

10th July 2026

Written Summary of Oral Representation Made by HDC at Issue Specific Hearing 3

This document summarises the oral representation made by [REDACTED] (AECOM) on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC/the Council) and the Host Authorities at the Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) on 9th June 2026.

This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of parties other than HDC and the Host Authorities. Furthermore, it is confined to landscape matters and should not be read as a summary of comments made by other interested parties or Host Authorities in relation to other agenda items, including matters such as public rights of way, which do not fall within HDC's remit as the lower-tier authority.

The table is structured according to the order of items in the agenda for the Hearing published by the Examining Authority (ExA) on 18th May 2026.

Agenda Item	The Councils' Submission
3b PRow and Landscape The applicant will be asked to explain its overall approach on the impact on views by users of the PRow network, significant effects and mitigation proposed.	<u>Significance Ratings in relation to receptors along the PRow network</u> 1. It is noted that wherever there is a moderate effect on visual amenity this is taken to be non-significant, noting the methodology indicates it could and, in some cases, should be a significant effect as stated in Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 5-1 LVIA Assessment Methodology P01 [APP-069]: <i>Paragraph 5.2.6 'Greater than 'moderate' effects are more likely to be significant. This does not preclude a 'moderate' effect or lower being significant or a greater than 'moderate' effect not being significant. This judgement will depend on the specific circumstances being considered.'</i> 2. The Host Authorities overall conclusion in respect of this is that there is some slight under-representation of significant effects and that the screening of views as a result of mitigation planting has generally been assessed as an

	improvement to magnitude of impact and not been assessed as a potentially adverse change. <u>PRoW and mitigation</u> - Effects on visual receptors are broadly accepted as appropriate, noting that there is a heavy reliance on the landscape mitigation to screen the solar panels but any effects of obstructed or truncated views, as a result of mitigation planting, are not referenced and will adversely change the experience of users of PRoW. - Paragraph 6.25 of the Huntingdonshire District Council Local Impact Report [REP1-078] states: <i>‘Effects on visual receptors are broadly accepted as appropriate, noting that there is a heavy reliance on the landscape mitigation to screen the solar panels, but any effects of obstructed or truncated views are not referenced and will adversely change the experience of users of PRoW. Similar to the comments for landscape character, it is noted that wherever there is a moderate effect on visual amenity this is taken to be non-significant, noting the methodology indicates it could and, in some cases, should be a significant effect.’</i> - Within ES Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual P01 [APP-041] a selection of viewpoints where mitigation encloses views alongside PRoW are assessed as significant for the duration of the Proposed Development. - There are also a number of viewpoints where mitigation encloses views alongside PRoW and impacts are assessed to be significant during construction, reducing to non significant effects from year 0. During the Issue Specific Hearing 3 on Public Rights of Way, the Applicant provided evidence in relation to Viewpoint 12 and the assessed moderate adverse (non significant)
--	--

	effect, arose as a result of the retention of part of the open view from that location. This is at odds with the assessment for impacts on PRow users where assessed impacts are reduced to non significant effects at year 10 when there is a total enclosure of the view from solar panels and/ or mitigation planting. Examples within ES Appendix 5-4 Effects at Viewpoints P01 [APP-072] include: a. Receptors at viewpoint 15 (footpath 29) as illustrated on Figure 15.19 Viewpoint 15 [APP-131] are assessed to result in a major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse non significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse non significant effect at year 10. The view to the north-west along a large stretch of the footpath will contain views of solar PV panels during the early stages of operation. Once hedgerow vegetation is established, by year 0 the view will be enclosed by hedgerows, reducing the extensive views. b. Receptors at viewpoint 77 (bridleway 112/7) as illustrated on Figure 15.81 Viewpoint 77 [APP-142] are assessed to result in a moderate to major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse non significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse non significant effect at year 10. The proposed mitigation would enclose the view, although it is noted that there are gaps in the vegetation which allow for buried utilities, mitigation largely restricts views along the line of the PRow. c. Receptors at viewpoint 78 (footpath 112/5) as illustrated on Figure 15.82 [APP-142] are assessed to result in a moderate to major adverse significant effect during construction, reducing to moderate adverse non significant during year 0, and further reducing to minor to moderate adverse non significant effect at year 10. There would be
--	--

	views of solar PV panels along the majority of the route, although it is noted that there is an existing solar farm located to the south that may be visible at points along the PRow. 7. While the Council acknowledges that the screening planting as proposed within the Scheme does provide landscape screening benefits, in terms of overall landscape character, setting and specifically regarding views from the PRow Footpaths and Bridleways this will result in adverse visual impacts in terms of reading the broader, open landscape – this will adversely change the experience of users of the PRow. The effects of obstructed or truncated views are not referenced by the Applicant and are not fully addressed in the LVIA.
--	---