trees and Shrubs leaflet *"Overgrown hedges next to paths pose a hazard to people who are disabled or visually impaired and young children or other pedestrians who risk injury or damage to themselves or their clothing from thorns and branches. If the path is narrow or the obstruction is excessive, they may be prevented from using the path, forcing them to use a long route around."* (CD 5.63)

Wysall (Conservation Area).

3.3.31 The 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would make no alteration to the overall landscape assessment gradings. There would be an increase in visual enclosure for certain locations through additional planting intended to fill in gaps and correct omissions in the original submission. The 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would also avoid the unnecessary encroachment onto PRow Wysall FP4 from poorly designed security fencing, which appears to have arisen due to a draughting error in the submitted plans. There would still however, be an obstruction of PRow Wysall FP3.

#### Summary of Landscape Effects

3.3.32 My assessment of the overall landscape effects for the proposed development in isolation is set out in the Table SH-6 below, with cumulative effects in Table SH-7. These gradings combine my judgements of sensitivity with magnitude of change, for each receptor.

3.3.33 Changes to topography would be minor and adverse and changes to water features would be negligible and neutral. The changes to landcover would be moderate adverse at Year 1 and Year 15. There would be minor adverse effects on the hedgerow resource in Year 1, rising to moderate by Year 15, with moderate beneficial effects to the tree resource by Year 15.

3.3.34 However, there would be major and adverse effects upon the PRow, aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the Appeal Site and its overall landscape character, with the obstruction of footpath routes, creation of a large-scale and complex industrial facility, with reduced openness and tranquillity. This would not be mitigated by the establishment of the additional tree and hedgerow planting which is intended to screen and enclose the facility. The alternative enhanced landscape strategy would not alter these gradings.

3.3.35 The effect upon the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps' of the proposed development in isolation would be minor and adverse, rising to moderate adverse cumulative effect, when considering the proposed development in conjunction with the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL. The proposals would create a new dominant industrial feature, which conflicts with the mainly rural

character of the landscape, have an adverse effect on characteristic extensive views obtained from higher ground and diminish a sense of place (for example by obscuring views of heritage assets).

- 3.3.36 The effect upon the Local Landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds' of the proposed development in isolation would be negligible to minor and adverse, rising to minor adverse cumulative effects, when considering the proposed development in conjunction with the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL. A small area of solar arrays and secondary access at the consented project will be located in this character area, with additional access points for the proposed development, cable route and changes to outward views (thereby influencing 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 consented solar project 22/00303/FUL, noted above.

### **4.2 General Extent of Visibility**

- 4.2.1 Pegasus's Updated LVIA included a screened zone of theoretical visibility and viewpoint location plan (in Figure P21\_2533\_EN\_01) for the proposals. This identified theoretical visibility primarily extending for approximately 1km to the east and west and 2km to the south (including the southwest and southeast) of the Appeal Site. Visibility to the north was restricted by woodland. There were also intermittent patches of theoretical visibility beyond this distance in all directions.
- 4.2.2 The application for the adjacent consented solar project also included a screened zone of theoretical visibility with viewpoint locations (in Figure P20\_1785\_08) for the proposals. This identified a similar spread of theoretical visibility primarily extending for approximately 1km to the east and west and 2km to the south (including the southwest and southeast). Visibility to the north was restricted by woodland. There were also intermittent patches of theoretical visibility beyond this distance in all directions.
- 4.2.3 In other words, the two adjacent projects have similar and overlapping zones of theoretical visibility, suggesting that they would most likely be perceived together at the same time and from the same locations. For example, from TLP Photomontage location at Viewpoint E in Pegasus' Updated LVIA. This is described in GLVIA3 as 'combined' cumulative visual effects.
- 4.2.4 Successive cumulative visual effects are also likely, where the two 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. For example, from the PRoW on the edge of Bunny Old Wood.
- 4.2.5 Finally, sequential cumulative visual effect are also likely where the two projects are seen as a visual receptor moves along a transport route or footpath, such as along

Wysall Road to the south of both sites (and passing by access points to each).

- 4.2.6 As part of my fieldwork, I have concluded that visibility would extend beyond localised, due to its valley side position and approximate elevation range of 25m. Visibility to the north would be restricted by the adjacent Bunny Old Wood and to the east by vegetation between Bradmore Road, Keyworth Road and around Wysall. However, visibility to the south would extend for c. 2km, around Windyridge Road to the southeast, Hill Farm, Peatlands Farm and Oak Tree Farm to the south and around Canaan Farm and along part of the Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill Road - A60 to the southwest.
- 4.2.7 This is consistent with WWA Review and Response to Updated LVIA which referenced adverse effects *“would not be restricted to localised areas and these effects would be experienced and felt by people using recreational routes and public footpaths from a number of longer and medium distance areas in the wider countryside.”*

### **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 The Study Area includes the following visual receptors:
- Users of PRoW within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way;
  - Users of PRoW to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8, HG61/3 and Thorpe in the Glebe FP7);
  - Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site (this may also include future development of dwellings in the barns at Lodge Farm); and
  - Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge;
  - Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site,



including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm; and

- Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60.

4.3.3 8 representative viewpoints were used within Pegasus' Updated LVIA, supported by 2 photomontages, with a further 6 photomontages produced by TLP.

4.3.4 I consider this to be inadequate and not consistent with the approach used in the LVIA for the adjacent project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm (also prepared by Pegasus February 2022) which identified 10 representative viewpoints which were subject to detailed visual assessment.

4.3.5 I would suggest that the following views should have been specifically assessed as part of the LVIA during the application stage:

- the 'Significant Views' from track leading from Costock Road in the southwest Wysall Conservation Area (my Context Photographs 14 and 16); and
- my Context Photograph 8, from Costock FP4 next to the memorial bench near to Canaan Farm looking north-east towards Appeal Site.

4.3.6 I have carried out detailed assessment of these viewpoint locations.

4.3.7 Nevertheless, I have visited and reviewed the 8 viewpoints from the LVIA and considered the experience of the visual receptors more generally, for example sequential views along sections of footpath or road.

4.3.8 For example, my Context Photograph 9 from the footpath alongside A60. In addition, there are views from other PRoW to the south, such as Thorpe in the Glebe FP7, near to Windyridge Farm (as illustrated at Figure 26 in Mr Partington's Heritage Impact Assessment) and from Bradmore Road at the north of Wysall Conservation Areas (as illustrated at Mr Partington's Figure 22). These further locations would have been useful to assess as part of the LVIA during the application stage. Figure SH-8 is my mark up of Pegasus' Site Location & Context Plan to show the location of my 13 additional context photographs and 3 locations selected from Mr Partington's Heritage Impact

Assessment, included in Appendix 3.

4.3.9 In addition, I have also reviewed the 10 viewpoints in Highfields LVIA, with Highfield VP1 at same location as TLP Viewpoint C, Highfields VP3 at same location at TLP Viewpoint D, Highfields VP7 at same location as TLP Viewpoint E and Highfields VP8 at same location as TLP Viewpoint A. Highfields VP4 is the same location as my Context Photograph 5. These are included in my detailed assessment tables.

4.3.10 There is over 1.2km of public footpath (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4) which extend through the Appeal Site and connect to other PRoWs to the north and east. Wysall FP3 extends for a further 1km to the edge of Wysall. This footpath route connects the historic village of Wysall with Bunny Old Wood Nature Reserve and is promoted as part of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way. These routes offer recreational opportunities where experience of the rural landscape is important.

4.3.11 A PRoW (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3) which extends for over 3km from Costock to Wysall Road, Wymeswold, via Wysall Lane is also well used for recreation by local residents, with a memorial bench near Canaan Farm (See my Context Photograph 8) as well as forming part of the wider rural rights of way network.

#### **4.4 Visual Effects**

4.4.1 I have used the visualisations provided in Pegasus' Updated LVIA, as part of my review of visual effects.

4.4.2 Cumulative visualisations have not been submitted to assist decision-makers. I consider this to be below the required standard, especially given the request as part of the WWA initial consultation response (CD 4.64):

- *"I would also expect that a cumulative visual assessment be provided and supported up by cumulative wireframes set beneath photographs and / or photomontages prepared from key viewpoints to illustrate the magnitude of cumulative visual effects (which can also be useful to illustrate the nature and degree of cumulative change to the landscape)."*

4.4.3 Photomontages originally prepared for the planning application for the adjacent consented solar project 22/00303/FUL have been re-submitted and need to be reviewed alongside the separate photomontages prepared for the proposed

development, adjacent. Nevertheless, it is clear that that the additional solar arrays and associated infrastructure resulting from the proposed development would noticeably and directly extend those at the consented site 22/00303/FUL.

4.4.4 My assessment of the visual sensitivity for each receptor category is set out in the Table SH-8 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.

4.4.5 In summary, the visual receptors which have a high sensitivity to the proposed changes include users of PRow within and around the site, users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way, as well as local residents. Users of the local road network are identified as medium sensitivity.

#### Magnitude of Visual Effects

4.4.6 My assessment of the magnitude of visual change for each viewpoint for the proposed development in isolation is set out in the Table SH-9 below and for each visual receptor in Table SH-10, where I have taken account of size or scale of change, geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration.

4.4.7 My assessment of cumulative magnitude of change at each viewpoint is then set out in Table SH-11 and for each receptor in Table SH-12 based on the addition of the Appeal Site, with the other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm.

4.4.8 I have split the 40-year operational phase into Year 1 and Year 15, as per the approach within Pegasus' updated LVIA. As noted above, this overall duration can be considered to be effectively permanent in visual terms.

4.4.9 I have not assessed the effects after decommissioning, as at restoration all structures would be removed and the land returned to agricultural use.

4.4.10 There would be no change to views at Viewpoint 1 on Keyworth Road and Viewpoint 6 on Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill Road indicating the limits of visibility for the proposed development.

4.4.11 There would be a negligible to low magnitude of change at Viewpoint 4 on the PRow between Rempstone Lane and Wysall and TLP Photomontage F from PRow H62/1. The

other consented project is not predicted to be visible at these locations.

- 4.4.12 There would be a low magnitude at Viewpoint 2 on the southern section of Bradmore Road, near Wysall and TLP Photomontage B, from Bradmore Road in Year 1, where there would be some change in the view which is appreciable. This would then reduce to negligible by Year 15 due to the positive influence of mitigation planting. The other consented project is not predicted to be visible at these locations.
- 4.4.13 There would be a medium magnitude of change at Viewpoint 7 PRoW / Midshires Way between Wysall and the site in Year 1. This would then reduce to low by Year 15 due to the positive influence of mitigation planting. The other consented project comprises a small part of the view, beyond the Appeal Site and as such the cumulative magnitude of change would remain as medium.
- 4.4.14 There would be medium magnitude of change in Year 1 for CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west. This would then reduce to low by Year 15 due to the positive influence of mitigation planting. The other consented project would not be visible at this location and as such no cumulative effect is predicted.
- 4.4.15 There would be a low magnitude of change at Viewpoint 3 PRoW and Rempstone Lane, near Wolds Farm and TLP Photomontage E from PRoW Costock FP4, when the proposed development is taken in isolation. Hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect at these locations due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. When taking into account the consent project the cumulative magnitude would rise to medium as there would be change in the view that is clearly visible and occupying a larger proportion of these views.
- 4.4.16 There would be a high magnitude at Viewpoint 5 on the junction of Rempstone Lane and Wysall Road at Year 1, where there would be change that has a substantial influence on the overall view. This would then reduce to medium by Year 15 due to the positive influence of mitigation planting. The other consented project comprises a relatively small part of the view, beyond the Appeal Site and as such the cumulative magnitude of change would also be high, reducing to medium by Year 15.
- 4.4.17 There would be a high magnitude at Viewpoint 8 Costock FP7 / Wysall FP3 and TLP Photomontage D. The other consented project is not predicted to be visible at these

locations.

- 4.4.18 There would be a high magnitude at TLP Photomontage C PRow Costock FP7 and Midshires Way. Hedgerow management and tree planting on the submitted scheme would have screening effect at this location by Year 15 and during the summer, when in leaf. However, this would in turn reduce the wide expansive views currently obtained at this location.
- 4.4.19 There would be a high magnitude at Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4 Wysall FP4. The other consented project comprises a relatively small part of the view, beyond the Appeal Site and as such the cumulative magnitude of change would also be high. Hedgerow management and tree planting on the submitted scheme would have limited screening effect at this location due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. The 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would include an additional hedge and trees along the northside of PRow Wysall FP4, creating a corridor (in conjunction with the existing hedge) and this would inevitably reduce the wide expansive views currently obtained along this route. The submitted scheme has no hedge alongside the fence.
- 4.4.20 The ability of the public to appreciate and enjoy the rural character from the PRows within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way (and Notts Wolds Way) would be diminished and adversely impacted by the proposed development, with a high magnitude of change overall. This is the same either as the proposed development taken in isolation, or cumulatively with the consented solar project. The enhanced landscape strategy would not alter these gradings.
- 4.4.21 Open and expansive views 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 industrialised corridor effects or passageways, altering the recreational experience. It would also obscure views of the Wolds and Charnwood which is perceptible over part of the northern parcel as well as heritage assets of Highfields and Holy Trinity Church Spire (Listed Buildings).
- 4.4.22 The proposed development would be visible for users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8, HG61/3 and Thorpe in the Glebe FP7). The magnitude of change of the proposed development taken in isolation for

these receptors would be negligible to low, with a low cumulative magnitude of change overall. Solar panels on the northern parcel of Appeal Site would be the main visible elements from receptors at these distances, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). Mitigation planting is unlikely to be effective for these elevated positions. Additional planting shown in Field 3 on the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would thicken up the level of screening by Year 15 for certain positions to the southwest.

4.4.23 There would be some changes in the views for local residents to the east of the Appeal Site and within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site and road users in the study area which are appreciable and of low adverse cumulative magnitude (taking into account the other consented project). This would be reduced to negligible to low by Year 15 for the properties to the east and within the valley to the south due to the positive influence of mitigation planting. The magnitude of change of the proposed development taken in isolation for these receptors would remain as low and reducing to negligible to low by Year 15. The additional planting shown on the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would likely increase the level of screening for these residents by Year 15.

4.4.24 There would be some changes in the views for local residents on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site of negligible to low adverse magnitude, when taken in isolation. However cumulative magnitude of change would rise to low and would not reduce by Year 15.

4.4.25 The mainly rural character, particularly in relation to the mixed farmland and isolated properties and villages, would be reduced by the introduction of large areas of panels and other infrastructure, including transformers, inverters and fencing at the Appeal Site.

4.4.26 Deciduous vegetation generally has reduced or no foliage for 4-6 months of the year and therefore limited screening qualities, especially for close in viewpoints. There is also a delay from planting to establishment and sufficient growth necessary to provide effective screening.

#### Summary of Visual Effects

4.4.27 My assessment of the overall visual effects of the proposed development in isolation is

set out in the Table SH-13 below, with cumulative visual effects in Table SH-14, where I have combined my judgements of sensitivity with magnitude of change, for each receptor. I have summarised operational stage effects below.

- 4.4.28 I have identified major and adverse visual effects for users of PRoW within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way. The project would be at variance with character and substantially change a sense of place, with deterioration in the views and obstruction of footpath routes. This is the same either as the proposed development taken in isolation, or cumulatively with the consented solar project. The enhanced landscape strategy would not alter these gradings.
- 4.4.29 I have also identified Negligible (to Moderate) and adverse visual effects for users of PRoW to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8, HG61/3 and Thorpe in the Glebe FP7), when the proposed development is taken in isolation. However, there would be combined and sequential visibility of the proposed development with the consented project. The project would be at conflict with character and result in a deterioration in the views. As a result, the cumulative visual effects for these receptors would rise to moderate adverse.
- 4.4.30 Negligible (to Moderate) adverse effects are also identified for local residents on elevated land to the south of the Appeal site, when the proposals are taken in isolation. However, for the reasons set out above the cumulative visual effects, of the combined projects would rise to moderate adverse.
- 4.4.31 Moderate adverse effects are also identified for some of the local residents to the east and within the valley to the south of the Appeal site in Year 1, although disturbance would reduce once the construction phase is complete (due to vehicle movements and road works for the buried cable). By Year 15 effects would be negligible (to moderate) and neutral (to adverse) for these local residents. This is the same either as the proposed development taken in isolation, or cumulatively with the consented solar project. This also includes the CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west.
- 4.4.32 There would be minor and adverse effects during Year 1 for users of the local road network overall, reducing to negligible (to minor) and neutral (to adverse) by Year 15. The sections of Wysall Road and Rempstone Road which pass by the southern access

would have clear views into the site. Parts of Costock Road also offers transient views of the site. Sections of Bradmore Road, which passes by the northern access would also offer transient views (including from the northern part of Wysall Conservation Area). This is the same either as the proposed development taken in isolation, or cumulatively with the consented solar project.

- 4.4.33 The ability of the public to appreciate and enjoy the landscape character from many of the PRowS and recreational routes within and around the Appeal Site would be diminished and adversely impacted by the proposed development.



## 5 MATTERS IN DISPUTE

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 In this section of my Assessment, I consider the matters in dispute.

### 5.2 Scale of Landscape Effects within the Appeal Site

5.2.1 The draft Statement of Common Ground states that *"The Council and the Appellant disagree on the scale of landscape effects within the Appeal Site itself."*

5.2.2 I disagree on the scale of landscape effects within the Appeal Site in particular hedgerow resource, which I identify as being moderate adverse effects, rather than major beneficial, due to the effect the increase in heights would have on character and appearance.

5.2.3 I disagree on the scale of landscape effects to landcover which I have as moderate and adverse, rather than moderate and beneficial, due to the change arising from a mostly existing arable land use and field pattern to an industrial scale energy generation facility.

5.2.4 I disagree on the scale of landscape effects to ProW which I have as major and adverse, rather than negligible on the basis that two parts of the footpath routes will be obstructed by the security fencing, gates and/or hedgerows. This would reduce to one part of the route on the enhanced landscape strategy.

5.2.5 I disagree on the effects to landscape character within the Appeal Site which I have as major and adverse, rather than moderate and adverse. Also, I do not agree that these would diminish to minor adverse by Year 15. However, I also note that Pegasus' LVIA (CD.15) originally had major adverse effects for this receptor, see comparison below:

- Pegasus' LVIA in paragraph 7.3 that *"It is accepted that locally, within the eastern most part of the host NW01 the degree of change would be major adverse at Year 1. The residual effects at Year 15 however, have been assessed as diminishing to minor adverse."*
- Pegasus' Updated LVIA paragraph 8.5 of that *"it is accepted that locally, within the Site located in the eastern most part of the host NW01, the degree of change would be moderate adverse at Year 1. The residual effects at Year 15*

*however, have been assessed as diminishing to minor adverse.” This has been downgraded from major in the LVIA.*

5.2.6 This downgrading was referenced but disputed on page 5 of the WWA Response to Updated LVIA, as follows: *“We agree with Pegasus’ original conclusions as the solar array will appear as a new feature in the landscape, not in keeping with the current character. In addition, introduced vegetation through the landscape proposals will likely long outlast the solar array itself, these are specific to the scheme and are incongruent with existing field patterns.”*

5.2.7 I would also highlight that in not providing a separate assessment of aesthetic and perceptual aspects, or of the Character of Local Landscape ‘Widmerpool Clay Wolds’, that Pegasus’ Updated LVIA fails to fully and adequately capture the relevant landscape effects overall.

### **5.3 Proposed Planting within the Appeal Site, Loss of longer distance views and Sense of Place**

5.3.1 The draft Statement of Common Ground states that:

- *“The Council considers that the proposed planting is incongruent with the existing field pattern and will not have a wholly positive influence on the landscape character. These matters are in disagreement.”*
- *“The Council maintains that the mitigation planting would create a loss of longer distance views from the elevated countryside, which would represent a considerable reduction in visual amenity. This matter is in disagreement.”*
- *“The Council maintains that the mitigation planting would prevent people from appreciating their location within the valley landscape, changing the perceived sense of place and character, as open views would become enclosed and constrained. This matter is in disagreement.”*

5.3.2 I have reviewed the proposed hedgerow planting would be incongruent with the existing field pattern. This includes the creation of corridors along the PRoW and obstructing part of Wysall FP3.

5.3.3 Modification of the neat and well managed condition of the hedgerows to form taller

belts of vegetation, creating new patterns and corridors intended to screen the solar farm would alter the character of the area, reducing visual openness and be adverse in nature (also see Aldenham Appeal Decision 3295268<sup>10</sup>).

- 5.3.4 I have identified in my Context Photographs 2 and 3 in the northern parcel of the Appeal Site long-distance views of the rugged skyline of Charnwood at 15km away, close to or behind Highfields (Listed Building) and the wider Wolds undulating topography. This distinctive landmark is also apparent in 'Field 4'. The proposed hedgerow along the edge of 'Field 2' and tree planting block within 'Field 4' would obscure this view, changing the perceived sense of place and character, as open views would become enclosed and constrained.
- 5.3.5 TLP photomontage C is on the PRow in the northern parcel and close to the access point to Bunny Old Wood. At this location the existing wide and expansive views would be lost as a result of the proposed planting, which aim to obscure the solar panel structures. The industrialised corridor effect would reduce the legibility and modification to the desire line for the footpath users. The result would be unrecognisable from the description of the large arable field, leading to a footbridge and marker post in the Notts Wolds Way online brochure. The footbridge and marker post would be hidden.
- 5.3.6 I have identified that mitigation planting would potentially be effective for Viewpoints 2, 5 and 7, which are located either on the edge of, or off-site and would not have the existing expansive views obscured.
- 5.3.7 For Viewpoints 8, D and C within the Appeal Site, I do not consider that the mitigation planting would be wholly of benefit due to the resulting screening and enclosing of views, obscuring landscape features (rugged skyline of Charnwood at 15km away, close to or behind Highfields (Listed Building), as well as the wider undulating Wolds).
- 5.3.8 At Viewpoints 3 and E offsite to the south, hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising

---

<sup>10</sup> Appeal Decision 3295268 Aldenham - paragraph 154. *"Finally, for the Council is the issue of "channelling" or "tunnelling" of views, which the Appellant refuses to accept would occur, but which was considered likely by all relevant witnesses for the opposing parties. There are a number of locations where PRowS would pass between or alongside solar development and will be contained either between security fencing on both sides, or by a fence on one side and a hedge on the other. Although 5m offsets are proposed, views would inevitably be 'channelled' along the right of way corridor. The effect of this aspect of the design on perceptions of safety and comfort is a factor bearing on the overall sense of openness which should be taken into account."* (CD 7.57)

slopes of the Appeal Site.

- 5.3.9 At Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4 the 'enhanced' landscape strategy would introduce a new hedgerow to the north of the PRow. By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would contain and create an enclosed corridor for users. Winter views will allow for built elements to still be perceptible, due to proximity.
- 5.3.10 At CAAMP Significant Views track leading from Costock Road, looking west the 'enhanced' landscape strategy would introduce additional copse and tree planting along the eastern Appeal Site boundary. Whereas the submitted landscape Strategy only has a few trees along the existing hedge (and hedgerow management allowing for taller growth). The mitigation planting on the submitted scheme would be less effective, especially in winter when individual trees without leaves will be more transparent, than the thicker copse shown on the enhanced scheme (although with a copse of c. 10m deep, its still deciduous and filtered in winter, with time required to grow /mature).

#### **5.4 Scale of Effects upon Visual Amenity of PRowS**

- 5.4.1 The draft Statement of Common Ground states that *"The Council and the Appellant disagree on the scale of effects upon the general visual amenity associated with the PRowS within and around the Appeal Site, and PRowS in the southern study area."*
- 5.4.2 I note that in paragraph 8.7 of Pegasus' Updated LVIA that *"receptors at Viewpoint 5, Viewpoint 7, and Viewpoint 8 would be subject to major adverse effects at Year 1 in winter views only."* I agree with this point. I have identified major adverse effects for users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4), including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way.
- 5.4.3 However, the paragraph continues that *"Such effects are generally expected to reduce to moderate adverse to negligible at year 15 (in winter). The receptors at Viewpoint 8, within the site, have been assessed as subject to moderate adverse effects at Year 15 at most, given the proposed maturing structural vegetation."*
- 5.4.4 I disagree with this and consider that the major adverse effects will continue for as long as the obstructions to the route and the green corridors are in place, due to a reduction in legibility and loss of wide expansive views and obscuring landscape features. This reduces the interest of the route and it is less likely that someone would want to walk

on them should the development go ahead (also see Aldenham Appeal Decision 3295268<sup>11</sup>).

5.4.5 The large arable field and field-edge section with hedge left which are described along the route of the Notts Wolds Way online guide as it passes through the Appeal Site (my Figures SH-3 and SH-4) would be fundamentally altered by the proposals, creating an industrialised corridor, with hedges not just on the left but containing the route on both sides.

5.4.6 I note that in paragraph 8.10 of Pegasus' Updated LVIA that *"The PRow users travelling across the elevated southern part of the study area along Public Footpath Costock FP4 and Public Footpath Rempstone FP8 have been assessed as subject to negligible effects, generally speaking. Localised moderate adverse effects have been established where the visibility of the Development has been judged to increase."*

5.4.7 I disagree and have identified moderate adverse effects overall for users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3), taking account of the journey as a whole and visibility of the large-scale dominant feature.

## 5.5 Scale of Cumulative Effects

5.5.1 The draft Statement of Common Ground states that *"The scale of cumulative effects, in relation to landscape, visual amenity and views as experienced from the southern part of the study area is in disagreement."*

### Site Selection

5.5.2 As indicated by Figure SH-9 (my mark up of Figure C9 in SFLSCS), the Appeal Site is located in the eastern part of LAU A.

5.5.3 As such the proposals do not align with the following stated Key Design Principles for more appropriate siting of new solar projects in SFLSCS: *"The northern extent of the LAU and central area around the British Gypsum Head Office are influenced by existing large-scale industrial development. Sensitively designed development may be more appropriate at these locations, minimising impacts to the overall rural character of the*

---

<sup>11</sup> Appeal Decision 3295268 Aldenham - paragraph 260 *"The landscape change from undeveloped countryside to industrial built development would have a significant adverse impact. Fencing would give the feeling of being contained, a particular concern for lone female walkers. It is simply much less likely that someone would want to walk on them should the development go ahead.."* (CD 7.57)

LAU.”

- 5.5.4 The Appeal Site is well away from the areas identified as being more appropriate for further large-scale solar projects.
- 5.5.5 Accordingly, in landscape terms, this initial poor site selection hinders any subsequent attempts to sensitively design and successfully mitigate the adverse impacts of such a large-scale solar project.

#### Overall Combined Footprint

- 5.5.6 The proposals are contrary to the mitigation recommended within EN-1 paragraph 5.10.26 which states that *“Reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project.”*
- 5.5.7 The 100.96 ha proposed development would substantially increase the size of the consented large-scale solar project, more than doubling the overall site area. The two additional proposed parcels of land on the Appeal Site would effectively be connected by the consented solar project potentially resulting in a combined solar farm which extends for over 1.5km. Figure SH-2 shows the Combined Landscape Strategy Plans for Consented Development 22/00303/FUL (in colour) and Appeal Site (in grey scale).
- 5.5.8 It is clear that the proposals cannot be considered to help mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the consented development 22/00303/FUL, but would instead extend and increase them overall.
- 5.5.9 The combined area of the two solar farms would be much larger than NW01 ‘Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps’ namesakes (of Gotham and West Leake) combined, creating a new dominant feature:
- Gotham village is c. 54ha (see Figure SH-10);
  - West Leake village is c. 14ha (see Figure SH-11);
  - Total 68ha in comparison to 181ha combined area of the two solar farms.
- 5.5.10 The combined area of the two solar farms would also be much larger than the character area’s existing main industrial feature, British Gypsum HQ at East Leake which is c 27ha (see Figure SH-12), again demonstrating the potential creation of a new dominant

feature.

5.5.11 As stated in SFLSCS, LAU A covers an area of approximately 3,400ha. The combined area of the two solar farms in the character area would be around 5% and would be disproportionate for this type of land use change<sup>12</sup>. Gotham and West Leake combined, for comparison, make up only 2% of the character area.

5.5.12 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”*.

5.5.13 The two solar farms once constructed would become a new dominant feature / characteristic element for the character area, with the proposed development tipping the balance through its additional effects.

#### Extending onto Higher Ground

5.5.14 The proposals would extend development over higher ground and would not be nestled on low ground. As such it would not offer a positive contribution to the following Landscape Actions for in NW01 Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps:

- *“Ensure any new industrial development is nestled on low ground and has well wooded boundaries which integrate with woodland on higher ground to reduce its visibility”*

5.5.15 The extension of solar onto the higher ground of the northern parcel also conflicts with the Key Design Principles in the SFLSCS for LAU A which states that:

- *“Development should instead be considered on lower lying areas where there is greater potential for visual screening and integration within the LAU.”*

---

<sup>12</sup> 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 5.64)

### Moving Closer to Village

- 5.5.16 The proposals would extend consented solar development 22/00303/FUL eastwards and reduce the standoffs to nearby residential properties and the Wysall Conservation Area.
- 5.5.17 This swathe of rural land within the Appeal Site is alongside the approaches to the village from roads and public rights of way (PRoW). It is also visible from individual properties, as evidenced by views outwards from the site towards windows. It is also visible from outwards views from Wysall Conservation Area, including a publicly accessible defined 'Significant Views' in the CAAMP, on the track leading from Costock Road and the permissive routes beyond.
- 5.5.18 Covering over the agricultural fields with industrial scale solar panels, BESS, ancillary structures and infrastructure would alter the distinctive sense of place and diminish the character of this important buffer zone (which is otherwise protected and conserved by the boundary limits of the consented solar development 22/00303/FUL).

### Extending over PRoW

- 5.5.19 The selection of the Appeal site for further large scale solar also conflicts with NPS- EN-3, paragraph 2.10.35 (in Jan 2026 publication) which states that *"Applicants are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape"*.
- 5.5.20 In particular Footnote 94 states that *"screening along public right-of-way networks to minimise the outlook into the Solar Park may, impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscapes"*. The proposals would physically obstruct existing routes and impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscapes (and obscure features such as undulating Wolds and the distant rugged skyline of Charnwood).
- 5.5.21 The Appeal Site extends over PRoW and up to the Bradmore Road, whereas there are no PRoW crossing the consented site 22/00303/FUL. As was noted by WWA Review, the proposed screening along the PRoW network would adversely impact the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscape, changing the perceived sense of place and character, as open views would become enclosed and constrained, with industrial



elements. For example, refer to Viewpoint 8 and TLP D and Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4.

#### More than localised effects

5.5.22 I disagree with paragraph 6.50. of Pegasus' updated LVIA which states that *"In summary, the visual envelope of the Development does not extend towards Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill road, and this gives evidence of its highly localised effects."*

5.5.23 Notwithstanding the overall size of this large-scale solar project (at over 100ha), I have also included a view from A60 'Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill Road' as my Context Photograph 9, to supplement those along the elevated PRow network to the south (southeast and southwest), and have concluded that visibility would extend beyond localised and for c. 2km due to its valley side position, elevation range and undulating topography (also see Aldenham Appeal Decision 3295268<sup>13</sup>).

#### Combined and Successive Visibility

5.5.24 By extending the overall footprint of the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL eastwards, the proposed development would result in combined and successive cumulative visual impacts at several locations. For example:

- Footpath users at TLP Photomontage Viewpoint E;
- Footpath users at Highlands LVIA Viewpoint on Wysall FP4 west of Lodge Farm;
- Footpath users by Memorial Bench near Caanan Farm, on Costock FP4 looking north-east with my Context Photograph 8; and
- Users of A60 'Nottingham Road / Bunny Hill Road', with my Context Photograph 9.

5.5.25 Cumulative photomontages from the elevated PRow to the south have not been submitted to assist decision-makers. Photomontages originally prepared for the planning application for the adjacent consented solar project 22/00303/FUL have been

---

<sup>13</sup> Appeal Decision 3295268 Aldenham - paragraph 151 *"Again, the Appellant seeks to downplay this effect by describing it as "localised" and "limited" but the choice of words lacks credibility in the context of a site of this vast size.."* (CD 7.57)

re-submitted and need to be reviewed alongside the separate photomontages prepared for the proposed development, adjacent. Nevertheless, it is clear that the additional solar arrays and associated infrastructure resulting from the proposed development would noticeably and directly extend those at the consented site 22/00303/FUL. The combined scale of the two solar farms would be perceived from the south; the two developments would not be considered to be separate.

#### Sequential Visibility

5.5.26 By extending the overall footprint of the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL eastwards, the proposed development would result in sequential cumulative visual impacts at several locations. For example:

- for footpath users further eastwards along the distant PRow to the south at TLP Photomontage Viewpoint F where the consented solar would not be visible; and
- for road users further eastwards along Wysall Road nearer to the village at Viewpoint 5 and field gates such as my Context Photograph 10 and Bradmore Road at my Context Photographs 11 and 15 where the consented solar would not be visible.

#### Aesthetics

5.5.27 The proposals represent a large lateral extension of an existing large-scale facility and would not be sensitive to place (by enclosing views along PRow and diverting existing desire lines) or be matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic (by extending over more visible higher ground) and as such would be contrary to paragraph 4.7.2 of NPS EN-1.

### **5.6 'Enhanced' Landscape Strategy**

5.6.1 The Appellants Landscape Hearing Statement para 1.17. (CD 8.2.1) states that "*As part of this Appeal the proposed landscaping has been refined to account for further technical input from the design team and this is explained in the Statement of Case.*" From an LVIA point of view the changes are set out in a series of bullet points which I have repeated below, with my re-assessment thereafter.

5.6.2 Bullet point "*a. the addition of hedgerow trees along the southern boundary of Field 3.*"

My re-assessment concludes that this would relate to Viewpoint E and locations to the south and southwest more generally. There is potential for additional thickening of part of the boundary by Year 15 at these locations, although solar panels extending up the slopes are still anticipated to be visible from elevated positions.

- 5.6.3 Bullet point “b. *the addition of a small scale linear copse along the eastern boundary of Field 15.*” and “c. *the addition of hedgerow trees within the internal hedgerows, between Fields 12 and 15, Field 14 and 15, and Field 13 and 14.*” My re-assessment concludes that this would relate to local residents to the east of the Appeal Site and within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, users of the permissive footpaths and also the defined ‘Significant Views’ in the CAAMP, on the Costock Road. There is potential for additional screening of the solar panels by Year 15 at these locations, although in winter views will still be filtered. During the summer, when the additional trees are in leaf, the existing longer distance views over arable fields will also be lost.
- 5.6.4 Bullet point “d. *The route of Public Footpath Wysall FP4 confirmed to coincide with an existing agricultural track leading from Bradmore Road into the Appeal site.*” My re-assessment concludes that the route of Wysall FP4 had been incorrectly drawn on the submitted plans. When positioned on its correct alignment on the enhanced landscape strategy it would have conflicted with the submitted security fence and gates, creating an obstruction to the PRow. Associated with the amendment to the PRow route on the enhanced landscape strategy plans, the security fencing and access track have been re-aligned through the existing hedge.
- 5.6.5 I also note that the alignment of Wysall FP3 was also incorrectly drawn on the submitted landscape strategy plan, but has been adjusted on the enhanced landscape strategy plan. There is an obstruction of Wysall FP3 with proposed mitigation hedgerow planting. However, this has not been identified in the Appellant’s Landscape Hearing Statement or on the summary of changes plan (CD.35). I would also query the Footpath Buffer Distances plan (CD2.9) where the incorrect position of the PRow in relation to the fencing is misleading.
- 5.6.6 Bullet point “e. *Omission of the previously proposed hedgerow along the northern edge of Field 9*” My re-assessment concludes that is simply no longer required due to the error of the incorrectly drawn route of Wysall FP4 on the submitted landscape strategy plan noted above.

- 5.6.7 Bullet point *“f. Additional hedgerow to the southern edge of Field 5 and Field 6 to enclose Public Footpath Wysall FP4 to the north.”* My re-assessment concludes that this would also relate to users of the footpath and the adjustments associated with the incorrectly drawn route of Wysall FP4 on the submitted landscape strategy plan noted above. The new hedgerow planting, in conjunction with the existing hedge would create a corridor and inevitably reduce the wide expansive views currently obtained along this route. Also refer to Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4 Wysall FP4.



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

Factor	Indicators of Value
Natural Heritage	Physiographical interest from the gently undulating topography. Old Wood adjacent to northern Appeal Site boundary is designated as Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland and managed as Nature Reserve by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.
Cultural Heritage	Landscape offers a sense of time depth, with cultural interest of Wysall Conservation Area and views of Holy Trinity Church (Grade I) and Highfields (Grade II). Appeal Site is visible from defined ‘Significant Views’ in the CAAMP, on the Costock Road, as well as other parts of the Wysall Conservation Area.
Landscape Condition	Good physical condition / managed farmland, with hedgerows and woodland blocks.
Associations	No associations identified as part of this assessment.
Distinctiveness	Landscape has a strong sense of identity, being typical of Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps. Also views of the distant rugged skyline of Charnwood at c. 15km away gained from elevated areas, beyond the undulating Wolds.
Recreational	Recreational opportunities, with good accessibility via public rights of way, where experience of the landscape is important. Includes promoted route Notts Wolds Way and Midshires Way. Bunny Old Wood is Nature Reserve with public access / interpretation board. Permissive routes on west of Wysall connect to PRow.
Perceptual (Scenic)	Landscape appeals to the senses, primarily the visual sense, in particular via the appreciation of extensive views from higher ground, simple appearance and openness, resulting from being part of a rural area of mainly farmland. Including across the Wolds and towards the distant rugged skyline of Charnwood.
Perceptual (Wildness and Tranquillity)	Landscape has a sense of tranquillity, being largely rural in character, albeit road noise and airplanes descending to East Midlands Airport at certain times. As indicated by Figure SH-6 – CPRE Night Lights Mapping, the Appeal Site is located in area within the Darker category.
Functional	Landscape is primarily productive farming and the natural soils contribute to the healthy functioning of the area.

**Table SH-3 – Landscape Sensitivity**

<b>Landscape Receptor</b>	<b>Susceptibility (to a large solar farm together with all associated work, equipment and necessary infrastructure)</b>	<b>Landscape Value</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>
Land cover	<p>Medium</p> <p>The addition of panels would obscure the ground, pasture farming would continue, whilst the other elements (such as access tracks, BESS, inverters, etc) would alter the existing mainly arable land use. No reference currently to type of development proposed, other than pylon / overhead powerline in southern parcel.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Mainly farming landcover contributes to the rural character of the area</p>	Medium
Topography	<p>Medium</p> <p>Engineering earthworks and foundations associated with the new access tracks, BESS, inverters and other infrastructure would require soil resource management / stripping and storage (to ensure successful restoration) and localised levelling to alter the gently sloping baseline topography.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The gently sloping topography contributes to the distinctive character of the area</p>	Medium
Hedge Resource	<p>Medium</p> <p>The hedgerows are managed in a manner compatible with arable uses and are well-trimmed with some gaps or missing sections. 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 character.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The Ecological Assessment refers to 'native' hedgerows or 'native with trees' with some of the boundary hedgerows identified as 'species rich'. The hedgerows contribute to the distinctive character of the area</p>	Medium

Tree Resource	<p>High</p> <p>Trees, as a landscape feature are generally more difficult to replace and require a longer time to establish, thus are judged to be of high susceptibility</p>	<p>High</p> <p>None of the trees within the site's boundaries are protected by any Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The Aboricultural Assessment identified that the trees are typically medium to low quality (Category B and C). The trees contribute to the distinctive character of the area</p>	High
PRoW	<p>Medium</p> <p>Some ability to accommodate the proposed development, depending on detailed design and standoffs</p>	<p>High</p> <p>These routes provide a right to access and include part of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way, which are promoted routes.</p>	Medium to High
Water Features	<p>Medium</p> <p>Some ability to accommodate the proposed development, depending on detailed design and standoffs</p>	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>The baseline watercourses (including named Kingston Brook at south of Appeal Site and field drains) contribute to the character of the area, being visible from Wysall Road and referenced in the character area description.</p>	Medium to High
Aesthetic and perceptual aspects	<p>Medium</p> <p>The proposed solar farm, equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce a range of built vertical elements, which would contrast with the baseline (medium scale, simple appearance, openness and sense of tranquillity)</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The baseline aesthetic and perceptual aspects contribute to the rural character of the area and local distinctiveness</p>	Medium



Character of the Appeal Site	<p>Medium</p> <p>The solar farm, equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce urbanising / industrial features and contrast with the baseline rural character</p>	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>The baseline elements and features, aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the Appeal Site contribute to the rural character of the area. Recreational opportunities on PRow, connecting the ecological interest of Bunny Old Wood (Ancient Woodland and Nature Reserve) with the cultural interest of Wysall Conservation Area and Holy Trinity Church (Grade I), and elevated views / scenic quality (including towards Charnwood Forest) and tranquillity.</p>	Medium to High
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	<p>Medium</p> <p>The proposed solar farm, equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would physically extend the consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm, introducing further urbanising / industrial features and contrast with the baseline situation of the area</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Distinctive character area defined by the Local Authority, as Good Landscape Condition and Strong Landscape Strength, predominately rural and in agricultural production.</p>	Medium
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'	<p>Medium</p> <p>The solar farm, equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce urbanising / industrial features and contrast with the baseline rural character</p>	<p>Medium to High</p> <p>Distinctive character area defined by the Local Authority, as Good Landscape Condition and Strong Landscape Strength, predominately rural and in agricultural production.</p>	Medium

**Table SH-4 – Magnitude of Landscape Change (of Proposed Development in Isolation)**

Landscape Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
Land cover	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>The addition of panels would obscure the ground, whilst the other elements (such as access tracks, BESS compound, 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 area.</p> <p>Construction compounds would necessitate temporary changes to landcover. Temporary road works to install the grid connection, although road surface reinstated.</p> <p>Adverse overall.</p>	<p>Medium geographical extent</p> <p>There are 16 fields identified on the Landscape Strategy masterplan, with solar panels on 14 fields.</p> <p>The fenced off part of the Appeal Site (including BESS and substation) is approximately 69ha or 69%, with landscaping treatments in the remainder.</p> <p>BESS units and substations, transformers, inverter units, and access tracks have a total area of almost 3 Ha.</p>	Year 1	Medium
			Year 15	Medium
Topography	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Engineering earthworks associated with the new access tracks, BESS compound, battery units, MV inverters, auxiliary transformers would result in soil stripping and storage, with cut and fill of the gently sloping topography and individual concrete</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Most of the gently sloping topography within the Appeal Site would remain unchanged, with the panels set above the ground on racks.</p>	Year 1	Low
			Year 15	Low

	<p>plinth /foundations. Some localised levelling will be required during the construction stage for example around the substation and BESS.</p> <p>Cable trenching would temporarily change topography. Construction compounds and decommissioning may also have temporary stockpiles of aggregates, etc. Adverse.</p> <p>NB – Detailed design of potential soil storage stockpiles not provided. I have assumed that existing soils would be stripped from the access tracks and concrete plinths for the infrastructure, stored in distinct stockpiles and recoverable as part of the proposals to restore back to agriculture.</p>	<p>Nevertheless, the 4m wide internal access tracks extend for over 4km = 16,00m<sup>2</sup></p> <p>The BESS and substation compound is over 1ha, with a further 35 inverters requiring concrete plinths / foundations = 10,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Topsoil stripped to a depth of 0.3m would generate c. 7,800m<sup>3</sup> of material. Subsoil may also need to be stripped below this depth, depending on engineer's designs.</p> <p>These materials would need to be stored in discrete bunds to allow for their recovery and reuse as part of decommissioning and restoration.</p>		
Hedge Resource	<p>Low size or scale of change at Year 1 rising to Medium at Year 15</p> <p>Short sections of hedgerow to be removed and maintained short / 0.6m high for access visibility splays (see ASA para 6.4 to 6.9 of CD 2.35).</p> <p>Increase in height of the well managed hedgerows (e.g. from being cut down to c.1.5 - 2m to 3 – 3.5m, with seasonal growth on top), with additional hedgerow planting to achieve the</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Alternative management of the existing hedgerow boundaries within the Appeal Site.</p> <p>Additional hedgerows would be planted to form 'green corridors' along sections of public right of way (which are currently open fields / along field edges)</p>	Year 1	Low
			Year 15	Medium

	proposed screening of the solar farm. Whilst this could improve connectivity and structure, the site layout would change the field pattern and open character, obscuring views landmarks and locally distinctive features (such as Charnwood). Adverse (albeit beneficial on hedgerow length, but adverse on height and character).	Proposed hedgerow: 2679 lin. m (in comparison to c. 10km of security fence)  The 'Enhanced' landscape strategy adjusts the hedgerow planting in northern parcel along Wysall FP4		
Tree Resource	Negligible size or scale of change at Year 1 rising to Low after Year 15  No loss of significant trees. Some crown raising 5-6m ground clearance for visibility splays at site access points (see ASA para 6.4 to 6.9 of CD 2.35).  Additional tree planting to achieve the proposed screening of the solar farm. Whilst scattered trees and small blocks could potentially compliment open character, the site layout indicates obscuring views of landmarks and locally distinctive features (such as Charnwood Forest). Beneficial on tree resource (but adverse on character).	Low geographical extent  Part of the landscaping treatments around the Appeal Site include areas of tree blocks (0.7 ha copse planting, 1.9 ha woodland), also with a further 135 large scale trees: 85no., small scale trees: 5 no. Willow trees.  The 'Enhanced' landscape strategy increases tree planting further, for example in the southern parcel	Year 1	Negligible
			Year 15	Low
PRoW	High size or scale of change  Change from unsurfaced route to being crossed by section of loose stone track, encroachment to	Low geographical extent  Most of the 1.2km of PRoW routes which pass through the Appeal Site would be	Year 1	Major
			Year 15	Major

	<p>desire line / route alongside Fields 1 and 4 from fencing, gates and planting block.</p> <p>Wysall FP3 and FP4 would be obstructed by the proposed layout.</p> <p>Wysall FP4 route incorrectly drawn north of hedge on submitted landscape strategy plan, with solar fencing and access tracks encroaching onto actual route. Vehicle movements during construction and decommissioning phases. 'Enhanced' landscape strategy would rectify this by moving the fencing away from the route.</p> <p>Wysall FP3 incorrectly drawn on submitted plan, suggesting passing through a corridor, but the correct alignment shows it passing over a section of mitigation hedge planting. Also see photomontage for Viewpoint 8 and the desire line being obscured by fencing and gates.</p> <p>Adverse (also adverse on alteration of character and appearance by creation of corridors).</p>	<p>physically unchanged (although character and appearance would be altered).</p> <p>However, obstructions would occur in 2 locations (reducing to 1 location on the enhanced landscape strategy).</p>		
Water Features	Negligible size or scale of change	Negligible geographical extent	Year 1	Negligible
	Retention of bank and channel profiles with introduction of crossing point between Fields 3	Most of the watercourse within the Appeal Site will remain unaltered	Year 15	Negligible

	and 7 and upgrading of existing bridge over Kingston Brook by southern site access. Neutral.			
Aesthetic and perceptual aspects	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Existing medium scale of Appeal Site would become a large scale energy generation facility overall, but with small scale individual elements and components.</p> <p>Existing simple appearance of Appeal Site to increase in complexity, with a reduction in openness both internally from structures, but also via the planting and management of hedgerow barriers and tree blocks.</p> <p>Sense of tranquillity within Appeal Site would be reduced during construction and decommissioning from vehicle movements and other activities. Potential for noise from battery and inverter containers, BESS cooler and transformer during operations.</p> <p>Adverse overall.</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>The aesthetic and perceptual aspects of all of the Appeal Site would be transformed either by the addition of built elements or through landscaping treatments, with influence extending beyond and combining with the adjacent consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High
	High size or scale of change	High geographical extent	Year 1	High

Character of the Appeal Site	The solar farm equipment and infrastructure would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically well managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of views of landmarks and locally distinctive features (such as the Wolds and Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds). Adverse overall.	The character of all of the Appeal Site would be transformed either by the addition of built elements or through landscaping treatments.	Year 15	High
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	High size or scale of change  The solar farm equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to agricultural land. This would contrast with the largely rural landscape. The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of expansive views. Adverse overall.	Negligible to Low geographical extent  The Appeal Site extends over a relatively small part of the distinctive character area.	Year 1	Low  (in isolation)
			Year 15	Low  (in isolation)
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'	Negligible to Low size or scale of change  Limited direct change to this character area relating to new access points off Wysall Lane and Bradmore Road, hedgerow removal / management and tracks / loss of farmland.	Negligible geographical extent  The Appeal Site extends over a very small part of the distinctive character area.	Year 1	Negligible to Low  (in isolation)

	<p>Temporary installation of cabling and other construction activities, including compound off Bradmore Road.</p> <p>Longer-term changes to outward rural views of operational development. Adverse overall.</p>	<p>The proposed development would be visible in outward views from a relatively small area, especially along the valley and rising valleysides to the south (and thereby influencing character).</p>	Year 15	<p>Negligible to Low</p> <p>(in isolation)</p>
--	--	--	---------	--



Table SH-5 –Magnitude of Landscape Change (Cumulative)

Landscape Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Cumulative Magnitude of Change
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Most of the other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm will be located within this character area.</p> <p>The solar farm equipment and infrastructure at the Appeal Site would introduce further urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to additional areas of agricultural land.</p> <p>This would contrast with the largely rural landscape. The landscaping proposals would alter the characteristically managed hedgerows and increase enclosure, with a loss of expansive views. Adverse overall.</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>The Appeal Site when considered in conjunction with other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of Highfields Farm extends over a relatively small part of the distinctive character area, but it would form a large-scale element in its own right.</p> <p>The resulting combined facility would be much larger than the area's namesakes of Gotham and West Leake.</p>	Year 1	Medium (cumulative)
			Year 15	Medium (cumulative)
Character of local landscape -	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>A small area of solar arrays and secondary access at the other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the Northeast Of</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>The Appeal Site when considered in conjunction with other consented solar project 22/00303/FUL - Land to the</p>	Year 1	Low (cumulative)
			Year 15	Low

<p>'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'</p>	<p>Highfields Farm will be located in this character area.</p> <p>Limited direct change to this character area relating to new access points off Wysall Lane and Bradmore Road, hedgerow removal / management and tracks / loss of farmland. Temporary installation of cabling and other construction activities, including compound off Bradmore Road.</p> <p>Longer-term changes to outward rural views of operational development. Adverse overall.</p>	<p>Northeast Of Highfields Farm extends over a relatively small part of the distinctive character area.</p> <p>The proposed development would extend the visibility of the consented project in outward views, especially along the valley and rising valleysides to the south (and thereby influencing character).</p>		<p>(cumulative)</p>
--------------------------------	--	---	--	---------------------

Table SH-6 – Overall Landscape Effects (of Proposed Development in Isolation)

Landscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change	Overall Effect
Land cover	Medium	Year 1	Medium	Moderate Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Moderate Adverse
Topography	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Minor Adverse
Hedge Resource	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Moderate Adverse
Tree Resource	High	Year 1	Negligible	Negligible Beneficial
		Year 15	Low	Moderate Beneficial
PRoW	High	Year 1	High	Major Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major Adverse
Water Features	High	Year 1	Negligible	Negligible and Neutral
		Year 15	Negligible	Negligible and Neutral

Aesthetic and perceptual aspects	Medium	Year 1	High	Major Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major Adverse
Character of the Appeal Site	Medium to High	Year 1	High	Major Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major Adverse
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Minor Adverse
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'	Medium	Year 1	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Minor Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Minor Adverse

Table SH-7 – Overall Landscape Effects (Cumulative)

Landscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Development Phase	Cumulative Magnitude of Change	Overall Cumulative Effect
Character of the Local Landscape - 'Gotham and West Leake Wooded Hills and Scarps'	Medium	Year 1	Medium	Moderate Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Moderate Adverse
Character of local landscape - 'Widmerpool Clay Wolds'	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Minor Adverse

Table SH-8 – Visual Sensitivity

Visual Receptor	Susceptibility (to a large solar farm together with all associated work, equipment and necessary infrastructure)	Value of Views	Sensitivity
Recreational users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site	High  Recreational visitors, where their attention or interest will be focused on the rural views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.	Medium  Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.  Includes promoted walking routes (Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way) and attractions (Bunny Old Wood) Nature Reserve).	High
Road users travelling along local road network	Medium  General passing travellers, where their attention or interest will be primarily focused on the road corridor, albeit with rural views.	Medium  Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.	Medium
Local residents at home, such as Wysall and individual properties and farmsteads	High  People with views from settlement edge / individual properties over countryside which contributes to the landscape setting and enjoyed by residents of the area.	Medium  Rural location, where the landscape contributes positively to the character / sense of place.	High

**Table SH-9 –Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint (Proposed Development in Isolation)**

Viewpoint Number	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 1  Southern section of Keyworth Road, near Wysall, looking south west  Receptors: Road users	No size or scale of change  (no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)	No Change  (no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)	Year 1	No Change
			Year 15	No Change
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2  Southern section of Bradmore Road, near Wysall, looking south west  Receptors: Road users	Low size or scale of change  Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible in gap in roadside hedgerow. This would introduce glimpsed views of urbanising / industrial features and altering areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Viewpoint located on route of buried cable connection, so temporary works also apparent at this location. Adverse  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would mostly obscure the	Low reducing to Negligible geographical extent  Located on route of buried cable connection, with site access 200m away. Other parts of the development visible across limited parts of the view at 400-700m away and offset to direction of travel.  By Year 15, visible extent would reduce in summer, when foliage in leaf.	Year 1	Low  Some change in the view which is appreciable
			Year 15	Negligible

	development and increase sense of enclosure during summer, when foliage in leaf. From this elevated position, mitigation planting not anticipated to conflict with, or obscure wide expansive views. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.			
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3  Public Footpath and Rempstone Lane, near Wolds Farm  Receptors: PRow and Road users	Low to Medium size or scale of change  Solar panels on northern parcel of Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Management of roadside hedgerow will influence visibility (e.g. likely obscuring views prior to cut).	Negligible to Low geographical extent  Development extends across several parts of the view at c. 1km away and alongside the direction of travel.	Year 1	Low  Change in the view that is clearly visible
			Year 15	Low



<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 4</p> <p>Public Footpath between Rempstone Lane and Wysall, looking north</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels at the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and altering areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape.</p> <p>However, no change to composition. Also, intervening hedgerow in middle ground obscures much of the development, especially during the summer, when in leaf. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site.</p> <p>Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Development at c. 600m away and alongside direction of travel, but is mostly screened by intervening vegetation in field. This is especially during summer, when foliage in leaf.</p>	Year 1	<p>Negligible to Low</p> <p>Some change in the view which is appreciable</p>
			Year 15	Negligible to Low
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5</p>	<p>High size or scale of change, reducing to Medium</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p>	Year 1	High

<p>Junction of Rempstone Lane and Wysall Road, southern edge of the site, looking north west</p> <p>Receptors: Road users</p>	<p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes the substation and BESS, with solar panels appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Removal of section of roadside hedge for access. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have screening effects on certain elements during the summer, when in leaf. Winter views would allow for some built elements to be perceptible. Due to the position of the viewpoint by the access point, the roadway leading into the Appeal Site would still be visible. Views to rising valley slopes up to Lodge Farm would be obscured. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>Development extends across view at 0m away (being adjacent) and in the direction of travel for short section of Rempstone Lane users, but alongside for longer section of users of Wysall Road.</p>		Change that has a substantial influence on overall view
			Year 15	Medium
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 6</p>	<p>No size or scale of change</p> <p>(no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)</p>	<p>No Change</p>	<p>Year 1</p>	<p>No Change</p>

Nottingham Road/ Bunny Hill road, grass verge, looking east.  Receptors: Road users		(no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)	Year 15	No Change
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7  Public Footpath / Midshires Way between Wysall and the site looking south west  Receptors: PRow users	Medium size or scale of change  Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes the substation and BESS, with solar panel arrays appearing as overlapping structures (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect on lower parts of the development in the summer, when in leaf. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible. BESS, transformer and substation still anticipated to be visible. From this elevated position, mitigation planting not anticipated to	Low reducing to Negligible geographical extent  Development extends across the view at c. 300m away and in the direction of travel. Albeit southern parcel more visible than northern parcel which is filtered through deciduous hedgerow.	Year 1	Medium  Change in the view that is clearly visible
			Year 15	Low

	conflict with, or obscure wide expansive views. Neutral to Adverse.			
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 8</p> <p>Public Footpath Costock FP7 and Public Footpath Wysall FP3 / Midshires Way within the northern parcel of the site.</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes access tracks and security fencing, CCTV and solar panel arrays appearing as overlapping structures (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Change in composition. Legibility of footpath route to north-west would be diminished by creating corridor and obscuring views of waymarker on opposite field boundary. Similarly to south, footpath route contained in corridor, by new fencing and planting, and obscuring wide expansive views of Wolds. Adverse.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect, albeit being positioned next to security gate. Winter views will allow for some built</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends around the view at c. 0m away and in the direction of travel.</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High

	elements to be perceptible, due to proximity. Adverse			
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint B</p> <p>View from Bradmore Road looking west.</p> <p>Receptors: Road users</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels at the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features.</p> <p>However, intervening hedgerow in middle ground obscures much of the development, especially during the summer, when in leaf. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible. No change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>Construction compound and traffic will also be perceptible along this route.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have screening effect, but thickening up existing hedgerow. Winter views may allow for some built elements perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>Low reducing to Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Site access 100m away. Other parts of the development visible across limited parts of the view at 200m away, due to hedgerow and offset to direction of travel.</p> <p>By Year 15, visible extent would reduce in summer, when foliage in leaf.</p>	Year 1	Low  Some change in the view which is appreciable
			Year 15	Negligible

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint C (also Highfields Farm LVIA 1)</p> <p>From PRoW NT Costock FP7 and Midshires Way long distance footpath and bridleway looking southeast.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes security fencing and CCTV. Solar panels at the Appeal Site would be main visible elements appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Composition of view would be altered. Legibility of footpath route would be diminished by creating corridor and obscuring views of waymarker on opposite field boundary, by footbridge. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect in summer. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible. Mitigation planting would create further enclosure and corridor effects, diminishing and obscuring the expansive and wide views. Adverse</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends around the view at c. 0m away and in the direction of travel.</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint D</p> <p>From PRoW NT Costock FP7 and Midshires Way long distance footpath and bridleway looking northeast.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes security fencing and CCTV. Solar panels at the Appeal Site would be main visible elements appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect in summer. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible. Mitigation planting would create further enclosure and corridor effects, diminishing and obscuring the expansive and wide views. Loss of views of Highfields (Listed Building) and distance views of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds). Adverse</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends around the view at c. 0m away and in the direction of travel.</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint E (also Highfields Farm LVIA 7)</p> <p>View from PRoW  NT Costock FP4 footpath looking northeast.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>Low to Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. The additional planting shown in Field 3 on the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would thicken up the boundary planting by Year 15.</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across several parts of the view at c. 1km away and alongside the direction of travel.</p>	Year 1	<p>Low</p> <p>Change in the view that is clearly visible</p>
			Year 15	<p>Low</p>
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint F</p> <p>View from PRoW LT  H62/1 footpath looking north</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on northern parcel of Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across several parts of the view at c.</p>	Year 1	<p>Negligible to Low</p> <p>Some change in the view that is appreciable</p>



Receptors: PRow users	<p>result in changes to areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site.</p>	2km away and alongside the direction of travel.	Year 15	Negligible to Low
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Extract from Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes access tracks, security fencing and CCTV. Solar panels appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>The 'enhanced' landscape strategy would introduce a new hedgerow to the north of the PRow. By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would contain and create</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Viewpoint within Appeal Site and development extends across and in the direction of travel.</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High

	enclosed corridors for users. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible, due to proximity.			
CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west  Receptors: Local Residents, Recreational and Road users	Medium size or scale of change  Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes the solar panel arrays in southern parcel appearing as overlapping structures (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural	Low reducing to Negligible geographical extent  Development extends across part of the view (framed view along the track by road junction) at c. 300m away from field gate at end of track.	Year 1	Medium  Change in the view that is clearly visible

	<p>land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect on the development in the summer, when in leaf. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible. From this elevated position, mitigation planting would obscure longer distance views. Neutral to Adverse.</p> <p>The 'enhanced' landscape strategy would introduce additional copse and tree planting along the eastern boundary of the Appeal Site. This would thicken up the screening (when in leaf in summer months) whilst also obscuring longer distance views.</p>		Year 15	Low
<p>Context Photograph 8 – View from Costock FP4 looking north-east towards Appeal Site</p> <p>Receptors: Recreational</p>	<p>Low to Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across several parts of the view at c.</p>	Year 1	<p>Medium</p> <p>Change in the view that is clearly visible</p>

	<p>texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. The additional planting shown in Field 3 on the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would thicken up the boundary planting by Year 15.</p>	1.8km away and alongside the direction of travel.	Year 15	Low
--	--	---	---------	-----

**Table SH-10 –Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors (Proposed Development in Isolation)**

Visual Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change
<p>Users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7 and 8, TLP Photomontage C and D and S.Higson Context Photographs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6)</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes security fencing, CCTV and solar panels. This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Legibility, aesthetic and perceptual experience of footpath route would be diminished by creating corridors. Obscuring locally distinct features such as Highfields (Listed Building) and rugged skyline of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds. Adverse.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have varying degrees of screening effect due to topography, position of security gates and access tracks. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible. Levels of enclosure will further</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Over 1.2km pass through the site (with close in views, altering foreground), with additional visibility of 1km beyond the site boundaries (altering mid-ground of views).</p>	Year 1	High
			Year 15	High

	obscure the existing wide and expansive views. Adverse.			
<p>Users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3, TLP Photomontage Viewpoint E and F and S.Higson Context Photograph 8)</p>	<p>Low to Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements from this route, due to distance away, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce further additional urbanising / industrial features and result in changes to areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition of views. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to elevated topography of footpath route and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Adverse</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Approximately 3km of the route from Costock to Wysall Road, Wymeswold, via Wysall Lane, with visibility dependent on topography and vegetation along route, as well as direction of travel. Views of development medium to long distance.</p>	Year 1	Negligible to Low
			Year 15	Negligible to Low

<p>Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2 and TLP Photomontage Viewpoint B. also see CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west)</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change, reducing to Negligible</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, compounds and equipment and completed development at Appeal Site visible to varying degrees. Where visible would introduce urbanising / industrial features and changing areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, existing intervening vegetation and built forms offer some screening.</p> <p>Wysall village located on route of buried cable connection and associated roadworks. Construction traffic to pass The Elms and Lodge Farm to access northern parcel (also compound off Bradmore Road). Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would offer additional screening. Winter views may allow for built elements to be perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and/or topography. Effects also dependent on orientation of windows.</p> <p>The Elms and Lodge Farm properties back onto the Appeal Site, whereas Lorne House is on opposite side of road at 400m away from nearest panels.</p> <p>Similarly, whilst dwellings on the west part of Wysall has potential views at c. 600m away from nearest panels, no visibility is predicted from the eastern part of the village.</p> <p>Visibility also available on the local road network and immediate approaches to properties.</p>	Year 1	Low
			Year 15	Negligible to Low

<p>Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5 and TLP Photomontage A)</p>	<p>High size or scale of change, reducing to Low</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site visible to varying degrees. Includes BESS and substation structures on southern parcel. Where visible, would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition of views.</p> <p>Construction traffic to pass Scotland Hill Farm to access southern parcel. Elm Lodge located on route of buried cable connection and associated roadworks. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have screening effects. Winter</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows at over 150m away from nearest panels, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and/or topography. Effects also dependent on orientation of windows.</p> <p>Visibility also available on the local road network and immediate approaches to properties.</p>	Year 1	Low
			Year 15	Negligible to Low



	views may allow for built elements to be perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.			
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm  (e.g Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3, TLP Photomontage E and F and S.Higson context photographs 8, 12 and 16)	Low to Medium size or scale of change  Solar panels on northern parcel of Appeal Site would be main visible elements from receptors at these distances, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). Where visible they would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in changes to areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition.  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of these receptors	Negligible to Low geographical extent  Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows at c. 1km away, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and /or topography. Effects also dependent on orientation of windows.	Year 1	Negligible to Low  Some changes in the views which are appreciable
			Year 15	Negligible to Low

	and the rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Adverse.			
Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60	Medium size or scale of change, reducing to low  Where visible the construction vehicles / activity and compounds, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would introduce urbanising / industrial features and	Negligible to Low geographical extent  c. 500m section of Wysall Road route passing southern site access, with c. 200m Rempstone Lane opposite	Year 1	Low  Some changes in the views which are appreciable

(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 and 5 and 8 and S.Higson context photographs 9, 10, 11, 14 and 15, also see CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west)	<p>result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, roadside vegetation varies along route and at times of year due to management, but does offer screening for passing travellers (who are principally focused on road corridor).</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would also provide screening for certain sections of these routes, especially at lower elevations along Wysall Road (beyond the site access point). Mitigation planting will be less effective for the more elevated sections of other routes and the rising slopes of the Appeal Site, such as Windyridge Road and A60. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	southern site access and c. 300m of Bradmore Road passing the northern site access (and construction compound). Shorter sections of Windyridge Road and A60 with glimpsed views. Visibility dependent on topography and vegetation along route, as well as orientation of travellers.	Year 15	Negligible to Low
--	--	---	---------	-------------------

**Table SH-11 –Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity at each Viewpoint (Cumulative)**

Viewpoint Number	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Cumulative Magnitude of Change
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 1  Southern section of Keyworth Road, near Wysall, looking south west  Receptors: Road users	No size or scale of change  (no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)	No Change  (no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)		N/A
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2  Southern section of Bradmore Road, near Wysall, looking south west  Receptors: Road users		Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not visible.		N/A

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3</p> <p>Public Footpath and Rempstone Lane, near Wolds Farm</p> <p>Receptors: PRow and Road users</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on northern parcel of Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Management of roadside hedgerow will influence visibility (e.g. likely obscuring views prior to cut).</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across several parts of the view at c. 1km away and alongside the direction of travel.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also predicted to be visible, immediately adjacent to Appeal Site and with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a wider extent.</p>	Year 1	<p>Medium</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Change in the view that is clearly visible</p>
			Year 15	<p>Medium</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 4</p> <p>Public Footpath between Rempstone Lane and Wysall, looking north</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>		<p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not visible.</p>		N/A
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5 (also Highfields Farm LVIA 8 and TLP Photomontage A)</p> <p>Junction of Rempstone Lane and Wysall Road, southern edge of the site, looking north west</p>	<p>High size or scale of change, reducing to Medium</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes the substation and BESS, with solar panels appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across view at 0m away (being adjacent) and in the direction of travel for short section of Rempstone Lane users, but alongside for longer section of users of Wysall Road.</p>	Year 1	<p>High (cumulative)</p> <p>Change that has a substantial influence on overall view</p>

Receptors: Road users	<p>change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Removal of section of roadside hedge for access. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have screening effects on certain elements during the summer, when in leaf. Winter views would allow for some built elements to be perceptible. Due to the position of the viewpoint by the access point, the roadway leading into the Appeal Site would still be visible. Views to rising valley slopes up to Lodge Farm would be obscured. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also visible, immediately adjacent to Appeal Site and with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a wider extent and sequentially for travellers along Wysall Road route.	Year 15	Medium  (cumulative)
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 6</p> <p>Nottingham Road/ Bunny Hill road, grass verge, looking east.</p> <p>Receptors: Road users</p>	<p>No size or scale of change</p> <p>(no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(no views of proposed development due to intervening vegetation)</p>		N/A

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7</p> <p>Public Footpath / Midshires Way between Wysall and the site looking south west</p> <p>Receptors: PRow users</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes the substation and BESS, with solar panel arrays appearing as overlapping structures (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect on lower parts of the development in the summer, when in leaf. Winter views may allow for some built elements to be perceptible. BESS, transformer and substation still anticipated to be visible. From this elevated position, mitigation planting not anticipated to conflict with, or obscure wide expansive views. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>Low reducing to Negligible geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across the view at c. 300m away and in the direction of travel. Albeit southern parcel more visible than northern parcel which is filtered through deciduous hedgerow.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) partially visible beyond Appeal Site and intervening vegetation with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a larger extent.</p>	Year 1	<p>Medium</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Change in the view that is clearly visible</p>
			Year 15	<p>Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>



<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 8</p> <p>Public Footpath Costock FP7 and Public Footpath Wysall FP3 / Midshires Way within the northern parcel of the site.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>		<p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not anticipated to be visible beyond Appeal Site and intervening vegetation.</p>		N/A
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint B</p> <p>View from Bradmore Road looking west.</p> <p>Receptors: Road users</p>		<p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not visible.</p>		N/A

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint C (also Highfields Farm LVIA 1)</p> <p>From PRoW NT Costock FP7 and Midshires Way long distance footpath and bridleway looking southeast.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes security fencing and CCTV. Solar panels at the Appeal Site would be main visible elements appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to rows and backs of panels). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Composition of view would be altered. Legibility of footpath route would be diminished by creating corridor and obscuring views of waymarker on opposite field boundary, by footbridge. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have some screening effect in summer. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible. Mitigation planting would create further enclosure and corridor effects, diminishing and obscuring the expansive and wide views. Adverse</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends around the view at c. 0m away and in the direction of travel.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) likely to be visible in corridor standoff from woodland to west, with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a larger extent</p>	Year 1	<p>High</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Change that has a substantial influence on overall view</p>
			Year 15	<p>High</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>

<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint D (also Highfields Farm LVIA 3)</p> <p>From PRoW NT Costock FP7 and Midshires Way long distance footpath and bridleway looking northeast.</p> <p>Receptors: PRoW users</p>		<p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) obscured by the proposed development</p>		N/A
<p>Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP  Photomontage Location  Viewpoint E (also Highfields Farm LVIA 7)</p> <p>View from PRoW NT Costock FP4 footpath looking northeast.</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Development extends across several parts of the view at c. 1km away and alongside the direction of travel.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also predicted</p>	Year 1	<p>Medium</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Change in the view that is clearly visible</p>

Receptors: PRow users	and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. The additional planting shown in Field 3 on the 'enhanced' landscape strategy plan would thicken up the boundary planting by Year 15.	to be visible, immediately adjacent to Appeal Site and with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a wider extent.	Year 15	Medium  (cumulative)
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint F  View from PRow LT   H62/1 footpath looking north  Receptors: PRow users		Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not visible		N/A
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Extract from Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4  Receptors: PRow users	High size or scale of change  Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes access tracks, security fencing and CCTV. Solar panels appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and rough texture as positioned oblique to	High geographical extent  Viewpoint within Appeal Site and development extends across and in the direction of travel.	Year 1	High  (cumulative)  Change that has a substantial influence on overall view

	<p>rows). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Change to composition. Adverse</p> <p>The 'enhanced' landscape strategy would introduce a new hedgerow to the north of the PRow. By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would contain and create enclosed corridors for users. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible, due to proximity.</p>	Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also visible, immediately beyond the Appeal Site to the west and with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a wider extent	Year 15	High  (cumulative)
<p>CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west</p> <p>Receptors: Local Residents, Recreational and Road users</p>		Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) not visible		N/A
	Medium size or scale of change	Low geographical extent	Year 1	Medium  (cumulative)

Context Photograph 8 – View from Costock FP4 looking north-east towards Appeal Site  Receptors: Recreational	Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements at this distance, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition. Adverse  By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of viewpoint and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. The additional planting shown in Field 3 on the ‘enhanced’ landscape strategy plan would thicken up the boundary planting by Year 15.	Development extends across several parts of the view at c. 1.8km away and alongside the direction of travel.  Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also predicted to be visible, immediately adjacent to Appeal Site on lower fields and with the two projects to be perceived as a single facility, across a wider extent.		Change in the view that is clearly visible
			Year 15	Medium  (cumulative)

**Table SH-12 –Magnitude of Change to Views and Visual Amenity for Key Receptors (Cumulative)**

Visual Receptor	Size or Scale of Change	Geographical Extent	Development Phase	Cumulative Magnitude of Change
<p>Users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7 and 8, TLP Photomontage C and D and S.Higson Context Photographs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6)</p>	<p>High size or scale of change</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would be visible. This includes security fencing, CCTV and solar panels. This would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. Legibility, aesthetic and perceptual experience of footpath route would be diminished by creating corridors. Obscuring locally distinct features such as Highfields (Listed Building) and rugged skyline of Charnwood, beyond the undulating Wolds. Adverse.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have varying degrees of screening effect due to topography, position of security gates and access tracks. Winter views will allow for built elements to be perceptible. Levels of enclosure will further</p>	<p>High geographical extent</p> <p>Over 1.2km pass through the site (with close in views, altering foreground), with additional visibility of 1km beyond the site boundaries (altering mid-ground of views).</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) occasionally visible in views, beyond the Appeal Site either in combination with the Appeal Site or sequentially, thereby increasing geographical extent.</p>	Year 1	<p>High</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Changes that have a substantial influence on overall views</p>
			Year 15	<p>High</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>

	obscure the existing wide and expansive views. Adverse.			
<p>Users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3, TLP Photomontage Viewpoint E and F and S.Higson Context Photograph 8)</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on the Appeal Site would be main visible elements from this route, due to distance away, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). This would introduce further additional urbanising / industrial features and result in changes to areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition of views. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to elevated topography of footpath route and rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Adverse</p>	<p>Low geographical extent</p> <p>Approximately 3km of the route from Costock to Wysall Road, Wymeswold, via Wysall Lane, with visibility dependent on topography and vegetation along route, as well as direction of travel. Views of development medium to long distance.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also likely to be frequently visible in views, either in combination with the Appeal Site or sequentially, thereby increasing geographical extent.</p>	Year 1	<p>Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Some changes in the views which are appreciable</p>
			Year 15	<p>Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>



<p>Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2 and TLP Photomontage Viewpoint B, also see CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west)</p>	<p>Low size or scale of change, reducing to Negligible</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity and compounds, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site visible to varying degrees. Where visible would introduce urbanising / industrial features and changing areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape. However, existing intervening vegetation and built forms offer some screening.</p> <p>Wysall village located on route of buried cable connection and associated roadworks. Construction traffic to pass The Elms and Lodge Farm to access northern parcel (and construction compound off Bradmore Road). Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would offer additional screening.</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and/or topography. Effects also dependent on orientation of windows.</p> <p>The Elms and Lodge Farm properties back onto the Appeal Site, whereas Lorne House is on opposite side of road at 400m away from nearest panels.</p> <p>Similarly, whilst dwellings on the west part of Wysall has potential views at c. 600m away from nearest panels, no visibility is predicted from the eastern part of the village.</p>	Year 1	<p>Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Some changes in the views which are appreciable</p>
			Year 15	<p>Negligible to Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p>

	Winter views may allow for built elements to be perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.	<p>Visibility also available on the local road network and immediate approaches to properties.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) potentially visible for elevated views looking west, with the two projects perceived as a single facility, across a larger extent.</p>		
<p>Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5 and TLP Photomontage A)</p>	<p>High size or scale of change, reducing to Low</p> <p>Construction vehicles / activity, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site visible to varying degrees. Includes BESS and substation structures on southern parcel.</p> <p>Where visible, would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows at over 150m away from nearest panels, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and/or topography. Effects also</p>	Year 1	<p>Low</p> <p>(cumulative)</p> <p>Some changes in the views which are appreciable</p>

	<p>and open landscape. However, no change to composition of views.</p> <p>Construction traffic to pass Scotland Hill Farm to access southern parcel. Elm Lodge located on route of buried cable connection and associated roadworks. Adverse</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have screening effects. Winter views may allow for built elements to be perceptible. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>dependent on orientation of windows.</p> <p>Visibility also available on the local road network and immediate approaches to properties.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also potentially visible in views, with the two projects perceived as a single facility, across a larger extent.</p>	Year 15	Negligible to Low (cumulative)
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm	<p>Medium size or scale of change</p> <p>Solar panels on northern parcel of Appeal Site would be main visible elements from receptors at these distances, appearing as overlapping sheets (grey colour and smooth texture). Where visible they would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in changes to areas of sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale,</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>Visibility mostly limited to upper storey windows at c. 1km away, with ground floor and garden areas restricted by intervening vegetation and /or topography. Effects also</p>	Year 1	<p>Low (cumulative)</p> <p>Some changes in the views which are appreciable</p>

(e.g Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3, TLP Photomontage E and F and S.Higson context photographs 8, 12 and 16)	<p>simple and open landscape. However, no change to composition.</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would have limited screening effect due to the elevated nature of these receptors and the rising slopes of the Appeal Site. Adverse.</p>	<p>dependent on orientation of windows.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also potentially visible in views, either in combination with the Appeal Site or in succession, thereby increasing the geographical extent.</p>	Year 15	Low  (cumulative)
<p>Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60</p> <p>(e.g. Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 and 5 and 8 and S.Higson context photographs 9, 10, 11, 14 and</p>	<p>Medium size or scale of change, reducing to low</p> <p>Where visible the construction vehicles / activity and compounds, equipment and completed development at Appeal Site would introduce urbanising / industrial features and result in a fundamental change to sloping agricultural land. This would contrast with the medium scale, simple and open landscape.</p>	<p>Negligible to Low geographical extent</p> <p>c. 500m section of Wysall Road route passing southern site access, with c. 200m Rempstone Lane opposite southern site access and c. 300m of Bradmore Road passing the northern site</p>	Year 1	<p>Low  (cumulative)</p> <p>Some changes in the views which are appreciable</p>

15, also see CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west)	<p>However, roadside vegetation varies along route and at times of year due to management, but does offer screening for passing travellers (who are principally focused on road corridor).</p> <p>By year 15 hedgerow management and tree planting would also provide screening for certain sections of these routes, especially at lower elevations along Wysall Road (beyond the site access point). Mitigation planting will be less effective for the more elevated sections of other routes and the rising slopes of the Appeal Site, such as Windyridge Road and A60. Neutral to Adverse.</p>	<p>access. Shorter sections of Windyridge Road and A60 with glimpsed views. Visibility dependent on topography and vegetation along route, as well as orientation of travellers.</p> <p>Other cumulative site (22/00303/FUL) also likely to be frequently visible in views, either in combination with the Appeal Site or sequentially. For example, travellers along Wysall Road passing both sites.</p>	Year 15	Negligible to Low (cumulative)
--	---	---	---------	--------------------------------

**Table SH-13 – Overall Visual Effects (Proposed Development in Isolation)**

Visual Receptor	Visual Sensitivity	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change	Visual Effect	Nature of Effect
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 1  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	No Change	No Change	Neutral
		Year 15	No Change	No Change	Neutral
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral to Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3  Receptors: PRow and Road users	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (PRow users) and Minor (Road users)	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate (PRow users) and Minor (Road users)	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 4  Receptors: PRow users	High	Year 1	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Neutral (to Adverse)
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Neutral (to Adverse)

Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	High	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Moderate	Neutral (to Adverse)
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 6  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	No Change	No Change	Neutral
		Year 15	No Change	No Change	Neutral
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	Medium	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate	Neutral (to Adverse)
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 8  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	High	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint B  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral (to Adverse)

Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint C (also Highfields Farm LVIA 1)  Receptors: PRow users	High	Year 1	High	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint D  Receptors: PRow users	High	Year 1	High	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint E (also Highfields Farm LVIA 7)  Receptors: PRow users	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (PRow users) and Minor (Road users)	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate (PRow users) and Minor (Road users)	Adverse
	High	Year 1	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Moderate	Adverse



Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint F  Receptors: PRoW users		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Moderate	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Extract from Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	High	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major	Adverse
CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from Costock Road, looking west  Receptors: Local Residents, Recreational and Road users	High (Local Residents and Recreational) Medium (Road users)	Year 1	Medium	Major (Residents and PRoW users) and Moderate (Road users)	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate (Residents and PRoW users) and Minor (Road users)	Adverse
Context Photograph 8 – View from Costock FP4	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate	Adverse

looking north-east towards Appeal Site  Receptors: Recreational		Year 15	Low	Moderate	Adverse
Users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way	High	Year 1	Medium	Major	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Major	Adverse
Users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site (Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)	High	Year 1	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Adverse
Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Neutral (to Adverse)

Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm, Hillcrest Farm and Windyridge Farm	High	Year 1	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate)	Adverse
Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Minor)	Neutral (to Adverse)

Table SH-14 – Overall Visual Effects (Cumulative)

Visual Receptor	Visual Sensitivity	Development Phase	Magnitude of Change	Visual Effect	Nature of Effect
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 1  Receptors: Road users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 2  Receptors: Road users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 3  Receptors: PRoW and Road users	High	Year 1	Medium	Major (PRoW users) and Moderate (Road users)  (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Major (PRoW users) and Moderate (Road users)  (cumulative)	Adverse

Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 4  Receptors: PRow users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 5  Receptors: Road users	Medium	Year 1	High	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Moderate (cumulative)	Neutral (to Adverse)
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 6  Receptors: Road users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 7  Receptors: PRow users	High	Year 1	Medium	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Neutral (to Adverse)
				N/A	

Pegasus' Updated LVIA Viewpoint 8  Receptors: PRoW users				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint B  Receptors: Road users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint C (also Highfields Farm LVIA 1)  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	High	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint D  Receptors: PRoW users				N/A	
				N/A	

Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint E (also Highfields Farm LVIA 7)  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	Medium	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
Pegasus' Updated LVIA TLP Photomontage Location Viewpoint F  Receptors: PRoW users				N/A	
				N/A	
Pegasus' Updated LVIA Extract from Highfields Farm LVIA, Viewpoint 4  Receptors: PRoW users	High	Year 1	High	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	High	Major  (cumulative)	Adverse
CAAMP Significant Views on the track leading from				N/A	

Costock Road, looking west  Receptors: Local Residents, Recreational and Road users				N/A	
Context Photograph 8 – View from Costock FP4 looking north-east towards Appeal Site  Receptors: Recreational	High	Year 1	Medium	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
Users of PRow within and around the Appeal Site (Costock FP7, Wysall FP3 and FP4, including users of the Midshires Way and Notts Wolds Way	High	Year 1	Medium	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Medium	Major (cumulative)	Adverse
Users of PRow to the south of the Appeal Site	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Adverse



(Costock FP4, Rempstone FP9 and FP8 and HG61/3)		Year 15	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Adverse
Local residents at some of the properties within Wysall, as well as The Elms, Lodge Farm and Lorne House to the east of the Appeal Site	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate) (cumulative)	Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties within the valley to the south of the Appeal Site, including Scotland Hill Farm, Five Oaks Stables and The Elm Lodge	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Moderate) (cumulative)	Neutral (to Adverse)
Local residents at properties on elevated land to the south of the Appeal Site, including Canaan Farm, Wolds Farm and Wolds Farm	High	Year 1	Low	Moderate (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Low	Moderate	Adverse

Bungalow, Peatlands Farm, Oak Tree Farm and Hillcrest Farm				(cumulative)	
Road users travelling along local road network, such as Wysall Road, Costock Road, Rempstone Lane, Wysall Lane, Bradmore Road, Windyridge Road and A60	Medium	Year 1	Low	Minor (cumulative)	Adverse
		Year 15	Negligible to Low	Negligible (to Minor) (cumulative)	Neutral (to Adverse)



FELSTONE  
CONSULTING  
CHARTERED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Felstone Consulting Limited

Email: [contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk](mailto:contact@felstoneconsulting.co.uk) Web: [www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk](http://www.felstoneconsulting.co.uk)

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