

7. CHAPTER 7: LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 Introduction

This Chapter of the ESA evaluates the effects of the changes within Area A and Area C of the Amended Proposed Development, as detailed in Chapter 5 of this ESA, on both the character of the landscape and visual amenity. There are no changes in Area B of relevance to landscape and visual assessment.

The assessment follows the same structure as Chapter 7 within Volume 1 of the ES and notes where the Amended Proposed Development has given rise to a variation in potential effect or impact rating. In some cases, there would be a benefit and, in some cases, no noticeable change. The assessment has identified no increase in adverse effects, as the amendments to the Proposed Development at both the 'embedded' mitigation level and restoration stage, have had many positive impacts.

The re-assessment of the Amended Proposed Development was undertaken by a chartered landscape architect at Environmental Resource Management (ERM) on behalf of the Applicant.

7.2 Planning Policy

The guidance, legislation, and information sources considered within the assessment remain unchanged from Chapter 7 of the ES.

The findings of Sections 7.2 and 7.3 of the ES relating to compliance with Planning Policy are mostly similar, however, the Amended Restoration Plan (Figure 7.12, Volume 2 of this ESA) would have significantly improved biodiversity potential and would provide a new permissive way surfaced by bark chippings or similar suitable for use by horse riders and cyclists as well as walkers. This would run along the Site boundary near to and parallel with the existing footpath Sutton|FP1 and would extend through the Site from Lound Low Road and connect with bridleway Sutton|B4. These amendments would provide some improvement in terms of compliance with the requirements of national and local planning policy, and both Lound and Sutton-cum-Lound Neighbourhood Plans.

7.3 Consultation Process

Non-formal EIA technical engagement is ongoing and a new period of formal ES consultation will be commenced following the Regulation 25 submission. Consultee responses received to date have been summarised in Table 3.1 within Chapter 3 of the ESA.

A site visit was undertaken with a representative from NCC (Via East Midlands) on the 11th October 2023 to review and inform the assessment process. Following discussions, several figures have been updated and new visualisations produced to illustrate the visibility of the four proposed silos within Area C in views from the west, and the effects of tree removal and landform remodelling on the western and northern boundaries of Area A on Bellmoor Farm and Lound Low Road during the phased restoration of the Site (refer to Figures 7.15-7.17, and Figure 7.19, Volume 2 of this ESA).

The working strategy and phasing order have been revised to reduce the potential effects of air, noise, landscape, and visual effects. The changes to the Proposed Development are summarised in Section 5.5 and Table 5.3 of Chapter 5 of this ESA.

The Amended Restoration Plan (Figure 7.12, Volume 2 of this ESA) has also been revised to be a biodiversity led scheme and significantly improve the likely ecological benefits, including increasing the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) from 13% to 42%. These positive changes are discussed in more detail in Section 5.3 of this ESA.

7.4 Assessment Methodology, Scope and Significance Criteria

The assessment methodology and approach to significance criteria outlined in Section 7.5 of the ES remain unchanged. For more details refer to Technical Appendices 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4, Volume 3 of the ES.

The guidance documents, study areas, fieldwork, and viewpoints considered for the assessment of potential effects on landscape and visual amenity also remain unchanged (refer to Section 7.6, Volume 1 of the ES).

7.5 Baseline Conditions

The ES was submitted to NCC in February 2023 and the baseline landscape context including landscape character and designations, protected features, and receptors included in the appraisal have not changed.

Refer to Section 7.7.3, Volume 1 of the ES for a full description of the baseline landscape character and regional landscape character type and units. They are illustrated in Figure 7.6b, Volume 2 of the ES.

7.6 Amended Proposed Development Summary

A detailed description of the changes to the Proposed Development is provided in Chapter 5 of this ESA. Greater detail has been provided in order to provide clarity on the extraction processes, method of working, soil stripping, and restoration (including more information on restoration landform levels). Table 5.2 provides a summary, and the Phasing Plans are shown in Appendix 5.2, ESA Vol 3.

The landscape mitigation features included within the Amended Proposed Development seek to reinforce and improve boundary treatments. These include:

- Advance planting would be carried out before the commencement of extraction. This would primarily be along Lound Low Road to supplement the screening provided by the existing hedgerow and trees to be retained, and along the western edge of Area B to provide screening and replace vegetation to be removed.
- The sandstone lagoon embankments would be retained until the end of extraction in the relevant phase in order to substantially screen activities.
- The SSSI embankment to the south of HR P2 would be retained.
- Additional targeted amenity measures, such as bunding, would also be provided as a temporary measure along sections of Lound Low Road and the western boundary of HR P3 and HR P4. These bunds would be provided or partially retained to screen restoration activities and would utilise soils stored for later use during restoration activities of later phases of the Amended Proposed Development. Wind amelioration bunds would also be provided within the Site between phases HR P4, HR P5, and HR P6, which would limit views across the Site. These bunds would restrict views into and across the Site during the restoration works and would be seeded with wildflower annuals for visual and biodiversity interest.

These features are illustrated in Figure 7.18 (Volume 2 of this ESA). The operation is to be phased as before with ongoing and progressive restoration as each phase is extracted.

7.7 Development Design & Mitigation

As noted in Chapter 5 of this ESA, the process of 'mitigation by design' (previously included within Section 7.9, Volume 1 of the ES) has been amended to reduce environmental effects including to minimise residual effects and to maximise opportunities for biodiversity benefits post-restoration.

This includes changes to the 'embedded mitigation' that are described in Chapter 5 of this ESA (refer to Table 5.3). In terms of landscape and visual impact the key changes that have informed the revised assessment are identified below.

- The conveyor corridor has been repositioned away from the edge of Area A and semi-fixed Temporary Processing Areas 1-3 have been removed from the scheme, taking this elevated infrastructure away from the edge of the Site.

- An adjustable covered spur conveyor would be used to take the movable reception hopper close to the working extraction face.
- The maintenance road and conveyor would be extended progressively through the void at a lower level as the PFA is extracted, which is facilitated by working west to east. This allows the infrastructure to be positioned further away from sensitive receptors and facilitates screening by the existing lagoon embankments.
- The phasing order has been amended to run from west to east. The primary reason for changing the phasing order is to facilitate extraction always taking place at a lower level and being contained behind the existing lagoon embankments, therefore restricting visual effects. Note that previously the proposal to work from east to west after HR P1 required an elevated conveyor and maintenance road corridor running in an elevated position close to the southern boundary of the Site and in closer proximity to the properties at Bellmoor Farm.
- Each phase would be split into a number of small micro-phases. These would be soil stripped individually followed progressively by the PFA extraction process, with only around 1% of Area A undergoing extraction at any given time.
- Soil bunds would be provided or partially retained along sections of the northern boundary of LR P5 and HR P6 that adjoins Lound Low Road and PRoW Sutton|BOAT7 and along the western boundary of HR P3 as an additional and targeted visual amenity mitigation measure.
- The haul road and conveyor crossing between HR P1 and HR P2 has been moved further away from the properties within Bellmoor Farm.
- The existing vegetated embankment within the SSSI is to be permanently retained to screen Site activities from adjoining footpath users and visitors to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve.

7.8 Limitations and Assumptions

The limitations and assumptions of the LVIA addendum remain broadly similar to those described in Section 7.10, Volume 1 of the ES.

7.9 Assessment of No Development Scenario

No change to the 'no development scenario' is anticipated (refer to Section 7.11, Volume 1 of the ES).

7.10 Landscape Effects

Changes to the identified landscape effects are described below. Refer to Section 7.7.3, Volume 1 of the ES for a full description of the baseline landscape character and regional landscape character type and units. The landscape character units are illustrated in Figure 7.6b, Volume 2 of the ES.

The Site landscape character and the 'host' local character unit IL10 Ranskill (The Bassetlaw District Landscape Character Assessment (BDLCA), 2009) have the most potential for a reduced effect from the revised working strategy.

7.10.1 Landscape Effects during the Construction Stage

There would be a slight reduction in the number of trees to be removed as the sandstone embankment along the southern boundary adjoining the SSSI would be left wholly undisturbed.

7.10.2 Landscape Effects at Soil Stripping Stage

More detail has been provided on the location and timing of soil stripping. These activities, as discussed in Section 7.12.2 in the ES would introduce some temporary vehicle movements and disturbances that would influence the landscape character.

The revised method of stripping within smaller micro-phases (approximately 0.5-1.0 hectares (ha) in size) would limit the effects on landscape character as the area of activity would be confined to a smaller area than previously stated in the ES. This would noticeably reduce landscape effects placing them on parity with general agricultural activities. The effects on landscape character would therefore be less than the effects previously reported in the ES.

7.10.3 Landscape Effects at Operational Stage: Year One

The landscape effects at Year 1 would be concentrated within HR P1 and the main vehicular access from the A638. The predicted effects have reduced slightly as the amount of vegetation to be removed to facilitate the widened access has been reduced to a 15 metre (m) wide band and the taller infrastructure has been repositioned to form a grouping around the existing Breedon silo minimising its influence. All extraction would be carried out at depth behind the retained embankments with limited surface working outside of soil stripping activities.

7.10.4 Landscape Effects at Restoration: Ongoing & After Decommissioning

An ongoing progressive restoration is proposed. This is described fully in Section 5.3 of the ESA. Following extraction of the PFA, the amended restoration (taking on board comments from NCC and NWT) has been designed to provide:

- Greater emphasis on biodiversity with more wet grassland and reedbeds and a reduction in pasture.
- The complete retention of the SSSI embankment.
- The minimisation of vehicle movements over the restored landscape through the use of covered conveyors.
- The replacement of large open water bodies with more shallows and clusters of ponds to encourage amphibians and aquatic invertebrates, using on-site restoration materials to raise levels, including the lagoon embankments thereby unlocking valuable soils.
- Fewer but larger woodland blocks to maximise and improve woodland habitats.
- A commitment to manage the land (aftercare) for up to 30 years for each extraction phase following Restoration.

These changes would similarly enhance the existing landscape character of the Site and its environs which would provide a beneficial change not only for the Site but to the wider landscape setting (refer to Figures 7.12-7.14 in ESA, Volume 2).

7.10.5 Assessment of Landscape Effects

Residual landscape effects have been reduced following the revised working strategy. The most pronounced adverse effects would be limited to a short period during restoration, as the vegetated sandstone embankments left in situ during extraction are progressively removed and the landform remodelled. This is a temporary effect.

Significant effects are now restricted to beneficial effects post-restoration. Table 7.1 below provides an assessment of the residual landscape effects described within this Chapter post-embedded and including additional mitigation following the revised approach to construction, soil stripping, extraction, and restoration.

Table 7.1: Assessment of Landscape Effects

Receptor/ Phase	Sensitivity and Magnitude of Change	Classification of Effect
LANDSCAPE EFFECTS (Refer to Figures 7.6a and 7.6b: Volume 2 of the ES)		
Landscape Character		
IL10 Ranskill (The Bassetlaw District Landscape Character Assessment, 2009) - This is the 'host' Landscape Character Parcel (LCP). This and the Site character have the greatest potential for a pronounced magnitude of change in character resulting from the Amended Proposed Development.		
Construction	Medium sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor adverse and temporary
Operation	Medium sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor adverse, temporary and reversible. These effects would be concentrated within or surrounding the 0.5 - 1.0 ha area of working with lower effects elsewhere
Restoration (Year 1)	Medium sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change.	Moderate adverse, temporary and reversible. These effects would be concentrated within or surrounding the 0.5 - 1.0 ha area of working with lower effects elsewhere.
Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	Medium sensitivity/ Large magnitude of change.	Moderate-major beneficial
Site Landscape Character - This and the 'host' landscape character parcel (LCP) have the greatest potential for a pronounced magnitude of change in character.		
Construction	Medium sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor adverse and temporary
Operation	Medium sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change	Minor adverse, temporary and reversible. These effects would be concentrated within the 0.5 - 1.0 ha area of extraction with lower effects elsewhere
Restoration (Year 1)	Medium sensitivity/ Large magnitude of change	Up to moderate-major adverse with the most pronounced effects concentrated within the 0.5 -1.0 ha area being restored with lower effects elsewhere
Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	Medium sensitivity/ Large magnitude of change	Moderate-major beneficial at the Site level

7.10.6 Summary of Landscape Effects

In summary, the Amended Proposed Development would have reduced effects on landscape receptors in comparison with the earlier design. Pronounced effects would be restricted to within the Site and would generally relate to the restoration stage. Areas of working have been reduced in scale (between 0.5 to 1 ha) and the silos have been grouped adjacent to the existing Breedon silo which is of similar scale. Any lighting used within Area C at the Main Processing Site or within Area A at the

extraction face during working hours would be directional or controlled by sensors to minimise light spill and urbanising influences.

Indirect effects on the surrounding landscape character would be limited by the retention of the SSSI embankment along the southern boundary and the working at depth behind the western and northern embankments, with reduced surface working. Soil stripping activities would take from 5 days for the smaller phase LR P2 to 12 days approximately for the largest phase HR P1.

Features that contribute to the landscape character such as the perimeter woodland belts would either remain largely intact or only be removed at the end of extraction as part of the site wide restoration strategy. The embankment removal and infilling would take up to two weeks approximately for the larger phases with planting and seeding undertaken as soon as possible. The progressive and ongoing restoration would enable landform profiling that would ultimately result in beneficial landscape effects both on the Site and adjoining landscape areas with the potential for vistas and a greater degree of openness from the more naturalistic topography, in keeping with the wider landscape character.

7.11 Visual Effects

The visual receptors included within the appraisal are unchanged (refer to Sections 7.13.1 to 7.13.2, Volume 1 of the ES). There are some changes to visual effects from the revised working and restoration strategy which are outlined below.

As previously described, the individual stages of the Amended Proposed Development would have varying effects, in terms of the visual receptors affected and the extent of the change effected.

7.11.1 Visual Effects at the Construction Stage

The main changes include:

- The conveyor corridor has been repositioned away from the edge of Area A and semi-fixed Processing Area 1-3 has been removed; and
- The haul road and conveyor would be extended progressively through the void as the PFA is extracted and would be positioned at a lower level behind the existing lagoon embankments where extraction is ongoing.

7.11.2 Visual Effects at the Soil Stripping Stage

The primary change would be the reduction of the area of soil stripping and therefore the area of PFA exposed at any given time. The soils would be stripped from micro-phases of around 0.5-1.0 ha, rather than stripping the entire phase at the same time. The sandstone embankments would be retained during extraction and proposed internal wind management bunding provided between HR P4, HR P5, and HR P6, and temporary visual amenity mitigation bunding along a section of Lound Low Road and HR P3. This would provide additional filtering of views experienced by visual receptors.

7.11.3 Visual Effects at the Operational Stage: Year 1

The main change to the previous appraisal includes:

- The use of the existing sandstone embankments and low bunds to screen or filter views to extraction and processing activities. The change to the phasing order would enable working at lower levels, which would provide benefits in terms of reducing potential visual effects.
- Reduced area of working minimises the extent of effects.
- The maintenance road and conveyor have been moved further away from sensitive receptors.

These changes would reduce effects visual amenity experienced at Bellmoor Farm and Bellmoor Cottage (and the other properties in this location) (R2) and Low Farm (R1) and the Wetlands Fishery (R9).

7.11.4 Visual Effects at Restoration: Ongoing & After Restoration

The primary difference between the previous and the revised restoration strategy is the increased provision of biodiversity-led restoration and aftercare across the Site. This would provide better ecological value and biodiversity gain from the range of habitats created (as the increase in BNG illustrates) and improved landscape and visual benefits.

Wind amelioration and targeted amenity bunds seeded with wildflower annuals would screen views across or into the Site from visually sensitive locations during restoration activities as the embankments are remodelled to create the final landform gradients. Refer to Figure 7.18, Volume 2 of the ESA.

A new permissive way would also be provided post-restoration which would widen public access to the Site with a bird hide / viewpoint location and interpretation board providing recreational benefits to visitors following restoration.

7.11.5 Visual Effects of Lighting

The light spill from the Amended Proposed Development would be strictly controlled to minimise effects on visual receptors. Flat glass diffusers with downward directional lighting would be utilised within the extraction void and in the Main Processing Site to minimise the area of influence, and limit and control spread.

Effects would be most pronounced in the autumn/winter when day lengths are shorter, and lighting would be required at the beginning or end of the day during the period from 7 am to 7 pm on weekdays and 7 am to 1 pm on Saturdays. Lighting would also have more potential to be visible during the autumn and winter months, due to the loss of leaves from vegetation and darker evenings, but any light spill from headlights and directional lighting would be filtered or screened by intervening landform such as retained or partially retained embankments and bunding or fencing. Vegetation to be retained on the perimeter of the Site would also have some filtering effects, particularly in combination with landform undulations and bunding alongside sensitive receptors.

Any lighting associated with the construction or the extraction phases would be restricted to the active works area and would use two mobile lighting towers, typically up to 7 m tall. Lighting within Area C, the Main Processing Site, would also use mobile lighting towers to light the operational areas, with supplementary motion sensor security lighting as necessary around the Materials Storage Building and car parking area. Working at depth within Area A behind the sandstone embankments would mitigate lighting effects during the extraction phase with greater effects predicted during the preliminary soil stripping phase and during restoration when more surface working would be required. This would be a temporary and short-term effect and limited to discrete micro-phases. The impact of lighting has been considered within the assessments of the effects on visual receptors throughout.

The approach to lighting is described in more detail in Section 5.6 in Chapter 5 of this ESA. It should be noted that a detailed lighting strategy to control and mitigate the effects of any lighting required may be secured by a planning condition.

7.12 Viewpoints

The viewpoints appraised remain unchanged, but for some of these, the effects have lowered (refer to Section 7.13.4, Volume 1 and Figures 7.4, 7.5 and 7.11a-7.11l, Volume 2 of the ES). The viewpoints illustrate the Site and landscape context so that the composition of the view can be fully understood.

7.12.1 Viewpoint Selection

Advice has been sought from VIA East Midlands (NCC’s landscape representative) on the choice of viewpoints. Following the preliminary desktop review to identify sensitive receptors a list of viewpoint locations was included in the EIA Scoping Report, and in the VIA scoping response (SC/4471 dated 04th November 2022) it was confirmed that: *‘We agree with the range of viewpoints chosen – these cover recreational receptors on Public Rights of Way (PRoW), residential receptors within the closest settlements, and vehicle receptors on adjacent roads.’* Further viewpoint recommendations were made by VIA in their response to the ES (ES/4518, 21st September 2023). These were reviewed on the Site walkover on the 11th of October.

7.12.2 Viewpoints Discounted from Selection

Views disqualified from selection are listed below in Table 7.2. Following a review of the suggested viewpoint locations on Site by the author and a representative of VIA East Midlands on the 11th October 2023, it was decided that these locations would have limited value in increasing the understanding of impacts on the visual amenity of receptors in the wider area and they were discounted from further analysis. Refer to Figures 7.4, 7.5, and 7.11a-7.11l, Volume 2 of the ES.

Table 7.2: Summary of Viewpoints Disqualified from Selection

Suggested Viewpoint Location	Revision or Reason for Disqualification
VIA Response (SC/4471, 04th November 2022)	
Portland Place (500 m, W)	The viewpoint was micro sited on Site and is illustrated by Viewpoint 8.
St. Bartolomew’s Church, Sutton-cum-Lound (950 m, W)	This location was reviewed but was found to have no, or very limited visibility of the Amended Proposed Development due to intervening built form and vegetation. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Town Street Conservation Area	Viewpoint 8 represents this viewpoint.
Eastern edge of Lound at the beginning of Chainbridge Lane	Viewpoint 1 represents this viewpoint.
Idle Valley Nature Reserve to the North of the River Idle	A variety of viewpoints were added from the Riverside Discovery Walk and Woodland Trail within the Idle Valley Nature Reserve and the most representative views were chosen. These are represented by Viewpoints 4, 5 and 6.
VIA Response (ES/4518, 21st September 2023)	
Edge of Bellmoor Lake SSSI (770 m, E)	There would potentially be glimpsed views of the upper elements of structures associated with the Main Processing Site (e.g., tops of the silos) but these elements would not dominate or fundamentally change the characteristics of the view which already contains glimpses of similar features. The vegetated embankment along the edge of the SSSI boundary is to be retained and would effectively restrict views even in winter. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
PRoW FP1 at Sutton (250 m, E)	Despite the close proximity of the viewpoint location there would be only limited potential for glimpsed views of the upper elements of structures associated with the Main Processing Site due to intervening vegetation. This vegetation would screen views even in winter. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Randall Way (650 m SE)	Randall Way links North Road with Hallcroft Road on the northwestern edge of Retford. Roadside bunding and vegetation (5-6 m tall) screen views such that there would be no, or very limited visibility only, of the Amended Proposed Development. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Babworth Home Farm, Sutton Lane (1.7 km, SSW)	This viewpoint is located adjacent to a football ground to the North of a cluster of residential buildings and outbuildings associated with Babworth Home Farm. The lane is flanked on either side by hedgerow planting and the view is filtered by

	intervening built form and vegetation such that there would be no, or very limited visibility only, of the Amended Proposed Development. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Chesterfield Canal (1 km WSW)	This viewpoint location is located near Forest Bottom Lock 57. The tow path to the immediate east of the canal is lined in part by scrub. There would be potential for transient and glimpsed views of the upper elements of structures associated with the Main Processing Site and the change in landform height and loss of vegetation but at a distance of 1 km these would have very limited influence and would be filtered by intervening woodland belts. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Chesterfield Canal (1.4 km WSW)	This viewpoint location is located near Forest Middle Lock 56. The tow path to the immediate east of the canal is lined in part by scrub. There would be potential for transient and glimpsed views of the upper elements of structures associated with the Main Processing Site and the change in landform height and loss of vegetation but at a distance of 1 km these would have very limited influence and would be filtered by intervening woodland belts. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Keepers Cottage (1.5 km WSW)	This property is accessed by a single-track road lined by a hedgerow North of Forest Farm. The curtilage of the dwelling is bounded on all sides by tall and mature trees such that views out to the wider landscape are heavily filtered. Combined with intervening vegetation between the cottage and the Amended Proposed Development views would be screened further, and there would be no, or very limited visibility of the Amended Proposed Development only. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Station Road, Sutton-cum-Lound (1.2 km W)	This viewpoint is located adjacent to 4 no. Properties on Station Road, which falls between Barnby Moor and Sutton-cum-Lound and links Sutton Lane with the A638 (Great North Road). There is a footpath running adjacent to the carriageway on the north side and a roadside hedgerow. The building is orientated to face south, and any potential ground-based views would be oblique and extensively filtered by intervening vegetation. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Sutton FP 3 (470 m, WSW)	This viewpoint location is situated on a PRoW to the south of Sutton-cum-Lound. The footpath comprises an informal track through farmland. Any potential views across the field would be filtered by field boundary hedgerows and trees. This view is a replication of the views represented by viewpoints 9 and 10 which are closer and have a clearer view of the Site boundary. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.
Sutton FP 3 (300 m, NW)	This viewpoint location is situated on a PRoW to the south of Sutton-cum-Lound. The footpath comprises an informal track through farmland. This view is slightly less open than at PAV20 above due to the presence of more field boundary trees. Any potential views across the field would be extensively filtered by field boundary hedgerows and trees. This view is a replication of the views represented by viewpoints 9 and 10 which are closer and have a clearer view of the Site boundary. On this basis it has not been included in the assessment.

7.12.3 Viewpoint Assessment

Viewpoints are an important element of the LVIA but should not be the sole means of considering the potential effects of the Proposed Development.

A total of 12 viewpoints, representative of the landscape context, closest, and type of receptors likely to be affected by the Amended Proposed Development are used in the LVIA. Each viewpoint illustrates the approximate horizontal extent of the Amended Proposed Development. This umbrella annotation on the viewpoint figures is included to orientate the reader and does not indicate that the Proposed Development would be visible. The assessment of effects describes the potential visibility at each viewpoint.

Those viewpoints with a potential change due to the Amended Proposed Development are discussed below. Refer to Figures 7.4, 7.5 and 7.11a-7.11l, Volume 2 of the ES, for the original viewpoint assessment, and Figures 7.4 and 7.5 in Volume 2 of this ESA for the updated ZTVs.

7.12.3.1 Viewpoint 4 Idle Valley Nature Reserve Riverside Discovery Walk (230 m, S)

This viewpoint in addition to Viewpoint 5 below is illustrative of the views available from the trail within the Idle Valley Nature Reserve from the riverside (refer to Figure 7.11d, Volume 2 of the ES). It is an enclosed viewpoint even in winter.

The wooded embankment adjoining the SSSI boundary is now to be permanently retained and all vertical infrastructure and the maintenance road and conveyor have been re-located away from the edge of the Site. All soil stripping and extraction activities are now to be undertaken within small cells which would limit both the extent and length of disruption. Any surface-level work would be limited in scale.

A length of 2 m high soil bunding would also be provided along the southern edge of LR P2 and LR P1. This would greatly reduce any potential for visibility, with any possible glimpsed views through thinner sections of boundary vegetation extensively filtered, and barely discernible.

People undertaking recreation are assessed as having high sensitivity however during the majority of operation, including extraction and restoration, there would be no change to the baseline view and limited or no effects on visual amenity.

7.12.3.2 Viewpoint 5 Idle Valley Nature Reserve Woodland Walk (80 m, S)

This viewpoint is representative of views that people would potentially experience from a woodland walk within the Idle Valley Nature Reserve (refer to Figure 7.11e, Volume 2 of the ES).

The view is directed across the River Idle and through around 80 m of extensive vegetation to the wooded lagoon embankment forming the boundary of the Site. The distance and density of the woodland planting means that views of the Amended Proposed Development are unlikely even in winter.

The vegetated embankment adjoining the SSSI boundary (circa 17.3 m AOD) would now be permanently retained, and infrastructure including the maintenance road and conveyor have been re-located away from the edge of the site. Furthermore, these would also be repositioned at a lower level behind the retained embankment and not in an elevated position. These changes would significantly reduce any potential for visibility of Site activities, with any possible views extensively filtered, or screened.

People undertaking recreation are assessed as having high sensitivity and there would be potential for negligible adverse effects for a short period when glimpsed or transient views may be available during the soil stripping activities in HR P2. This activity would be limited to approximately 5.5 days with the only other visible activity outside of this period including occasional maintenance vehicle visiting the filter pond area. During the majority of operation, including extraction and restoration, there would be no change to the baseline view and no effect on visual amenity.

7.12.3.3 Viewpoint 6 Idle Valley Nature Reserve (260 m, S)

The views from this location are directed across the Idle Valley Nature Reserve wetland area and lake to a belt of mature woodland which is located on the retained embankment that forms the southern boundary of the Site (refer to Figure 7.11f, Volume 2 of the ES).

As described above, the vegetated embankment adjoining the SSSI boundary (circa 17.3 m AOD) is to be retained, the conveyor corridor moved to extend progressively to follow the direction of extraction, and the semi-fixed processing plant removed.

Views to Area A are screened by intervening landform and vegetation. There may be intermittent views of the repositioned silos emerging above woodland although any visibility would be filtered by intervening vegetation and built form including the new Griffin Freight Services Industrial Unit which is currently under construction but not included within the ZTV data sets. Potential visibility illustrated by

the updated Figure 7.5, Volume 2 of this ESA, is therefore predicted to be less than shown for this location.

Recreational receptors at this location have been considered as being of high sensitivity to change. There would be very limited changes to the baseline view or visual amenity during construction, operation or restoration and the magnitude of change would be less than negligible and the resulting effect negligible adverse.

7.12.3.4 Viewpoint 7 Sutton Lane North of Cross Road Farm (360 m, SW)

The view from this location is directed east from the highway through gaps in a roadside hedgerow across a flat landscape of rough grassland to a vegetated skyline which is the western boundary of the Site, primarily Area B and Area C. Refer to Figure 7.15 and Figure 7.19, Volume 2 of this ESA. This is representative of views that would be available from residential receptors, PRow, and road users to the west of the Site.

The main change from the previously assessed scheme relates to the proposed silos which have been repositioned to adjoin the existing Breedon silo. There is an existing glimpsed view of the upper section of the Breedon silo at the Bellmoor Industrial Estate, which is of comparable height to the repositioned four proposed silos within Area C emerging above the intervening vegetation. Refer to Figure 7.15, Volume 2 of this ESA. Note that the majority of vegetation along the western boundary of Area C where the silos are located is evergreen and around 20 m high. This planting was originally provided in order to screen the former Bellmoor Quarry plant site.

Residential receptors are assessed as having high sensitivity and road users of minor roads such as this, of medium sensitivity. Primary effects would still be during the construction phase when two 15 m wide (approx.) thin bands of vegetation would be removed to facilitate access from Area A, across Area B, and into Area C. Losses would be minimised and a 2 m high, seeded earth bund would be provided as part of the advanced mitigation programme.

During both construction and operation, the magnitude of change to the view would be Small, associated with the removal of a 15 m wide band of vegetation, a new 1.8 m high timber fence and hedgerow or targeted amenity measure soil bund, and the repositioned four silos. There would be increased traffic during the construction phase and views of the bund or fence installation. This change in the view would result in a minor adverse effect for road users and a minor-moderate effect for the residential receptors (R3). As a result of the advance planting these effects would lower to negligible as views of on-site vehicular movements would become increasingly filtered by maturing vegetation or the soil bund.

7.12.3.5 Viewpoint 9 PRow South of Bellmoor Farm (On Western Site Boundary)

This viewpoint illustrates the immediate landscape context and visual amenity of Bellmoor Farm and the other properties in this location (R2) (refer to Figure 7.11i, Volume 2 of the ES).

The revised extraction programme would begin in area HR P1 and progressively work easterly, with the Low-Rise area extracted last. Importantly, this would facilitate repositioning the maintenance road and conveyor at a lower level behind the lagoon embankments and approximately 100 m further away (south) from Viewpoint 9 (approximately 270 m to the south of R2) and 6-8 m lower than previously proposed, including the crossing between HR P1 and HR P2. Note that the previously assessed scheme worked from east to west after HR P1 and required the conveyor and maintenance road corridor to run in an elevated position (6-8 m higher) and much closer to Viewpoint 9 and the properties at Bellmoor Farm.

The boundary embankments of the Site would continue to form raised vegetated boundaries and significant visual screens to the east and south during extraction. Refer to Figure 7.11i, Volume 2 of the ES. The southern embankment would be retained in perpetuity (the northern half of it is not

controlled by the Applicant) and the eastern embankment would be removed only after the PFA extraction behind it has been completed. It is anticipated that the only visible activities during the extraction stage would be the soil stripping required in close proximity to the Site boundary, after which operations would be at a lower level behind the retained lagoon embankments. It should also be noted that the number of days required for soil stripping would be spread through the year as a result of the micro-phasing approach forming part of the Amended Proposed Development. Refer to Table 5.3 Working Scheme Timings.

Following extraction in HR P3, and to a lesser extent HR P4, there would still be a visible loss of woodland and vegetation when the western lagoon embankment is progressively removed to facilitate restoration, but this would be temporary and only evident when the area is restored. The landform would reduce in scale and traffic movements on the embankment would be visible to both PRow users and residential receptors during the restoration activities. As the landform is reduced the visibility of activities would lower, with the most notable effects during the initial stages. The embankment removal and reprofiling would be for a temporary period (between 5 to 15 days approximately).

The Amended Proposed Development includes additional amenity measures following removal of the HR P3 embankment, to both screen temporary restoration activities and any longer distance views of later extraction phases, such as HR P4, HR P5 and HR P6 whilst restoration planting matures. It is proposed to provide 2 m high screen bunds and retain some mature trees along the western boundary of the Site. These are shown in plan Figure 7.18, Volume 2 of the ESA. This includes a bund along the western boundary of the Site (shown as a purple dashed line), to be retained until extraction is complete in Area A; and additional wind dissipation bunds (shown as a yellow dashed line) added along the boundaries of HR P4, HR P5 and HR P6 before extraction in these phases and to be removed when each is complete. The bunds would be seeded with wildflower annuals to provide visual and biodiversity benefits.

Any views of the interior of the Site before restoration planting matures would therefore be distant and screened or filtered by the combination of retained perimeter vegetation and screen bunds. This would be an improvement to the effects predicted for the previous scheme. An Artist's Impression has been prepared to illustrate this potential glimpsed view into the Site post-restoration (refer to Figure 7.21, Volume 2 of this ESA).

PRow users and residential receptors are assessed as having a high sensitivity to change. The Amended Proposed Development would have reduced effects, and the magnitude of change would be negligible during the construction and extraction phases increasing to medium during progressive restoration of HR P3, although this would be short term and reversible. Effects of post-restoration would remain as appraised previously Section 7.13.4.9, Chapter 7 in the ES (minor-moderate beneficial).

7.12.3.6 Viewpoint 10 PRow at Sutton Lakes (260 m, W)

The view from this location is directed across a lake and along the access track and PRow that extends to Bellmoor Farm and associated dwellings (R2). Refer to Figure 7.16, Volume 2 of this ESA.

The main embedded mitigation within the Amended Proposed Development includes the conveyor being moved further away from the edge of HR P3, and minimal surface working during soil stripping. There would be no change to the baseline view during extraction, as this would be carried out at depth behind the sandstone embankments. Additional bunds are also provided as a targeted amenity measure as HR P3 and HR P4 are restored post-extraction.

During the phased restoration the embankment would be removed and there would be a partial clearance of vegetation from the slopes to facilitate the ground re-modelling. Vehicles and machinery would be apparent during this stage, possibly on the skyline. This would be a short-term effect during the initial stages of restoration (approximately 15 days). The targeted amenity bund and the internal

wind dissipation bunds would filter or screen views from outside of the Site. The indicative bund locations are shown in plan Figure 7.18, Volume 2 of the ESA.

This includes a bund along the western boundary of the Site (shown as a purple dashed line), to be retained until extraction is complete in Area A; and additional wind dissipation bunds (shown as a yellow dashed line) added along the boundaries of HR P4, HR P5 and HR P6 before extraction in these phases and to be removed when each is complete. The bunds would be seeded with wildflower annuals to provide some visual and biodiversity benefits. Refer to Table 5.3 Working Scheme Timings.

As the more naturalistic landform is seeded and replanted there would be a beneficial effect from the increased openness and potential vistas through to the wetland area beyond which would increase as planting matures. Some select views or vistas may be maintained through selective management of the density and height of vegetation.

People undertaking recreation such as fishing are assessed as having a medium sensitivity, while PRow users and residential receptors are assessed as having high sensitivity. The magnitude of change during the initial construction phase would be negligible as there is a mature and established woodland belt to the south of Bellmoor Farm which would extensively filter views to the Main Processing Site and construction activity. This would result in negligible adverse effects.

As the extraction progresses eastward, effects would increase with up to a small magnitude of change predicted with a minor adverse effect on the people undertaking recreation at the fishing lake and a minor-moderate adverse effect on the PRow user and residential receptors. This would increase to a medium magnitude of change and up to moderate-major adverse effects during the removal of the lagoon embankment and partial vegetation clearance as part of the restoration of the Site.

This would be a short-term effect (embankment removal would only require approximately 5-15 days per phase) as the restoration would be carried out in a progressive and phased manner. As the restoration seeding and replacement planting are established these effects would reduce and there would be a beneficial effect from the enhanced setting which would be more in keeping with the character of the surrounding landscape. An Artist's Impression has been prepared to illustrate this view post-restoration (refer to Figure 7.22, Volume 2 of this ESA).

7.12.3.7 Viewpoint 11 Lound Low Road at Wetland Fisheries (On Northern Site Boundary)

This viewpoint illustrates the visual amenity of PRow and road users on Lound Low Road (Sutton|BOAT7) which adjoins the northern boundary to the Site. Refer to Figure 7.17, Volume 2 of this ESA.

The high-rise embankment forms the northern boundary to the Site, adjacent to this viewpoint. A hedgerow maintained at approximately 1-2 m height and an avenue of mature trees are also prominent in the foreground. The existing hedgerow would be retained and allowed to grow taller, supplementary advanced planting undertaken and the trees in the foreground retained.

There are two residential properties at Wetlands Fisheries (R9) located behind a vegetated curtilage. Visual impacts are considered to be negligible for these properties, due to the screening effect of the garden vegetation, retained hedgerow and retained lagoon embankment.

The main potential impacts on views experienced by PRow users would continue to be the short-term soil stripping activities which would be carried out over approximately 11 days spread over approximately 3 years to minimise effects and the removal of the embankment following PFA extraction for restoration purposes. There are no changes here from the original assessment and it is still proposed to retain the high-rise embankment until extraction is completed in HR P5 and HR P6. Refer to Table 5.3 Working Scheme Timings.

The Amended Proposed Development however now includes additional mitigation and amenity measures to be used during the removal of the HR P5 and HR P6 embankments, to both screen

temporary restoration activities and any longer distance views of later extraction phases in the Low-Rise. This would include, in addition to allowing the existing hedgerow to grow taller, additional supplementary tree and shrub planting at strategic locations to infill gaps or enhance thinner sections. Furthermore, a 2 m screen bund would be provided along the northern boundary of HR P5 and HR P6; and along the northern boundary of the Low-Rise prior to extraction commencing here. The proposed bunds are shown indicatively (in purple) in plan Figure 7.18, Volume 2 of the ESA.

The bunds, along with the soil and overburden store on the northern edge of the Low-Rise, would be seeded with wildflower annuals to provide some visual and biodiversity benefits. The bunds would be retained until extraction in Area A is complete and removed as part of final restoration activities.

The additional mitigation measures would screen views into the operational area from the PRoW. The amended construction, soil stripping, and extraction programme would minimise working at the surface level to a number of days in any given year and ensure that operations for the most part are not visible. This would further reduce effects when compared to the previous assessment.

PRoW users are of high sensitivity, and road users are of medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change considering the additional mitigation and targeted amenity measures would be reduced to negligible during operation and small during the progressive restoration as the landform is remodelled. This would result in lower effects: minor adverse effect for road users and a minor-moderate adverse effect for PRoW users.

Following restoration, there would be a positive change resulting in localised beneficial effects for biodiversity and landscape character. An Artist’s Impression has been prepared to illustrate this view post-restoration (refer to Figure 7.23, Volume 2 of this ESA).

7.13 Cumulative Effects Assessment

The cumulative effects assessment remains largely unchanged although two small areas of infill housing currently under construction at Knight’s Gate and The Meadows at Sutton-cum-Lound have been added to Figure 7.10, Volume 2 of the ESA. There is no inter-visibility or potential for indirect effects identified and no change to the previous assessment (refer to Section 7.14, Volume 1 of the ES).

7.14 Summary of Visual Effects

The assessed residual visual effects on the following receptors have been reduced. Table 7.3 below provides a summary of the changes to the residual visual effects described within this Chapter post-mitigation following the revised approach to construction, soil stripping, extraction, and restoration.

Table 7.3: Summary of Visual Effects

Receptor / Phase	Sensitivity and Magnitude of Change	Classification of Residual Effect
VISUAL EFFECTS (Refer to Figures 7.11d, e, f, i, Volume 2 of the ES; and 7.15-7.17 and 7.19, Volume 2 of the ESA)		
Viewpoints 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11		
Viewpoint 4: Idle Valley Nature Reserve Riverside Discovery Walk (230 m, S)		
Construction	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ No change	No effects
Operation	Recreational receptor: High	No effects

	sensitivity/ No Change	
Restoration (Year 1)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ No Change	No effects
Restoration (Year 15-20)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible beneficial from improved wider setting

Viewpoint 5: Idle Valley Nature Reserve Woodland Walk (80 m, S)

Construction	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Less than negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Operation	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Less than negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Less than negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible beneficial from improved wider setting

Viewpoint 6: Idle Valley Nature Reserve (260 m, S)

Construction	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Operation	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Neutral or up to negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Up to negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible

Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	Recreational receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible beneficial from improved wider setting
---	--	---

Viewpoint 7: Sutton Lane North of Cross Road Farm (360 m, SW)

Construction	Residential receptor: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/Small magnitude of change	Less than minor adverse for road user and Minor-moderate adverse for residential receptor temporary, and reversible
Operation	Residential receptor: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/Small magnitude of change	Less than minor adverse for road user and Minor-moderate adverse for residential receptor reducing to negligible adverse over time and temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Residential receptor: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 15-20)	Residential receptor: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible beneficial from improved wider setting

Viewpoint 9: PRoW NT|Sutton|BW4 South of Bellmoor Farm

Construction	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse temporary, and reversible
Operation	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/Up to medium magnitude of change.	Up to moderate-major adverse, temporary, and reversible during woodland and bund clearance during progressive restoration of HR P3. This would be a short term and reversible effect undertaken over weeks with lower effects outside this period.

Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity / Small magnitude of change.	Minor-moderate beneficial
Viewpoint 10: PRoW at Sutton Lakes		
Construction	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change.	Negligible adverse temporary, and reversible
Operation	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Up to minor adverse for road user/ people undertaking recreation and minor-moderate adverse for ProW and residential receptors. Effects would be temporary and reversible for residential receptor.
Restoration (Year 1)	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change	Up to moderate-major adverse, temporary, and reversible during woodland and bund clearance during progressive restoration of HR P3 undertaken over weeks. This would be a short term and reversible effect with lower effects outside this period
Restoration (Year 15-20)	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity / Small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate beneficial
Viewpoint 11: Lound Low Road at Wetland Lakes (On Northern Site Boundary)		
Construction	Residential receptor and PRoW user: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary and reversible
Operation	Residential receptor and PRoW user: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate-adverse for PRoW user, and Minor adverse for road user. Both effects would be temporary and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Residential receptor and PRoW user: High sensitivity Road user: medium/ Medium magnitude of change	Up to minor-moderate adverse for PRoW user and minor adverse for road users and with lesser effects predicted for residential receptors. Effects would be temporary and reversible
Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	PRoW user: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Up to minor beneficial to road users and minor-moderate beneficial for PRoW user

Residential Receptors (Refer to Figure 7.8, Volume 2 of the ES)

R2: Bellmoor Farm and Bellmoor Cottage and Other Properties (150 m, N and W)

Construction	PRoW user and residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse temporary, and reversible
Operation Phase	Residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Residential receptor: High sensitivity/ Up to medium magnitude of change	Up to moderate-major adverse, temporary, and reversible during woodland and bund clearance during progressive restoration of HR P3. This would be a short-term and reversible effect with lower effects outside this period.
Restoration (Year 15-20 post-restoration)	High sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change	Minor-moderate-beneficial

PRoW Users (Refer to Figure 7.9, Volume 2 of the ES)

NT|Sutton|FP1

Construction	High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change.	Minor-moderate adverse, temporary, and reversible within this context which already includes similar infrastructure along a length of the route at Bellmoor Industrial Estate.
Operation	High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate adverse, temporary and reversible within this context which already includes similar infrastructure along a length of the route at Bellmoor Industrial Estate.
Restoration (Year 1)	High sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change	Up to moderate–major adverse for a short section of the PRoW route. Effects would be temporary and reversible.
Restoration (Year 15 -20 post-restoration)	High sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change.	Moderate-major beneficial

NT|Sutton|BOAT7

Construction	Residential receptor and PRoW user: High-sensitivity / negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Operation	PRoW user: High sensitivity/ small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate-adverse, effects would be temporary and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	PRoW user: High sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/	Up to minor-moderate adverse, temporary, and reversible

Restoration (Year 15 -20 post-restoration)	PRoW user: High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Up to minor-moderate beneficial for PRoW user
NT Sutton BW4		
Construction	PRoW user: High sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse temporary, and reversible
Operation	PRoW user: High sensitivity/ Small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate- adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	PRoW user: High sensitivity/ Medium magnitude of change	Up to moderate-major adverse. Effects would be temporary and reversible
Restoration (Year 15-20)	PRoW user: High sensitivity / Small magnitude of change	Minor-moderate beneficial

Transport Routes (Refer to Figure 7.9, Volume 2 of the ES and Figure 7.17, Volume 2 of this ESA)

Lound Low Road

Construction	Residential receptor and PRoW user: High-sensitivity Road user: medium sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Operation	Road user: Medium sensitivity/ Negligible magnitude of change	Negligible adverse, temporary, and reversible
Restoration (Year 1)	Road user: medium/ small magnitude of change	Up to minor adverse. Effects would be temporary, and reversible.
Restoration (Year 15 -20 post-restoration)	Medium sensitivity/ small magnitude of change	Minor beneficial for road user

7.14.1 Summary of Restoration Effects

The restoration would be undertaken on a phased and ongoing basis (refer to Figures 7.12, 7.13, and 7.14, Volume 2 of the ESA).

The revised restoration includes the following:

- Some, smaller areas of dry land for pasture, woodland, and scrub, which have been set at around 1 m above groundwater. The species-rich grassland would be managed using sheep grazing to

maximise conservation value and woodland and tree planting concentrated along the Site perimeter to limit their use by raptors.

- The existing embankment overlapping and adjoining the SSSI boundary would be retained.
- Seasonally wet grassland with a network of inter-connected scrapes and ditches that is on or around 0.5 m above groundwater.
- Clusters of ponds, areas of open water and extended shallow areas for reedbed fringes that are on or below groundwater level.

Habitats would form a graded edge with woodland transitioning to scrub and grassland. Native species of tree and shrub that are locally appropriate would be used throughout and where possible local provenance seeds would be used through a process of 'green hay' transfer or strip inoculation to spread out and colonise the surrounding sward.

7.14.2 Summary of Cumulative Effects

The limited potential for static cumulative effects and potential for sequential cumulative effects remains unchanged (refer to Section 7.15.2, Volume 1 of the ES). Some additional cumulative sites have been added to Figure 7.10 (Volume 2 of this ESA). These include:

- Infill housing at Knights Gate and The Meadows at Sutton-cum-Lound, have limited potential for any inter-visibility with the Site. Construction is almost complete and there would be limited potential for indirect cumulative effects from construction traffic.
- Griffin Freight Industrial Unit, Bellmoor Quarry adjacent to the Main Processing Site and which is almost completed. This is a sizable building that would effectively filter views from the southeast toward the Site infrastructure.

7.15 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The revised approach to extraction and restoration and its embedded mitigation would reduce the landscape and visual effects of the Amended Proposed Development in a notable way. There are some residual significant effects in terms of the EIA Regulations predicted on landscape or visual amenity receptors, but these would be restricted to:

- The landscape character at the Site level and for residential receptors at Bellmoor Farm (R2) during woodland and bund clearance during progressive restoration of HR P3. This would be a short-term and reversible effect with lower effects outside this period.
- Effects on PRow users of Sutton|FP1 and Sutton|FP2 within the Site and Sutton|BW4 which extends to the Site boundary. These significant effects would be for a discrete period of time and for a short length of the PRow route.
- Pronounced beneficial effects post-restoration at both the Site and 'host' Ranskill LCP level.

Impacts on adjoining sensitive visual receptors would be reduced overall with the provision of targeted amenity bunding along the Site perimeter to screen views from sensitive receptors, with the previously most affected reducing down from moderate-major to minor-moderate effects during operation (i.e., Bellmoor Farm hamlet; and users of Sutton|BW4).

Visual and landscape effects would be highest during the preliminary stages of restoration as the embankment are removed; however, the removal of the embankments in each phase would require only 5-15 days, after which restoration activities would be focussed in reprofiling the restoration landform and planting/seeding. This would have the potential for up to a moderate-major effect but this would be a temporary effect which would extend to a matter of days or weeks. The resultant restoration would ultimately have minor-moderate beneficial effects from the creation of a landform more in keeping with the surrounding landscape character and the variety of habitats proposed.

The Amended Proposed Development would have a temporary moderate-major adverse visual effect during the construction phase on Sutton|FP2 footpath that extends from the A368 and crosses the Site vehicular access. These predicted effects would remain the same as previously in the ES.

There would also be potentially significant effects on the visual amenity of PRow users of Sutton|FP1 during the preliminary stages of restoration of HR P3 however, these would be temporary effects and for a short duration of the length of the PRow route. Other PRow which adjoin or are located in the wider landscape would not have significant effects due to the existing and mature vegetation on the Site boundary and within the wider landscape which restrict visibility.

The proposed biodiversity-led restoration would provide significant landscape and ecological enhancement at both the Site level and for the wider landscape in the long-term, with potential for an extension to the existing wetland areas to the south and east. These beneficial effects would be most notable at the Site level resulting in a moderate-major beneficial effect on landscape character and visual amenity, and within adjoining areas such as along Lound Low Road and Bellmoor Farm (R2) which would have a minor-moderate beneficial effect.