

## **Review of Landscape and Visual Aspects**

of the Planning Application by

IDI Gazeley

Hybrid Planning Application comprising: 1) Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 427,200 sq m Storage and Distribution (B8) with ancillary offices (B1a), up to 3,700 sq m for a Logistics Institute of Technology (D1) with associated playing field, up to 9,000 sq m small business space (B1a, B1b), up to 300 sq m estate office with conference facility and exhibition centre (D1), the creation of a Country Park, other open space and landscaping works on land to the north of Mere Lane, formation of access road from Magna Park, creation of roundabouts, partial realignment of Mere Lane, upgrading of A5 to dual carriageway, creation of roundabout access on A5, creation of SuDS facilities and associated infrastructure and landscaping works (siting, extent and use of the defined parcels, the maximum quanta and height of buildings, the restriction on the siting of yards, demolitions and means of access to be considered only); and 2) Detailed application for the creation of a 140 space HGV parking facility, associated gatehouse and HGV Driver Training Centre, vehicle wash and fuelling facilities, and a rail freight shuttle terminal, with associated hardstanding, landscaping works and SUDS facilities on land adjacent to Asda George Headquarters, A4303 | Land At Mere Lane Bittesby Leicestershire

Land at Mere Lane,  
Bittesby,  
Leicestershire

Planning Application: 15/01531/OUT & 15/01531/FUL

on behalf of



Harborough District Council

Quality Control

Review of Landscape and Visual aspects of

Storage and distribution centre (B8) with ancillary B1(a) offices and logistics institute (D1) and 140 space HGV parking facility, associated gatehouse and HGV Driver Training Centre on land adjoining and linked to Magna Park  
Land at Mere Lane, Bittesby, Leicestershire

Planning Application: 15/01531/OUT and 15/01531/FUL

Checked by Project Manager:	Approved by:
Signature: 	Signature: 
Name: Jonathan Billingsley	Name: Jonathan Billingsley
Title: Director	Title: Director
Date: 21 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Date: 21 <sup>st</sup> March 2016

The Landscape Partnership is registered with the Landscape Institute, the Royal Town Planning Institute, and is a member of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment

**The Landscape Partnership**

*Registered office*  
Greenwood House  
15a St Cuthberts Street  
Bedford  
MK40 3JG

Registered in England No. 2709001

## Contents

### Report

1	Introduction	1
2	Review of landscape materials in the application	3
3	Conclusions	22

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report has been prepared by The Landscape Partnership (TLP) for Harborough District Council (HDC) to review the submissions on landscape and visual matters in relation to a hybrid planning application 01531/OUT, a proposal by IDI Gazeley comprising:

1) Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 427,200 sq m Storage and Distribution (B8) with ancillary offices (B1a), up to 3,700 sq m for a Logistics Institute of Technology (D1) with associated playing field, up to 9,000 sq m small business space (B1a, B1b), up to 300 sq m estate office with conference facility and exhibition centre (D1), the creation of a Country Park, other open space and landscaping works on land to the north of Mere Lane, formation of access road from Magna Park, creation of roundabouts, partial realignment of Mere Lane, upgrading of A5 to dual carriageway, creation of roundabout access on A5, creation of SuDS facilities and associated infrastructure and landscaping works (siting, extent and use of the defined parcels, the maximum quanta and height of buildings, the restriction on the siting of yards, demolitions and means of access to be considered only); and

2) Detailed application for the creation of a 140 space HGV parking facility, associated gatehouse and HGV Driver Training Centre, vehicle wash and fuelling facilities, and a rail freight shuttle terminal, with associated hardstanding, landscaping works and SUDS facilities on land adjacent to Asda George Headquarters, A4303 on land adjacent to Mere Lane, Bittesby near the Lutterworth, Leicestershire.

1.2 Site visits were made in December and January 2014/15 during the process of pre-application discussions by Jonathan Billingsley (CMLI) to view the Site including from the viewpoints selected within the LVIA. An initial visit was made in December 2014 and a further visit in January 2015 to agree with the applicant's Landscape Architects (Nicholas Pearson Associates and Grant Associates) the range of representative viewpoints to be used within the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA). The Site visit process was carried out for both application 15/00919/FUL and application 01531/OUT as there was some overlap of the Site area and benefit in agreeing some common locations for both applications. In addition a number of additional viewpoints were identified by TLP and raised with the applicant's team on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2015 to cover the proposed HGV parking facility that was added to the original Site area. A further Site visit was made by TLP on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016 to examine the wireline drawings and photomontages submitted with the application in the field from the agreed representative viewpoints and also to explore the range of views from the public right of way network and existing permissive routes within the vicinity of the Site.

1.3 The purpose of this report is to:

- ◆ review the submitted materials in relation to landscape and visual matters in relation to their sufficiency, and the judgements made on the level of impact
- ◆ considered the acceptability of the scheme in landscape and visual terms

## 2 REVIEW OF LANDSCAPE MATERIALS IN THE APPLICATION

2.1 This report considers the relevant documents submitted with the application in relation to landscape and visual effects as follows :

- ◆ Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Nicholas Pearson Associates (NPA) forming Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement that accompanied the application. This includes the main text and supporting appendices, figures and wireframes. Other supporting sections of the Environment Statement have also been referred to including Chapter 1: Introduction, Chapter 2: Proposed Development and Chapter 4: Assessment Methodology.
- ◆ Landscape and Visual Effects: Update of the Environmental Statement Chapter 9 and Supplemental Information (11<sup>th</sup> February 2016). This update of the main Environment Statement was produced in response to initial comments from TLP sent in an email of 22 January 2016 to Mark Patterson of HDC.
- ◆ The landscape design proposals prepared by Grant Associates in support of the proposals.
- ◆ Design and Access Statement and specifically, Section 2 Vision and Objectives, Section 3: Site analysis, Section 4: Design Principles, Section 5: Design Evolution and Section 6: The Landscape and Masterplan Proposals.

### ***Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment - Chapter 9 of the ES***

- 2.2 The LVIA has been prepared in accordance with the GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition (2013) which is the current best practice guidance document for producing LVIAs within an Environmental Statement.
- 2.3 The structure and content of the LVIA follows the GLVIA guidance and provides a comprehensive level of information for a scheme of this type.
- 2.4 The baseline description and policy context is thorough and the number and location of representative viewpoints is considered comprehensive and appropriate.
- 2.5 Our review of the LVIA has identified some differences in the judgement between ourselves and the author of the report e.g. in relation to the sensitivity of a location/receptor and the magnitude of change at certain locations. This in turn can affect the resultant significance of effects identified.
- 2.6 TLP carried out a similar review for the DHL application (15/00919/FUL) in September 2015. This earlier detailed planning application largely comprises Unit G within the current Hybrid Application. The application was approved by HDC Planning Committee in January 2016.

2.7 We have set out our comments in tabular form below. The LVIA at 170 pages (plus appendices and images) is of considerable length and we have therefore only covered the main points of note in our review below:

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
<b>Policy and Guidance</b>			
9.2	National and Local Policy	<p>The section covers the main points as part of the background.</p> <p>However, Policy CS 8 is also considered to be highly relevant and particularly in relation to part a) – dismantled railway lines and rights of way and part c) – iii, iv and vi and part d) -biodiversity.</p> <p>The LVIA does not comment on compliance with the policies and guidance in relation to the proposals.</p> <p>Policy CS7 h) is mentioned – while not a landscape focused policy it does state that there should not be an extension of Magna Park outside its current boundaries. Discussion on this policy is covered within the separate Planning Statement that accompanies the application. The scope of this policy is focused on employment and strategic allocations and these aspects are considered to be outside the remit of Landscape and Visual matters.</p>	Consider relevant sections of policy CS8
9.2.20	Designations	In relation to Green Belt the application is fully outside the Green Belt. However, it would have a visual influence which could potentially be included in 'any harm' or 'any other harm' to Green Belt as per para 88 of the NPPF.	Considered potential effects on Green Belt due to the extensive nature of Zone 1 directly adjacent to Green Belt on the other side of the A5
9.2.21-30		The LVIA includes a number of heritage designations and rights of way as part of the baseline where there may be visual effects – the assets potentially affected are identified and considered more fully later in the LVIA. Effects on 'setting' from a heritage perspective is covered in	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		the Heritage Chapter and Heritage Statement.	
<b>Methodology</b>			
9.3.7	Significant effects	<p>The LVIA methodology identifies that effects which are 'above moderate' are considered to be 'significant' effects and are important considerations at a local and district scale and if adverse can be potential concerns to the project and may become a key factor in the decision making process.</p> <p>While the 'above moderate,' threshold is not universal in LVIA's TLP consider that this is an important definition in the assessment process.</p> <p>[NB It is noted that in the DB Symmetry application to the east of the existing Magna Park the methodology used considers that effects that are moderate and above are considered to be 'significant' effects. This is a different threshold in the identification of significant effects.]</p>	
Technical Appendix F2	Methodology	<p>The technical Appendix generally provides a clear structure to the approach used in the LVIA that is based on GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.</p> <p>Definitions for levels of sensitivity, magnitude and level of effect for both landscape character and visual effects are provided which act to provide benchmarks to make judgements. These definitions also include the sub-component categories of sensitivity and magnitude as set out in the GLVIA.</p> <p>The LVIA explains that in combining various factors professional judgement had been made. The rationale for the judgements is set out within the text of the LVIA. However, the final reason for that judgement is a professional opinion.</p> <p>It is noted that there are no matrices included to guide how sensitivity and magnitude factors combine to give certain levels of effect. Such matrices can be used to support and summarise narrative text and help trace the resultant judgements and effect. However, the applicant is based judgements on consideration within the text which is also a valid approach.</p>	
<b>Baseline</b>			



Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
9.4.9 -9.4.34	Published Character Assessments	The LVIA provides a comprehensive review of existing published assessments from National to District level.	
9.4.35-9.4.67	Landscape of the Site and immediate setting	The LVIA generally provides a good description of the Site and immediate area.	
9.4.38	Hedgerow to loss	TLP are not sure that the loss of hedgerows on within Zone 1 has been 'substantial'. Reference to the 1887 OS plan shows few of the field boundaries present in 1887 have been lost. However, there is more likely to have been a loss of hedgerow trees.	
9.4.46 etc.	Church towers	Both St Peters church Claybrooke Parva and St Leonards at Willey have towers but not spires.	Note
9.4.49	Off-Site planting	The LVIA states that a 20m wide strip of arable land is proposed for off-Site tree planting. However, the graphic on the cross section 1 indicates planting to width of 10 m with lower ground cover 3 and 6 m wide respectively.	Applicant to clarify width of tree planting
9.4.68	Nature of the landscape receptors	The LVIA includes an assessment of the strength of character and condition of the three affected district scale landscape character areas (LCAs). In addition the Upper Soar LCA has been sub-divided into two distinct landscape types.	
9.4.70- page 31 -42	Strength of Character and Condition of LCAs	<p><b>Lutterworth Lowlands LCA</b> - TLP would agree with the judgements of value, susceptibility to change and sensitivity in relation to the part of Zone 1 and Zone 2 that fall within the Lutterworth Lowlands LCA.</p> <p><b>Upper Soar LCA</b> – This is the LCA most affected by the development. A good description is provided for the two sub-areas of the LCA. TLP would agree with the judgement of 'moderate' strength of character and 'moderate' condition for the 'low lying clay vale farmland' sub-type. However, TLP consider that based on the description provided in the LVIA and TLPs Site observations are that the strength of character within the 'Soar</p>	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>tributary flat floodplain and terrace landscape type' should be 'moderate to good' rather than 'moderate' (as defined in the LVIA). TLP agree that the condition of this subtype is 'moderate'.</p> <p><b>High Cross Plateau LCA</b> - TLP agree with the LVIA that the strength of character is 'moderate' and the overall condition is 'moderate to good'.</p>	
9.4. 74-110	Visual Baseline	The description of the visual baseline, limit of visibility and the viewpoints are generally agreed.	
9.4.112	Growth rates of trees	<p>The Environment Statement includes an assessment of growth of trees on pots the Site within the last 8 to 10 years based on trees planted in 2006 under a stewardship scheme. See appendix F.6 (F-10 on the HDC web site).</p> <p>This indicates growth rates of between 6 to 10 m have been achieved over a ten year period in this locality. TLP consider this to be a good rate of growth but realistic with good growing conditions and management.</p> <p>NB. These growth rates have been used in the preparation of photomontages at Year 10.</p>	
<b>Construction Effects - Landscape</b>			
9.5.4	Avoidance, Reduction and Remedial measures	<p>The LVIA sets out a series of measures within Zones 1 and 2 for each of the landscape character types. Most of these seem sound and following good practice. However, one reduction measure (bullet point 4) suggested for the Soar tributary flat floodplains and terrace landscape type refers to reducing wet woodland loss and loss of wetland scrapes in the creation of new attenuation features. However, the proposals as shown on the illustrative masterplan suggest that the space is tight to retain these features.</p>	Note
Table 9.3	Construction Impacts	The table provides a comprehensive list of likely activities during the construction stage that would create impacts. It should be underlined that these effects would extend over a likely 10 year period as set out in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement. This extended	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		duration of construction period is likely to have a more significant impact than many other schemes that would be completed within a shorter timescale.	
9.5.10-9.5.38	Effects on Lutterworth Lowlands LCA	TLP agree with the findings of the LVIA in respect of the significance of impacts within this LCA.	
9.5. 39-67  9.7.11-14	Upper Soar LCA -low lying clay Vale farmland with gentle ridges landscape type	<p>A full description of the sensitivity of the Site and magnitude of change arising from construction activities is provided.</p> <p>The LVIA assesses a 'medium' <b>value</b> for this part of the Site, and also a 'medium' <b>susceptibility to change</b> from the introduction of the development proposals.</p> <p>However TLP consider that the <b>susceptibility to change</b> arising from the proposed logistics development is High rather than Medium.</p> <p>The LVIA accepts there would be a high <b>magnitude</b> of change on the Site and a High to Medium effect within 2 km of the Site. TLP broadly agree with this finding.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that the overall level of <b>effect</b> would be Moderate to Major Adverse on the Site - in contrast TLP consider there would be a Major Adverse effect on the Site.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that overall there will be a Moderate Adverse <b>effect</b> on the locality (within 2 km) - in contrast TLP consider that there would be a 'Moderate to Major' and significant <b>effect</b> on the locality.</p> <p>The difference in TLPs judgement from the LVIA primarily relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the scale of the proposed works - these would take place over a considerable area extending over 2 km in length along the A5 corridor and would be widely appreciated.</li> <li>• effect on the topography. Zone 1 has an undulating character of the landform that would require changes to the landform to create level platforms for very large buildings at different levels.</li> </ul>	Applicant to clarify the loss of existing mature trees and Bittesby House is described as an effect. However, in the photomontages from Viewpoint 7 are still shown as being retained in providing mitigation against the proposed logistics buildings.

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The duration and extent of the works. The works are due to take place over at least a 10 year period and with all the attendant earthworks, construction activities, cranes this would represent a significant effect over this time period</li> <li>• Loss of vegetation and field patterns. Including grade A and grade B trees at Bittesby House and areas of young establishing vegetation.</li> </ul>	
<p>9.5.68-9.5.92 9.7.15-16</p>	<p>Upper Soar LCA - Soar tributary flat floodplains and terrace</p>	<p>Again a full description of the sensitivity of the Site and magnitude of change arising from construction activities is provided.</p> <p>The LVIA also assesses a 'medium' <b>value</b> for this part of the Site, and a 'medium to high' <b>susceptibility to change</b> from the introduction of the development proposals resulting in a Medium <b>sensitivity</b> overall.</p> <p>However, TLP consider that the <b>value</b> of the character type is relatively higher (Medium/High) reflecting the presence of the scheduled ancient monuments both within and outside the Site the more contained character of the valley, the stream, attendant vegetation and associated features. TLP also consider that the <b>susceptibility to change</b> would be Medium/High based on the relatively higher strength of character. TLP therefore consider the <b>sensitivity</b> of this character type within and adjacent to the Site is Medium/High.</p> <p>The LVIA identifies there would be a Medium to High <b>magnitude</b> of change on the Site and a Medium to Low <b>effect</b> on the locality. TLP still consider there would be a High magnitude of change on Site reducing to Moderate to High within the vicinity.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that the overall level of <b>effect</b> would be Moderate on the Site and Moderate to Minor in the vicinity and therefore not significant.</p> <p>In contrast TLP consider there would be a Moderate to Major Adverse and significant <b>effect</b> on the Site.</p>	<p>Applicant to clarify: The susceptibility to change at paragraph 9.5.72 states this is 'high to medium' whereas in table F .5 .1a this is classified as Medium</p>

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>The difference in judgement between the LVIA and TLP primarily relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the scale of the proposed works. This would involve direct effects on the character type and a widely appreciated effect from adjacent sub-areas.</li> <li>• Effect on the topography and tributary valley landscape character. This would be through the introduction of attenuation ponds on sloping ground causing extensive cut and fill and introduction of units E1 and E2 and the associated sports pitches and parking and the edge of Units F.</li> <li>• The duration and extent of the works which would take place over at least a 10 year period and with all the attendant earthworks, construction activities, cranes. This would represent a significant effect over this time period on the positive qualities of the character type /area.</li> </ul>	
9.5.93-9.5.122	High Cross Plateau LCA	TLP agree with the findings of the LVIA in respect of the significance of impacts within this LCA arising from both Zone 1 and Zone 2.	
<b>Construction Effects - Visual</b>			
9.5. 123 - Table F.5.2a and Residual Effects section 9.7.23	Visual effects during construction	<p>The effects during construction are summarised on Table F.5.2ai. The Residual Effects section 9.7.23 provides a written description of similar material. TLP agree with most of the judgements of sensitivity, magnitude and effect with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>sensitivity</b> to change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints 4aii the 4bi-bii, 4c, 9a-c,13 ,14b, 15 and 21</li> <li>• The <b>magnitude</b> of change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints 5aiii, 6ai-aiii, 7, 9bii, 12, 15</li> </ul> <p>Significant visual <b>effects</b> (i.e. Major and Moderate to Major) during construction are noted in the LVIA at 11 of the 38 assessed viewpoints/receptors. This includes: Viewpoint locations: 3, 4ai and</p>	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>4aiv, 4bi-ii, 4cii-iv, 5aii, 6ai-aiii, 6aiv, 6b, 7, 9a, 9bi and 9bii, 15 and 16a-d.</p> <p>TLP identify a number of locations where they consider there would be greater <b>effects</b> than recorded in the LVIA including additional significant effects on Viewpoints 5aiii, 8ai, 12, 13 and 14b.</p> <p>NB. TLP have not viewed the effects directly from within White House Farm. Although the views of the property from the local public footpaths would indicate that there are likely to be Major Adverse impacts on the residential units.</p> <p>It is noted that the location and extent of construction effects vary across the Site and are likely to affect some locations for shorter or longer durations depending on the orientation of the viewer to the Site and the specific activities within each construction works phase.</p>	
<b>Operation Effects and Mitigation</b>			
9.6.3	Avoidance, Reduction and Remedial measures	<p>The LVIA sets out a series of measures within Zones 1 and 2 for each of the landscape character types. Most of these seem sound and following good practice.</p> <p>One important reduction measure (bullet point 2) suggested for the Upper Soar LCA – ‘Low-lying clay vale with gentle ridges landscape type’ is the colour of the cladding to be applied to the upper sections of buildings. The selected colour gradation is vitally important to ensure the most harmonious fit with the local landscape character and sky. Some recent examples to the east of Milton Keynes by the M1 in TLP’s opinion have colour selections that are rather too prominent/vibrant within the local landscape drawing attention to themselves rather than being recessive.</p> <p>The presence, type and hours of use for any lighting associated with the sports pitches at the Magna Park hub area (Units E1 and E2) should also be agreed to minimise any effects particularly on</p>	<p>Colouring of cladding panels to be subject to a planning condition/s and allow for viewing the colours on samples of sufficient size in situ prior to any approval/discharge of conditions.</p> <p>Condition to be applied for any external lighting of sporting facilities.</p>

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		Willey village that may have direct views towards the facility.	
9.6.7	Effects on Lutterworth Lowlands LCA	TLP agree with the findings of the LVIA in respect of the significance of impacts within this LCA. None of the identified effects are considered to be significant.	
9.6.24-32 Table F.5.1b 9.7.37-42	Upper Soar LCA -low lying clay Vale farmland with gentle ridges landscape type	<p>The LVIA relies on the previous description within construction section for the assessment of sensitivity.</p> <p>The LVIA assesses a 'Medium' <b>value</b> for this part of the Site, and also a 'medium' <b>susceptibility to change</b> from the introduction of the development proposals.</p> <p>TLP agree with the assessed <b>value</b> of the area at Medium. However, TLP consider that the <b>susceptibility to change</b> arising from the proposed logistics development is still High rather than Medium resulting in a Medium to High <b>sensitivity</b> overall.</p> <p>The LVIA accepts there would be a High <b>magnitude</b> of change on the Site in the early years but assesses that this would reduce to High to Medium and the mitigation establishes.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that the <b>effect</b> on the Site would be Major to Moderate Adverse (and therefore significant) in the short-term but would reduce to Moderate Adverse (not significant) in the mid-term. The effect on the local area within 1.5 km of the Site is assessed in the LVIA as initially being Moderate but reducing to Moderate to Minor Adverse in the mid-term.</p> <p>In contrast TLP consider that there would be a 'Major Adverse' <b>effect</b> in the short-term reducing to 'Moderate to Major' in the medium to long-term. This would therefore be a significant <b>effect</b> on the locality in the short and medium-term.</p> <p>The difference in judgement by TLP from the LVIA primarily relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of the proposed works - these would take place over a considerable area extending over 2</li> </ul>	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>km in length along the A5 corridor and 1.5km along Mere Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fundamental change in landscape character type. The current open undulating arable landscape would be replaced with a logistics distribution centre and appear as an extension of the existing Magna Park</li> <li>• Effect on the topography. Zone 1 has an undulating character of the landform that would require extensive changes to the landform to create level platforms for very large buildings.</li> </ul>	
<p>9.6.24-32 Table F.5.1b  9.7.43-45</p>	<p>Upper Soar LCA - Soar tributary flat floodplains and terrace</p>	<p>The LVIA also assesses the landscape type as having a 'medium' <b>value</b> for this part of the Site, and a 'medium to high' <b>susceptibility to change</b> from the introduction of the development proposals resulting in a Medium <b>sensitivity</b> overall.</p> <p>However, TLP consider that the <b>value</b> of the character type is relatively higher (Medium/High) reflecting the presence of the scheduled ancient monuments both within and outside the Site, the more contained character of the valley, the stream, attendant vegetation and associated features. TLP also consider that the <b>susceptibility to change</b> would be Medium/High based on the relatively higher strength of character. TLP therefore consider the <b>sensitivity</b> of this character type within and adjacent to the Site is Medium/High.</p> <p>The LVIA identifies there would be a Medium to High <b>magnitude</b> of change on the Site and a Medium to Low <b>effect</b> on the locality. TLP consider there would be a High magnitude of change on Site reducing to Moderate to High within the vicinity.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that the overall level of <b>effect</b> would be Moderate on the Site and Moderate to Minor in the vicinity and therefore not significant.</p> <p>In contrast TLP consider there would be Major Adverse <b>effect</b> in the short-term moderating to a Moderate to Major Adverse effect on the maturing of the</p>	



Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>proposed Landscape Framework. All these effects would be significant on landscape character the Site and local area up to locations within 1.5 km.</p> <p>The difference in judgement by TLP (from the LVIA) primarily relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of the proposed works - these would take place over a considerable area. This would include direct effects on the character type and widely appreciated effects from the adjacent character areas.</li> <li>• Effect on the topography and tributary valley landscape character. This would be through the introduction of attenuation ponds causing extensive cut and fill and introduction of units E1 and E2 and the associated sports pitches and parking and the edge of Units F.</li> <li>• The transformation in landscape character in the adjacent local LCA and this local area</li> </ul>	
9.6.48-9.6.54	Effects on High Cross Plateau LCA	TLP agree with the findings of the LVIA in respect of the significance of impacts within this LCA. None of the identified effects are considered to be significant.	
<b>Operation Effects - Visual</b>			
9.6.56-59 9.7 Residual Effects ( 9.7.52 Appendix F5.3b	Visual effects	<p>The effects during construction are summarised on Table F.5.3b and also described in Section 9.7 – Residual Effects. TLP agree with many of the judgements of sensitivity, magnitude and effect with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TLP consider the <b>magnitude</b> of change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints: 7 (High), 9bii (Major reducing to Major-Moderate) and 12b, c, d and e (Major to Moderate) due to the scale of the development and extent occupied within the views. This is likely to result in some significant Major and Moderate to Major effects during the operation of the scheme from these locations at Year 1. The magnitude would then slowly reduce in time as the landscape mitigation establishes.</li> </ul>	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
		<p>The LVIA at Table L.5.3b identifies significant visual effects in the short-term from Viewpoints including: 3, 4bii, 4aiv, 4cv and 4cvi, 6ai, 7, 9a and 9bi and 16a-d.</p> <p>However, in only one case (para 9.7.53) for an 800m stretch of footpath W92 are any significant <b>effects</b> (i.e. above Moderate) identified from the medium-term onwards.</p> <p>In contrast TLP identify additional significant <b>effects</b> on views in the medium to longer term on Viewpoints including: 4bii, 4cv and 4cvi, 6ai, 7, 9a and 9bi and 12.</p>	
<b>Residual Effects</b>			
9.7.56	Night time effects	<p>The effects of lighting on the full extent of the proposed application Site in Zone 1 are likely to be widespread over the new units and access roads. However, the effects of the units are generally unlikely to be significant subject to a suitable scheme of lighting being conditioned and approved including the use of suitable cut off lanterns. Effects at Moderate level or less would generally be typical.</p> <p>However, in certain circumstances higher levels of adverse effect may occur subject to the details as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) lighting column masts in service areas (as present in the existing Magna Park) if seen from public/private locations</li> <li>b) flood lighting associated with the sports pitches – as potentially visible from the settlement of Willey.</li> <li>c) Internal Access Roads</li> <li>d) Lighting of new junctions and sections of the A5 on properties including White House Farm</li> </ul>	Effects of high mast lights in yards, playing pitches, internal access roads and A5 junctions to be verified
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>			
Table 9.5	Schedule of potential cumulative schemes	TLP would agree with the schemes that have been scoped out (those in bold) in Table 5.	
9.8.5-13	Cumulative effects on the	TLP agree that the works physically within the Lutterworth Lowlands would	

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
	Lutterworth Lowlands	<p>have a low magnitude of change and neutral to minor cumulative effect from all schemes except for the DB Symmetry scheme(see below)</p> <p>Equally there would be a non-significant cumulative visual effect from all schemes except for the DB Symmetry scheme (see below)</p>	
9.8.17-25	Cumulative effects with DB Symmetry in Lutterworth Lowlands	<p>The LVIA considers that the Hybrid scheme would have a Moderate to Minor effect on the Lutterworth Lowlands during construction and a Minor to Negligible effects during Operation but that the DB Symmetry scheme would have a Major to Moderate effect on the LCA until the medium term.</p> <p>TLP agree that the part of the Hybrid scheme itself would not result in significant cumulative effects in the Lutterworth Lowlands.</p>	
9.8.28	Cumulative Visual effects	<p>It is agreed that there would be no notable locations where both the DB Symmetry and IDI Hybrid scheme (excluding Zone 2) would be seen at the same time. Therefore cumulative visual effects essentially relate to sequential effects.</p> <p>The LVIA notes there would be Major adverse <b>effects</b> along a 2km length of the A5 during the construction period. The effects would reduce to Moderate adverse in the short term of operation and then to Minor in the Mid Term.</p> <p>However, TLP consider that the cumulative <b>effects</b> would still be significant in the short term at c. Moderate to Major due to the total combined length of both schemes and the existing Magna Park. The planting would only have just been implemented and would take a number of years to be effective. TLP accept that the adverse <b>effects</b> would reduce in time but that a new more enclosed character would be created in contrast to the existing open views.</p>	
<b>Cumulative effects – Supplemental Information – 11<sup>th</sup> Feb 2016</b>			

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
3.3-3.9 and 3.20	Cumulative Landscape Effects	<p>Following comments from TLP additional information has been included in the Update of the ES.</p> <p>In terms of cumulative landscape effects the Update included an assessment on the whole local area all around Magna Park rather than just being confined to the defined LCAs whose boundaries run along Mere Lane and the A5.</p> <p>The IDI ES Update has identified that there would be significant cumulative <b>effects</b> at the local area during operation (from opening year and beyond) to a Moderate to Major level by the addition of the DB Symmetry Site.</p> <p>TLP agree that the effects involving IDI and DB Symmetry would be significant in addition to the existing Magna Park. Para 3.20 also notes that there would be a high magnitude of change with the addition of DB Symmetry.</p> <p>However, this cumulative impact is an <b>effect</b> arising from both schemes and not just the addition of the DB Symmetry scheme which seems to be the impression of the text in the Update. The approach to cumulative effects should have a focus on the main project (IDI in this case) and how or whether it adds to or combines with the others being considered to create a significant cumulative effects (GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> edition para 7.28).</p> <p>The last sentence at para 3.9 of the ES Update indicates that the DB Symmetry scheme is more at odds with the existing landscape character. While the local valley at the DB Symmetry Site would be significantly affected, the watercourse is retained in a new setting. In contrast the IDI scheme safeguards aspects of the central valley on the Site but the scheme area is much more extensive geographically and has a number of other adverse effects e.g. on Bittesby House and grounds and the setting of the SAM. There would still be a permanent change to the landscape where the main development would take place.</p>	Applicant to consider effect of adding the IDI scheme to a situation including the DB Symmetry scheme as per GLVIA para 7.28

Ref.	Topic	Comment	Applicant Action
3.10- 12	Cumulative Visual Effects	TLP are not persuaded that roads users on Lutterworth Road are less sensitive than on Coal Pit Lane and Mere Lane or that motorists would be travelling slower on a straight road (para 3.11).	
3.13-3.15 and Table L1	Sequential effects during Construction	TLP would generally agree with the combination of routes noted as experiencing significant sequential visual <b>effects</b> that would include views of both the IDI scheme and the DB Symmetry scheme.	
3.16-3.18 and Table L2	Sequential effects during Operation	<p>TLP would also generally agree with the combination of routes noted as experiencing significant sequential visual <b>effects</b> that would combine views of both the IDI scheme and the DB Symmetry scheme.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the Construction Phase is likely to last 10 years for both schemes and the effect would only reduce to become not significant by c. Year 10 of Operation stage. Therefore there would be significant sequential effects for up to c. 20 years on these routes which is a considerable period of time.</p> <p>It is also noted that the way the Update is presented is such that the significant cumulative effects are due to the addition of the DB Symmetry scheme whereas both the IDI and DB Symmetry schemes would in combination result in the cumulative effects.</p>	
<b>Summary</b>			
9.9	Summary	The summary section provides a clear overview of the LVIA assessment. However, TLP do not fully agree with some of the judgements as detailed above.	

### ***Comments on the Design and Access Statement***

- 2.8 The Design and Access Statement (DAS) provides a comprehensive approach to the background, objectives and design of the scheme. The document is clearly set out and accompanied by high quality illustrations. The DAS notes (2.1.3) that this is a landscape led scheme and this statement is reflected by the volume and level of detail relating to landscape orientated matters. Much of the analysis material on landscape and visual matters in the DAS is common with sections of the LVIA in the ES.
- 2.9 Section 2 sets out the Vision and Objectives for the Site. The first three objectives relate to commercial matters including: taking full advantage of the capacity of the application Site as an extension to Magna Park, extending the existing Park to provide efficiencies and e-commerce of scale and providing a suitable location logistics based training and innovation centre. Of the remaining nine objectives seven relate to landscape and or environmental matters. Paragraph 2.4.1 states that the masterplan has been conceived as an evolution of Magna Park and in reality should the scheme progress it would involve a fundamental change to the character of the existing landscape combining both an expanded logistics centre and areas of supportive landscape and open space. The green infrastructure approach is embedded within scheme and is reflected by the approach to inter alia: water management, protected landscapes, access, landscape management and adaptation to climate change.
- 2.10 Section 3 provides analysis of the Site in relation to a range of topics including: landscape character, soils, arboriculture, ecology, public rights of way, heritage and sensitive views. The descriptive material relating to landscape reflects material within the LVIA and uses similar illustrations. One particularly important aspect is the topography of the Site. It is noted this varies by approximately 22 m across the Site. A series of tributary streams and valleys of the River Soar run through the centre of the application Site with areas of high ground to the south-west, south-east and north. The topography is well illustrated by the contour plan provided on page 41. The topography of the application Site is very different to the plateau landscape on which the existing Magna Park has been established which is also similar to another area plateau to the west of the A5. Comments on the sensitivity of the landscape are provided based on a district scale character area. The LVIA provides an additional (and in TLP's view preferable) sub-division of these character areas in the assessment of landscape effects.
- 2.11 Section 4 sets out the Design Principles and in particular at page 68, paragraph 4.2.3 how they respond to landscape character and views.
- 2.12 While these principles are understood the ability to which they are achieved is a matter of judgement. TLP would offer some comments on a number of these principles as follows:
- ◆ **conservation and promotion of areas of separation between the application Site and nearby settlements** – an area of proposed separation is indicated at paragraph 4.3.4 and the drawing on the accompanying page 71. If the scheme were to be approved by HDC then TLP

would support an extension of such a designation to restrict any further development towards the settlements of Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke Parva.

- ◆ **Integration of the proposed extension to Magna Park in the manner that is responsive to the key characteristics of the Lutterworth Lowlands and Upper Soar LCAs** - while the scheme design may seek to respond to the characteristics of the existing landscape character there is still likely to be a fundamental change in the landscape baseline through the introduction of the proposed development within the Upper Soar LCA. This is implicit in number of the other design principles which seek to integrate the proposed buildings and associated yards and activities within the local context. Rather than integrating the scheme with the intrinsic characteristics of the Upper Soar LCA a new landscape would be created in a comparable manner to how the existing Magna Park scheme previously created a new landscape character on the former aerodrome area.
- ◆ **conservation of hedgerows wherever possible and where not balancing their loss with new planting of hedgerows** - due to the large scale and resultant unforgiving footprint of the proposed buildings there would be an inevitable loss of some hedgerows and other vegetative features. This is illustrated on the diagram on page 100. It is noted that significant additional planting is included as part of the proposals but these would not replicate the existing features due to the form and layout of the proposed development.

2.13 Section 5-Design Evolution explains how the development has emerged. This includes the main responses from community consultation and the exploration of a number of different options. The proposal to remove Bittesby House and associated outbuildings is explained at paragraph 5.2.23 as the best viable option to allow the efficient use of the Site for the logistics development. A series of Masterplan Concepts are also set out from page 92 to 97. These explore scheme options that are driven by diverse factors e.g. capacity, landscape, heritage or a more integrated approach. Options 4 and 5 illustrate the selected concept. This includes locating the majority of the built forms at right angles and adjacent to the A5 corridor and a further large unit (DHL Unit G) adjacent to Mere Lane and existing Magna Park. The remaining central triangular area which follows the course of the low lying valley and watercourses that run through the Site area are mainly set aside for open space, heritage features, water management and recreational purposes. The rationale for the selected option based on the stated constraints appears sound subject to the requirement and proven need to provide this volume of logistics development at this specific location.

2.14 Sections 6 and 7 detail the Landscape and Masterplan Proposals for the Site. Zone 1 is included in Section 6 and Zone 2 within Section 7. The Sections include strategies for: the Site access and plot layout, the tree and woodland planting strategy and Habitat mitigation. The masterplan is accompanied

by series of annotated illustrations, perspectives and cross sections. These provide evidence of a well-considered approach to create a diverse range of habitats and appropriate high-quality setting to a proposed extension to Magna Park. TLP consider that this information is sufficient to support an outline planning application and provide the basis for further Reserved Matters applications were the scheme to be on balance acceptable in planning terms.



### 3 CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 The LVIA produced by NPA within the Environmental Statement and the Supplementary Information submitted in February 2016 on behalf of the applicant provide well-structured and clear reports. Equally the landscape proposals within the Design and Access Statement and the accompanying drawings provide a clear and comprehensive approach to a scheme of this type and scale.
- 3.2 The proposals within the application comprise a very large development including 427,200m<sup>2</sup> of Storage and Distribution with ancillary offices, a Logistics Institute of Technology and up to 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> of small business space. It is acknowledged that within this quantum of development that Unit G was granted planning consent in January 2016 equating to approximately 100,844m<sup>2</sup>. However, the current application would involve a further 3.23 fold increase in a similar type development along with a range of other related facilities. In particular the development to the north-west along the A5 corridor introduces a significant linear extension into the open countryside beyond the existing Magna Park. While a rationale has been provided for the selected design of the Site layout this scheme this would in TLP's opinion still result in significant effects in the short and longer term.
- 3.3 The application scheme is supported by and a wide range of landscape measures including a 'Country Park'. These include measures around the Site and in the wider area increasing opportunities for recreation and public access. The level and approach to the landscape design within the commercial areas is comparable to that of the approach within the existing Magna Park which is already acknowledged to demonstrate a high standard of implementation and maintenance for a scheme of this type. In addition the Country Park areas represent a new feature and facility not currently present within the existing Magna Park.

#### ***Landscape character effects***

- 3.4 The effects on landscape character are assessed in the LVIA using district scale units: Lutterworth Lowlands, Upper Soar and High Cross Plateau and further sub-divisions of the Upper Soar within Zone 1 of the Site. The LVIA considers the effects at three levels, the Site, the local area and the district scale character unit.
- 3.5 The LVIA has identified some significant effects during the construction period. As these would extend (according to the application materials) to approximately 10 years' duration these effects are notable. The Logistics Units would be progressively built out over the 10 year period with successive effects from earthworks, construction activity, cranes and transport movements. Effects during a construction period can sometimes be given less weight due to the short duration of the activity. However, in this application due to long build period the relative weight afforded to the significant construction effects should be increased.

3.6 The greatest landscape character effects would be on the Upper Soar LCA. TLP have identified some relatively higher levels of sensitivity, magnitude and effect compared to the LVIA. The levels of effect assessed by the LVIA and TLP are summarised in the Table below. Text in bold reflects a different judgement by TLP from the LVIA:

	<b>LVIA Construction Stage</b>	<b>TLP Construction Stage</b> (bold when different to LVIA )	<b>LVIA Operation Stage</b>	<b>TLP Operation Stage</b> (bold when different to LVIA )
<b>Character Area</b>	<b>Upper Soar – Low lying clay vale farmland with gentle ridges - landscape type</b>			
<b>Sensitivity</b>	• Medium	• <b>Medium to High</b>	• Medium	• <b>Medium to High</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High (Site)</li> <li>• High to Medium (&lt;2km)</li> <li>• Medium ( District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High (Site)</li> <li>• High to Medium (&lt;2km)</li> <li>• Medium (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High reducing to High to Medium (early years) (Site)</li> <li>• High to Medium reducing to Medium (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Medium reducing to Medium to Low (District LCA )</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High reducing to High to Medium (early years) (Site)</li> <li>• High to Medium reducing to Medium (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Medium reducing to Medium to Low (District LCA )</li> </ul>
<b>Level of effect</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate to Major Adverse (Site)</li> <li>• Moderate Adverse (&lt;2km)</li> <li>• Moderate Adverse (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Major Adverse (Site)</b></li> <li>• <b>Moderate to Major Adverse (&lt;2km)</b></li> <li>• Moderate Adverse (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major to Moderate Adverse reducing to Moderate (Site)</li> <li>• Moderate Adverse (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Moderate Adverse reducing to Moderate to Minor (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Major Adverse reducing to Major to Moderate (Site)</b></li> <li>• <b>Major to Moderate Adverse reducing to Moderate (&lt;1.5km)</b></li> <li>• Moderate Adverse reducing to Moderate to Minor (District LCA)</li> </ul>
	<b>Upper Soar - Soar tributary flat floodplains and terrace - landscape type</b>			
<b>Sensitivity</b>	• Medium	• <b>Medium to High</b>	• Medium •	• <b>Medium to High</b>

	<b>LVIA Construction Stage</b>	<b>TLP Construction Stage</b> (bold when different to LVIA )	<b>LVIA Operation Stage</b>	<b>TLP Operation Stage</b> (bold when different to LVIA )
<b>Magnitude</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium to High (Site)</li> <li>• Medium to Low (&lt;2km)</li> <li>• Low (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>High (Site)</b></li> <li>• <b>High to Medium (&lt;2km)</b></li> <li>• <b>Medium (District LCA)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium to High reducing to Medium (Site)</li> <li>• Low reducing to Very Low (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Low reducing to Negligible (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High reducing to High to Medium (early years) (Site)</li> <li>• High to Medium reducing to Medium (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Medium reducing to Medium to Low (District LCA)</li> </ul>
<b>Level of effect</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate Adverse (Site)</li> <li>• Moderate to Minor (&lt;2km)</li> <li>• Minor (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Major Adverse (Site)</b></li> <li>• <b>Moderate to Major Adverse (&lt;2km)</b></li> <li>• <b>Moderate Adverse (District LCA)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate Adverse reducing to Minor (Site)</li> <li>• Minor reducing to Negligible (&lt;1.5km)</li> <li>• Minor reducing to Minor to Negligible (District LCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Major Adverse reducing to Major to Moderate (Site)</b></li> <li>• <b>Moderate Adverse (&lt;1.5km)</b></li> <li>• <b>Moderate Adverse reducing to Moderate to Minor (District LCA)</b></li> </ul>

3.7 The LVIA considers that there would be some significant landscape character effects (i.e. Major to Moderate and above) on the Upper Soar LCA. These are restricted to significant effects on the part of the Site within the – ‘Low lying clay vale farmland with gentle ridges - landscape type’. It is in this sub-area that the majority of the larger logistic buildings would be located and relates to effects both during the construction phase and in the early years of the operation phase. Once the landscape mitigation has established all effects in the LVIA reduce to Moderate or less and are therefore assessed as not significant.

3.8 In TLPs opinion the geographical extent and duration of significant effects would be greater. This would extend to significant effects both during the construction and operation periods within both landscape sub-types of the Upper Soar within the Site and extending to locations within the immediate area up to 2 km during the construction phase and 1.5 km from the operation phase. This assessment is made in the knowledge of the substantive landscape proposals incorporated within the development

but reflects the scale and location of development and the likely visibility of the many built forms once the scheme is operational particularly in the winter months and after the planting as become established. This would constitute a locally significant effect on the landscape character of the Upper Soar.

- 3.9 TLP agree with the LVIA that there are unlikely to be significant effects on the other two district landscape character areas i.e. Lutterworth Lowlands and High Cross Plateau in the vicinity. In the case of the Lutterworth Lowlands the extent of the effect is relatively localised and the works within Zone 2 comprise a development that is essentially very similar to an scheme that is already approved. From within the High Cross Plateau the effects are indirect and reduced due the combination of distance and that the plateau character of the landscape helps to assimilate the proposed buildings from this direction and taking into account the planting proposed along the A5 corridor.

### ***Visual effects***

- 3.10 The LVIA has assessed the effect on views within the area through the use of 22 representative viewpoints or receptors (some of which are then subdivided a, b etc. to reflect sequential routes e.g. along rights of way giving a total of 38 locations).
- 3.11 During the construction period the LVIA has identified significant visual effects at viewpoint locations: 3, 4ai and 4aiv, 4bii, 4civ, 5aii, 6ai-aiii, 6b, 7, 9ai, 9bi and 9bii, 15 and 16a-d. These include locations extending to Woodway Lane to the north-west and the fringes of Claybrooke Parva and Ullesthorpe to the north. Other locations are from closer proximity to the Site or within the Site particularly from both the public rights of way and permissive routes that pass through or close to the Site. Furthermore due to the very large scale of the application Site (c. 2.2km x 1.5km) and the number of public footpaths that pass through the Site it is important not to underplay effects that would occur from within the Site itself during both the construction and operation period.
- 3.12 TLP agree with many of the judgements of sensitivity, magnitude and effect in the LVIA and that all the significant effects would be within c.1.4km of the Site. However, there are a number of differences in professional judgement between the LVIA and TLP. TLP consider the sensitivity to change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints 4aii the 4bi-4bii, 4c, 9a-c, 13, 14b, 15 and 21. The magnitude of change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints 5aiii, 6ai-aiii, 7, 9bii, 12, 15. TLP identify a number of locations where they consider there would be greater effects than recorded in the LVIA including additional significant effects on Viewpoints 5aiii, 12, 13 and 14b 8ai.
- 3.13 During the operation period TLP agree with many of the judgements on sensitivity and magnitude in the LVIA. Differences in professional judgement include: TLP consider the magnitude of change is likely to be higher at Viewpoints: 7 (High), 9bii (Major reducing to Major-Moderate) and 12b, c, d and

e (Major to Moderate) due to the scale of the development and extent occupied within the views. This is likely to result in some significant Major and Moderate to Major effects during the operation of the scheme from these locations at Year 1. The magnitude would then slowly reduce in time as the landscape mitigation establishes.

- 3.14 The LVIA at Table L.5.3b identifies significant visual effects in the short-term from Viewpoints 3, 4bii, 4cv and 4cvi, 6ai, 7, 9a and 9bi and 16a-d. However, no significant effects (above Moderate) are identified from the medium-term onwards. In contrast TLP identify additional significant effect in the medium to longer term on Viewpoints 4bii, 4cv and 4cvi, 6ai, 6aiv, 7, 9a and 9bi and 12. It is also likely that there would be significant visual effects on properties at White House Farm. It is recognised that these additional significant visual effects are from locations either within the Site or relatively close to it.
- 3.15 The proposed development is extensive comprising many large built forms set within a new landscape context. From some orientations e.g. as seen from the west on Woodway Lane the proposed buildings would be seen against the backdrop of the existing Magna Park. Where this is the case the level of impact once mitigation was established would be relatively lower. However, from viewpoints to the south and north the notable linear extension of built form along the A5 would intrude into the existing open rural views and the levels of effect would be much greater. There would be a number of significant and expansive views of the development from public rights of way once leaving villages in the local area e.g. 4aiii, 6ai and 14b. A number of these routes are from local ridges where there are fine panoramas over the undulating arable landscape. The built forms would break the skyline in number of these viewpoints and even after the planting has established would still remain prominent features on the horizon.

### ***Lighting***

- 3.16 The proposals include for improved cut off lighting to the main buildings with a whier and more natural light. This should help to make a notable reduction in night time impact compared to the orange glow of the existing Magna Park lighting. While the intensity of lighting on the buildings could therefore be reduced the geographical spread of the effects would increase along the A5 corridor and along Mere Lane. However, a number of elements of the lighting design may also result in higher levels of adverse effect including: lighting column masts in service areas (as present in the existing Magna Park) if seen from public/private locations, potential flood lighting associated with the sports pitches as part of the innovation centre (as potentially visible from Willey), internal access roads and roundabout lighting on the A5 near White House Farm.

### ***Cumulative effects***

- 3.17 The LVIA identifies significant cumulative visual effects during the construction stage in association with the DB Symmetry scheme. This includes sequential effects along the A5 corridor. However, TLP consider that these effects would also extend into the early years of the Operation Phase.
- 3.18 The Environmental Update also identifies significant cumulative effects on the landscape character local to the existing Magna Park from the addition of both the application scheme and the DB Symmetry scheme during operation (from opening year and beyond) to a Moderate to Major level by the addition of the DB Symmetry Site. TLP would broadly agree with the identification of this significant cumulative effect on the local landscape character. Both schemes would result in a permanent change to the existing landscape character effectively extending the existing Magna Park character of a much wider geographical area.
- 3.19 The Environmental Update also identifies additional significant cumulative sequential visual effects on users of route combinations including Mere Land and Coventry Road (where used in combination with sections of the A5) that pass both the application Site and the DB Symmetry Site. TLP consider these significant effects would extend for c 20 years including the construction phase and initial 10 years of the operation phase.

### ***Compliance with policies***

- 3.20 **Policy CS7: Enabling Employment and Business Development.** The policy seeks to guide the strategic location of employment with clause h) specifically relating to the existing Magna Park Strategic Distribution Site. The policy states that no further phase of development or large scale expansion of the Site, beyond the existing development footprint (to be defined in the Allocations DPD) will be supported. On this basis the application is contrary to the policy. However, it is understood that the evidence base relating to employment need for this policy is being reviewed, which is outside the scope of landscape and visual matters.
- 3.21 **Policy CS8: Protecting and Enhancing Green Infrastructure.** The proposed scheme should be able to deliver some positive contributions towards deliver of a high quality, accessible and multifunctional green infrastructure network. This would include opportunities to maximise the potential value of existing and new green space for public access, recreation, education, biodiversity, and water management, the protection and enhancement of heritage assets and the local landscape. However, there would also be some adverse impacts e.g. on the landscape setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and changes to the character of the tributaries to the Soar. The green infrastructure facilities would not be in close walking distance of many residents but accessibility could be made easier by car and cycle. A balance of the positive provisions of the scheme towards green infrastructure against the adverse effects would need to be made in relation to this policy. TLP's view is that there

would be a net benefit with the proposals in terms of provision of green infrastructure against Policy CS8.

- 3.22 **Policy CS 14: Lutterworth.** Clause e) includes for the principle of a separation area between Magna Park, Bitteswell and Lutterworth to ensure the retention of identity and distinctiveness of these nearby settlements. Proposals leading to the formation of accessible natural and semi-natural green space, tree planting, improved local routes for walking, horse riding and cycling and the promotion of improved biodiversity will be supported in this area. While the application Site is outside of the defined Separation Area should an extension to Magna Park be consented by HDC then TLP consider there is merit in extending the principle of a Separation Area between the Site and villages of Ullesthorpe and Claybrooke Parva.
- 3.23 **Policy CS 17: Countryside, Rural Centres and Rural Villages.** This policy indicates that outside the main towns and key villages new development in the countryside and other settlements will be strictly controlled. This restriction would directly apply to the expansion of Magna Park which is proposed within open countryside. The scheme would be contrary to this policy.
- 3.24 **Policy EV/7: Development in the Countryside.** This saved policy is similar in intent to policy CS 17 seeking that development in the countryside will be strictly controlled unless a number of criteria are met. It would appear that a number of the detailed criteria: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8, would not be met.
- 3.25 **Policy EV/20: Landscape Schemes.** This saved policy requires that applications should be accompanied by a landscape scheme related to the scale nature and location of the development. Based on the submitted application materials TLP consider that this policy has been met.

### ***Overview***

- 3.26 The submitted assessment material and descriptive and illustrative proposals (including those within the Supplemental Information) provide a comprehensive package of information that systematically assesses the landscape and visual effects of the scheme. The landscape proposals are suitable and appropriate for a scheme of this type and scale and introduce a number of positive additional features centred on a Country Park which incorporates heritage and biodiversity assets and provides an enhanced access network for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. However, the relatively generous provision of open space and green infrastructure is in part a function of the character and context of the Site and the constraints of introducing a large scale logistics units and development within an undulating landscape character with low-lying tributary valleys at the core. The Site constraints have led to a design solution which although supported by a logical and rational approach have resulted in a layout of large-scale logistic units extending some 2 km further to the west than the existing Magna Park along the A5. This would represent a notable and visible extension of Magna Park transforming

the existing landscape character of the Upper Soar Landscape Character Area. The greatest changes would be perceived from the north and the south where the extent of development would protrude into areas of countryside that are currently unaffected. Views from the east are contained by the existing Magna Park and views from the west are moderated to a degree by the presence of the existing Magna Park development in the backdrop of views.

- 3.27 TLP consider that in contrast to the findings of the LVIA there would be some relatively greater significant adverse effects on both the landscape character of the countryside and visual receptors within 1.5km. The greatest and most extensive visual effects are on users of the public rights of way network (including W83, W86, W88, W89, W92 and R52) and areas of open access land and permissive routes where they focus towards and pass through the Site. This would be most noticeable during the considerable construction period but also extend into operation phase.
- 3.28 Although in relatively close proximity (c 1.5km) to the built development TLP consider that it is unlikely that the visual effects would be unacceptable on the closest settlements of Ullesthorpe, Claybrooke Parva and Willey. The greatest visual effects generally become apparent prior to entering or leaving villages on the public rights of way network and local roads.
- 3.29 The proposals would also result in some significant cumulative effects in combination with the DB Symmetry proposal if both schemes were approved and be implemented. These effects would extend to the local landscape character around the existing Magna Park and on road users along the A5, Mere Lane and Coventry Road.
- 3.30 The proposals also appear to be contrary to Policies CS7 h) and CS17 in the Harborough District Council Core Strategy and Saved Policy EV/7 of the Local Plan since the development would be taking place in open countryside outside any identified allocation for further B8 use.
- 3.31 In terms of the balancing of adverse landscape and visual effects against the positive landscape mitigation proposals incorporated into the scheme design TLP consider that there would be a net adverse effect on landscape character and visual receptors from the scheme. Therefore the adverse effects on landscape character and visual receptors will need to be considered alongside other adverse effects and the positive benefits of the proposal by the decision maker.