

---

## CHAPTER 5

<b>5.0</b>	<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
5.1	Introduction.....	1
5.2	Methodology .....	5
5.3	Baseline.....	9
5.4	Assessment of Effects .....	16
5.5	Mitigation .....	28
5.6	Residual Effects and Conclusions.....	29

### **Figures (Volume 2 – Bound Separately)**

Figure 5.1a	ZTV and Viewpoint Locations
Figure 5.1b	Landscape and Visual Context
Figure 5.2a-g	Viewpoint Photographs
Figure 5.3a-f	Photomontages

### **Appendices (Volume 3 – Bound Separately)**

Appendix 5.1	LVIA Methodology
Appendix 5.2	Effects on Landscape Character
Appendix 5.3	Effects on Viewpoints
Appendix 5.4	Context Photos
Appendix 5.5	Wireframe Visualisations



---

## 5.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was undertaken by a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI). The LVIA follows best practice guidance set out in '*Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*'<sup>1</sup>, hereafter referred to as the GLVIA.

5.1.2 Landscape and visual effects are separate, although closely related and interlinked issues.

5.1.3 Landscape effects are caused by physical changes to the landscape, which may result in changes to the distinctive character of that landscape and how it is perceived.

5.1.4 Visual effects are changes to what can be seen by people as a result of what is proposed. A visual assessment assesses the change in visual amenity undergone by people (either individually or in groups) that would arise from any change in the nature of views experienced.

5.1.5 In accordance with the guidance set out in GLVIA, the LVIA adopts an approach proportionate to the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The conclusions of the LVIA have been determined via use of professional judgement, set within a structured assessment framework, and supported by reasoned justification

5.1.6 The LVIA aims to establish the following:

- A clear understanding of the Site and its context, in respect of the physical and perceived landscape and in respect of views and visual amenity;
- An understanding of the Proposed Development in terms of how this would relate to the existing landscape and views;
- An identification of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape and upon views, throughout the life-cycle of the Proposed Development;
- Potential for mitigation to reduce / eliminate any potential adverse effect on the landscape or views arising as a result of the Proposed Development; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 2013. *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- 
- A conclusion as to the residual likely significant landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development.

5.1.7 The process follows a standard approach, namely:

- The establishment of the baseline conditions, against which the effects of the Proposed Development will be assessed;
- The determination of the nature of the receptor likely to be affected, i.e. its sensitivity;
- The prediction of the nature of the effect likely to occur, i.e. the magnitude of change; and
- An assessment of whether a likely significant landscape and visual effect would be experienced by any receptor, by considering the predicted magnitude of change together with the sensitivity of the receptor, taking into account any proposed mitigation measures.

5.1.8 Further details regarding the specific methodologies of assessment and determination of significance are included in Appendix 5.1. The LVIA has been informed by both desk and field based studies.

5.1.9 It should be noted that the landscape (including the context in which views are experienced) is dynamic, i.e. it is affected by social, economic, technological and climatic changes, all of which can influence patterns of land use, land cover and land management. As such, the baseline context for the LVIA is not static.

5.1.10 An assessment of effects upon the setting of heritage assets is included in Chapter 10.0 (Archaeology and Cultural Heritage). The LVIA and Cultural Heritage Assessment, whilst sometimes considering effects upon the same receptors, deal with different environmental effects, using different methodologies.

### ***Description of the Proposed Development***

5.1.11 For a full description of the Proposed Development, refer to the Planning Supporting Statement and to the Design and Access Statement.

5.1.12 As noted in Chapter 1.0, the planning application is to be made in outline with all matters reserved except access. A series of development parameters are set out in Chapter 4.0, describing the realistic maximum size, scale and mass of individual elements, and hence the Proposed Development as a whole. The Illustrative Masterplan (Figure 4.2) depicts the Proposed Development at the upper end of the

---

range. This enables a reasonable worst case assessment to be undertaken of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development.

5.1.13 In summary, the Proposed Development would comprise:

- an Amenity Building which would sit under a green roof;
- a Fuel Filling Station located immediately to the east of the Amenity Building, underneath the same green roof;
- a separate stand-alone Fuel Filling Station for HGVs and coaches, with a green roof;
- a separate stand-alone Drive through Coffee Shop, with a green roof;
- parking space provision for cars, HGVs, coaches, caravans and motorcycles;
- a dedicated means of access from the A1(M), comprising new entry and exit slip roads, and dumbbell junction with two roundabouts connected by an overbridge spanning the A1(M);
- a dedicated mean of access from the B6265 that would be only used for staff and deliveries;
- realignment of c.650m of the A168;
- two Abnormal Load Bays, located on the new northbound and southbound entry slip roads;
- surface water drainage infrastructure, forming part of a site-wide sustainable drainage system;
- An extensive on-site hard and soft landscape scheme, together with earthworks across the site and the provision of screen mounding. The landscape areas would incorporate:
  - A Children's Play Area;
  - Dog Exercise Area; and
  - Driver Stretch / Exercise Area.
- other associated infrastructure including fencing, lighting and signage etc.

5.1.14 The landscape scheme developed for the Site is illustrated on Figure 4.2. This forms an integral part of the Proposed Development, and comprises retention of the majority of existing boundary vegetation, the planting of new hedgerows, including hedgerow trees, new native trees (both individually and in groups), new shrub planting, areas of species-rich grassland, and new waterbodies. The provision of green roofs on the proposed new buildings would provide further additional vegetation cover. New

---

hedgerow planting would also be provided along the route of the realigned A168. Full details of landscape proposals would be addressed as a Reserved Matter.

### ***Legislative and Policy Context***

5.1.15 Details of the planning and policy background for the proposal, including an appraisal of effects on relevant landscape-related policies, as set out in the adopted Statutory Development Plan, are included in the Planning Supporting Statement. Key legislation and policies relevant to the LVIA are summarised below.

#### *European Landscape Convention*

5.1.16 The UK Government is a signatory of the European Landscape Convention (ELC), which became binding in March 2007. The Convention is aimed at the protection, management and planning of all landscapes and raising awareness of the value of a living landscape. It relates chiefly to public bodies and to the policies, plans and programmes produced by these.

5.1.17 The LVIA is a development specific process which accords with Article 6C of the ELC. The LVIA is informed by extant Landscape Character Assessment studies (described in Section 5.3 below), which more directly relate to the provisions of Article 6C.

#### *Planning Policy*

5.1.18 For details of relevant planning policies, refer to the Planning Supporting Statement. Relevant policy documents are listed below:

- *National Planning Policy Framework*<sup>2</sup>;
- Saved policies from *District Local Plan*<sup>3</sup>;
- *Core Strategy*<sup>4</sup>.

### ***Previous Applications at the Site***

5.1.19 As set out in Chapter 3.0, a previous proposal for a motorway service area development at the Site was refused on appeal (Ref: APP/E2734/A/09/2102196 –

---

<sup>2</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework*

<sup>3</sup> Harrogate Borough Council, adopted 2001, with selective alteration 2004. *Harrogate District Local Plan*.

<sup>4</sup> Harrogate Borough Council, adopted 2009. *Harrogate District Local Development Framework Core Strategy*

---

08/05860/EIAMAJ) in 2012<sup>5</sup>. The appeal was a conjoined one, examining a total of five different service area proposals along the A1. Predicted significant effects on landscape character were amongst the reasons for refusal.

5.1.20 The Inspectors Report produced in relation to the Appeal noted that a proposed screening mound and associated new woodland planting would:

*“...be alien features in the countryside here that would significantly harm the character of the surrounding open landscape...”*<sup>6</sup>

5.1.21 And concluded that:

*“...the proposal would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape...”*<sup>7</sup>

5.1.22 The Inspector also identified adverse visual effects from residential properties located on Church Lane (at the edge of Kirby Hill) and near Skelton Windmill, and also a slight detrimental night-time effect from skyglow. However, none of these visual effects were concluded to be significant.

5.1.23 It should be recognised that this previous proposal was significantly different from the Proposed Development, comprising as it did built development on both sides of the motorway and incorporating extensive woodland planting.

## **5.2 Methodology**

### ***Current Guidance***

5.2.1 As noted in Section 5.1, this LVIA has followed a methodology which has been developed using the published good practice guidelines set out in the GLVIA. The detailed methodology followed in undertaking the LVIA is set out in Appendix 5.1.

5.2.2 The LVIA has also had reference to guidance produced by the Landscape Institute regarding use of photography and visualisations<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012. *Decision Letter from the Secretary of State to the Appellants*. 12 October 2012.

<sup>6</sup> The Planning Inspectorate, 2011. *Report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government by R R Lyon. Motorway and truck stop proposals on the A1(M) between Wetherby and Barton and Truckstop Proposal at Fairfield farm, Leeming Bar*. Paragraph 14.3.79

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, paragraph 14.3.81

<sup>8</sup> Landscape Institute, 2011. *Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment. Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11*

---

### ***The Study Area***

- 5.2.3 The Study Area selected for the LVIA extends approximately 5km from the Site boundary in all directions (refer to Figure 5.1a). Visits to the Study Area to gain an understanding of the landscape and visual context revealed that significant effects would be most likely to occur at closer distances to the Site, and as such, a greater level of attention is paid to closer receptors (within approximately 2km).

### ***Significance of Effect***

- 5.2.4 Not all landscape and visual effects arising as a result of a particular proposal will be significant. Furthermore, where likely significant environmental effects are predicted, this does not automatically mean that such effects are unacceptable. The acceptability of landscape and visual effects is a matter to be weighed in the planning balance alongside other factors. What is important is that the likely environmental effects of any proposal are transparently assessed and described in order that the relevant determining authority can bring a balanced and well-informed judgement to bear as part of the decision-making process.
- 5.2.5 The judgement in relation to this LVIA is that a greater than 'moderate' level of effect is more likely to be significant. This is because such an effect would generally result from larger magnitudes of change on higher sensitivity receptors. This does not preclude a 'moderate' effect or lower being significant, or a greater than 'moderate' effect not being significant. The judgement made will depend on the specific circumstances being considered. Refer to Appendix 5.1 for further details.

### ***Consultation***

- 5.2.6 The scope of the LVIA, including viewpoint locations, was set out in the Scoping Report submitted to Harrogate Borough Council in April 2017 (refer to Appendix 2.1). As noted in Chapter 2.0, at the time of writing, a response had not been received from the Council.
- 5.2.7 Irrespective of the receipt of any formal scoping response, further discussion regarding the LVIA was carried out with Harrogate Borough Council's Landscape Officer in May and June 2017, initially over the telephone and then at a face-to-face meeting. These discussions helped to define the scope of the LVIA (as reported below).

- 
- 5.2.8 Matters discussed included the potential visibility of the proposed new motorway overbridge and the consequent possible need to increase the Study Area from what was proposed in the Scoping Report. The viewpoint locations and Study Area as set out in the Scoping report were largely derived from a review of the previous application that was the subject of the 2012 Inspector's Decision referenced in Section 5.1 above.
- 5.2.9 It was agreed with the Landscape Officer that there was a need to provide a robust and clear justification for the inclusion of specific viewpoint locations in this current LVIA, recognising that the Proposed Development differs in a number of respects from the previous scheme. It was agreed that any photomontages produced as part of the LVIA should include one that reflected the likely change in view from the settlement of Kirby Hill (with the Church considered to be a good candidate location for this).
- 5.2.10 A ZTV of the Proposed Development was requested by the Landscape Officer and subsequently tabled at the face-to-face meeting, along with viewpoint photography. It was acknowledged that in many views, visibility was likely to be quite marginal due to the relatively flat landscape, localised undulations in landform, and vegetation cover. The use of wireline visualisations were suggested by the Landscape Officer as a useful way of demonstrating the extent of visibility/ lack of visibility as appropriate.

#### ***Previous Assessment work***

- 5.2.11 As noted in Section 5.1, a previous proposal for motorway service area development at Kirby Hill was refused on appeal in 2012. The planning application for this earlier proposal was submitted in 2008, and included an LVIA (the 2008 LVIA)<sup>9</sup>.
- 5.2.12 The 2008 LVIA included a bespoke landscape character assessment, which subdivided the area surrounding the Site into a series of scheme-specific landscape character areas. This approach has not been carried forward into the current LVIA. The landscape character assessment produced by Harrogate Borough Council (discussed in more detail in Section 5.3 below) is considered to be sufficiently fine-grained to pick up local variations in character, and additionally includes a series of sensitivities and guidelines against which the effects of the Proposed Development

---

<sup>9</sup> Heather Ive Associates, 2008. *Kirby Hill A1(M) MSA Environmental Statement Update 2008*. Chapter 9.0.

can be measured. As such, we consider that there would be no additional value added to the LVIA by the inclusion of a further layer of character areas.

5.2.13 Additionally, the 2008 LVIA included an assessment of visual effects from twelve viewpoint locations. Some of these locations have been carried forward into the current LVIA. Other have not been carried forward. A list of viewpoints included in the 2008 LVIA is set out in Table 5.1 below (with locations shown on Figure 5.1a), together with reasons for inclusion in or omission from the current LVIA.

**Table 5.1: 2008 LVIA Viewpoints**

<b>Viewpoint</b>	<b>Include in current (2017) LVIA</b>
A. Church View, Kirby Hill	<u>Yes.</u> Effects on nearby properties were highlighted in the Inspectors Report
B. Church of All Saints, Kirby Hill	<u>Yes.</u> Effects on the church were highlighted in the Inspectors Report
C. Millings Lane	No. Views from this road are relatively well screened by hedges. An alternative viewpoint (Viewpoint 7) from the footpath to the north has been included instead.
D. Boroughbridge to Dishforth Road	<u>Yes.</u> To pick up views from east of the Site
E. Highfield Lane	No. Views are well screened by the rising landform to the south.
F. Highfield Lane overbridge	<u>Yes.</u> To pick up views from the minor road north of the Site
G. Chapel Lane	<u>Yes.</u> To pick up views from the minor road north of the Site
H. Moor Lane	No. The route is a private track, so is not a publicly accessible location.
I. Footbridge near Cottage Farm	No. This is not a sensitive location, with views dominated by the motorway. The Proposed Development would be largely screened from view by the existing B6265 bridge and associated features (including vegetation)
J. Leeming Lane, Kirby Hill	<u>Yes.</u> To pick up views from the north-west edge of Kirby Hill
K. Providence Lodge	No. The location is a private property, and hence not publicly accessible
L. Ripon Road, near properties west of A1(M)	<u>Yes.</u> Effects on nearby properties were highlighted in the Inspectors Report

### **Limitations**

5.2.14 Assessment work reflects the level of vegetation cover present at the time of the field visit to the study area (June 2017). Where relevant to its conclusions, the LVIA makes assumptions as to the likely visibility of the Proposed Development at other times of year.

---

## 5.3 Baseline

### *Data Collection*

- 5.3.1 Baseline data for the LVIA has been gathered by both desk and field based surveys. These have included review of extant landscape character assessment studies (see below) and field visits to gain an understanding of the landscape and visual context of the Site.

### *Baseline Conditions*

#### *The Site and its Surroundings*

- 5.3.2 The Site of the Proposed Development is currently occupied by arable farmland and is located on either side of the A1(M) motorway (and the A168 parallel) and immediately north of the B6265 Ripon Road. The western boundary of the Site is formed by a hedgerow. The northern and eastern boundaries lie within existing fields. Photographs 10 and 11 of Appendix 5.4 illustrate the views into the Site from the south.
- 5.3.3 The B6265 to the south of the Site crosses the A1(M) via an overbridge, and the embankments on the approaches to this overbridge are planted with woodland, as is the land between the A1(M) and the A168. The junction of the A168 and B6265 is located south-east of the Site, and consists of a roundabout of approximately 50m diameter. Large scale trunk road/ motorway signage and tall (approx. 10m high) lighting columns are present at the roundabout and the roads that lead up to it.
- 5.3.4 The nearest residential property to the Site is approximately 275m to the west at Dale View on the B6265. Further properties to the west are arranged along the same stretch of road in a linear fashion, including Skelton Windmill (a Grade II listed building).
- 5.3.5 Further isolated properties are located at High Moor Road (approximately 320m to the south-west), west of the A1(M), and at Providence Lodge (approximately 330m to the south-east), east of the A1(M).
- 5.3.6 The village of Kirby Hill is located approximately 685m to the south-east of the Site. Other nearby settlements include properties associated with Dishforth Airfield (approximately 990m to the north-east), Marton-le-Moor (approximately 1.4km to the north-west), Norton-le-Clay (approximately 1.5km to the north-east), Skelton-on-Ure

---

(approximately 2km to the south-west), and the town of Boroughbridge, the north-western edge of which is approximately 1.73km south of the Site.

- 5.3.7 The wider landscape of the Study Area is agricultural (arable) located on an undulating landform between the Rivers Swale and Ure. The A1(M) motorway corridor (including the parallel A168) runs north-south through this. In the vicinity of the Site, there is considerable tree and shrub planting present within the highway boundary. Lighting columns at the junction of the B6265 and A168 are visible above the tree cover, and signage along the A168 is also clearly visible from the east.
- 5.3.8 With the exception of some dense mature vegetation associated with the motorway corridor, the landscape east and west of the Site, and to the north, is open, with only low, trimmed hedges marking field boundaries. Further to both the east and west, small woodlands, mature hedgerows trees and dense tree belts along roads and watercourses and around properties are significant landscape features. Newby Hall is a Registered Park and Garden, open to the public, located approximately 2.25km south-west of the Site. The landscape in the vicinity of Newby Hall includes extensive tree planting, including mature, formal avenues.
- 5.3.9 Dishforth Airfield is located between approximately 1km and 3km north of the Site. Flights into the Airfield ceased in 2016, and the facility is scheduled to close in 2031. It includes an expansive open area occupied by runways and close-mown grass, together with large hangars and other structures, and very tall high-mast lighting columns that are very evident from surrounding areas, including Kirby Hill. To the south-east of the Airfield is an area of residential properties and a school.

#### *Landscape Designations*

- 5.3.10 The nearest statutory landscape designation to the Site is the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which is over 8.5km to the west. At this distance, development of the type proposed would not give rise to significant landscape and visual effects. As such, no further consideration is given.
- 5.3.11 HBC currently maintains a local-level Special Landscape Area (SLA) designation. However, the Site is not located within an SLA, the nearest of which is at the eastern edge of Ripon, approximately 4.5km west of the Site. The SLAs are protected by

---

local planning policy C9<sup>10</sup> and underpinned by a supporting study<sup>11</sup>. The wording of policy C9 makes reference to development proposals within the designation boundary only, and the supporting text is clear that the SLAs are intended to protect the setting of the settlements of Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon. It is clear that the SLA designation would not be materially affected by the Proposed Development, and therefore no further consideration is given.

### *Landscape Character Assessment and Related Studies*

#### *National Character Areas*

- 5.3.12 At a national level, 159 National Character Areas (NCA) have been identified by the former Countryside Commission (now Natural England). Details of each NCA are available via the Natural England website<sup>12</sup>.
- 5.3.13 These NCAs provide background and context to more detailed landscape character assessments produced at county and district levels. Their broad geographic reach means that the key characteristics identified as typical of a particular NCA may not necessarily apply to a specific location within that NCA.
- 5.3.14 The Proposed Development would be located within NCA30: Southern Magnesian Limestone, close to the boundary with NCA28: Vale of York. Key characteristics of NCA30 include that the NCA is:
- Fertile, intensively farmed arable land, with large fields bound by clipped hawthorn hedges, creating a generally large-scale, open landscape;
  - Influenced by the transport corridor of the A1, which is apparent in an otherwise undisturbed rural countryside.

---

<sup>10</sup> Harrogate Borough Council. *Harrogate District Local Plan (adopted 2001), augmented composite including saved policies*, 2009.

<sup>11</sup> Harrogate Borough Council, 2016. *Review of Local Landscape Designations: Special Landscape Areas 2011: Updated 2016*.

<sup>12</sup> Natural England, 2014. *National Character Area profiles*. [online] <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles>>

---

### *Local Landscape Character*

5.3.15 The *Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment*<sup>13</sup> subdivides the borough into a series of landscape character areas (LCAs). The Proposed Development would be located within LCA 81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland, close to the boundaries with LCA 74: Skelton on Ure rolling farmland, LCA 76: East of Ripon farmland, and LCA 85: Thornton Bridge drained, low lying arable farmland. The locations of these four LCAs are shown on Figure 5.1b.

5.3.16 Sensitivities and pressures relating to LCA 81 are identified, which include:

- Linear planting along the A1(M) and at its junctions does not sit well within this open landscape;
- Large-scale industrial development has impacted upon the character of this open area which is sensitive to large scale development; and
- Residential development at Dishforth Airfield<sup>14</sup> does not respect vernacular nor landscape characteristics. The harsh line between development and the rural landscape is highlighted by a row of overgrown conifers. This is at odds with the rural character of the area.

5.3.17 The LCA sheet also describes a series of guidelines, including:

- Maintain extensive views across and beyond the area;
  - Extensive large scale tree planting would be inappropriate;
  - Development requiring large scale blocks of woodland screening should be discouraged;
  - Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape.
- Integrate existing development into the character area;
  - Large-scale development cannot be easily accommodated without further detriment to landscape character;
  - Avoid highlighting the A1(M) and A168 corridors. Linear planting along these corridors does not reflect the landscape pattern.
- Reinforce the diverse landscape pattern of the field systems;
  - Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows, particularly in areas of pre parliamentary enclosure;

---

<sup>13</sup> Harrogate Borough Council, 2004. Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment

<sup>14</sup> This residential development is approximately 1.5km north of the Site.

- 
- Planting to mitigate the impact of large-scale buildings should soften rather than screen impact and the potential for planting beyond the site should be considered
  - Conserve historic features in the landscape.

5.3.18 Observations made in the field as part of the current LVIA process confirmed that in the vicinity of the Site, the A1(M) corridor is densely planted, but that this planting and the road itself (which tends to run through an area of cutting) is not very widely visible. The A168 to the east is more visible locally, as this road is at grade and vegetation immediately east of the road is low in height. The A1(M) is far more clearly visible further to the north, in the vicinity of Dishforth Airfield, where the road is at grade, and where there is little vegetation within the highway corridor.

5.3.19 The District LCA notes the presence of greater tree cover in LCA 74, identifying key characteristics that include:

- Hedgerow trees feature throughout, but are sparse in places;
- Blocks of woodland are spread evenly through the area with the exception of Langthorpe Moor

5.3.20 Tree cover is also noted within the key characteristics of LCA 76, as follows:

- Several small to medium sized deciduous woodland blocks/ clumps and mixed clumps;
- Individual tree scattered along field boundaries and around settlement.

#### *Future Landscape Change*

5.3.21 Should the Proposed Development not gain planning permission, it is assumed that the current land use, i.e. arable farming, would continue. The District LCA notes in relation to LCA 81 that sensitivities and pressures on the landscape (in addition to those already mentioned above) include the influence of intensive farming practices and the effects of this upon archaeological features and field patterns.

#### *ZTVs*

5.3.22 Computer-generated Zones of Theoretical Visibility have been calculated using Ordnance Survey Terrain 50 height data, and existing site topographic information and details of proposed ground levels as appropriate, to create a digital terrain model

---

(DTM) of the Site and the study area. The DTM does not take account of the screening effects of vegetation, buildings or other structures.

5.3.23 These ZTVs, which compare the theoretical visibility of a HGV on the existing B6265 overbridge immediately south of the Site (in green), and the additional visibility of a similar vehicle on the proposed new access bridge (in red), are set out on Figure 5.1a. The ZTV Figure illustrates a worst-case scenario of visibility. Actual visibility is much less widespread due to the presence of vegetation cover which often provides significant screening of views.

#### *Viewpoints*

5.3.24 Following the consultation process discussed in Section 5.2, consideration of locations included in previous assessment work (as also discussed in Section 5.2) and a visit to the study area, fourteen viewpoints have been included in the LVIA.

5.3.25 Viewpoints fall into three categories, as set out in the GLVIA:

- Representative viewpoints (which represent the experience of different types of receptors in the vicinity);
- Specific viewpoints (a particular view, for example a well-known beauty spot);
- Illustrative viewpoints (which illustrate a particular effect/ issue, which may include limited/ lack of visibility).

5.3.26 The viewpoints are set out in Table 5.2 below (refer to Figures 5.1a-b for viewpoint locations).

**Table 5.2: Viewpoint Locations**

<b>Viewpoint</b>	<b>British National Grid Co-ordinates</b>	<b>Viewpoint Type</b>
1. Highfield Road overbridge	438415, 470011	<i>Specific</i> view from the minor road bridge north of the Site
2. Dishforth	439000, 470740	<i>Representative</i> of views from village north of Site
3. Public footpath west of Norton-le-Clay	439834, 470748	<i>Specific</i> view from the junction of the footpath with the adjacent minor road
4. Minor road west of Thornton Bridge	442736, 470603	<i>Representative</i> of views from the minor road network east of the Site
5. Minor road north-east of Milby	440785, 468425	<i>Representative</i> of views from the minor road network east of the Site
6. Minor road north-east of Kirby Hill	439228, 469582	<i>Specific</i> view from junction of the minor road and the public footpath
7. Public footpath north-east of Kirby Hill	439411, 468998	<i>Representative</i> of views available to footpath users
8. All Saints Church, Kirby Hill	439292, 468364	<i>Specific</i> view from the northern edge of the churchyard
9. Public footpath, Church View, Kirby Hill	439074, 468604	<i>Representative</i> of views available to residents in nearby properties on Church View, and to footpath users
10. North-west edge of Kirby Hill	438804, 468532	<i>Representative</i> of views available to residents and road users at the north-west edge of the village
11. Ripon Road roundabout	438493, 468983	<i>Specific</i> view from the roundabout at the junction of the A168 and B6265
12. High Moor Road, near Cottage Farm	438091, 468458	<i>Representative</i> of views from the countryside west of the A1 (south-west of the Site), including the minor road and adjacent public footpath
13. Junction of High Moor Road with B6265	437908, 469208	<i>Representative</i> of views from the properties on the northern side of the B6265
14. Chapel Lane, east of Marton-le-Moor	437696, 470324	<i>Representative</i> of views from the minor road north of the Site (west of the A1)

5.3.27 Photography from each of the viewpoints is displayed on Figures 5.2a-g. Additionally, photomontages illustrating the likely change in view that would occur as a result of the Proposed Development have been prepared for three of the viewpoints, and

---

these are illustrated on Figures 5.3a-f. These photomontages illustrate how the Proposed Development would appear in the first year after opening (Year 1) and in the fifth year (Year 5) after opening, once proposed planting has had chance to develop.

5.3.28 Wireframe visualisations from each viewpoint are included in Appendix 5.5.

5.3.29 It should be noted that the viewpoint itself is not the receptor; rather the receptors are those people that would be experiencing the view from the viewpoint. Receptors in the vicinity of the Site that are likely to experience views of the Proposed Development include:

- Local residents;
- Users of public rights of way and other routes with public access; and
- Road users.

5.3.30 Other photography illustrating the landscape of the Study Area, including views towards the Site is included in Appendix 5.4. The photography included in this Appendix does not reflect the views towards the Site from any of the LVIA viewpoints, and is included for context only.

#### *Cumulative Baseline*

5.3.31 As set out in Chapter 2.0, an assessment of cumulative effects is not included in the Environmental Statement.

## **5.4 Assessment of Effects**

### ***Incorporated Mitigation***

5.4.1 The design of the Proposed Development has been developed via an iterative process, taking potential landscape and visual effects, and other environmental effects into account. As such, the scheme as proposed includes built-in 'mitigation by design'. The landscape proposals also form an intrinsic part of the Proposed Development. Specific measures incorporated into the Proposed Development include:

- Retention of the great majority of existing boundary vegetation;
- Siting the main building and principal car parking areas in the lowest part of the Site, below surrounding ground levels to reduce their potential prominence;

- 
- Use of ground modelling – a combination of cut and fill, with low screening mounds running parallel to the western boundary of the Site to reduce visibility of lorries;
  - The planting of new trees and hedgerows along these mounds, and elsewhere along the western and north-western boundary to break up views (in keeping with guidelines set out in the district landscape character assessment);
  - New hedgerow planting along the line of existing removed hedgerows within the Site;
  - New native tree planting east of the A1(M) to help integrate new earthworks and help screen traffic, signage and lighting columns at the new overbridge;
  - A new hedgerow with trees along the route of the realigned A168, to help screen views of vehicle movement;
  - Changes to the management of the existing hedgerow along the western boundary of the Site, allowing this to grow taller than at present, to help screen views from the properties to the west along the B6265;
  - Use of green roofs on proposed buildings to assist assimilation with surroundings;
  - Main building to have a gently sloping roof that reflects the contours of the surrounding landform, to reduce potential contrast and reduce the prominence of the building;
  - A well-designed lighting scheme, developed in accordance with best practice measures, which would minimise potential adverse night-time effects;
  - Implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which would include measures to protect landscape and visual amenity during the construction period.

### ***Construction***

5.4.2 Refer to Chapter 4.0 for a description of the construction stage of the Proposed Development. Construction would be managed in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), setting out how environmental issues would be managed in compliance with any particular limitations imposed by the planning permission, as well as in compliance with relevant legislation, regulations and best practice guidance. This is explained in more detail in Chapter 4.0.

5.4.3 Items to be addressed by the CEMP that pertain to landscape and visual effects are likely to include:

- 
- Measures to ensure the successful retention of existing vegetation (for example, use of protective fencing);
  - Measures taken to limit the effects of temporary construction lighting;
  - Protocols governing the establishment of the temporary contractor's compound/s (to reduce any potential adverse effects upon the amenity of nearby properties).

5.4.4 Construction sites feature distinctive elements that are likely to draw attention, including temporary signage and fencing, and site operatives wearing high-visibility clothing. Construction also, by necessity, requires the use of suitable vehicles and other plant, some of which would potentially be readily apparent by virtue of their colour, form and movement. Two temporary contractor's compounds are anticipated to be required (one on either side of the motorway) which would also feature potentially visible built forms including site offices, welfare facilities, storage, etc.

5.4.5 It is anticipated that construction activities would be limited to 07.00 to 19.00hrs Monday to Friday and 07.00 to 13.00hrs Saturday and, as such, construction lighting would generally be limited to hours of darkness during this period. Lighting would be required to ensure the health, safety and welfare of those on Site during poor light conditions, and in particular at the beginning and end of the working day in winter. This may require both fixed lighting columns and mobile task lighting. In some instances, lighting may be required for work on elevated structures, including crane mounted lighting. Additionally, night-time working is anticipated to be required in order to minimise disruption to traffic on the motorway during the construction of the new slip roads and overbridge. Some use of low level lighting of compounds for security purposes may also be required through the night. Potential adverse effects upon amenity arising from such lighting would, as stated above, be addressed by the CEMP.

#### *Construction Effects*

5.4.6 It has been assumed that construction activity would take place largely within the footprint of the Site. It is anticipated that should a temporary construction compound be required east of the motorway, that this would be located within existing agricultural land. As such, there would be some additional vegetation loss relating to construction activity, over and above the vegetation removal required to facilitate the Proposed Development. This loss would be to agricultural grassland, which is of low sensitivity, and which would be restored following construction. Construction-stage effects upon the landscape fabric would not be significant.

- 
- 5.4.7 Construction activities would be temporary and would be largely contained within the Site due to the natural screening provided by existing topography and retained vegetation at the boundary. Notable exceptions to this that would be visible from outside the Site include the construction of the realigned A168 and the access to the Site from the A1(M), as well as the movement of plant and delivery vehicles into the Site, and the presence of cranes and tall work platforms whilst buildings are erected. These would be temporary and intermittent activities, having only a localised influence upon the character of the surrounding landscape and upon views, which would not be significant.
- 5.4.8 Night-time construction effects resulting from lighting would largely be limited to the beginning and end of the normal working day in winter, and would not be significant. Lighting of night-time work during slip road and overbridge construction is likely to be evident for a period of up to six months, but lighting levels may vary during this period depending upon particular work elements. Following slip road/ overbridge construction, lighting would generally not be present outside of normal working hours, other than low-level security lighting. The CEMP would include measures to minimise any effects on amenity. All construction lighting would be experienced in the context of the existing lighting in the surrounding landscape, including at the A168/ B6265 roundabout.
- 5.4.9 Construction would chiefly involve elements that are relatively low in height and which would typically benefit from the level of screening provided by vegetation in the surrounding landscape. Nevertheless, some visibility of construction activity would occur. There would inevitably be short-term landscape and visual effects during the construction phase, however these would be temporary in duration, limited in extent, and would not be significant.

### ***Landscape Effects: Operational***

#### *Effects on Landscape Fabric*

- 5.4.10 The Site currently comprises agricultural grassland. Tree and hedge cover is present at field boundaries and within highway corridors.
- 5.4.11 Such grassland is commonplace within the Study Area. It makes a contribution to local character only as a component of the wider mosaic of fields (including field boundaries) and can readily be recreated should the need arise. Both susceptibility to change and value are low to medium, and sensitivity is also low to medium.

- 
- 5.4.12 The condition of tree and hedgerow vegetation within the Site and along its boundaries has been surveyed as part of the Arboricultural Report submitted as part of the planning application, which identifies all the vegetation surveyed as either 'retention desirable' or 'could be retained'. This vegetation provides structure and definition to the landscape by delineating field boundaries, and also helps to integrate, and in some cases screen, the road network. As such, there is a clear contribution to character made by this planting, albeit that some of it (where planted along the A1(M)/ A168 corridor) is identified (in the District LCA) as being out of keeping with the wider underlying character. Substitution by replacement planting is possible in the case of hedges (and young trees), but some allowance needs to be made for such planting to develop. Where tree planting is more mature, such as the two hedgerow trees on the western boundary of the Site, direct like-for-like replacement is not feasible given the time required for new planting to develop. Both susceptibility to change and value are medium to high, and sensitivity is also medium to high.
- 5.4.13 The Proposed Development would occupy all of one field and part of another to the west of the A1(M) corridor. The new access roundabout and the realigned section of the A168 would extend into fields on the eastern side of the motorway. The slip roads for the new access would occupy land with the existing highway corridor, and the staff entrance onto the B6265 would require some localised widening to an existing field entrance.
- 5.4.14 As such, there would be replacement of existing agricultural grassland, and hedgerow vegetation within the Site boundary, with new buildings, and other structures, associated hard surfacing and new landscape works. Additionally, there would be localised loss of tree and hedgerow vegetation to accommodate access routes and road realignments. Ground modelling would be required west of the A1(M) to create the landform required for the development. Proposed ground levels would in general be slightly lower than existing towards the south-west of the Site, and slightly higher elsewhere.
- 5.4.15 New landscape elements would include new hedgerows (including hedgerow trees), new native trees (planted individually and in groups), large areas of new species-rich grassland and new waterbodies. Some of the new hedgerow planting west of the A1(M) would follow the lines of similar existing features removed to facilitate construction. The main building would be constructed with a grass roof, and as such would provide further new grassland. Subtle and carefully integrated bunding within the Site would help to enclose and segregate parking areas. New native tree and

---

woodland planting would be planted on the embankments of the new bridge over the A1(M), along the slip roads leading to this, and along the route of the former A168. A new hedgerow would be planted on the eastern side of the realigned stretch of the A168, including hedgerow trees, which would provide some screening of vehicle movement along the road.

- 5.4.16 The arable grassland within the Site would undergo a large magnitude of permanent change. This element would be largely replaced by new features. There would be a net loss of vegetation, but new grassland and planting would be more diverse than the existing agricultural sward. A moderate level of effect would occur, which would be not significant given the increased diversity of the replacement vegetation. Given the amount of vegetation loss, effects can only be considered adverse, but the introduction and long-term management of new features would also have a beneficial effect.
- 5.4.17 There would be a low to medium magnitude of change to the existing tree and hedgerow vegetation. A minor to moderate level of effect would occur, which would not be significant, as the majority of this vegetation would be retained, and new planting would in the longer-term provide a replacement for removed vegetation. The initial loss of vegetation would be adverse, but as new planting matures and is subject to targeted long-term management, effects are more likely to be beneficial.

#### *Effects on Landscape Character*

- 5.4.18 A detailed assessment of effects upon the character of the four district LCAs that are located within approximately 2.5km of the Site is set out in Appendix 5.2.
- 5.4.19 Change would be most evident in LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland. The Proposed Development would be located within this LCA and its introduction would result in localised changes in landform to accommodate new structures, hard surfaces and access roads. New buildings, car parking and other external features would be introduced west of the A1(M). East of the motorway, the A168 would be realigned, locally extending the road corridor further to the east, and also resulting in localised changes to the field pattern. A new bridge over the motorway would be introduced and the associated roundabouts and embankments would be apparent from parts of the wider landscape due to their elevation above the existing ground levels, and the presence of traffic, lighting columns and other highway infrastructure. The increase in the number of lighting columns locally would result in a localised change in night-time character, extending the established influence of the lighting.

The presence of the Proposed Development would result in an increase in the established influence of the A1(M)/ A168 corridor due to the introduction of new features associated with the highway, which would locally increase both the width and the visibility of the motorway corridor. The most obvious addition would be the overbridge and associated traffic and infrastructure. Other new features would have a relatively limited influence due to the siting, design and layout of the Proposed Development. Effects on character would not be significant.

5.4.20 In relation to the guidelines for LCA81 highlighted in the District LCA (as referenced in Section 5.3 above), the following conclusions can be drawn.

**Table 5.3: LCA81 & The Proposed Development**

<b>Selected Guidelines from the District LCA</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
Extensive large scale tree planting would be inappropriate	Extensive large scale tree planting does not feature in the landscape proposals for the scheme. The design of the Proposed Development makes use of the surrounding landform, together with existing vegetation to restrict the extent of visibility from outside.
Development requiring large scale blocks of woodland screening should be discouraged	The Proposed Development has been designed in such a fashion that large scale blocks of woodland are not required to screen views. Tree planting is proposed east of the new overbridge but would be a continuation of the established linear planting along the road corridor
Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape	The landscape design for the Proposed Development makes use of small scale blocks of trees which, together with the retention of existing vegetation cover, help to visually integrate new features.
Large-scale development cannot be easily accommodated without further detriment to landscape character	Importantly, this part of the guidelines does not indicate that large scale development cannot be accommodated, but rather that it cannot be accommodated easily.  The open nature of the landscape and the lack of suitability of mass planting as a means of screening a site do present a challenge, and as such careful site selection and considered design become key to enabling integration without harm to character. The topography and orientation of this Site, in combination with established vegetation elements, is such that an opportunity existed here to develop a successful solution. It has thus been possible, with careful and responsive design, to achieve the integration of a relatively large development without notable change to surrounding landscape character.

Selected Guidelines from the District LCA	Commentary
Avoid highlighting the A1(M) and A168 corridors. Linear planting along these corridors does not reflect the landscape pattern	Whilst we do not dispute the assertion that linear highway planting can serve to highlight the presence of a road in the landscape and can be unsympathetic to wider character, the fact is that the A1(M)/ A168 corridor is an established influence upon landscape character and that its associated planting performs a useful screening function that mitigates the influence of the road and traffic upon adjacent areas. The Proposed Development would seek to maintain the existing linear planting in order to retain the integrity of this mitigation function – replanting areas where removal of existing vegetation is required and adding some new planting to the east of the proposed overbridge
Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows, particularly in areas of pre parliamentary enclosure	Hedgerows removed to accommodate the Proposed Development would be reinstated as part of the landscape proposals, along their existing alignments wherever possible. Additionally, a new hedgerow running along the eastern side of the realigned A168 would link with similar existing features in the adjacent fields. No pre-parliamentary enclosure hedgerows are affected.
Planting to mitigate the impact of large-scale buildings should soften rather than screen impact and the potential for planting beyond the site should be considered	Planting proposed consists of strategic small groups of trees which are intended to break up and soften views towards and into the Site rather than achieve a screen. The exception is along the A1(M) corridor to the east where an established screen would be reinstated and reinforced. It is not considered that further off-site planting would be necessary.
Conserve historic features in the landscape	The landscape proposals for the Proposed Development include the reinstatement of a number of pre-existing field boundary hedgerows. In terms of cultural heritage assets, as set out in Chapter 10 of the ES, the Proposed Development would not physically affect any known extant historic features. A programme of archaeological investigation would be undertaken prior to construction, and appropriate mitigation measures agreed with Harrogate Borough Council.

5.4.21 In the other three LCAs (LCAs 74, 76, and 85), change would be limited to minor change in the visual context of the landscape, with additional lighting columns and, to a lesser extent, vehicles on the new bridge visible locally, thereby emphasising the presence of the A1(M)/ A168 corridor, and resulting in some limited intensification in the influence of lighting upon the night-time landscape (existing lighting at the A168/ B6265 roundabout is an established presence). The existing characteristics of the three LCAs would not change appreciably and effects upon landscape character would not be significant.

---

### ***Visual Effects: Operational***

- 5.4.22 An assessment of visual effects at each of the fourteen viewpoints included in the LVIA is set out in Appendix 5.3. None of the viewpoints would experience significant effects.
- 5.4.23 The Proposed Development would be generally inconspicuous, being well screened by a combination of the surrounding landform and the presence of vegetation cover, particularly along the A1(M)/ A168 corridor, but also along the western boundary of the Site and in the surrounding landscape (refer to Viewpoints 2, 3, 4 and 5). The main service area to the west of the motorway has been designed so that the main amenity building and car parking areas are set lower than the surrounding ground level, and with a low screen mound planted with hedgerows running parallel to the western boundary of the Site. The existing western boundary hedgerow would be allowed to grow taller than at present, providing further screening. Additionally, the provision of green roofs on proposed buildings would reduce the degree of contrast with existing vegetation from locations where these buildings can be glimpsed above surrounding landform and vegetation (refer to the photomontages from Viewpoint 13, Figures 5.3e-f).
- 5.4.24 The realignment of the A168 would be visible from locations to the east of the motorway. The new road would extend further eastwards than the existing road, coming slightly closer to receptors at the edge of Kirby Hill (refer to Viewpoints 8, 9 and 10) and also to the public footpaths and minor roads to the east (refer to Viewpoints 6 and 7). Nevertheless, the arrangement of visual elements would not change appreciably, with road traffic, signage and lighting columns remaining visible, and with the road surface itself largely hidden from view, as is the case with the existing road. Whilst change in view would be apparent from some locations, the influence of the realigned road would not be appreciably different from that of the existing road.
- 5.4.25 The most visible elements of the Proposed Development would be the new overbridge and its associated roundabouts, traffic, signage and lighting columns. By its nature, the bridge would need to be at a higher elevation than the surrounding ground level in order to take traffic over the motorway. Despite this, the structure itself would rarely be evident, but large vehicles travelling across it would be apparent, as would some signage and lighting columns, particularly early in the life of the Proposed Development (refer to Viewpoints 1, 5-9 and 14). New native tree planting

---

on the new embankments to the east of the bridge and at the north-west perimeter of the Site would help to integrate the structure into the landscape over time when viewed from the surrounding area (including from the edge of Kirby Hill). It is estimated that after approximately five years, the bridge itself, and associated earthworks, vehicles and signage would be largely screened from view, particularly in summer (refer to the photomontages from Viewpoint 8, Figures 5.3c-d), although lighting columns would remain visible.

- 5.4.26 Some other lighting columns would also be partially visible, i.e. those along the western edge of the Site which would illuminate the HGV parking area, but would typically be viewed in a context where the existing columns at the A168/ B6265 roundabout are also visible. From some locations, existing columns would remain more prominent than the new columns (refer to Viewpoints 10, 11 and 12). The columns are slender structures and would become less easy to make out as distance from the Site increases (refer to Viewpoints 3-5, and to the photomontages from Viewpoint 6, Figures 5.3a-b).
- 5.4.27 The overall effect of the introduction of these new more visible elements would be to increase the established influence of the A1(M)/ A168 corridor within some views. As such, a degree of incremental change in view would occur, which would be adverse. These visual effects would not be significant.
- 5.4.28 Views from the majority of nearby residential properties are reflected by Viewpoints 9 and 10 (properties at the northern edge of Kirby Hill), and by Viewpoint 13 (properties along the B6265, west of the motorway).
- 5.4.29 Views from Providence Lodge, south of the A168/ B6265 roundabout, (approximately 330m south-east of the Site) would be well screened by the tree belt immediately south of the roundabout, and as such, clear views of the Proposed Development would not be available. Any glimpsed views filtered through the trees (whether in summer or winter) would be in the context of the existing busy roundabout (including associated traffic, lighting and signage) which would be located between the property and the Proposed Development. The property is oriented such that its main windows face north-east, perpendicular to the direction of the Proposed Development. Photograph 7 of Appendix 5.4 illustrates the property as seen from the A168 to the north-east. It is clear that, despite the proximity of Providence Lodge to the Proposed Development, that residents would not experience significant visual effects.

---

5.4.30 Views from the elevated upper windows of Skelton Windmill are likely to include elements of the Proposed Development that would be screened from ground level or first-floor views from other properties. The windmill is approximately 15m high and long-range views are thus available outwards from upper windows, some of which face south-eastwards and have relatively direct views towards the Site. It is possible that some partial views of parked vehicles may be available from these elevated parts of the property. There would also be greater visibility of the new buildings, predominantly of the gently sloping green roofs. The new vegetation cover and low screening mounds close to the western boundary of the Site may also be visible. This change would increase the existing influence of the A1(M)/ A168 corridor upon views from the property, but would occur in the context of much longer views eastward towards the North York Moors. In the context of these expansive views, effects would not be significant.

5.4.31 As noted above, existing vegetation cover in the landscape would restrict the visibility of the Proposed Development from the surrounding area. Much of this vegetation is concentrated in relatively narrow tree belts, or in hedges. As such, there is likely to be greater visibility in winter, when deciduous foliage is absent and the movement of traffic, in particular brightly coloured HGVs, is more conspicuous. However, existing features are also likely to be more visible for the same reasons, and visual change set against a baseline of winter views is unlikely to be appreciably greater in magnitude than summer change. Additionally, as noted above, proposed new planting and changes to the management of existing vegetation, would provide increased screening of the Proposed Development in the medium-term. This screening would inevitably be less effective in winter due to the absence of foliage, but is still likely to reduce the visible of new features over time.

### ***Night-time Effects***

5.4.32 Existing light sources in the vicinity of the Site include the road lighting at the A168/B6265 roundabout and the adjacent approach roads. Traffic at and near the roundabout is also a source of light, albeit one that is variable depending upon traffic volume. In the vicinity of the Site the A1(M) runs through an area of vegetated cutting, and hence light from traffic on this road is well screened. Street lighting in Kirby Hill and most other settlements in the Study Area is relatively low-key, reflecting the rural character. Boroughbridge has more characteristically urban street lighting. The very tall lighting columns at Dishforth Airfield are understood not to be in use, following the cessation of aviation activity in 2016.

- 
- 5.4.33 As described in Chapter 4.0, the Proposed Development would introduce new lighting to the Site. This would include lighting along the new access slip roads from the A1(M), along internal access roads, lighting of parking areas, at fuel stations, around building entrances, and along pedestrian walkways. The realigned section of the A168 would also require road lighting where it joins the roundabout with the B6265, similar to that on the existing stretch of road. As also described in Chapter 4.0, the proposed lighting would be designed in accordance with best practice measures intended to minimise the generation of obtrusive light/ light spillage. A lighting assessment is set out in Appendix 4.1.
- 5.4.34 The location of the Proposed Development is such that there are few opportunities for views into the Site itself available, due to the surrounding landform and presence of vegetation cover along the Site boundary and in the surrounding area. As such, illuminance of hard surfaces such as roads and parking areas would not be obvious from many areas beyond the Site and its immediate surroundings.
- 5.4.35 The main source of potential night-time effects would be the lighting that is located at the more elevated parts of the Proposed Development, specifically along the new access road into the Site, particularly where this crosses over the A1(M). The elevated nature of these light sources would be such that views of luminaires would be likely to be available from some locations within the surrounding area. As set out in the lighting assessment, the lighting would consist of modern full cut-off luminaires which are designed to eliminate upward and sideways escape of light and as such visibility of point light sources would be minimised. The existing influence of lighting at the A168/ B6265 roundabout would nonetheless be extended and intensified as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 5.4.36 This change would be more evident from locations east of the motorway, where the majority of the Proposed Development, including lit parking areas and internal access roads, would be fully screened, due to intervening topography and dense vegetation. A limited number of new lighting columns would remain evident above screening features. As such, a cluster of new light sources would be introduced to the night-time sky, to the north of and separate from the existing cluster of light sources at the A168/ B6265 roundabout. There would be an extension of existing phenomena associated with the A1(M) corridor. The night-time scene would continue to be sparsely lit with scattered light sources present across a generally dark landscape, and as such, whilst there would be localised adverse change resulting from the Proposed Development, this would not result in significant night-time effects.

- 
- 5.4.37 From areas immediately to the west of the Proposed Development, notably in the vicinity of Viewpoint 13, new lighting would be noticeably more apparent, with columns associated with the lighting of internal access roads and parking areas visible above screening features. Hence, new light sources would be introduced to the night-time sky. As stated above, use of modern full cut off luminaires would very effectively limit sideways light spill and direct visibility of light sources. The Proposed Development would intensify the presence of artificial light in a localised area and there would be a degree of adverse night-time change, with new lighting seen in conjunction with the existing lighting at the A168 / B6265 junction. Effects would not be significant. Planting along the western site boundary would reduce the number of columns visible over time but would never fully screen the tallest columns.
- 5.4.38 At greater distances from the Site, the perception of individual lights would be likely to diminish but it is likely that a perception of a lit A1(M)/ A168 corridor would increase (for example around Viewpoints 12 and 14). Despite this the use of modern luminaires would ensure that sky would continue to be remain generally dark, with only limited change from baseline and effects would not be significant.
- 5.4.39 As daylight hours are shorter during the winter months, the proposed lighting would be in use for a greater proportion of the day, and at times when larger numbers of people are likely to be outside to experience views towards the Site (i.e. going to and from work). As such, the night-time effects of the Proposed Development upon views are more likely to be experienced during the winter.

## **5.5 Mitigation**

- 5.5.1 Mitigation measures incorporated directly into the design of the Proposed Development, including the proposed landscape scheme are described in Section 5.4 above.
- 5.5.2 In addition to these incorporated mitigation measures, it is proposed that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan covering the Site could be developed, in agreement with Harrogate Borough Council and other key stakeholders, to ensure that longer-term benefits of the landscape proposals are maximised.
- 5.5.3 It should be noted that full details of the landscape works forming part of the Proposed Development would be addressed as a reserved matter.

---

## 5.6 Residual Effects and Conclusions

- 5.6.1 The Proposed Development would be introduced into a location already influenced by the presence of the A1(M) and A168 and the associated traffic, signage and lighting. Movement of traffic, and in particular HGVs, views of tall lighting columns and the presence of typical A road signage is a familiar presence at the A168/ B6265 roundabout, immediately south-east of the Site. A long, linear belt of tree cover defines the route of the motorway (and screens views of the road from the east). Traffic on the A168 is visible to the east of this existing vegetation.
- 5.6.2 The scheme has been designed to reflect guidance set out in the *Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment*, and with regard to previous planning decisions that relate to the Site. The design of the Proposed Development would result in new buildings and parking areas west of the motorway being set below the existing ground level and being screened by new mounds planted with hedgerows. The use of green roofs would mean that the visible sections of new buildings would not contrast strongly with the surrounding landscape. The new bridge over the motorway, the associated approach roads and associated traffic, signage and lighting would be more evident from the surrounding area, due to its elevation above the surrounding ground level.
- 5.6.3 The Proposed Development would result in an increase of the established influence of the A1(M)/ A168 corridor upon the surrounding landscape and upon views. The design of the Proposed Development would limit this influence, but there would nevertheless be adverse change, resulting chiefly from the visibility of traffic, signage and lighting columns associated with the bridge over the motorway. Effects upon landscape character would not be significant due to the limited scale of the change that would occur. Visual effects would also not be significant due to the incremental nature of the change in view, and/ or the continued prominence of other features associated with the motorway corridor, which would remain more prominent than the Proposed Development from some locations.
- 5.6.4 Proposed lighting would be sensitively designed so as to minimise light spillage, and the location of the Site in relation to surrounding visual receptors would mean that any hard surfaces illuminated by new lighting would be unlikely to be visible beyond the Site boundary. There would be localised, notable but non-significant night-time effects experienced along the stretch of the B6265 immediately west of the Site and

---

obliquely from the adjacent residential properties, due to the amount of new light sources introduced at short-range.