

Appendix B

Review of Additional Information – August 2023

B.1 LUC was commissioned by North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) in August 2023 to provide a review of the response and additional information provided by the applicant in July 2023. This additional information has been provided in response to LUC's initial review of the LVIA for the Proposed Development of 'Land North-East of Junction 10 M42, North Warwickshire', produced by WSP for Hodgetts Estates (planning application ref. PAP/2021/0663), and the meeting held with the Council and the applicant on 31st January 2023. The purpose of this appendix is to provide a technical review of the additional information provided in the Applicant's response received July 2023.

B.2 Table B.1: below sets out the different elements of the additional information received, and LUC's response.

Table B.1: Additional information received

Item	LUC comment
<p>Viewpoint photography taken during winter conditions (inc. relocation of VP 5)</p> <p>(Ref: 230714_403.V11077.00001.LAJ5-48)</p>	<p>Winter photography has been provided from all of the viewpoints. This is in accordance with the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 6-19. The winter photography illustrates the increased filtered visibility towards the site which will be afforded through vegetation during the winter months. This is particularly evident from viewpoints 9, 11, 13 and 14.</p> <p>Viewpoint 5 has been micro-sited to be located slightly higher up at the edge of the recreational area following LUCs recommendation at the January 2023 meeting. This provides a more elevated view towards the site, with greater visibility above the intervening block of woodland. There would be greater visibility of the proposed development from this viewpoint.</p>
<p>Full resolution versions of the Design & Access Statement and Design Guide</p>	<p>A full resolution version of the D&A statement was provided which shows more clearly the wirelines provided for viewpoints 1, 4 and 5. The wirelines alone are not particularly informative as they show the maximum parameters with matured mitigation planting screening most of the view. The Type 3 photomontages provide a much clearer indication of what views of the proposed development would look like.</p> <p>In reading these documents it is noted that non-native landscape planting is proposed, as copied below. We would suggest that in this rural fringe location, it would be more appropriate to adopt a purely native planting list, and note that the use of non-natives around the adjacent distribution centres appears somewhat incongruous in terms of its character, on the edge of</p>

Item	LUC comment																																																																																																		
	<p>more undeveloped countryside.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 443 1503 1684"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="491 443 1503 474">Ornamental Shrubs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 474 979 506">Ornamental Shrub Mix 2 – Small</td> <td data-bbox="979 474 1503 506">Ornamental Shrub Mix 1 – Medium</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 506 979 537">Berberis frikartii 'Amstelveen'</td> <td data-bbox="979 506 1503 537">Ceanothus 'Blue Mound'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 537 979 568">Ceanothus thyrsiflorus repens</td> <td data-bbox="979 537 1503 568">Choisya ternate</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 568 979 600">Genista lydia</td> <td data-bbox="979 568 1503 600">Escallonia 'Apple Blossom'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 600 979 631">Hebe albicans</td> <td data-bbox="979 600 1503 631">Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 631 979 663">Lonicera pileata</td> <td data-bbox="979 631 1503 663">Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 663 979 694">Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'</td> <td data-bbox="979 663 1503 694">Pyracantha coccinea 'Red Cushion'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 694 979 725">Skimmia confusa 'Kew Green'</td> <td data-bbox="979 694 1503 725">Viburnum davidii</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 725 979 757">Spiraea japonica 'Goldflame'</td> <td data-bbox="979 725 1503 757">Cornus sanguinea 'Midwinter Fire'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 757 979 788"></td> <td data-bbox="979 757 1503 788"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 788 979 819">Ornamental Groundcover Mix</td> <td data-bbox="979 788 1503 819">Ornamental and Feature Shrubs</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 819 979 851">Hedera helix</td> <td data-bbox="979 819 1503 851">Cornus stolonifera 'Kelsey Gold'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 851 979 882">Hypericum moserianum</td> <td data-bbox="979 851 1503 882">Aucuba japonica 'Rozannie'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 882 979 913">Hebe rakaiensis</td> <td data-bbox="979 882 1503 913">Spiraea japonica 'Golden Princess'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 913 979 945">Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'</td> <td data-bbox="979 913 1503 945">Hebe rakaiensis</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 945 979 976">Lonicera nitida 'May Green'</td> <td data-bbox="979 945 1503 976">Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 976 979 1008"></td> <td data-bbox="979 976 1503 1008">Euonymus fortunei 'Silver Queen'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1008 979 1039"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1008 1503 1039">Elaeagnus ebbingel 'Gilt Edge'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1039 979 1070"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1039 1503 1070">Viburnum tinus 'Variegatum'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1070 979 1102"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1070 1503 1102">Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1102 979 1133"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1102 1503 1133"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1133 979 1164"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1133 1503 1164"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1164 979 1196"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1164 1503 1196"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1196 979 1227"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1196 1503 1227"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1227 979 1258"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1227 1503 1258"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1258 979 1290"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1258 1503 1290"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1290 979 1321"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1290 1503 1321"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1321 979 1352"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1321 1503 1352"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1352 979 1384"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1352 1503 1384"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1384 979 1415"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1384 1503 1415"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1415 979 1447"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1415 1503 1447"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1447 979 1478"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1447 1503 1478"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1478 979 1509"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1478 1503 1509"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1509 979 1541"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1509 1503 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1541 979 1572"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1541 1503 1572"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1572 979 1603"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1572 1503 1603"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1603 979 1635"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1603 1503 1635"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1635 979 1666"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1635 1503 1666"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1666 979 1697"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1666 1503 1697"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1697 979 1729"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1697 1503 1729"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1729 979 1760"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1729 1503 1760"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1760 979 1792"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1760 1503 1792"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1792 979 1823"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1792 1503 1823"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1823 979 1854"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1823 1503 1854"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1854 979 1886"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1854 1503 1886"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1886 979 1917"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1886 1503 1917"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1917 979 1948"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1917 1503 1948"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 1948 979 1980"></td> <td data-bbox="979 1948 1503 1980"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ornamental Shrubs		Ornamental Shrub Mix 2 – Small	Ornamental Shrub Mix 1 – Medium	Berberis frikartii 'Amstelveen'	Ceanothus 'Blue Mound'	Ceanothus thyrsiflorus repens	Choisya ternate	Genista lydia	Escallonia 'Apple Blossom'	Hebe albicans	Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'	Lonicera pileata	Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'	Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'	Pyracantha coccinea 'Red Cushion'	Skimmia confusa 'Kew Green'	Viburnum davidii	Spiraea japonica 'Goldflame'	Cornus sanguinea 'Midwinter Fire'			Ornamental Groundcover Mix	Ornamental and Feature Shrubs	Hedera helix	Cornus stolonifera 'Kelsey Gold'	Hypericum moserianum	Aucuba japonica 'Rozannie'	Hebe rakaiensis	Spiraea japonica 'Golden Princess'	Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'	Hebe rakaiensis	Lonicera nitida 'May Green'	Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'		Euonymus fortunei 'Silver Queen'		Elaeagnus ebbingel 'Gilt Edge'		Viburnum tinus 'Variegatum'		Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'																																																								
Ornamental Shrubs																																																																																																			
Ornamental Shrub Mix 2 – Small	Ornamental Shrub Mix 1 – Medium																																																																																																		
Berberis frikartii 'Amstelveen'	Ceanothus 'Blue Mound'																																																																																																		
Ceanothus thyrsiflorus repens	Choisya ternate																																																																																																		
Genista lydia	Escallonia 'Apple Blossom'																																																																																																		
Hebe albicans	Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'																																																																																																		
Lonicera pileata	Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'																																																																																																		
Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'	Pyracantha coccinea 'Red Cushion'																																																																																																		
Skimmia confusa 'Kew Green'	Viburnum davidii																																																																																																		
Spiraea japonica 'Goldflame'	Cornus sanguinea 'Midwinter Fire'																																																																																																		
Ornamental Groundcover Mix	Ornamental and Feature Shrubs																																																																																																		
Hedera helix	Cornus stolonifera 'Kelsey Gold'																																																																																																		
Hypericum moserianum	Aucuba japonica 'Rozannie'																																																																																																		
Hebe rakaiensis	Spiraea japonica 'Golden Princess'																																																																																																		
Potentilla fruticosa 'Elizabeth'	Hebe rakaiensis																																																																																																		
Lonicera nitida 'May Green'	Prunus laurocerasus 'Otto Luyken'																																																																																																		
	Euonymus fortunei 'Silver Queen'																																																																																																		
	Elaeagnus ebbingel 'Gilt Edge'																																																																																																		
	Viburnum tinus 'Variegatum'																																																																																																		
	Photinia fraseri 'Red Robin'																																																																																																		
<p>2 x wirelines in full resolution <i>(ref: 230123_403.11077.00001.L AJ-53-56)</i></p>	<p>In addition to the wirelines provided within the high-resolution D&A statement, additional high-resolution wirelines have been provided from viewpoints 8 and 9. These show more clearly which parts of the building will be visible from the viewpoint, and which parts will be screened by existing planting and/or proposed mitigation planting. As above, the wirelines are not particularly informative as they show the maximum parameters with matured mitigation planting screening most of the view. The Type 3 photomontages provide a much clearer indication of what views of the proposed development would look like.</p>																																																																																																		

Item	LUC comment
<p>Updated SLR Technical Note</p> <p>(ref: 230531_403.11077.00001 Version 3)</p>	<p>An updated technical note was provided by SLR in response to the Review of Additional Information by LUC issued in November 2022, and following the January meeting with all parties. This updated technical note includes further information relating to dark sky landscapes.</p> <p>Our comments on the technical note below consider discussions had during the January 2023 meeting with NWBC and SLR, and the SOAM which was issued by the Council in May 2023.</p> <p>Study Area – Following review of the LVIA and subsequent discussions in January, it was agreed that the extent of the study area, as illustrated by the ZTV map was appropriate. This is confirmed in the SOAM.</p> <p>Baseline photography – Updated viewpoint photography better displaying the horizontal angle of view has been provided. In addition, this most recent pack of information includes a new set of baseline photography taken during the winter months, as requested during the January 2023 meeting. This is in accordance with the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 6-19.</p> <p>Visualisations – Additional wireline visualisations were requested from viewpoints 8, 10/11, and 13. SLR provided updated wirelines for viewpoints 8 and 9 which show potential visibility from Dordon. No updated wireline visualisations were provided from viewpoints 10 and/or 11 as these <i>“are at close range to the proposed development and provide limited information on potential effects”</i>. Given VP10 is identified as major (significant) at construction stage and moderate (not significant) with mitigation planting, it would have been useful to see the visualisations to fully understand the scale that the proposed development would appear. No visualisations were provided from viewpoint 13 because <i>“it is not considered a particularly informative view with the motorway and motorway junction in the foreground and the recent St Modwen development in the background”</i>.</p> <p>Following the meeting in January, SLR have provided photomontages of the proposed development based on the indicative site plans and elevations from viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9. These show the development with and without mitigation planting, which helps provide clarity as to the levels of likely effects, given that planting will take 10-15 years to reach semi-maturity, and thus become a more effective screen.</p> <p>CLVIA methodology clarifications – It is understood that Site Allocation E2 has been included as part of the baseline and within the cumulative assessment as it has a high certainty of coming forward due to being found justified (appropriate) and effective (deliverable).</p> <p>LUC originally stated that we thought the cumulative effects associated with the proposed development have been underestimated, particularly when considered with the development immediately south of the site. We stand by this comment and provide the following justification for it. The proposed development will increase the cumulative effect of the presence of largescale commercial buildings as experienced from around the junction 10 roundabout, developing the last undeveloped quadrant with a large-scale scheme similar to those south and west of the site. The proposed development would be visible alongside existing and proposed development (notably site E2) from across the study area. From viewpoint 1, industrial development is visible in filtered views to the south and west. The proposed E2 site would be located east of the existing development south of the site. It is expected E2 will be of a similar scale to the existing development. The addition of the proposed development alongside in views from VP1 will introduce large-scale development in much closer proximity to the viewpoint. Similarly, from viewpoints 4 and 5, the addition of the proposed development alongside development at E2 will extend the presence of large-scale commercial development across the view, with the proposed development likely to appear of a greater scale, from VP4 in particular.</p> <p>Off-site mitigation – It is confirmed that off-site mitigation planning will be secured via s.106 agreement and obligations would remain if land were sold or transferred in the future. LUC welcome the off-site mitigation planting. It is for the Council’s planning and legal advisors to advise on appropriate process.</p>

Item	LUC comment
	<p>L&V effects – It is noted that potential construction effects were assessed at a high-level in section 10.5, which are useful to understand the general construction related effects. With relation to our original comments, it would have been helpful if construction effects were considered separately for each viewpoint in the main assessment. We appreciate that this is an outline application and there is no detailed understanding of the construction requirements, however by providing a high-level assessment for each viewpoint, it may show more clearly which viewpoints could be most affected during the construction phase. We note the requirement for extensive areas of cut and fill and the large scale of the earthworks and excavation that would be required in order to dig out flat construction platforms.</p> <p>With relation to 'value', 'susceptibility', 'size and scale' and 'geographic extent', very brief commentary is provided in Appendices 10.3 and 10.4. This is noted; however, it is our opinion that this could be better explained in the assessment to make it easier for the reader to understand the assessment process and effects identified. That said, the overall information is there, perhaps just not presented in the most user-friendly way.</p> <p>VP selection – Information on why viewpoints were selected has been provided, and it is understood from our meeting with the SLR and NWBC in January 2023 that these viewpoints were agreed between both parties. This approach was agreed in the SOAM. Recommendations to microsite viewpoint 5 have been taken on board in the most recent set of visualisations, and this shows that the proposed development would be more visible from the slightly more elevated location.</p> <p>ZTV – The applicant has provided an updated ZTV which show the theoretical visibility of the development (built form and proposed bunding on which trees would be planted). Although no proposed tree planting has been modelled into the ZTV, the inclusion of the bunding illustrates that more of the proposed development would be visible from the east towards Dordon. Beyond this area, the extent of visibility would remain largely similar to the previous iteration, which included the proposed planting as a screening element, although its effectiveness during the first 1-15 years or so would be limited, given the time taken for plants to grow. The applicant states that woodland planting is a desirable characteristic of the landscape character area, and it is therefore considered suitable mitigation. Whilst we welcome the inclusion of woodland, we still have concerns about the prominence of the woodland, and the way it will block longer distance open views, due to being planted on the underlying very large-scale bund (see further comment on this below under design guide). However, it is noted that details of the bund morphology would be set out at Reserved Matters stage, and that a height/scale and shape more sympathetic to the surrounding landscape may be agreed.</p> <p>Design Guide – Comments relating to the planting of native species is welcomed and it is noted that not all of the 10,000 trees would be "<i>adolescent or semi-mature</i>". With relation to concerns about bunding height, the applicant has advised that the bunds are only indicatively illustrated. Bund morphology would be set out at Reserved Matters stage, and that a height/scale more sympathetic to the surrounding landscape can be agreed. Provided appropriate discussions are had to determine the height/scale as well as the shape and profiling of the bund, this approach is considered to be acceptable, although there are still concerns how it will be possible to achieve a sympathetic bund morphology within the confines of the site area, given the very large volume of excavated material that will be created from the excavation of flat development platforms.</p> <p>Following the site visit in January, LUC consider that the landscape of the site and the area to the east, although transitional, does still have rural qualities. It is recognised that the surrounding area to the south and west is industrial in nature and does influence the wider area, however where possible the rural qualities of the site and strategic gap area should be protected. LUC agree that the proposed development would be similar to the character of the other industrial areas to the south and west of the site but is not characteristic of the landscape, fringed with smaller scale residential dwellings, immediately to the north and east.</p> <p>D&A Statement – With relation to the prominence of the proposed development from Dordon, it is not considered that siting the large-scale buildings (which will take up much of the site) to the south-west will have a significant role in reducing visual prominence from key</p>

Item	LUC comment
	<p>viewpoints. The photomontages provided illustrate that from most views the development will be a prominent feature which will block longer distance views, and of a similar scale to the existing industrial development. The change to landscape character from an open arable field to commercial building within bunds, fringed with planted trees will remain considerable. Proposed planting between Dordon and the proposed development may break up the massing of the built form in time and to an extent, however based on the photomontages, the buildings would still be notably visible above this planting, especially in the earlier years.</p> <p>Light levels – Information on the baseline light levels within the site have been provided, concluding that the "site is already strongly influenced by light from adjacent settlements and infrastructure" and is a "characteristic of the site". LUC acknowledge that there are existing light sources around the site but note the additional impact that lighting on the proposed development would have, and recommend that a reduced lighting scheme is agreed. It is welcomed that a sensitively design lighting scheme would be designed to minimise potential impacts and we would urge conversations be had at reserved matters stage to minimise the brightness and potential effects on the landscape.</p>
<p>Indicative Masterplan INST+ Specification <i>(ref: 4263-CA-00-00-DR-A-00090 Rev SK5)</i></p>	<p>An indicative masterplan has been provided which illustrates the form in which a multi-unit scheme is likely to come forward at the site. This layout is illustrated within the accompanying Type 3 photomontages.</p> <p>It is useful to understand the likely layout and configuration of the scheme, supplemented by photomontages (discussed further below).</p>
<p>Indicative Elevations based on Indicative Masterplan INST+ Specification</p> <p>Proposed South Unit Proposed Elevations <i>(Plan ref: 4263-CA-00-00-DR-A-05008 Rev SK3)</i></p> <p>Proposed Middle Unit Proposed Elevations <i>(Plan ref: 4263-CA-00-00-DR-A-05009 Rev SK3)</i></p> <p>Proposed North Unit Proposed Elevations <i>(Plan ref: 4263-CA-00-00-DR-A-05010 Rev SK3)</i></p> <p>Proposed Smaller Unit Proposed Elevations <i>(Plan ref: 4263-CA-00-00-DR-A-05011 Rev SK2)</i></p> <p>(See also the Five images of the G.Park Blue Planet warehousing development at Chatterley Valley, Stoke-on-Trent)</p>	<p>Figures showing the elevations of each of the buildings forming the development have been provided. The three larger buildings will have a maximum height of 21m, whereas the smaller building will have a maximum roof height of 12m. These building heights are comparable (although still taller) to the other industrial buildings to the south, south-east and west of the site. They are, however, much larger than the nearby properties at Birchmoor to the north.</p> <p>Indicative elevations have been provided which illustrate that the buildings would use colour banding transitioning from green to grey as they get higher up. This design may help the development blend better into the landscape and sky, particularly when viewed from more elevated locations (e.g., Viewpoint 8). In addition, the curved roof on the buildings may help the buildings blend better into the sky, albeit that at this outline stage there is no certainty as to the design/colour etc. Agreement through Reserved matters would be required.</p> <p>Although the development will be a very prominent feature in views from the surrounding landscape (particularly to the east) whilst the mitigation planting matures, the colour banding approach is considered to be more suitable than using block colours, for example as used in the light grey scheme to the south of the site. This existing scheme is visually very prominent in the landscape.</p> <p>The photos of G Park Blue Planet are helpful in understanding what the development may look like once built, albeit again at this outline stage, the design is uncertain. One comment is that the green colour used on these appears to be much brighter than indicated in the proposed elevations, and therefore appears more prominent. It is recommended that if this approach is taken slightly more toned down/ natural looking RAL colours are used.</p>
<p>Sections A, B, C and D based on Indicative Masterplan INST+ Specification <i>(Plan refs: 403.11077.00001.LAJ-54)</i></p>	<p>Cross sections across the site have been provided based on the indicative master plan.</p> <p>Section A-A' provides a south-north cross section across the site. It illustrates that the large building at the southern end of the site will sit at a level slightly above the existing ground level, whilst the larger buildings in the middle and northern part of the site will sit at lower elevations compared to the existing ground level. The ground level will be stepped further north in the site, with the smallest unit sat higher up compared to the others. Although the</p>

Item	LUC comment
<p>Rev D and 403.11077.00001.LAJ-55 Rev D)</p>	<p>ground level of this unit will be higher, it will still sit below the existing ground level, and the height of the building itself will be lower than the larger units.</p> <p>The proposed tree planting between the buildings and Birchmoor will be on bunding which sits at a higher level to the current ground level of the site. This bunding will be tapered. A separation distance of c.15m will be maintained between the bunding/ woodland and between the gardens of Birchmoor. This area currently contains paddocks. Therefore, the proposed northern bund and woodland is not expected to cause loss of sunlight. Detailed plans should be reviewed as part of Reserved Matters, to examine this issue, as these south facing properties presently benefit from their open outlook across the fields and the sunshine which falls on their facades.</p> <p>Sections B-B', C-C' and D-D' provide a west-east cross section at the southern, middle and northern parts of the site. Bunding as shown in the C-C' cross-section of the site appears to be quite high compared to the northern and southern sections. As previously discussed, LUC still consider that the scale of this bunding as shown indicatively is not sympathetic to the character of the surrounding landscape. However, it is understood that this bunding is indicative and that the final morphology would be set out at Reserved Matters stage, whereby a scape and scale more sympathetic to the surrounding landscape can be agreed.</p>
<p>Type 3 Photomontages (based on Indicative Masterplan INST+ Specification) (ref: 403.11077.00001.LAJ- 56-LAJ-70 Rev E)</p>	<p>Type 3 photomontages are provided from viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9. These show the existing view, a photomontage of the proposed development at year 1 (showing building and landform but no vegetation), and a photomontage of the proposed development at year 15 (with proposed planting modelled in at a height of 8m). The photomontages use the winter photography that was captured this year following our meeting on 31st January.</p> <p>LUC have previously raised concerns about the levels of effect which have been identified in the LVIA. This was based on a limited number of wirelines which were provided (showing the mitigation planting once matured). Photomontages have been produced from 5 viewpoints. LUC have revisited the LVIA in light of these visualisations. Our comments are provided below.</p> <p>Viewpoint 1 – The LVIA identified a slight magnitude of change (MOC) at construction, and a negligible MOC after 15 years. The visual effect is Moderate (not significant) at construction and Minor (not significant) after 15 years.</p> <p>The photomontage produced for year 1, clearly shows the proposed development forming a prominent feature and taking up much of the view from this location. LUC disagree that the MOC is 'slight' with an overall moderate (not significant) effect. LUC consider this to be a substantial MOC resulting in a significant effect.</p> <p>LUC agree that screening provided at year 15 will reduce the MOC and significance of effect, although the planting itself will also result in a significant change to the view.</p> <p>Viewpoint 4 - The LVIA identified a substantial MOC at construction, and a negligible MOC after 15 years. The visual effect is Major (significant) at construction and Moderate (not significant) after 15 years.</p> <p>The photomontage produced for year 1, clearly shows the proposed development forming a prominent feature and taking up much of the view from this location. LUC agree that the MOC is 'substantial' with an overall major (significant) effect.</p> <p>LUC do not agree that the MOC at 15 years will be negligible, as the proposed development would be clearly visible above the intervening mitigation planting, and the bund and planting itself would also lead to a significant change in the view.</p> <p>Viewpoint 5 - The LVIA identified a slight MOC at construction, and a negligible MOC after 15 years. The visual effect is Moderate (not significant) at construction and Minor (not significant) after 15 years.</p> <p>The photomontage produced for year 1, shows the proposed development as a notable feature in the photomontage, albeit with views filtered by intervening vegetation. Given the prominence of the proposed development from this view, LUC disagree that the MOC is</p>

Item	LUC comment
	<p>'slight' with an overall moderate (not significant) effect. LUC consider this to be at least a medium MOC resulting in a significant effect.</p> <p>LUC do not agree that the MOC at 15 years will be negligible, as the proposed development would be clearly visible above the intervening mitigation planting. The view remains largely similar between year 1 and year 15 from this viewpoint due to its elevated nature.</p> <p>Viewpoint 8 - The LVIA identified a medium MOC at construction, and a slight MOC after 15 years. The visual effect is Moderate (not significant) at construction and after 15 years.</p> <p>The photomontage produced for year 1, clearly shows the proposed development forming a prominent feature and taking up much of the view from this location. LUC disagree that the MOC is 'medium' with an overall moderate (not significant) effect. LUC consider this to be a substantial effect with significant effects.</p> <p>LUC do not agree that the MOC at 15 years will be slight, as the proposed development would be clearly visible above the intervening mitigation planting. LUC consider this to be at least a medium MOC, as a result of the new buildings. The proposed hedgerows and field trees would be beneficial and are welcomed.</p> <p>Viewpoint 9 -The LVIA identified a slight MOC at construction, and a negligible MOC after 15 years. The visual effect is Moderate and minor (not significant) for walkers and vehicle users, respectively, at construction and Minor (not significant) after 15 years. LUC agrees with this assessment. Seeing this photomontage, we would suggest that the location is not particularly informative. The view would be more apparent from further along the road to the east.</p>