

Rosefield Solar Farm

Environmental Statement

Volume 4
Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-
project Cumulative Effect Assessment
(Tracked)

EN010158/APP/6.4.32
Revision 32
Deadline 24
~~March~~ April 2026
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction 1**
 - 1.1. Introduction1
 - 1.2. The Order Limits1
 - 1.3. The Proposed Development.....1
 - 1.4. Structure of this Report3
 - 1.5. Legislative framework, planning policy and guidance3
- 2. Methodology 6**
 - 2.1. Introduction6
 - 2.2. Inter-project cumulative effects6
 - 2.3. Landscape and visual receptors21
- 3. Assessment of inter-project cumulative effects during construction 22**
 - 3.1. Decommissioning effects22
 - 3.2. Inter-project cumulative landscape effects22
 - 3.3. Inter-project cumulative visual effects39
- 4. Assessment of inter-project cumulative effects during operation (including maintenance) 54**
 - 4.1. Inter-project cumulative landscape effects54
 - 4.2. Inter-project cumulative visual effects84
- 5. Summary 105**
- 6. References 124**

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction

~~1.1.1. This document has been updated at Deadline 2 in response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (Q1.11.25) for consistency and to provide further explanation of the conclusions. The document references have not been updated from the original submission. Please refer to the **Guide to the Application [EN010158/APP/1.2.7]** for the list of current versions of documents.~~

~~1.1.1. This appendix has been updated at Deadline 1 to consider further existing and/or approved developments that form part of the short list. A full update to the short list has been undertaken, with an assessment cut off of 20 February 2026. The same process will be repeated at Deadline 5 (29 July 2026), as necessary, with an assessment cut off of 10 July 2026, or at other times as may be requested by the Examining Authority. The document references have not been updated from the original submission. Please refer to the **Guide to the Application [EN010158/APP/1.2.6]** for the list of current versions of documents.~~

1.1.2. This Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effect Assessment has been prepared on behalf of Rosefield Energyfarm Limited ('the Applicant') to set out the inter-project cumulative effects with regards to surrounding proposed developments in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the construction, operation (including maintenance), and decommissioning of Rosefield Solar Farm (hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Development').

1.2. The Order Limits

1.2.1. The extent of the Order Limits are shown in **Location, Order Limits and Grid Coordinate Plans [EN010158/APP/2.1.2]** and the Proposed Development is described in full in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010158/APP/6.1]** and shown spatially on the **Works Plans [EN010158/APP/2.3]**.

1.3. The Proposed Development

1.3.1. The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation (including maintenance), and decommissioning of solar photovoltaic ('PV') development and energy storage, together with associated infrastructure and an underground cable connection to the National Grid East Claydon Substation.

- 1.3.2. The location of the Proposed Development is shown on **ES Volume 3, Figure 1.1: Location Plan [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. The Proposed Development would be located within the Order Limits (the land shown on the **Works Plans [EN010158/APP/2.3]** within which the Proposed Development can be carried out). The Order Limits plan is provided as **ES Volume 3, Figure 1.2: Order Limits [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Land within the Order Limits is known as the 'Site'.
- 1.3.3. The principal components of the Proposed Development include:
- Solar PV development consisting of:
 - Ground mounted Solar PV generating station. The generating station would include Solar PV modules and mounting structures; and
 - Balance of Solar System (BoSS) which comprises: Inverters; Transformers; Switchgear; Combiner Boxes; acoustic barriers and cabling.
 - A project substation (the 'Rosefield Substation') compound comprising: Transformers; Switchgear; reactive power compensation bays; disconnectors; circuit breakers; busbars; control equipment; lightning surge arrestors; building(s) including office, control, functions, material storage, material laydown areas and welfare facilities; firewalls; fencing and acoustic fencing; a security cabin; parking as well as wider monitoring, maintenance and emergency equipment;
 - A Main Collector Compound and two Satellite Collector Compounds comprising: Switchgear; Transformers; ancillary equipment; operation and maintenance and welfare facilities; material storage; material laydown areas; fencing and acoustic fencing; and security cabins;
 - Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) compound comprising: batteries and associated Inverters; Transformers; Switchgear, ancillary equipment and their containers; office, control and welfare buildings; fencing and acoustic fencing; monitoring, maintenance and emergency systems; air conditioning; electrical cables; fire safety infrastructure; operation (including maintenance) security facilities; material storage; and material laydown areas;
 - Interconnecting Cabling Corridor(s) to connect the Solar PV modules and the BESS to the Satellite and Main Collector Compounds to the Rosefield Substation;
 - A Grid Connection Cable Corridor to connect the Rosefield Substation to the National Grid East Claydon Substation via 400kV cabling;
 - Ancillary infrastructure works comprising: boundary treatment; security equipment; lighting; fencing; landscaping; internal access tracks; works to facilitate vehicular access; earthing devices; earthworks; surface water management; utility connections and diversions; and any other works identified as necessary to enable the Proposed Development;

- Green and blue infrastructure, recreation and amenity works comprising: landscaping; habitat management; biodiversity enhancement; the creation of three permissive footpaths; and works to permanently divert four PRow Footpaths in five instances;
- Site-wide operational monitoring and security equipment; and
- Highways infrastructure improvements and safety works comprising: minor junction improvement works; road widening; passing places; and works to facilitate vehicular access to the Site.

1.4. Structure of this Report

1.4.1. This Appendix sets out the inter-project methodology and details the inter-project landscape and visibility cumulative effects with developments in the surrounding area. It is supported by the following figures that support **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2]** presented in **ES Volume 3 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**:

- **Figure 17.1: Cumulative Zone of Influence;**
- **Figure 17.2: Cumulative Short List Radius;**
- **Figure 17.3: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and National Grid East Claydon Substation Extension;**
- **Figure 17.4: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and East Claydon Greener Grid Park;**
- **Figure 17.5: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Tuckey Solar Farm;**
- **Figure 17.6: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Longbreach Solar Farm;**
- **Figure 17.7: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and East Claydon BESS;** and
- **Figure 17.8: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Littleton Manor Farm**
- **Figure 17.9: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and all cumulative sites.**

1.4.2. This chapter is further supported by the following technical appendix presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**:

- **Appendix 17.3: Cumulative Visualisations.**

1.5. Legislative framework, planning policy and guidance

1.5.1. This assessment has been undertaken with regard to the following legislation, policy and guidance.

1.5.2. It should be noted that this chapter does not assess the compliance of the Proposed Development against relevant planning policy. Such an

assessment is presented in the **Planning Statement [EN010158/APP/5.7]**.

Legislation

- Schedule 4 paragraph (5)(e) of the EIA Regulations **[Ref. 1]** states that the Environmental Statement (ES) should include “a description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from... the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the uses of natural resources”.
- Regulation 5(2) of the EIA Regulations states that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on population and human health, biodiversity, land, soil, water, air and climate, material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape.
- Regulation 5(2)(e) of the EIA Regulations also requires applicants to assess “the interaction between those factors.”

National planning policy

- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) (2023) **[Ref. 2]** provides the basis for decisions regarding nationally significant energy infrastructure. There are multiple references to cumulative assessment, such as paragraph 4.1.5, which requires that potential adverse impacts, including any long term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts are considered.
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) (2023) **[Ref. 3]** sets out the policies relating to electricity generation from renewable sources of energy and includes multiple references to cumulative assessment. Section 2.10 gives specific consideration to solar development including assessment of cumulative impacts.
- National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5) (2023) **[Ref. 4]**, paragraph 2.9.10 makes reference to cumulative landscape and visual impacts where new overhead lines are required along with other related developments such as substations, wind farms and/or other new sources of power generation. However, no such overhead lines are required in respect of the Proposed Development.
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) **[Ref. 5]** makes reference to ensuring adverse cumulative effects are addressed appropriately, particularly related to highways, landscape and visual,

flood risk, ground conditions and pollution, air quality, human health and the historic environment.

Local planning policy

- Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013 – 2033 (Adopted September 2021) **[Ref. 6]**, specifically policies:-
 - NE1 ‘Biodiversity and Geodiversity’;
 - NE3 ‘The Chilterns AONB and setting’;
 - NE8 ‘Trees, hedgerows and woodlands’;
 - C3 ‘Renewable Energy’; and
 - I1 ‘Green infrastructure’.
- Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016-2036 (2019) **[Ref. 7]**.

Guidance

- Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment (2024) **[Ref. 8]**; and
- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment: The State of Environmental Impact Assessment in the UK (2011) **[Ref. 9]**.

2. Methodology

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. Cumulative effects occur as a result of several actions on an environmental receptor which may overlap or act in combination. The following types of cumulative effects have been considered, in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 **[Ref. 1]** (hereafter ‘the EIA Regulations’) and best practice guidance:

- **Intra-project cumulative effects:** the interaction and combination of different environmental residual (post-additional mitigation) effects from within the Proposed Development affecting a receptor; and
- **Inter-project cumulative effects:** the combined residual (post-mitigation) effects of the Proposed Development and ‘other existing development and/or approved development’ on a single receptor/resource.

2.2. Inter-project cumulative effects

2.2.1. The approach to the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects has been undertaken as set out in **Section 17.4 of ES Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2]**.

2.2.2. This is in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment **[Ref. 8]**, the identification of other existing development and/or approved developments comprises two clear stages, as follows:

- **Stage 1:** establish a long list of other existing development and/or approved developments based on appropriate spatial and temporal limits; and
- **Stage 2:** apply a clear rationale to establish a short list of other existing development and/or approved developments which, in combination with the Proposed Development, have the potential to result in a significant inter-project cumulative effect for inclusion within the assessment.

2.2.3. The overall combined ‘search area’ for the long list of relevant other existing development and/or approved development(s) has been based on the largest Zol (study area) in terms of distance, which in this case is 10km.

2.2.4. The long list of other existing development and/or approved developments is provided in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 17.1: Cumulative Long List [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and follows the Matrix set out in Appendix 1 of the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment **[Ref.**

8]. This long list is accurate as of 30 June 2025 and has been kept under review by the Applicant's Planning Team to allow for a robust assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.

- 2.2.5. Deriving from the long list, where an existing development and/or approved development meets all of the criteria set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Cumulate Effects Assessment [**Ref. 8]**, it has been included on the 'short list' and has been taken forward for further consideration in the assessment. The 'short list' is detailed below in **Table 1** and the location of each development is shown in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.2: Cumulative Short List Developments [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.
- 2.2.6. The information provided in **Table 1** is accurate as of 30 June 2025, the assessment cut-off date.

Table 1: Short list of other existing developments and/or approved developments

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
1	23/03875/APP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 5/3360815	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	East Claydon BESS. Development of a battery energy storage system (BESS), connected directly to the national grid with associated infrastructure including access, drainage, and landscaping.	Within Order Limits	Approved 11 September 2025 – following appeal	Yes
2	25/01297/APP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	East Claydon Greener Grid Park. Construction of a greener grid park comprising energy storage and grid balancing equipment and associated infrastructure including access, drainage, landscaping and other incidental works.	Within Order Limits	Pending decision	Yes
3	19/00983/APP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Tuckey Solar Farm. Ground mounted solar farm, ancillary infrastructure and associated works including the diversion of public rights of way and landscape planting.	Within bounding circle	Approved 29 April 2021	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km ZoI
5	Hybrid Bill With consideration to: 23/03641/HS2 22/00119/HS2 23/03784/HS2 21/03707/HS2 22/03796/HS2 25/02188/HS2, 25/02187/HS2, PL/25/3039/HS2 PL/25/5085/HS2 PL/25/5100/HS2 PL/25/5101/HS2 PL/25/6272/HS2 PL/25/6273/HS2	High Speed Rail Bill	High Speed Rail 2 ('HS2')	Bounding circle and beyond	Ongoing	Yes
7	CM/0016/21	Town and County Planning Act 1990	Calvert Solar Farm. Application for the construction of solar array/solar park comprising of ground mounted solar PV panels and associated works including: Distributor Network Operator (DNO) switching station, client switching station, battery containers, general storage	Partially in bounding circle	Pending decision	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
			container, access track, fencing, security cameras and cabling for a temporary period of 35 years at Calvert Landfill Site.			
8	25/00013/DCO PINS Reference: TR040012	Planning Act 2008	East West Rail DCO: Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements.	1km	EIA Scoping Opinion received 30 September 2025	Yes
9	25/01865/APP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Longbreach Solar Farm. Erection of a solar farm and creation of new vehicular access, new footpath, substation compound, customer substation, inverters, CCTV Tower, storage containers, perimeter fencing, car parking and associated ancillary development.	1.18km	Pending decision	Yes
11	21/B2851//NON Appeal ref. 22/00125/REF	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Grendon Prison. Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access, layout, and scale for the construction a new category C prison (up to 67,000 sqm GEA)	1.63km	Approved 31 March 2025 –	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
	With consideration to: 21/A2851//NON 25/02292/ADP		within a secure perimeter fence together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works.		following appeal	
13	25/00883/AOP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Demolition of existing buildings and commercial redevelopment with residential development, including affordable housing, along with associated access and infrastructure.	1.7km	Pending decision	Yes
14	24/00407/APP	Town and County Planning Act 1990	Erection of 10 no. dwellings and associated green infrastructure.	2.64km	Approved 5 January 2026	Yes
16	25/01567/AOP	Town and County Planning Act 1990	Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the development of up to 24 dwellings, open space, sustainable drainage and associated works.	4.2km	Pending decision	Yes
19	22/03873/F	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Padbury Brook Solar Farm. Installation and operation of a renewable energy generating station	6.9km	Approved 20 May 2025 –	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
	Appeal ref. APP/C3105/W/2 4/3353069		comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with a switchgear container, inverter/transformer units, Site access, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure and landscaping and biodiversity enhancements.		following appeal	
20	24/03004/APP	Town and County Planning Act 1990	Hybrid application for the redevelopment of the site comprising outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except access, for a drive thru restaurant (Use Class E(b)/Sui Generis) and EV charging hub and full planning permission for an office building (Use Class E(g)(ii)) and a day nursery (Use Class E(f)) with associated landscaping, parking and access arrangements.	6.95km	Approved 18 February 2026	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
21	21/04112/OUT Appeal ref. APP/C3105/W/2 2/3301485	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline application for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, including up to 8 live-work dwellings (use class sui generis), public open space, access, infrastructure and demolition of existing buildings (all matters reserved except principle means of access from Station Road).	8.14km	Approved 3 November 2022 – following appeal	Yes
22	24/03426/AOP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 5/3372565	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline application (all reserved apart from access) for approx. 220 residential dwellings, pre-school/nursery, SuDS and open space off Bourton Road, Buckingham, MK18 7R.	8.2km	Awaiting Appeal – following non determination	Yes
24	24/00949/F	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Siting of battery storage facility; substation for the connection of the BESS to the grid; ancillary equipment; security fencing; landscaping and vehicular access alterations.	9.02km	Approved 5 September 2024	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
25	21/03558/OUT	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline application for residential development for up to 250 dwellings including affordable housing and ancillary uses including retained Local Wildlife Site, public open space, play areas, localised land remodelling, compensatory flood storage, structural planting and access.	9.4km	Pending decision	Yes
26	24/03259/F	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	The erection of two Use Class B8 floorspace units (with ancillary office floorspace (Use Class E(G(i))) with associated infrastructure including: a building for the use as an energy centre (details of the energy generation reserved for future approval); loading bays; service yards; external plant; bin stores, vehicle parking (HGV, lorry, car and motorcycle); cycle parking, amenity areas, landscaping including permanent landscaped mounds; sustainable drainage details. Demolition of three vacant	9.5km	Approved 26 June 2025	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km ZoI
			agricultural building (and two smaller structures) to the north east corner of the site. Access from the existing Symmetry Park estate road.			
27	21/01224/OUT	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline planning application for Automotive Experience Quarter comprising Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2), Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F) and vehicle circuits (Sui Generis) with all matters reserved aside from that of access).	9.63km	Approved 31 March 2023	Yes
28	25/00439/SCOP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	EIA scoping opinion for a proposed residential-led development.	9.7km	Scoping Opinion issued 14 April 2025	Yes
30	23/01610/OUT	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline application (matters of access to be considered, with matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved) cross boundary with Buckinghamshire LPA (application reference	9.9km	Pending decision	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
			23/02180/AOP) for a Sustainable Urban Extension comprising residential development of up to 1,265 dwellings (Use Class C3), a mixed-use local centre (Class E(a) Display or retail sale of goods, other than hot food, E(b) Sale of food and drink for consumption (mostly) on the premises, E(c) provision of: E(c)(i) Financial services, E(c)(ii) professional services (other than health or medical services), or E(c)(iii) Other appropriate services in a commercial, business or service locality, E(e) Provision of medical or health services (except the use of premises attached to the residence of the consultant or practitioner), E(f) Creche, day nursery or day centre (not including a residential use)), sui-generis hot food takeaway, a care home/extra care provision, community and commercial uses, a primary school, vehicle accesses from and a link			

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
31	22/03384/AOP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 5/3376431	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	road between the A421 and H6 Childs Way, diversion of existing PROW and new pedestrian and cycle access points and routes, car and cycle parking, open space, sports provision, play areas, landscaping, plant, earthworks and ground remodelling, demolition of existing buildings, electrical substations, and associated infrastructure works. EIA development. Littleton Manor Farm. Hybrid application to comprise: Part A - Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved (except for 2 principal points of access) for a residential development of up to 535 dwellings; primary school; commercial units; mobility hubs; parking; upgraded vehicular access onto A41 and Quanton Road; vehicle accesses; cycle and pedestrian accesses; a community	3.5km	Awaiting Appeal – following non determination	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
			hub including residential care and retail; associated landscaping, parkland and woodland, ecological and environmental enhancements/habitat creation; green and blue infrastructure. Part B - A full planning application for an Energy Park development comprising a solar PV array, a wind turbine, an electric vehicle charging station, a substation, roundabout connecting to the A41 including new access roads and associated infrastructure.			
32	24/03817/AOP Appeal ref. 25/00085/REF PINs Ref. 6003090	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline planning application for up to 70 dwellings, including vehicular access, pedestrian and cycle lines, public open space, landscaping, drainage and associated works.	6.0 km	Awaiting Appeal – against refusal	Yes
33	25/02132/APP	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Thornton Estate Solar Farm. Installation of a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar PV panels with an installed capacity	7.9 km	Pending decision	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
			of 49.99MW AC including mounting system, inverters, underground cabling, stock proof fence, CCTV, internal tracks and associated infrastructure, landscaping, biodiversity net gain and environmental enhancements for a temporary period of 50 years and a permanent substation.			
34	20/03556/AOP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 2/3303420	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Outline development of up to 60 residential dwellings (a minimum of 50% affordable) with associated open space, landscaping, highway and drainage infrastructure	2.4 km	Approved 29 December 2022 - following appeal	Yes
35	PL/25/2877/FA	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Erection of 21 dwellings, access arrangements and car parking, landscaping and other associated works at Land east of Clements Lane, Marsh Gibbon.	4.8 km	Pending decision	Yes
36	PL/25/3733/FA	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	Erection of fourteen detached, semi-detached and terraced two-storey dwellings (including 25% affordable housing) together with access and	0.76 km	Pending decision	Yes

ID No. in the long list	Application reference	Planning regime	Brief description	Distance from the Order Limits	Status	Within 10km Zol
37	PL/25/4279/OA	Town and Country Planning Act 1990	footways, parking and garages, open space, landscaping, drainage works and biodiversity enhancements Outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 36 dwellings (Use Class C3) (matter to be considered at this stage: access)	2.3 km	Pending decision	Yes

2.3. Landscape and visual receptors

2.3.1. As detailed in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, receptors judged to experience negligible or slight/negligible magnitude of effects from the Proposed Development, are not considered for inter-project cumulative effects on the basis that any significant effects arising would primarily be caused by the other existing and/or approved development and would be unlikely to be contributed to by the Proposed Development. Those receptors as identified and assessed in Section 10.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** as experiencing a negligible or slight/negligible magnitude of effect from the Proposed Development, which would otherwise have been included in one or more of the inter-project cumulative effects assessments below, are detailed as follows:

- NCA 108: Upper Thames Clay Vales;
- NCA 109: Midvale Rodge;
- LCA 5.4: Twyford Vale;
- LCA 9.3: Pitchcott-Whitchurch Ridge;
- Settlements: North Marston and Oving;
- Main roads: Winslow Road/East Claydon Road and Queen Catherine Road;
- Main transport routes: HS2 with the exception of LCT 5 and LCT 7;
- Recreational routes NCN No.51; and
- PRow: Finemere Hill to HS2/Claydon Road.

2.3.2. In addition to these receptors, LCA 9.1, Calvert Road and Claydon Road are not considered for inter-project cumulative effects on the basis that any large-scale effects arising would be as a result of the Proposed Development alone. Any potential inter-project cumulative effects with other existing development and/or approved developments would result in no greater effects than the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, and they are therefore not considered for further inter-project cumulative effects assessment.

~~3.2.5-3.2.6.~~ In each case, if both the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~or~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) ~~or~~ ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are each individually constructed in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further into LCT 5. However, in each case the effects would still remain over a very limited extent of the LCT 5 landscape as a whole.

~~3.2.6-3.2.7.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~or~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) or ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCT 5 during construction, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.7-3.2.8.~~ In the scenario where the Proposed Development and the ~~seven~~ other existing development and/or approved developments identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects on LCT 5 would clearly be experienced over a wider area.

~~3.2.8-3.2.9.~~ This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other and would likely be perceived as one area of construction. In addition, although quite discrete in nature, both ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would increase the extents of development into the wider LCT 5. As identified above, whilst the level of effect would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, this would extend over a wider area. Whilst ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is somewhat more separated it too would add to the presence of solar energy being constructed within LCT 5. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would increase the extents of development to the south of Quainton from where it would be a notable feature.

~~3.2.9-3.2.10.~~ A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the five other existing energy development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

~~3.2.10-3.2.11.~~ It is likely that the ~~seven~~ eight other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects some 1.5km to the north, 5km to the north west, ~~0-15~~km to the east, ~~6~~2km to the south and 5km to the south east, which is considered an un-localised

intermediate extent of LCT 5 resulting in a moderate/~~slight~~ magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.11.~~3.2.12. The sensitivity of LCT 5: Shallow Valleys is assessed as low. Therefore, in the scenario that the ~~five~~eight other existing development and/or approved developments are developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 5 during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect, which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCA 5.6: Claydon Valley

~~3.2.12.~~3.2.13. It is possible that construction of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) developments may coincide with construction of the Proposed Development and as such inter-project cumulative effects on landscape character may arise within LCT 5.6: Claydon Valley. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) are located, together with the northern most field of Parcel 3 (Field E10), in LCA 5.6, whilst ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located within the neighbouring LCA 5.7 together with the majority of the eastern and northern most areas of the Proposed Development.

3.2.14. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) which is located in LCA 5.7 over 1km to the south of LCA 5.6. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.6, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, be very limited and it is considered that the any additional scale of change as a result of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be negligible over a very limited extent. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 7.5km. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are ~~ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is~~ therefore not considered further in the assessment of cumulative effects on LCA 5.6.

~~3.2.13.~~3.2.15. Viewpoints 23, 24 and 26 are representative of views from within LCA 5.6.

~~3.2.14.~~3.2.16. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site,

reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m, considered a limited extent of LCA 5.6 resulting in a slight magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.15-3.2.17.~~ 3.2.17. It is likely that ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending to a large/medium scale change by *circa* 1km to the north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road, considered a localised extent of the LCA 5.6 landscape as a whole, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.16-3.2.18.~~ 3.2.18. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.6 to the Proposed Development is low. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.6, during construction, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.17-3.2.19.~~ 3.2.19. Similarly, it is likely that ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, extending the large/medium scale change by *circa* 1.5km to the north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road and 1km to the east of the Proposed Development, considered a localised extent of the LCA 5.6 ~~within LCA 5.7.~~

~~3.2.18-3.2.20.~~ 3.2.20. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.6, during construction, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.19-3.2.21.~~ 3.2.21. Both ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are located on the boundary of LCA 5.6 within neighbouring LCAs. In each case, if the Proposed Development and either ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were constructed in combination, it is likely that the large and medium scale effects experienced as a result of the Proposed Development alone, would extend only a very limited additional extent further into LCA 5.6.

~~3.2.20-3.2.22.~~ 3.2.22. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCA 5.6 during construction, a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect would remain, which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.21-3.2.23.~~ 3.2.23. In the scenario where the Proposed Development and the four other existing development and/or approved developments identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation

development are developed in combination, the effects on LCA 5.6 would clearly be experienced over a wider area.

~~3.2.22~~3.2.24. This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other. As identified above, whilst the type and scale of construction effects would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, they would extend over a wider area.

~~3.2.23~~3.2.25. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the five other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

~~3.2.24~~3.2.26. It is likely that the five other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects some 1.5km to the north, 1km to the east and 0.5km to the west, which is considered an intermediate extent of LCA 5.6, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.25~~3.2.27. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.6 during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands

~~3.2.26~~3.2.28. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments from within LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the two renewable energy developments are presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 4.5km. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit potential visibility, and the scale of any potential additional inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) ~~and~~ ID No. 8 (East West Rail) ~~and~~ ID No. 32

(Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 5.7.

3.2.29. The proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is located in LCA 5.7 approximately 1km to the south of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

3.2.27-3.2.30. Viewpoints 18-20, 22, 25 and 27 are representative of views from within LCA 5.7.

3.2.28-3.2.31. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the construction of the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site, reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 500m.

3.2.29-3.2.32. It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change to *circa* 1km to 2.5km within LCA 5.7 to between Hogshaw Road and Marston Road, considered a wide extent of LCA 5.7, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.

3.2.30-3.2.33. The sensitivity of LCA 5.7 is assessed as medium/low. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.7 during construction, there would be a moderate adverse cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

3.2.31-3.2.34. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.7, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, primarily be limited to within the site and its immediate environs.

3.2.32-3.2.35. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were constructed in combination, this would give rise to a broadly

similar large to medium scale of landscape change over a radius extending *circa* 0.5km further to the east towards Granborough, considered an intermediate (tending towards wide) extent of the LCA 5.7 landscape as a whole.

~~3.2.33~~3.2.36. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) was constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCA 5.7 during construction, there would remain a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

~~3.2.34~~3.2.37. In the scenario where the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects on LCA 5.7 would clearly be experienced over a wider area.

~~3.2.35~~3.2.38. This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other and would likely be perceived as one development during construction. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would further extend the influence of renewable energy development within LCA 5.7. As identified above, whilst the type and scale of effects would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, they would extend over a wider area.

~~3.2.36~~3.2.39. It is likely that the three other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects *circa* 1km to 2.5km to the south and 0.5km to the east, which is considered a wide extent of LCA 5.7, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.37~~3.2.40. Therefore, in the scenario that the three other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.7 during construction, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

LCA 5.8: North Marston Undulating Claylands

~~3.2.38-3.2.41.~~ 3.2.41. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments from within LCA 5.8: North Marston Undulating Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the renewable energy developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential additional inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 3.5km. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of cumulative effects on LCA 5.8.

3.2.42. The proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is located in the neighbouring LCA 5.7 approximately 1km to the south of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. The ZTV indicates a broadly similar extent of LCA 5.8 would be affected.

~~3.2.39-3.2.43.~~ 3.2.43. Viewpoints 28, 29 and 32 are representative of views from within LCA 5.8.

~~3.2.40-3.2.44.~~ 3.2.44. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the construction of the Proposed Development on its own would result in medium scale change to landscape character to LCA 5.8 over a localised extent of land up to 1.2km to the east of Parcel 3.

~~3.2.41-3.2.45.~~ 3.2.45. It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, over a similar, localised, extent of LCA 5.8, as evidenced by the ZTV. The sensitivity of LCA 5.8 is assessed as low. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.8 during construction, there would be a minor adverse cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.42-3.2.46.~~ 3.2.46. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. A cumulative

ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. The ZTV indicates a broadly similar extent of LCA 5.8 would be affected.

~~3.2.43-3.2.47.~~ 3.2.47. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were constructed in combination, this would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a similar, localised, extent of LCA 5.8, as evidenced by the ZTV.

~~3.2.44-3.2.48.~~ 3.2.48. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) was constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCA 5.8 during construction, there would remain a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.45-3.2.49.~~ 3.2.49. In the scenario where the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects on LCA 5.8 would remain of a similar scale.

~~3.2.46-3.2.50.~~ 3.2.50. Therefore, in the scenario that the three other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.8 during construction, there would remain a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCT 7: Wooded Rolling Lowlands

~~3.2.47-3.2.51.~~ 3.2.51. There is not anticipated to be ~~any~~ substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from within LCT 7: Wooded Rolling Lowlands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit ~~any~~ potential visibility, and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be small to negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 7.

3.2.52. Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are located within LCT 7 to the south and north of Parcel 1 respectively. It is likely that both

ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, reinforcing the perception of built form, activity and movement to the landscape within the vicinity of Parcel 1 and extending it somewhat to the south east of Parcel 2.

3.2.48-3.2.53. Viewpoints 1-14, 17, 21, 35, 36, 38-40 and 42 are representative of views from within LCT 7.

3.2.49-3.2.54. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 7 which extends to a maximum of 1km to the north of the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

3.2.50-3.2.55. If the Proposed Development and either ID no.5 (HS2) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination, the minor effect would extend in a discrete manner up to 3km to the south east of Parcel 2 and 3km to the north of Parcel 1 respectively. However, in each case the effects would remain over a limited extent of the LCT 7 landscape as a whole.

3.2.51-3.2.56. Therefore, in the scenario either ID no.5 (HS2) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 7, during construction, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.2.52-3.2.57. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to a similar limited extents of LCT 7 to its eastern boundary.

3.2.53-3.2.58. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were constructed in combination, the minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of LCT 7.

3.2.54-3.2.59. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCT 7 during construction, there would remain a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.2.55-3.2.60.~~ In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, localised extent of LCT 7.

~~3.2.56-3.2.61.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 7 during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl

~~3.2.57-3.2.62.~~ There is not anticipated to be **any** substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from within LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be **small to** negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 7.3.

3.2.63. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is located within LCA 7.3 to the north of Parcel 1. It is likely that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, reinforcing the perception of built form, activity and movement to within the landscape between Parcel 1 and Steeple Claydon.

~~3.2.58-3.2.64.~~ Viewpoints 1-14, 21, 38-40 and 42 are representative of views from within LCA 7.3.

~~3.2.59-3.2.65.~~ It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 7.3 which extends to a maximum of 1km to the north of the Site and this is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.2.60-3.2.66.~~ 3.2.66. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination, the moderate effect would remain between the north of Calvert Road and Steeple Claydon, considered an intermediate extent of the total LCA 7.3 landscape as a whole.

~~3.2.61-3.2.67.~~ 3.2.67. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 7.3, during construction, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

~~3.2.62-3.2.68.~~ 3.2.68. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within the neighbouring LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to a similar localised extents of LCA 7.3 to its eastern boundary.

~~3.2.63-3.2.69.~~ 3.2.69. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 7.3 to the Proposed Development is medium.

~~3.2.64-3.2.70.~~ 3.2.70. It has been assessed that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character to within 1km to the west of Parcels 2 and 3, considered an intermediate extent of LCA 7.3.

~~3.2.65-3.2.71.~~ 3.2.71. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were constructed in combination, this moderate adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of the LCA 7.3.

~~3.2.66-3.2.72.~~ 3.2.72. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCA 7.3 during construction, there would remain a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance

rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

3.2.67-3.2.73. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects on LCA 7.3 would remain of a similar scale.

3.2.74. Therefore, in the scenario that the four other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 7.3 during construction, there would remain a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

LCT 9: Low Hills and Ridges

3.2.75. There is not anticipated to be any substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from within LCT 9: Low Hills and Ridges. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between these developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, all of these developments are situated at greater distance from the AAL and behind the Proposed Development and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 9.

3.2.76. Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) are located within adjacent LCT to the south of Parcels 1 and 2 but would be in cutting and would share very limited intervisibility with the Proposed Development. ID no.5 (HS2) is therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 9.

3.2.77. Viewpoints 15, 16, 30, 31, 34, 41 and 43 are representative of views from within LCT 9.

3.2.78. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach

Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar extents of LCT 9.

3.2.79. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the moderate/minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of LCT 9.

3.2.80. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually developed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCT 9 during construction, there would remain a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.2.81. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A Cumulative ZTV showing the extent of cumulative intervisibility with the Proposed Development is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) with the Proposed Development would increase the extents over which medium scale effects were experienced over LCT 9.

3.2.82. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were constructed in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further to the north of Quainton and Waddeston and south of Oving but would amount to a limited extent of the total LCT 9.

3.2.83. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 9 during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.2.84. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are constructed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, localised extent of LCT 9, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.68~~ 3.2.85. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 9 during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCA 9.2: Quainton Hill

~~3.2.69-3.2.86.~~ The primary intervisibility between the Proposed Development and the ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is most likely to be within Parcel 3 from LCA 9.2: Quanton Hill. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the four renewable energy developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

~~3.2.87.~~ As well as being substantially less intervisible with Parcel 2 of the Proposed Development, the proposed ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments are all situated behind the Proposed Development and at greater distance of separation from LCA 9.2. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential additional inter-project cumulative effects would be minor/negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 9.2.

~~3.2.70-3.2.88.~~ Viewpoints 30 and 31 are representative of views from within LCA 9.2.

~~3.2.71-3.2.89.~~ It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction the Proposed Development on its own would result in at most medium scale change to LCA 9.2 over a localised extent of land up to *circa* 2km to the south of Parcel 3. This would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2 which is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.2.72-3.2.90.~~ It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would each give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change experienced over a similar extent of LCA 9.2.

~~3.2.73-3.2.91.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 9.2, during construction, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect considered to be **not significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the effects would be experienced at distances of 2km or more and would influence a relatively small area of LCA 9.2. This is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating and in the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance to a not significant effect.

~~3.2.74-3.2.92.~~ In the scenario where the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are ~~constructed developed~~ in combination, the scale of change to within the neighbouring LCA 9.2 would remain medium.

~~3.2.75-3.2.93.~~ A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows that these other existing development and/or approved developments would not enlarge the extent of visibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 9.2.

~~3.2.94.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that the three other existing development and/or approved developments were ~~constructed developed~~ in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 9.2 during construction, there would remain a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be, as described above, **not significant**.

Quinton-Wing Hills AAL

~~3.2.95.~~ The is not anticipated to be any substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from within Quinton-Wing Hills AAL. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between these developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, all of these developments are situated at greater distance from the AAL and behind the Proposed Development and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on the AAL.

~~3.2.96.~~ Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) are located to the south of the AAL but would be in cutting and would share very limited intervisibility with the Proposed Development. ID no.5 (HS2) is therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on the AAL.

~~3.2.97.~~ ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within neighbouring landscapes. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1

(East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar extents of AAL.

3.2.98. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were individually constructed in combination, the moderate/minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of the AAL.

3.2.99. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, there would remain a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.2.100. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A Cumulative ZTV showing the extent of cumulative intervisibility with the Proposed Development is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8a: Cumulative ZTV – Littleton Manor Farm – Bare Earth [EN010158/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-046]** and **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8b: Cumulative ZTV – Littleton Manor Farm – Screening [EN010158/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-046]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) with the Proposed Development would increase the extents over which medium scale effects were experienced over the AAL.

3.2.101. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were constructed in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further to the north of Quainton and Waddeston and south of Oving which would amount to a localised extent of the total the AAL.

3.2.102. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the AAL, there would be a moderate/minor adverse cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.2.103. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are constructed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, although still localised extent of the AAL, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

~~3.2.76~~ 3.2.104. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.3. Inter-project cumulative visual effects

Settlement

Botolph Claydon

- 3.3.1. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Botolph Claydon. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). Although this would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) any limited and intermittent visibility would be at distances of at least 6km and it is therefore not considered further in the assessment.
- 3.3.2. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 13 and 40, which are representative of residents, users of Botyl Road/Saint Mary's Road and the footway (including ECL/11/1, ECL/11/2, ECL/11/3, ECL/11/4) to within the settlement which make up this receptor group.
- 3.3.3. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same residential properties, roads and footpaths at distances of at least 2.3km to the east of view. Although ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would extend views of construction activity to within the wider landscape it would be viewed at considerable distance and partially screened and filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 3.3.4. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 3.3.5. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were developed in combination, the moderate adverse residual effects would remain, in spite of a small increase in the extent of construction activity to within views from the southern and eastern edges of the Botolph Claydon.
- 3.3.6. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be potentially visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same residential

properties, roads and footpaths at distances of at least 1.6km to the east. Although ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would potentially extend the view of construction activity to within the wider landscape it would be viewed at considerable distance and always beyond the Proposed Development. In views from Botolph Claydon, the construction of ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would either be screened by, or subservient to, the Proposed Development, with the latter in the foreground and hence there would be no substantive increase in scale of view experienced as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.

- 3.3.7. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the scale of change in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.
- 3.3.8. If the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were developed in combination, the moderate adverse residual effects would remain, in spite of a relatively small increase in the extent of construction activity to within views from the southern and eastern edges of the Botolph Claydon.
- 3.3.9. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be, as described above, **not significant**.

Granborough

- 3.3.10. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4, 17.5 and 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Granborough. It is noted that the ZTVs for both ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) suggest a very limited degree of visibility to the north western extents of Granborough; however, it is considered that any such views would most likely be limited to first floor views screened or heavily filtered by intervening vegetation and they are therefore not reported on further.

- 3.3.11. The cumulative **ZTV presented in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggests that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would not be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development, with any substantive views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) limited to the southern extents of Granborough from where the Proposed Development is screened by landform. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) with any limited and intermittent visibility at distances of at least 7.5km. There would therefore be no additional cumulative effects on this receptor group as a result of both schemes being constructed simultaneously~~There would therefore be no additional cumulative effects on this receptor group as a result of both schemes being constructed simultaneously.~~
- 3.3.12. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoint 28, which is representative of views from the western edge of the settlement and the footpath network (including GRA/10/1) on rising land approximately 1.2km to the east of the Proposed Development.
- 3.3.13. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of *circa* 0.7km to the west. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would therefore extend the view of construction activity to within the landscape considerably closer to the receptor group, albeit views would be partially filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 3.3.14. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a medium scale of change to visual amenity. This would be experienced over a limited extent of the receptor group and would be medium term duration and would result in a slight magnitude of effect.
- 3.3.15. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the western edge of Granborough. Therefore, during construction, there would be a large to medium scale change in views experienced over a limited extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 3.3.16. The sensitivity of this receptor group has been assessed to be high/medium. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the scale of change in the

professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

- 3.3.17. If all other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

Steeple Claydon

- 3.3.18. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** demonstrate that there would be no theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Steeple Claydon. Although there would potentially be some limited visibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) any potential views would be at distances over 9km and it is therefore not considered further in the assessment.
- 3.3.19. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be seen at Viewpoints 7 and 38, which is representative of views from the southern edge of the settlement and the footpath network (including SCL/9/1 and the permissive footpath) on rising land approximately 1.5km to the north of the Proposed Development.
- 3.3.20. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of *circa* 0.7km to the south of view, bringing construction activity potentially closer to the receptor group.
- 3.3.21. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 3.3.22. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 8 (East West Rail) construction activity. There would be a medium/small scale of change to visual amenity over a localised extent of the receptor group, during construction. This would be experienced over a medium term duration and would result in a slight magnitude of effect.
- 3.3.23. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-

project cumulative effects would be moderate/minor adverse, which is considered to be **not significant**.

Users of recreational routes

North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way

3.3.24. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way.

3.3.25. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the Proposed Development would be seen at Viewpoints 21, 22, 25, 27 and 29 from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way. In the case of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) there would be no views in combination with the Proposed Development other than the distant views from Quanton Hill.

3.3.26. Locations from where there would be potential combined views with ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the Proposed Development are very limited, and in each case, views of ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be nominal and would not add to the *solus* effects of the Proposed Development. This assessment of the potential cumulative construction effects on the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way is therefore limited to longer distance views from Quanton Hill.

~~3.3.26-3.3.27.~~ 3.3.27. Potential in combination views with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be experienced over a somewhat greater extent of these trails from the western flank of Quanton Hill, albeit at long distance and primarily in combination with Parcel 2 of the Proposed Development. In addition, users of these trails would also experience sequential effects along the route, with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) noticeable in views between Waddesdon and Quanton from where the views of the construction of the Proposed Development would effectively be screened by landform.

~~3.3.27-3.3.28.~~ 3.3.28. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.4 to 17.7: [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires

Way to the elevated section of the trail *circa* 2km to the south of the Site on Quainton Hill.

~~3.3.28~~-3.3.29. If the Proposed Development was developed in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), although each development on its own would result in a small commensurate increase in the geographic extent of construction activity, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.

~~3.3.29~~-3.3.30. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.3.30~~-3.3.31. If the Proposed Development was ~~developed~~ constructed in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), the magnitude of change in views would remain moderate/slight.

3.3.32. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) was developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the trail (particularly the value associated within it) is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

3.3.33. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were constructed in combination, there would be successive views of the two schemes from the western flank of Quainton Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be visible in sequential views between Quainton and Waddesdon over approximately 3.5km of the route. During construction, there would be further medium scale effects experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

~~3.3.31~~-3.3.34. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is developed in combination with Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has

been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the trail users (particularly the value associated with it) is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

~~3.3.32.~~—There would be no further increase in the magnitude of effect should all of the cumulative schemes be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction. Effects would therefore remain moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be **significant**, should all of the cumulative schemes be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way.

~~3.3.33-3.3.35.~~ The potential sequential cumulative views experienced to the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way are very limited. There would be potential views of ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) to the north of Parcel 3, however these would not be extensive and would be well separated from views of the Proposed Development. Similarly, there would be potential views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) to the south of Hogshaw Road to the south of Parcel 3, however, again these would not be extensive and would be well separated from views of the Proposed Development. It is therefore considered that these sequential cumulative effects would not add substantively to the experience of users of the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way and construction effects would remain as described above.

Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring

~~3.3.34-3.3.36.~~ The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring.

~~3.3.35-3.3.37.~~ With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the Proposed Development would be seen at Viewpoints 30 and 31 from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring. In the case of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), there would be no views in combination with the Proposed Development other than the distant views from Quainton Hill.

~~3.3.36-3.3.38.~~ In the case of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), each development on its own would be viewed in close proximity to the

Proposed Development. In each case, although there would be a small commensurate increase in the extent of construction activity, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.

~~3.3.37-3.3.39.~~ 3.3.39. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.3.38-3.3.40.~~ 3.3.40. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~3.3.39-3.3.41.~~ 3.3.41. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were developed in combination, the scale of effects would increase somewhat as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) from the elevated views from Quainton Hill. However, the large to medium scale effects experienced over a limited extent of this receptor group would remain, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

3.3.42. The sensitivity of this receptor group has been assessed to be high/medium. Therefore, during construction, there would be a moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be **not significant**.

3.3.43. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were constructed in combination, there would be some potential increase in successive views of the two schemes from the higher elevations of Quainton Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be visible in sequential views between Quainton and Waddesdon over approximately 3.5km of the routes. There would be large to medium scale effects experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

~~3.3.40-3.3.44.~~ 3.3.44. Therefore, during construction, there would be a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the extent of the trail that would experience large scale change would be limited. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect major/moderate effect than a major/moderate effect.

~~3.3.41-3.3.45.~~ There would be no further increase in the magnitude of effect, ~~over that of combined views with ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm),~~ should all of the cumulative schemes be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction. Effects would therefore remain moderate ~~/minor~~ adverse ~~residual effect~~ for this receptor group, which is considered to be **not significant**, ~~as described above should all of the cumulative schemes be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring.~~

Bernwood Jubilee Way

~~3.3.42-3.3.46.~~ The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the Bernwood Jubilee Way to within Parcel 2. Whilst the ZTV illustrates potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) cumulative effects would primarily be experienced sequentially along this route.

~~3.3.43-3.3.47.~~ As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

~~3.3.44-3.3.48.~~ With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 10 and 11, which are representative of users of the Bernwood Jubilee Way.

~~3.3.45-3.3.49.~~ It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** during construction that the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.3.46-3.3.50.~~ Although both ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be potentially visible in combination with the Proposed Development, they would not result in any greater scale or extent of views over and above those experienced as a result of the near distance views of the Proposed Development.

~~3.3.47-3.3.51.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the scale of change in the professional

opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

3.3.52. If the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were constructed in combination, there would be some potential increase in successive views of the two schemes from the higher elevations of Finemere Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be visible in sequential views between Finemere Hill and Waddesdon over approximately 5km of the route. In spite of this, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude of effect as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.

3.3.53. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) was constructed in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, again considered to be **significant**.

~~3.3.48.~~3.3.54. Similarly, if ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were ~~developed~~ constructed in combination with the Proposed Development ~~during operation~~, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

~~3.3.49.~~ ~~The potential sequential cumulative views experienced to the Bernwood Jubilee Way are very limited. There would be potential views of ID No. 8 (East West Rail) to the east of Steeple Claydon, however these would not be extensive and would be well separated from views of the Proposed Development. It is therefore considered that these sequential cumulative effects would not add substantively to the experience of users of the Bernwood Jubilee Way and construction effects would remain as described above.~~

PRoW between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood

~~3.3.50.~~3.3.55. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the PRoW between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood to within Parcel 2. Whilst the ZTV illustrates potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) it would not add substantively to the experience of users of these footpaths, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.

~~3.3.51.~~3.3.56. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be

the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

~~3.3.52-3.3.57.~~ With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 10 and 11, which are representative of users of the PRoW between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood.

~~3.3.53-3.3.58.~~ It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a major/moderate adverse residual effect, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.3.54-3.3.59.~~ Although both ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) development would be potentially visible in combination with the Proposed Development, they would not result in any greater scale or extent of views over and above those experienced as a result of the near distance views of the Proposed Development.

~~3.3.55-3.3.60.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**.

~~3.3.56-3.3.61.~~ Similarly, if ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development during operation, inter-project cumulative effects would remain as described above.

PRoW between East Claydon Road/East Claydon and within Parcel 3

~~3.3.57-3.3.62.~~ The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from this receptor group. Whilst ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) demonstrate a minor degree of visibility, any views would be heavily filtered and primarily set behind either the existing National Grid East Claydon Substation or the Proposed Development. Any combined effects with ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ~~and~~ ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would therefore not add substantively to those of the Proposed Development on its own.

~~3.3.58-3.3.63.~~ 3.3.63. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as the ZTVs indicate. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

~~3.3.59-3.3.64.~~ 3.3.64. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 21-25, which are representative of users of local footpaths (including ECL/3/1, ECL/3A/1, ECL/3/2, ECL/4/1, ECL/4/2, ECL/5/1, ECL/6/1), which extend east to west through Parcel 3.

~~3.3.60-3.3.65.~~ 3.3.65. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same footpaths to the east of East Claydon at distances of at least 1.9km. Although ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would extend the view of construction activity to within the wider landscape it would be viewed at considerable distance and partially screened and filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.

~~3.3.61-3.3.66.~~ 3.3.66. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

~~3.3.62-3.3.67.~~ 3.3.67. If both the Proposed development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were developed in combination, the moderate effects would remain, in spite of a small increase in the extent of construction activity to within views from the eastern edge of the Botolph Claydon.

~~3.3.63-3.3.68.~~ 3.3.68. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is developed in combination with Proposed Development, during construction, cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the scale of change in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

~~3.3.64-3.3.69.~~ 3.3.69. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be potentially visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same footpaths that extend from East Claydon to the west of the Site. Although ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would potentially extend the view of BESS to within the wider landscape it would be viewed with the Proposed Development in the foreground and hence would be subservient to it. There would, therefore, be no substantive increase in scale of view experienced during construction as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.

~~3.3.65-3.3.70.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

~~3.3.66-3.3.71.~~ If the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were developed in combination, the large to medium scale effects would extend further north to Winslow Road/East Claydon Road. Large scale effects would therefore extend over a wide area of this receptor group, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

~~3.3.67-3.3.72.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be major/moderate adverse, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

PRoW between East Claydon Road/Parcel 3 and Hogshaw Road/Granborough

~~3.3.68-3.3.73.~~ The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ~~and~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from this receptor group. It is noted that the ZTVs for both ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) suggest a very limited degree of visibility to the north western extents of Granborough; however, it is considered that any such views would be screened, or heavily filtered by, intervening vegetation and are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects. Similarly, any combined effects with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be at considerable distance and would not add substantively to those of the Proposed Development on its own, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.

~~3.3.69-3.3.74.~~ The cumulative ZTV presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggests that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would not be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development, with any substantive views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) limited to the southern extents of Granborough from where the Proposed Development is screened by landform. There would therefore be no additional cumulative effects on this receptor group as a result of both schemes being constructed simultaneously.

~~3.3.70-3.3.75.~~ With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 26 and 28, which is representative of views from the footpath network (including HOG/6/1, GRA1/1, GRA/1/2, GRA/2/1, GRA/2/2, GRA/3/1, GRA/3/2, GRA/4/1, GRA/10/1, GRA/11/1, WIS/1/2) on rising land approximately 1.2km to the east of the Proposed Development.

~~3.3.71-3.3.76.~~ ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be visible in combined and sequential views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of up to 0.7km to the west. Views of construction effects would therefore extend over a wider extent of the receptor group, albeit views would be partially filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.

~~3.3.72-3.3.77.~~ It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction the Proposed Development on its own would result in medium to small scale of change in views over an intermediate extent of these routes resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

~~3.3.73-3.3.78.~~ If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were developed in combination, the scale of effects would inevitably increase across the receptor group during construction. Therefore, large to medium scale effects would be experienced over an intermediate extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

~~3.3.74-3.3.79.~~ Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the scale of change in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

PRoW and roads between Steeple Claydon/Queen Catherine Road and Calvert Road

~~3.3.75-3.3.80.~~ The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** demonstrate that there would be no theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from this receptor group. **The cumulative ZTV presented in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8a: Cumulative ZTV – Littleton Manor Farm – Bare Earth [EN010158/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-046] and ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8b: Cumulative ZTV – Littleton Manor Farm – Screening**

[EN010158/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-046] demonstrates some potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm). However, any cumulative effects would be very limited and viewed at considerable distance, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.

3.3.76-3.3.81. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be seen at Viewpoints 7, 38 and 39, which are representative of the footpaths and footways (including SCL/7/1, SCL/7/2, SCL/8/1, SCL/8/2, SCL/8/3, SCL/8/4, SCL/9/1, SCL/9/3, MCL/10/1, MCL/10/2, Addison Road) which extend to the south of Steeple Claydon towards Parcel 1.

3.3.77-3.3.82. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group, bringing construction activity potentially closer to the receptor group.

3.3.78-3.3.83. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during construction, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group, which is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

3.3.79-3.3.84. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of construction from the footpath network to the south of Steeple Claydon during construction. Therefore, medium/small scale effects would be experienced over an intermediate extent of this receptor group, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect.

3.3.80-3.3.85. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development during construction, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate/minor adverse, which is considered to be **not significant**.

4. Assessment of inter-project cumulative effects during operation (including maintenance)

4.1. Inter-project cumulative landscape effects

Effect on LCT 5: Shallow Valleys

- 4.1.1. The cumulative ZTV plans showing the extent of cumulative visibility with the Proposed is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.3-17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. There would be likely inter-project cumulative landscape effects as a result of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID no.5 (HS2), ID No. 8 (East West Rail), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) developments to within LCT 5: Shallow Valleys.
- 4.1.2. The short sections of ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) located within LCT 5 but would each only have a negligible inter-project cumulative effect in conjunction with the Proposed Development. They are therefore only considered within the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 5 in conjunction with all other existing development and/or approved developments. [Viewpoints 18-20 and 22-27, are representative of views from within LCT 5.](#)
- 4.1.3. The Proposed Development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are located in LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.4: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.
- 4.1.4. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCT 5 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park).
- 4.1.5. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site, reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a very limited extent of LCT 5 surrounding the Site.

- 4.1.6. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change therefore, extending the large/medium scale change within LCT 5 to the north of East Claydon Road by no more than 500m.
- 4.1.7. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.8. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 5 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.9. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further to the north of East Claydon Road, considered a limited extent of the total LCT 5 landscape as a whole.
- 4.1.10. Therefore, in the scenario that the ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 5, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.11. The Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) are located in LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.5: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.
- 4.1.12. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCT 5 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm).
- 4.1.13. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site,

reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a very limited extent of LCT 5 surrounding the Site.

- 4.1.14. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change therefore extending the large/medium scale change within LCT 5 to the 1.5km north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road and 1km east towards Winslow.
- 4.1.15. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.16. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 5 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.17. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further to the north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road and east towards Winslow, and would be considered a limited extent of the total LCT 5 landscape as a whole.
- 4.1.18. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 5, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.19. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCT 5 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm).
- 4.1.20. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m.

Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a very limited extent of LCT 5 surrounding the Site.

- 4.1.21. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change within LCT 5 to the south of Hogshaw Road.
- 4.1.22. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.23. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 5 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.24. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further to the south of Granborough Road, considered a limited extent of the total LCT 5 landscape as a whole.
- 4.1.25. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 5, there would be a minor adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.26. The Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.
- 4.1.27. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCT 5 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

- 4.1.28. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site, reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a very limited extent of LCT 5 surrounding the Site.
- 4.1.29. It is likely that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a marginally wider radius, in particular to the east of the Proposed Development towards Granborough, within LCT 5.
- 4.1.30. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.31. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 5 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.32. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further east towards Granborough; however, this would still remain a very limited extent of the total LCT 5 landscape as a whole.
- 4.1.33. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 5, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.34. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change within LCT 5 to the south of Quanton.
- 4.1.35. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a

similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.

- 4.1.36. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 5 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.37. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend to the south of Quainton to the full extents of the study area, considered a limited extent of the total LCT 5 landscape as a whole.
- 4.1.38. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 5, there would be a minor adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.39. In the scenario where the Proposed Development and the seven other existing development and/or approved developments identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination, the effects on LCT 5 would clearly be experienced over a wider area.
- 4.1.40. This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other and would likely be perceived as one development. In addition, although quite discrete in nature, both ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would increase the extents of development into the wider LCT 5. Whilst ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is somewhat more separated it too would add to the presence of solar energy development within LCT 5. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would clearly increase the extents of development to the south of Quainton from where it would be a notable feature. As identified above, whilst the type and scale of effects would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, they would extend over a wider area.

- 4.1.41. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the six other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.9: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.
- 4.1.42. It is likely that the eight other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects some 1.5km to the north, 5km to the north west, 1km to the east and 6km to the south and 5km to the south east, which is considered an intermediate extent of LCT 5, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.
- 4.1.43. Therefore, in the scenario that the eight other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 5, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the judgement of low sensitivity, in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

LCA 5.6 Claydon Valley

4.1.44. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) which is located in LCA 5.7, over 1km to the south of LCA 5.6. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.6, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, be very limited and it is considered that the any additional scale of change as a result of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be negligible over a very limited extent. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 7.5km. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of cumulative effects on LCA 5.6.

4.1.44.4.1.45. Viewpoints 23, 24 and 26 are representative of views from within LCA 5.6.

4.1.45.4.1.46. Field E10 of the Proposed Development and the entirety of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) are located in Landscape Character Area (LCA) 5.6: Claydon Valley. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed

Development and the ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.4 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

4.1.46-4.1.47. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.6 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park).

4.1.47-4.1.48. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site, reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a limited extent of LCA 5.6.

4.1.48-4.1.49. It is likely that ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change within LCA 5.6 to the north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road by *circa* 1km.

4.1.49-4.1.50. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.50-4.1.51. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.6 which extends to a maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.51-4.1.52. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) were operational in combination, the large to medium scale change would extend *circa* 1km further to the north of East Claydon Road, considered a localised extent of the total LCA 5.6 landscape as a whole, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect.

4.1.52-4.1.53. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.6, during operation there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.53-4.1.54. Field E10 of the Proposed Development and the entirety of ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) are located in LCA 5.6. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**.

4.1.54-4.1.55. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.6 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm).

4.1.55-4.1.56. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site, reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 750m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over a very limited extent of LCA 5.6 surrounding the Site.

4.1.56-4.1.57. It is likely that ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change within LCA 5.6 to *circa* 1.5km to the north of Winslow Road/East Claydon Road and 1km east towards Winslow.

4.1.57-4.1.58. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.58-4.1.59. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.6 which extends to a

maximum of 750m from the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

~~4.1.59~~4.1.60. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the large to medium scale change would extend approximately 1.5km to the north and 1km to the east of the Proposed Development, considered a localised extent of the LCA 5.6 landscape as a whole, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect.

~~4.1.60~~4.1.61. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.6, there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~4.1.61~~4.1.62. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is located to the northern boundary of LCA 5.6 and would have no intervisibility with the Proposed Development. It is likely to extend the perception of built form, activity and movement to within the landscape to the north of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) to within the northern extents of LCA 5.6.

~~4.1.62~~4.1.63. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were operational in combination, the minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would increase over a limited extent of the total LCA 5.6 landscape.

~~4.1.63~~4.1.64. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.6, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~4.1.64~~4.1.65. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the south of LCA 5.6. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.6, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, be very limited.

~~4.1.65~~4.1.66. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, this minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would extend further east towards Granborough; however, this would still remain a limited extent of the total LCA 5.6 landscape as a whole.

4.1.66-4.1.67. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.6, there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.67-4.1.68. In the scenario where the Proposed Development and the four other existing development and/or approved developments identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects on LCA 5.6 would clearly be experienced over a wider area.

4.1.68-4.1.69. This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other and would likely be perceived as one development. As identified above, whilst the type and scale of effects would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, they would extend over a wider area.

4.1.69-4.1.70. It is likely that the four other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects some 1.5km to the north, 1km to the east and 0.5km to the west, which is considered an intermediate extent of LCA 5.6, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is well separated and would not add to the presence of solar energy development within LCA 5.6

4.1.70-4.1.71. Therefore, in the scenario that the four other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.6, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the judgement of low sensitivity, in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands

4.1.71-4.1.72. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments from within LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the two renewable energy developments is presented in **ES Volume 3**,

Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 4.5km. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 5.7.

4.1.73. The proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is located in LCA 5.7 approximately 1km to the south of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.6, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, be very limited.

4.1.72-4.1.74. Viewpoints 18-20, 22, 25 and 27 are representative of views from within LCA 5.7.

4.1.73-4.1.75. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.7 to the Proposed Development is medium/low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm).

4.1.74-4.1.76. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in large to medium scale change to landscape character within the Order Limits and surrounding the Site reducing to small scale change beyond a maximum distance of 500m. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that large or medium scale change would remain over an intermediate extent of LCA 5.6 surrounding the Site.

4.1.75-4.1.77. It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the large/medium scale change *circa* 1 to 2.5km within LCA 5.7 to the south of Hogshaw Road to Marston Road.

4.1.76-4.1.78. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar

Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.77-4.1.79. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.7 which extends to a maximum of 500m from the Site and this is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.78-4.1.80. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the large to medium scale change would extend to the south of Hogshaw Road to Marston Road, considered a wide extent of the total LCA 5.7 landscape as a whole, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.

4.1.79-4.1.81. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.7, there would be a moderate adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate rather than moderate/minor effect.

4.1.80-4.1.82. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Although this shows a degree of visibility to within LCA 5.7, it is noted that extensive field study has shown that visibility would, in fact, be very limited.

4.1.81-4.1.83. It is likely that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a marginally wider radius, in particular to the east of the Proposed Development towards Granborough, within LCA 5.7 considered an intermediate (tending towards wide) extent of the LCA 5.7 landscape as a whole.

4.1.82-4.1.84. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed

around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.83-4.1.85. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.7 which extends to a maximum of 500m from the Site and this is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.84-4.1.86. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, this would give rise to a broadly similar large to medium scale of landscape change over a radius extending *circa* 0.5km further to the east towards Granborough, considered an intermediate (tending towards wide) extent of the LCA 5.7, resulting in substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.

4.1.85-4.1.87. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.7, during operation there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

4.1.86-4.1.88. This is particularly the case where the National Grid East Claydon Substation development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are located in close vicinity to each other and would likely be perceived as one development. As identified above, whilst the type and scale of effects would be similar to those identified for the Proposed Development on a *solus* basis, they would extend over a wider area.

4.1.87-4.1.89. It is likely that the three other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a wider radius, extending the large and medium scale effects some 0.5km to the north, 2.5km to the south and 0.5km to the east, which is considered a wide extent of LCA 5.7, resulting in a substantial magnitude of effect.

4.1.88-4.1.90. Therefore, in the scenario that the three other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.7 there would be a major/moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

LCA 5.8: North Marston Undulating Claylands

4.1.89.4.1.91. There is not anticipated to be any intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments from within LCA 5.8: North Marston Undulating Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the two renewable energy developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), which although likely to be visible in part, would be viewed intermittently at distances of at least 3.5km. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 5.8.

4.1.92. The proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is located in the neighbouring LCA 5.7 approximately 1km to the south of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows a similar degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 5.8, particularly towards its western boundary.

4.1.90.4.1.93. Viewpoints 28, 29 and 32 are representative of views from within LCA 5.8.

4.1.91.4.1.94. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.8 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm).

4.1.92.4.1.95. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in a medium to small scale change to LCA 5.8 over a localised extent of land up to 1.2km to the east of Parcel 3. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that a medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of LCA 5.8.

4.1.93.4.1.96. It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a similar, localised, extent of LCA 5.8 as evidenced by the ZTV, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect.

- 4.1.94.4.1.97. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.95.4.1.98. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.8 which extends over a localised extent and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.1.96.4.1.99. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of the total LCA 5.8 resulting in a slight magnitude of effect.
- 4.1.97.4.1.100. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.8, there would be a minor adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.1.98.4.1.101. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows a similar degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 5.8, particularly towards its western boundary.
- 4.1.99.4.1.102. It is likely that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a similar, localised, extent of LCA 5.8 as evidenced by the ZTV.
- 4.1.100.4.1.103. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 5.8 to the Proposed Development is low. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).
- 4.1.101.4.1.104. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in a medium scale change

to LCA 5.8 over a localised extent of land up to 1.2km to the east of Parcel 3. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that a medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of LCA 5.8.

4.1.102-4.1.105. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.103-4.1.106. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 5.8 which extends over a localised extent and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.104-4.1.107. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of the total LCA 5.8 resulting in a slight magnitude of effect.

4.1.105-4.1.108. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 5.8, during operation there would be a minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.106-4.1.109. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) development, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination, the scale of effects on LCA 5.8 would remain broadly similar.

4.1.107-4.1.110. It is likely that the three other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change over a similar, localised, extent of LCA 5.8.

4.1.108-4.1.111. Therefore, in the scenario that the three other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 5.8, there would be a minor adverse inter-project

cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**.

LCT 7: Wooded Rolling Lowlands

4.1.112. There is not anticipated to be ~~any~~ substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from within LCT 7: Wooded Rolling Lowlands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4, 17.5 and 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be small to negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 7.

4.1.109.4.1.113. Viewpoints 1-14, 17, 21, 35, 36, 38-40 and 42 are representative of views from within LCT 7.

4.1.110.4.1.114. Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are located within LCT 7 to the south and north of Parcels 1 and 2 respectively. It is likely that both ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, reinforcing the perception of built form, activity and movement to the landscape within the vicinity of Parcel 1 and extending it somewhat to the south east of Parcel 2.

4.1.111.4.1.115. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that in Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/minor residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCT 7 which extends to a maximum of 1km to the north of the Site and this is considered to be not significant on a solus basis.

4.1.112.4.1.116. If the Proposed Development and either ID no.5 (HS2) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination, the moderate/minor effect would extend in a discrete manner up to 3km to the south east of Parcel 2 and 3km to the north of Parcel 1 respectively. However, in each case the effects would remain over a limited extent of the LCT 7 landscape as a whole.

4.1.113.4.1.117. Therefore, in the scenario either ID no.5 (HS2) or ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 7, in Years 1 to 10 of operation

(including maintenance), there would be a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.114-4.1.118. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar extents of LCT 7 to its eastern boundary.

4.1.115-4.1.119. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the moderate/minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of LCT 7.

4.1.116-4.1.120. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually developed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCT 7 during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would remain a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.117-4.1.121. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), ID no.5 (HS2) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, localised extent of LCT 7.

4.1.118-4.1.122. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 7 during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the localised extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect.

LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl

4.1.119-4.1.123. There is not anticipated to be ~~any~~ substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener

Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from within LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing development and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4, 17.5 and 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential inter-project cumulative effects would be small to negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 7.3.

4.1.124. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is located in LCA 7.3 and runs in a broadly east to west direction, approximately 0.9km to the north of the Proposed Development in Parcel 1 at its closest point. Viewpoints 7, 38 and 39 illustrate the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail).

4.1.120-4.1.125. Viewpoints 1-14, 21, 38-40 and 42 are representative of views from within LCA 7.3.

4.1.121-4.1.126. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 7.3 to the Proposed Development is medium. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to ID No. 8 (East West Rail) development.

4.1.122-4.1.127. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in a medium scale change to landscape character up to 1km to the north of Parcel 1 reducing to small scale change beyond this. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that medium scale change would remain over an intermediate extent of LCA 7.3 surrounding the Site.

4.1.123-4.1.128. It is likely that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, reinforcing the perception of built form, activity and movement to within the landscape between Parcel 1 and Steeple Claydon.

4.1.124-4.1.129. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 8 (East West Rail). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore

been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.125.4.1.130. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 7.3 which extends to a maximum of 1km from the Site and this is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.126.4.1.131. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would remain to between the north of Calvert Road and Steeple Claydon, considered an intermediate extent of the total LCA 7.3 landscape as a whole.

4.1.127.4.1.132. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 7.3, during operation there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect (particularly the extent of the effect) is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

4.1.128.4.1.133. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located to within the neighbouring LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these schemes is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6-17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In both cases, potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar localised extents of LCA 7.3 to its eastern boundary.

4.1.129.4.1.134. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 7.3 to the Proposed Development is medium. Given the proximity and similar scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

4.1.130.4.1.135. It has been assessed that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in and large to medium scale effects on landscape character during Year 1 operation (including maintenance) within LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl to the immediate environs of the Proposed Development. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely

that Large to medium scale change would remain over an intermediate extent of LCA 7.3.

4.1.131-4.1.136. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, this large to medium scale effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of the LCA 7.3 resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect.

4.1.132-4.1.137. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are each operational individually in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCA 7.3, there would remain a moderate adverse cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect.

4.1.133-4.1.138. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination, the effects on LCA 7.3 would remain of a similar scale.

4.1.134-4.1.139. Therefore, in the scenario that the four other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 7.3 during Years 1 to 10 of operation, there would remain a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

LCT 9: Low Hills and Ridges

4.1.140. There is not anticipated to be any substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from within LCT 9: Low Hills and Ridges. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between these developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, all of these developments are situated at greater distance from the AAL and behind the Proposed Development and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 9.

4.1.135-4.1.141. Viewpoints 15, 16, 30, 31, 34, 41 and 43 are representative of views from within LCT 9.

4.1.136-4.1.142. Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) are located within adjacent LCT to the south of Parcels 1 and 2 but would be in cutting and would share very limited intervisibility with the Proposed Development. ID no.5 (HS2) is therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCT 9.

4.1.137-4.1.143. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar extents of LCT 9.

4.1.138-4.1.144. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the moderate/minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of LCT 9.

4.1.139-4.1.145. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually developed in combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to LCT 9 during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would remain a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

4.1.140-4.1.146. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A Cumulative ZTV showing the extent of cumulative intervisibility with the Proposed Development is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) with the Proposed Development would increase the extents over which medium scale effects were experienced over LCT 9 to the north of Quainton.

4.1.141-4.1.147. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further to the north of Quainton and Waddeston and south of Oving but would ~~still~~ amount to a localis~~imited~~ extent of the total LCT 9.

4.1.142-4.1.148. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) ~~ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm)~~ is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCT 9, there would be a moderate/~~minor~~ adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and

Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the limited extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect.

4.1.143.4.1.149. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, although still limited extent of LCT 9, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

4.1.144.4.1.150. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCT 9 during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the limited extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect.

LCA 9.2: Quainton Hill

4.1.145.4.1.151. The primary intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are most likely to be with Parcel 3 from within LCA 9.2: Quainton Hill. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the four renewable energy developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. As well as being substantially less intervisible with Parcel 2 of the Proposed Development, ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) developments are all situated behind the Proposed Development and at greater distance of separation from LCA 9.2. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, intervening hedgerow boundaries and woodland belts would limit any potential visibility, and the scale of any potential additional inter-project cumulative effects would be minor/negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on LCA 9.2.

- 4.1.146-4.1.152.** A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]** with intervisibility extending to both Parcels 2 and 3 of the Proposed Development.
- 4.1.147-4.1.153.** The proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is located in the neighbouring LCA 5.7 approximately 1km to the south of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows a degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 9.2.
- 4.1.148-4.1.154.** It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 9.2 to the Proposed Development is medium. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the type of development proposed at ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm).
- 4.1.149-4.1.155.** It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in at most medium scale change to LCA 9.2 over a localised extent of land up to 2-2.5km to the south of Parcel 3. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that a medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of LCA 9.2.
- 4.1.150-4.1.156.** It is likely that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the medium scale change within LCA 5.8 to between Hogshaw Road and Granborough Road.
- 4.1.151-4.1.157.** Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.1.152-4.1.158.** It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2 which extends over

a localised extent and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.153-4.1.159. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further towards Granborough Road but would still amount to a localised extent of the total LCA 9.2, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

4.1.154-4.1.160. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 9.2, there would be a moderate adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant, as the effects would be experienced to a localised extent and at distances of 2km or more which is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating.

4.1.155-4.1.161. The proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is located in LCA 5.7 immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows a degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 9.2.

4.1.156-4.1.162. It is likely that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, in particular to the east of the Proposed Development towards Granborough, within LCA 5.7.

4.1.157-4.1.163. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 9.2 to the Proposed Development is medium. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

4.1.158-4.1.164. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2. Following the establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that a medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of LCA 9.2.

4.1.159-4.1.165. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, therefore extending the medium scale change within LCA 5.7 to between Hogshaw Road and Granborough.

4.1.160-4.1.166. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

4.1.161-4.1.167. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2 which extends over a localised extent and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

4.1.162-4.1.168. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further towards Granborough Road but would still amount to a localised extent of the total LCA 9.2, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

4.1.163-4.1.169. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 9.2, during operation there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be, as described above, **not significant**.

4.1.164-4.1.170. The proposed ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is located in LCA 5.9 immediately to the south of LCA 9.2. A cumulative ZTV plan showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. This shows a degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development to within LCA 9.2 to the higher elevations of the landscape and to ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) alone to the south facing slopes.

4.1.165-4.1.171. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that the sensitivity of LCA 9.2 to the Proposed Development is medium. Given the proximity and similarities in terms of scale and nature of the infrastructure, this judgement applies equally to the proposed ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm).

4.1.166-4.1.172. It has been assessed that initially (in Year 1 of operation) the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2. Following the

establishment of mitigation planting (Year 10), the scale of landscape change would be less than in Year 1, but it is likely that a medium scale change would remain over a localised extent of LCA 9.2.

~~4.1.167~~4.1.173. It is likely that the proposed ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would give rise to a broadly similar scale of landscape change, with combined effects therefore extending the medium scale change within LCA 9.2 to the southern extents of Quainton Hill.

~~4.1.168~~4.1.174. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.

~~4.1.169~~4.1.175. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate residual adverse effect on landscape character within LCA 9.2 which extends over a localised extent and this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.

~~4.1.170~~4.1.176. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further to the north of Quainton and would amount to an intermediate extent of the total LCA 9.2, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect.

~~4.1.171~~4.1.177. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to LCA 9.2, during operation there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the increased extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating.

~~4.1.172~~4.1.178. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination, the medium scale effects on LCA 9.2, would be experienced over a wider geographic area.

~~4.1.173~~4.1.179. It is likely that the four other existing development and/or approved developments in combination with the Proposed Development

would give rise to a medium scale of landscape change over an intermediate extent of LCA 9.2, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect.

4.1.174-4.1.180. Therefore, in the scenario that the four other existing development and/or approved developments are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within LCA 9.2, there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

Quanton-Wing Hills AAL

4.1.175-4.1.181. There is not anticipated to be any substantial intervisibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from within Quanton-Wing Hills AAL. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between these developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.5 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. In spite of the potential intervisibility illustrated by these ZTVs, all of these developments are situated at greater distance from the AAL and behind the Proposed Development and the scale of any additional potential inter-project cumulative effects would be negligible. ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on the AAL.

4.1.176-4.1.182. Sections of ID no.5 (HS2) are located to the south of the AAL but would be in cutting and would share very limited intervisibility with the Proposed Development. ID no.5 (HS2) is therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects on the AAL.

4.1.177-4.1.183. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are both located within neighbouring landscapes. Cumulative ZTVs showing the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and these other existing developments and/or approved developments is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) with the Proposed Development would be limited to similar extents of AAL.

4.1.178-4.1.184. In each case, if both the Proposed Development and either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the moderate/minor adverse effect on existing landscape character would remain to the same extent of the AAL.

4.1.179-4.1.185. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were each individually developed in

combination with the Proposed Development, with regard to the AAL during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would remain a moderate/minor adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**.

~~4.1.180.~~4.1.186. ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is located within the neighbouring LCT 5: Shallow Valleys. A Cumulative ZTV showing the extent of cumulative intervisibility with the Proposed Development is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]**. Potential intervisibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) with the Proposed Development would increase the extents over which medium scale effects were experienced over the AAL ~~to the north of Quainton~~.

~~4.1.181.~~4.1.187. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale change would extend somewhat further to the north of Quainton and Waddeston and south of Oving ~~but and~~ would ~~still~~ amount to a localis~~imited~~ extent of the total the AAL.

~~4.1.182.~~4.1.188. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the AAL, there would be a moderate/~~minor~~ adverse cumulative residual effect in both Year 1 and Year 10 which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the limited extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect.

~~4.1.183.~~4.1.189. In the scenario where the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) identified above, together with the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are developed in combination, the effects would remain of a similar scale over a somewhat larger, although still localis~~imited~~ extent of the AAL, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.

~~4.1.184.~~4.1.190. Therefore, in the scenario that the five other existing development and/or approved developments were developed in combination with the Proposed Development, and with regard to the landscape within the AAL during Years 1 to 10 of operation (including maintenance), there would be a moderate adverse inter-project cumulative residual effect which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the limited extent of the effect is judged to have a defining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect.

4.2. Inter-project cumulative visual effects

Residential properties

- 4.2.1. An RVAA has been undertaken and the detailed findings are presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]**. This assessment of cumulative visual effects focuses only on those properties from where the addition of other existing development and/or approved developments could potentially add to such effects.

Sion Hill Farm

- 4.2.2. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from Sion Hill Farm. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).
- 4.2.3. Whilst it is noted that the ZTV suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), any potentially glimpsed views would be viewed in the context of the existing East Claydon National Grid Substation and the Proposed Development and would not add to the scale of inter-project cumulative effect.
- 4.2.4. Both ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from Sion House. Although it would extend the view of renewable energy infrastructure to within the wider landscape it would appear subservient to the Proposed Development, being partially screened and filtered by the Proposed Development in Parcel 3 together with intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 4.2.5. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a major adverse residual effect for this receptor in Year 1, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis. By Year 10 the long term effect was assessed as major/moderate adverse and significant (with principal views from first floor windows).
- 4.2.6. If both the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the major effects would remain in Year 1, in spite of a small increase in the geographic area of renewable energy infrastructure to within views.

- 4.2.7. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.8. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.9. If the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were operational in combination, the effects described above would remain as the main influence in terms of scale of effects would be the Proposed Development.
- 4.2.10. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be major adverse at Year 1 and major/moderate adverse at Year 10, both of which are considered to be **significant**.

Station House

- 4.2.11. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from Station House.
- 4.2.12. Whilst it is noted that the ZTV suggests a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the four renewable energy developments, any potentially glimpsed views would be either viewed in the context of the existing East Claydon National Grid Substation or would be heavily screened and filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation. No further assessment of these potential cumulative receptors has therefore been undertaken.
- 4.2.13. **Significant** inter-project cumulative effects as a result of the scenario that the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were operational

in combination with the Proposed Development are reported in **Section 17.6**.

Settlements

Botolph Claydon

- 4.2.14. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Botolph Claydon. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). Although this would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) any limited and intermittent visibility would be at distances of at least 6km and it is therefore not considered further in the assessment.
- 4.2.15. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 13 and 40, which are representative of residents, users of Botyl Road/Saint Mary's Road and the footway (including ECL/11/1, ECL/11/2, ECL/11/3, ECL/11/4) to within the settlement which make up this receptor group.
- 4.2.16. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same residential properties, roads and footpaths at distances of at least 2.3km to the east of view. Although ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would extend the view of Solar PV modules to within the wider landscape it would be viewed at considerable distance and partially screened and filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 4.2.17. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.18. If both the Proposed development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the medium scale effects would remain, in spite of a small increase in the geographical extent of Solar PV modules to within views from the southern and eastern edges of the Botolph Claydon. In Year 1 therefore, medium scale effects would therefore extend over a localised area of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

- 4.2.19. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1, which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.
- 4.2.20. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.21. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects it is there would therefore be a medium/small scale of change over a limited extent and a small scale change over a localised extent of the receptor group, resulting in a moderate slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.22. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.2.23. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be potentially visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same residential properties, roads and footpaths at distances of at least 1.6km to the east of view. Although ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would potentially extend the view of BESS to within the wider landscape, it would be viewed at considerable distance and always beyond the Proposed Development. In views from Botolph Claydon, ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would either be screened by, or subservient to, the Proposed Development, with the latter in the foreground and hence there would be no substantive increase in scale of view experienced at either Year 1 or Year 10 as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.24. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 1 and 10 and **not significant** in both cases, as described above.
- 4.2.25. If the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development were operational in combination, the medium

scale effects would remain, in spite of a relatively small increase in the extent of Solar PV modules and BESS to within views from the southern and eastern edges of the Botolph Claydon. In Year 1 therefore, medium scale effects would extend over a localised area of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

- 4.2.26. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be, as described above, **not significant**.
- 4.2.27. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects it is therefore considered at Year 10 there would be a medium/small scale of change over a limited extent and a small scale change over a localised extent of the receptor group, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.28. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be, as described above, **not significant**.

Granborough

- 4.2.29. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4, 17.5 and 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Granborough. It is noted that the ZTVs for both ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) suggest a very limited degree of visibility to the north western extents of Granborough; however, it is considered that any such views would most likely be limited to first floor views screened or heavily filtered by intervening vegetation and they are therefore not reported on further.
- 4.2.30. The cumulative ZTV presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggests that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would not be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development, with any substantive views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) limited to the southern extents of Granborough from where the Proposed Development is screened by landform. This would also be the case for ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) any limited and intermittent visibility would be at distances of at least 7.5km. There would therefore be no additional cumulative effects on this receptor group as a result of both schemes being operational simultaneously.

- 4.2.31. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoint 28, which is representative of views from the western edge of the settlement and the footpath network (including GRA/10/1) on rising land approximately 1.2km to the east of the Proposed Development.
- 4.2.32. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of *circa* 0.7km to the west of view. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would therefore extend the view of BESS to within the landscape considerably closer to the receptor group, albeit views would be partially filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 4.2.33. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.34. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the western edge of Granborough. In Year 1 therefore, large to medium scale effects would be experienced over a limited extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.35. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be major/moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.
- 4.2.36. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.37. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects and the fact that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would somewhat increase the screening of the Proposed Development, there would therefore be a medium scale of

change over a limited extent of the receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

- 4.2.38. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

Steeple Claydon

- 4.2.39. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** demonstrate that there would be no theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the settlement of Steeple Claydon. Although there would potentially be some limited visibility of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) any potential views would be at distances over 9km and it is therefore not considered further in the assessment.
- 4.2.40. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be seen at Viewpoints 7 and 38, which is representative of views from the southern edge of the settlement and the footpath network (including SCL/9/1 and the permissive footpath) on rising land approximately 1.5km to the north of the Proposed Development.
- 4.2.41. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of *circa* 0.7km to the south, bringing a cumulative receptor potentially closer to the receptor group. The main effect on views would be derived from the movement of trains within the view, albeit the railway line and associated electrical infrastructure would have some lesser effects.
- 4.2.42. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.43. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) were operational in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of the operational ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from the southern edge of Steeple Claydon. In Year 1 therefore, medium/small

scale effects would be experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group.

- 4.2.44. By Year 10 the scale of visual change would remain medium/small. This would be experienced over a long term duration and would result in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.
- 4.2.45. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1 and 10, which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case, the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

Users of recreational routes

North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way

- 4.2.46. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way.
- 4.2.47. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the Proposed Development would be seen at Viewpoints 21, 22, 25, 27 and 29 from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way. In the case of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) there would be no or very limited views in combination with the Proposed Development other than the distant views from Quainton Hill. Any additional cumulative effects for these schemes would, therefore, only be experienced over a limited extent of the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way.
- 4.2.48. Locations from where there would be potential combined views with ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the Proposed Development are very limited, and in each case, views of ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be nominal and would not add to the *solus* effects of the Proposed Development. This assessment of the potential inter-project cumulative effects on the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way is therefore limited to longer distance views from Quainton Hill.
- 4.2.49. Potential in combination views with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be experienced over a somewhat greater extent of these trails from the

western flank of Quanton Hill, albeit at long distance and primarily in combination with Parcel 2 of the Proposed Development. In addition, users of these trails would also experience sequential effects along the route, with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) noticeable in views between Waddesdon and Quanton from where the views of the Proposed Development would effectively be screened by landform.

- 4.2.50. The potential for other sequential cumulative views experienced to the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way are very limited. There would be potential views of ID No. 8 (East West Rail) and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) to the north of Parcel 3, however these would be very limited and well separated from views of the Proposed Development. Similarly, there would be potential views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) to the south of Hogshaw Road to the south of Parcel 3, however, again these would not be extensive and would be well separated from views of the Proposed Development. It is therefore considered that these sequential cumulative effects would not add substantively to the experience of users of the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way and these sequential views are not considered further.
- 4.2.51. The cumulative ZTV presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way to the elevated section of the trail *circa* 2km to the south on Quanton Hill.
- 4.2.52. If the Proposed Development was developed in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), although there would be a small commensurate increase in the geographical extent of renewable energy development in each case, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.53. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/slight magnitude of change over a localised extent of the receptor, resulting in a moderate adverse residual effect in Year 1, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.54. If the Proposed Development were operational in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), the magnitude of change in views would remain moderate/slight in Year 1.

- 4.2.55. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) were operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 1, which is considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the trail (particularly the value associated with it) is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.
- 4.2.56. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to each of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the developments.
- 4.2.57. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects, there would therefore be a medium scale of change over a limited extent of the receptor group, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.58. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate/minor adverse at Year 10, which is considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.2.59. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) were operational in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) from Quainton Hill. In Year 1 therefore, there would be further large to medium scale effects experienced over a limited extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.60. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the trail users (particularly the value associated with it) is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.

- 4.2.61. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.62. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects, there would therefore be a medium/small scale of change over a limited extent of the receptor group, resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.63. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate/minor adverse at Year 10, considered to be **not significant**.
- 4.2.64. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, there would be successive views of the two schemes from the western flank of Quainton Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be visible in sequential views between Quainton and Waddesdon over approximately 3.5km of the route. In Year 1 therefore, there would be further medium scale effects experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.65. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the trail users (particularly the value associated with it) is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.
- 4.2.66. Additional mitigation secured by the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6] has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.

- 4.2.67. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects, there would therefore be a medium scale of change over a localised extent of the receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.68. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be remain moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be, as described above, **significant**.
- 4.2.69. There would be no further increase in the magnitude of effect should all of the other existing development and/or approved developments be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development from the North Buckinghamshire Way and Midshires Way. Effects would therefore remain moderate adverse at Year 1 and Year 10, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**, with the increase in significant effects at year 10 primarily as a result of the addition of ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm).

Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring

- 4.2.70. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.8: [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring.
- 4.2.71. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the Proposed Development would be seen at Viewpoints 30 and 31 from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring. In the case of ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 8 (East West Rail), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm), there would be no views in combination with the Proposed Development other than the distant views from Quainton Hill.
- 4.2.72. If the Proposed Development is operational in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), although there would be a small commensurate increase in the geographical extent of renewable energy development in each case, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude of effect as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.73. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate adverse residual effect

for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, this is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.

- 4.2.74. If the Proposed Development was developed in combination with either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), the magnitude of change in views would remain moderate/slight in Years 1 and 10.
- 4.2.75. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Years 1 and 10, considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the sensitivity of the receptor group is judged to have a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.
- 4.2.76. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) are operational in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) from the elevated views from Quainton Hill. In Year 1 therefore, there would be medium scale effects experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/slight effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.77. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** would result in the softening of views, however, the medium scale effects would remain at Year 10. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) was operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Years 1 to 10, considered to be, as described above, **significant**.
- 4.2.78. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, there would be some potential increase in successive views of the two schemes from the higher elevations of Quainton Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) -would be visible in sequential views between Quainton and Waddesdon over approximately 3.5km of the routes. In Year 1 therefore, there would be ~~further-large to~~ medium scale effects experienced over a localised extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate/~~slight~~ magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.79. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** would result in the softening of views, however, the ~~large to~~ medium scale effects would remain at Year 10. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) was operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Years 1 to 10, considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

- 4.2.80. There would be no further increase in the magnitude of effect should all of the other existing development and/or approved developments be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development. Effects would therefore remain moderate adverse at Years 1 to 10 (considered to be **significant**) should all of the other existing development and/or approved developments be viewed in combination with the Proposed Development from the Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring.

Bernwood Jubilee Way

- 4.2.81. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the Bernwood Jubilee Way to within Parcel 2. Whilst the ZTV illustrates potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) cumulative effects would primarily be experienced sequentially along this route.
- 4.2.82. Other potential sequential cumulative views experienced to the Bernwood Jubilee Way are very limited. There would be potential views of ID No. 8 (East West Rail) to the east of Steeple Claydon, however these would not be extensive and would be well separated from views of the Proposed Development. It is therefore considered that these sequential cumulative effects would not add substantively to the experience of users of the Bernwood Jubilee Way, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.83. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm).
- 4.2.84. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 10 and 11, which are representative of users of the Bernwood Jubilee Way.
- 4.2.85. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a major/moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, which is considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.86. If the Proposed Development is operational in combination with either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS), although there would be a small commensurate increase in the

geographical extent of renewable energy development in each case, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude of effect as a result of inter-project cumulative effects. ~~would potentially be visible in combination with the Proposed Development.~~

- 4.2.87. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, during operation inter-project cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse in Years 1 and 10, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.88. If the Proposed Development and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) were operational in combination, there would be some potential increase in successive views of the two schemes from the higher elevations of Finemere Hill. In addition, ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be visible in sequential views between Finemere Hill and Waddesdon over approximately 5km of the route. In spite of this, there would be no overall increase in scale or magnitude of effect as a result of inter-project cumulative effects. ~~would potentially be visible in combination with the Proposed Development.~~
- 4.2.89. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) was operational in combination with the Proposed Development, during operation inter-project cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse in Years 1 and 10, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.90. Similarly, if ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) are operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse in Years 1 and 10, which is considered to be **significant**.

PRoW between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood

- 4.2.91. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from the PRoW between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood to within Parcel 2. Whilst the ZTV illustrates potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) it would not add substantively to the experience of users of these footpaths, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.92. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

- 4.2.93. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 9, 10 and 11, which are representative of users of the PRow between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood.
- 4.2.94. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a major adverse residual effect in Year 1 and a major/moderate adverse residual effect in Year 10, considered to be significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.95. Although both ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) development would be potentially visible in combination with the Proposed Development, they would not individually result in any greater scale or extent of views over and above those experienced as a result of the near distance views of the Proposed Development.
- 4.2.96. Therefore, in the scenario that either ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain major adverse in Year 1 and a major/moderate adverse in Year 10, which is considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.97. Similarly, if both ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would remain as described above in Years 1 and 10.

PRow between East Claydon Road/East Claydon and within Parcel 3

- 4.2.98. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.6 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from this receptor group. Whilst ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) demonstrate a minor degree of visibility, any views would be heavily filtered and primarily set behind either the existing National Grid East Claydon Substation or the Proposed Development. Any combined effects with ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would therefore not add substantively to those of the Proposed Development on its own.
- 4.2.99. As reported in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**, actual visibility of the Proposed Development would not be as extensive as ZTVs. The same is likely to be the case in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS).

- 4.2.100. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the proposed ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 21-25, which are representative of users of local footpaths (including ECL/3/1, ECL/3A/1, ECL/3/2, ECL/4/1, ECL/4/2, ECL/5/1, ECL/6/1) which extend east to west through Parcel 3.
- 4.2.101. ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same footpaths to the east of East Claydon at distances of at least 1.9km. Although ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would extend the view of Solar PV modules to within the wider landscape it would be viewed at considerable distance and partially screened and filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 4.2.102. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a major/moderate adverse residual effect for this receptor group in Year 1 and moderate in Year 10, with both considered to be significant on a *solus* basis
- 4.2.103. If both the Proposed development and ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) are operational in combination, the medium scale effects would remain, in spite of a small increase in the geographical extent of Solar PV modules to within views from the eastern edge of the Botolph Claydon. In Year 1 therefore, large to medium scale effects would extend over an intermediate area of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.104. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.105. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.106. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects there would therefore be a medium to small scale of change over an intermediate extent of the receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

- 4.2.107. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) is operational in combination with Proposed Development, cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be **significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be significant as the scale and extent of change in the professional opinion of the assessor, tips the balance of significance closer towards a major/moderate effect than a moderate/minor effect.
- 4.2.108. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be potentially visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from the same footpaths that extend from East Claydon to the west of the Site. Although ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would potentially extend the view of BESS to within the wider landscape, it would be viewed with the Proposed Development in the foreground and hence would be subservient to it. There would therefore be no substantive increase in scale of view experienced at either Year 1 or Year 10 as a result of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.109. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain major/moderate adverse at Year 1 and moderate at Year 10, **significant** in both cases, as described above.
- 4.2.110. If the Proposed Development, ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination, the large to medium scale effects would extend further north to Winslow Road/East Claydon Road. In Year 1 large to medium scale effects would therefore extend over a wide area of this receptor group, resulting in a substantial/moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.111. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be major/moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.112. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects, it is therefore considered at Year 10 there would be a medium scale of change over a wide extent of the receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.113. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and the National Grid East Claydon Substation development are operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would remain moderate adverse at Year 10, which is considered to be, as described above, **significant**.

PRoW between East Claydon Road/Parcel 3 and Hogshaw Road/Granborough

- 4.2.114. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggest a degree of theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm), ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) and ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) from this receptor group. It is noted that the ZTVs for both ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park) and ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm) suggest a very limited degree of visibility to the north western extents of Granborough; however, it is considered that any such views would most likely be screened or heavily filtered by intervening vegetation and are therefore not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects. Similarly, any combined effects with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm) would be at considerable distance and would not add substantively to those of the Proposed Development on its own, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.
- 4.2.115. The cumulative ZTV presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.6 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** suggests that ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) would not be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development, with any substantive views of ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) limited to the southern extents of Granborough from where the Proposed Development is screened by landform. There would therefore be no additional cumulative effects on this receptor group as a result of both schemes being operational simultaneously.
- 4.2.116. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the proposed ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be seen at Viewpoints 26 and 28, which is representative of views from the footpath network (including HOG/6/1, GRA1/1, GRA/1/2, GRA/2/1, GRA/2/2, GRA/3/1, GRA/3/2, GRA/4/1, GRA/10/1, GRA/11/1, WIS/1/2) on rising land approximately 1.2km to the east of the Proposed Development.
- 4.2.117. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would be visible in combined and sequential views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group at distances of up to 0.7km to the west. ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would therefore extend the view of BESS to within the receptor group, albeit views would be partially filtered by intervening field boundary vegetation.
- 4.2.118. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in medium to small scale of change in views over an intermediate extent of these routes in Years 1-10 resulting in a slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.

- 4.2.119. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) are operational in combination, the scale of effects would inevitably increase across the receptor group. In Year 1 therefore, large to medium scale effects would be experienced over an intermediate extent of this receptor group, resulting in a moderate magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.120. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, during operation inter-project cumulative effects would be major/moderate adverse at Year 1, considered to be **significant**.
- 4.2.121. Additional mitigation secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6]** has been proposed for the Proposed Development. It is assumed that a similar commitment would be agreed in relation to ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS). It is further assumed that any landscape mitigation proposals implemented around ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would mature over approximately the same timeframe as that proposed around the Proposed Development. No further additional mitigation has therefore been proposed to mitigate inter-project cumulative effects between the two developments.
- 4.2.122. Based on a similar level of mitigation effects and the fact that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) would increase the screening of the Proposed Development, there would therefore be a medium to small scale of change over an intermediate extent of the receptor group in Year 10, resulting in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect on visual amenity.
- 4.2.123. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) is developed in combination with the Proposed Development, during operation, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 10, considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

PRoW and roads between Steeple Claydon/Queen Catherine Road and Calvert Road

- 4.2.124. The cumulative ZTVs presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 17.4 to 17.7 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** demonstrate that there would be no theoretical cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and ID No. 2 (East Claydon Greener Grid Park), ID No. 3 (Tuckey Solar Farm), ID No. 9 (Longbreach Solar Farm) or ID No. 1 (East Claydon BESS) from this receptor group. The cumulative ZTV presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 17.8 [EN010158/APP/6.3]** demonstrates some potential combined visibility with ID No. 32 (Littleton Manor Farm). However, any cumulative effects

would be very limited and viewed at considerable distance, hence it is not considered further in the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.

- 4.2.125. With reference to the assessment viewpoints presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.6: Viewpoints and Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be seen at Viewpoints 7, 38 and 39, which are representative of the footpaths and footways (including SCL/7/1, SCL/7/2, SCL/8/1, SCL/8/2, SCL/8/3, SCL/8/4, SCL/9/1, SCL/9/3, MCL/10/1, MCL/10/2, Addison Road) which extend to the south of Steeple Claydon towards Parcel 1.
- 4.2.126. ID No. 8 (East West Rail) would be visible in combined views with the Proposed Development from this receptor group, bringing a cumulative receptor potentially closer to the receptor group. The main effect on views would be derived from the movement of trains within the view, albeit the railway line and associated electrical infrastructure would have some lesser effects.
- 4.2.127. It has been assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]** that during operation, the Proposed Development on its own would result in a moderate/minor adverse residual effect for this receptor group in both Years 1 and 10, this is considered to be not significant on a *solus* basis.
- 4.2.128. If both the Proposed Development and ID No. 8 (East West Rail) are operational in combination, the scale of effects would increase as a result of nearer distance views of the operational ID No. 8 (East West Rail) from the southern edge of Steeple Claydon. In Year 1 therefore, medium/small to small scale effects would be experienced over an intermediate extent of this receptor group.
- 4.2.129. By Year 10 the scale of visual change would remain medium/small to small. This would be experienced over a long term duration and would result in a moderate/slight magnitude of effect.
- 4.2.130. The sensitivity of this receptor group has been assessed to be high/medium. Therefore, in the scenario that ID No. 8 (East West Rail) is operational in combination with the Proposed Development, inter-project cumulative effects would be moderate adverse at Year 1 and 10, which is considered to be **not significant**. In this case the moderate effect has been assessed to be not significant as the magnitude of effect has a determining influence on the overall significance rating. In the professional opinion of the assessor, this tips the balance of significance closer towards a moderate/minor effect than a major/moderate effect.

5. Summary

- 5.1.1. **Table 2** below provides a summary of the residual inter-project cumulative effects as described in **Sections 3** and **4** above.

Table 2: Landscape and visual inter-project cumulative effects assessment

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
1	23/03875/APP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 5/3360815	East Claydon BESS. Development of a battery energy storage system connected directly to the national grid with associated infrastructure including access, drainage, and landscaping.	This development is located to the eastern boundary of the Proposed Development (Parcel 3) in the same landscape character area, LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. A cumulative ZTV illustrating the extent of cumulative visibility between Rosefield Substation and the East Claydon BESS is presented in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.7: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and East Claydon BESS [EN010158/APP/6.3] . There would be a visual connection with the Proposed Development between Botolph Claydon and Granborough and from Quainton Hill. There would therefore be shared landscape and visual receptors. There would be a small additional magnitude of effect on these landscape visual receptors if both developments were operational in combination.	No additional mitigation required.	Year 1: Major/moderate adverse (significant) on Granborough. Year 1: Major/moderate adverse (significant) & Year 10: Moderate adverse (not significant) on PRoW, lanes and roads between East Claydon Road/Parcel 3 and Granborough/Hogshaw Road. Other residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
2	25/01297/APP	<p>East Claydon Greener Grid Park.</p> <p>Construction of a Greener Grid Park comprising energy storage and grid balancing equipment and associated infrastructure including access, drainage, landscaping and other incidental works.</p>	<p>The proposed Greener Grid Park is located to within the Order Limits to the north of the East Claydon Road. Above ground infrastructure within the Greener Grid Park would be at least 1km distance from Solar PV modules and the Rosefield Substation to the south. A cumulative ZTV illustrating the extent of cumulative visibility between Rosefield Substation and the Greener Grid Energy Park is presented in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.4: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Greener Grid Park [EN010158/APP/6.3]. There would potentially be some negligible glimpses of the Proposed Development and the Greener Grid Energy Park from East Claydon Road but otherwise there would be no visual connectivity between the two projects. There would be limited sequential views from Bridleway ECL/2/1 (North Bucks Way/Midshires Way) over very limited extents with at most minor/negligible additional inter-</p>	<p>No additional mitigation required.</p>	<p>the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects</p> <p>Moderate/ minor adverse (not significant) on landscape character of LCA 5.6: Claydon Valley.</p> <p>Other residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects.</p>

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
3	19/00983/APP	<p>Tuckey Solar Farm.</p> <p>Ground mounted solar farm, ancillary infrastructure and associated works including the diversion of public rights of way and landscape planting.</p>	<p>project cumulative effect. There would be moderate additional inter-project cumulative effect on landscape character in LCA 5.6: Claydon Valley if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape of visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The approved solar farm is located to the north and south of East Claydon Road at least 350m from AGI. A cumulative ZTV illustrating the extent of cumulative visibility between Rosefield Substation and Tuckey Solar Farm is presented in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.5: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Tuckey Solar Farm [EN010158/APP/6.3]. There would be no significant inter-project cumulative effect on landscape character if both developments were operational in combination. There would potentially be limited views of the Proposed Development with Tuckey Solar Farm from</p>	<p>No additional mitigation required.</p>	<p>Moderate/minor adverse (not significant) on landscape character of LCA 5.6: Claydon Valley.</p> <p>Other residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed</p>

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
			<p>East Claydon Road but otherwise there would be little visual connectivity between the two projects in terms of visual receptors. There would be very limited discernible in-combination views of the Proposed Development from Granborough or Winslow and any sequential views from the local footpath network would be well separated.</p>		<p>Development <i>solus</i> effects.</p>
5	Hybrid bill HS2	High Speed Rail 2 ('HS2')	<p>HS2 lies in cutting at least 200m to the west of the Proposed Development in neighbouring LCA 5.4: Twyford Vale and LCA 7.2: Calvert Clay Pits with very limited discernible intervisibility. There would be very limited additional magnitude of effect on landscape character in either LCA 5.4: or LCA 7.2 if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a very small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development. On a broader scale, in combination effects would increase in extent to within the wider LCT 5: Shallow Valleys and LCT 7: Wooded Rolling Lowlands. There would potentially be intervisibility from the overbridge which connects SCL/13/2 with</p>	<p>No additional mitigation required.</p>	<p>Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects.</p>

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
7	CM/0016/21	Calvert Solar Farm. Application for the construction of solar array/solar park comprising of ground mounted solar PV panels and associated works at Calvert Landfill.	<p>SCL/18/2; however, any effects would be limited by distance and existing mature woodland. There would be a slight/negligible additional magnitude of effect on these visual receptors if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a very small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.</p> <p>The proposed solar farm lies approximately 1km to the south west of the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape receptors. There is potential for limited sequential views for users of the local footpath network. There would be a slight/negligible additional magnitude of effect on these visual receptors if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a very small additional effect in relation to the Proposed</p>	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
8	25/00013/DCO PINS Reference: TR040012	East West Rail DCO: Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements	<p>Development. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.</p> <p>East West Rail lies approximately 0.9km to the north of the Proposed Development (Parcel 1) in the same landscape character area, LCA 7.3: Claydon Bowl and to the north of LCA 5.6: Claydon Valley. There would be visual connection with the Proposed Development between Steeple Claydon and Calvert Road. There would therefore be shared landscape and visual receptors. There would be no overall additional magnitude of effect on landscape receptors and only a small increase in magnitude for local visual receptors (Steeple Claydon and local PRow) if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.</p>	No additional mitigation required.	<p>Moderate adverse (not significant) on Steeple Claydon.</p> <p>Moderate adverse (not significant) on PRow between Steeple Claydon and Calvert Road.</p> <p>Other residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects</p>

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
9	25/01865/APP	Longbreach Solar Farm. Erection of a solar farm and creation of new vehicular access, new footpath, substation compound, customer substation, inverters, CCTV Tower, storage containers, perimeter fencing, car parking and associated ancillary development.	Longbreach Solar Farm lies approximately 1km to the south east of the Proposed Development (Parcel 3) in the same landscape character area, LCA 5.7: Hogshaw Claylands. A cumulative ZTV illustrating the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the Longbreach Solar Farm is presented in ES Volume 2, Figure 17.6: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Wing Farm [EN010158/APP/6.2] . There would be visual connection with the Proposed Development between Botolph Claydon and Hogshaw Road and from Quainton Hill. There would therefore be shared landscape and visual receptors. There would be a <u>slight/negligible</u> additional magnitude of effect on these landscape visual receptors if both schemes were developed in combination but this would be <u>only</u> a small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects.
11	21/B2851//NON Appeal ref. 22/00125/REF	Grendon Prison. Outline planning application with all matters reserved for the construction of a new	The proposed prison lies approximately 1.8km to the south west of the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
	With consideration to: 21/A2851//NON 25/02292/ADP	category C prison (up to 67,000 sqm GEA) within a secure perimeter fence together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works.	connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape receptors. There is potential for limited sequential views for users of the local footpath network. There would be a slight/negligible additional magnitude of effect on these visual receptors if both developments were operational in combination, but this would be a small additional effect in relation to the Proposed Development. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.		anticipated to be not significant .
13	25/00883/AOP	Demolition of existing buildings and commercial redevelopment with residential development, including affordable housing, along with associated access and infrastructure.	Proposed residential development of 45 units located approximately 1.4km to the north west of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any sequential views extending from Granborough Road/East Claydon Road would be very small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
14	24/00407/APP	Erection of 10 no. dwellings and associated green infrastructure.	Given this is a relatively small proposed housing development to the north of Winslow, no significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
16	25/01567/AOP	Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the development of up to 24 dwellings, open space, sustainable drainage and associated works.	Proposed residential development of up to 44 units located approximately 4km to the west of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any potential sequential views would be very small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
19	22/03873/F Appeal ref. APP/C3105/W/24/3353069	Padbury Brook Solar Farm. Installation and operation of a renewable energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with a switchgear container,	This development is located approximately 6.8km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area (Rolling Farmland) and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
20	24/03004/APP	Hybrid application for the redevelopment of the site comprising outline planning permission, for a drive thru restaurant (Use Class E(b)/Sui Generis) and EV charging hub and full planning permission for an office building (Use Class E(g)(ii)) and a day nursery (Use Class E(f)) with associated landscaping, parking and access arrangements.	This development is located approximately 7.6km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area (Horwood Claylands) and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
21	21/04112/OUT Appeal ref. APP/C3105/W/2 2/3301485	Outline application for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, including up to 8 live-work dwellings (use class sui generis), public open space, access, infrastructure and demolition of existing buildings (all matters reserved except principle means of access from Station Road).	This development is located approximately 7.9km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
22	24/03426/AOP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/2 5/3372565	Outline application (all reserved apart from access) for approx. 220 residential dwellings, pre-school/nursery, SuDS and open space off Bourton Road, Buckingham, MK18 7R.	This development is located approximately 8.1km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area (Padbury Valley) and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
24	24/00949/F	Siting of battery storage facility; substation for the connection of the BESS to the grid; ancillary equipment; security fencing; landscaping and vehicular access alterations.	This development is located approximately 6.6km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area (Clay vale) and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
25	21/03558/OUT	Outline application for residential development for up to 250 dwellings including affordable housing and ancillary uses including retained Local Wildlife Site, public open space, play areas, localised land remodelling, compensatory flood storage, structural planting and access.	This development is located approximately 9.4km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
26	24/03259/F	The erection of two Use Class B8 floorspace units (with ancillary office floorspace (Use Class	This development is located approximately 9.7km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
		E(G(i))) with associated infrastructure including: a building for the use as an energy centre.	Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.		anticipated to be not significant .
27	21/01224/OUT	Outline planning application for Automotive Experience Quarter comprising Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2), Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F) and vehicle circuits (Sui Generis) with all matters reserved aside from that of access).	This development is located approximately 9.63km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
28	25/00439/SCOP	EIA scoping opinion for a proposed residential-led development.	This development is located approximately 9.6km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
			cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.		
30	23/01610/OUT	Sustainable Urban Extension comprising residential development of up to 1,265 dwellings.	This development is located approximately 9.2km away from the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
31	22/03384/AOP Appeal ref. APP/J0405/W/25/3376431	Littleton Manor Farm. Hybrid application comprising: Part A - Outline planning for residential development up to 535 dwellings; primary school; commercial units. Part B - Full planning application for a solar PV array, a wind turbine, an electric vehicle charging station, a	Littleton Manor Farm lies approximately 3.5km to the south of the Proposed Development (Parcel 2) in LCA 5.9: Westcott Claylands. A cumulative ZTV illustrating the extent of cumulative visibility between the Proposed Development and the Greener Grid Energy Park is presented in ES Volume 2, Figure 17.6: Cumulative ZTV – Rosefield and Wing Farm [EN010158/APP/6.2] . There would be visual connection with the Proposed Development from Quanton Hill from where there would be shared landscape and visual receptors. There would be a moderate	No additional mitigation required.	Moderate adverse (not significant) on LCT 9. -Moderate adverse (significant) on LCA 9.2. Moderate adverse (not significant) on Quanton-Wing Hills AAL.

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
		substation and roundabout connecting to the A41.	additional magnitude of effect on these landscape visual receptors if both schemes were developed in combination, primarily as result of the circa 150m high wind turbine.		<p><u>Moderate adverse (not significant) on Swan's Way/Outer Aylesbury Ring.</u></p> <p>Moderate adverse (significant) on users of the Buckinghamshire/Midshires Way.</p> <p>Other residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be no more than the Proposed Development <i>solus</i> effects</p>
32	24/03817/AOP Appeal ref. 25/00085/REF	Outline planning application for up to 70 dwellings, including vehicular access, pedestrian and cycle lines, public open space,	Proposed residential development of up to 70 units located approximately 6km to the north east of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any potential sequential views would be very	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
	PINs Ref. 6003090	landscaping, drainage and associated works	small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.		
33	25/02132/APP	Thornton Estate Solar Farm. Installation of a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar PV panels with an installed capacity of 49.99MW AC including stock proof fence, CCTV, internal tracks and associated infrastructure, landscaping, biodiversity net gain and environmental enhancements for a temporary period of 50 years and a permanent substation.	This development is located approximately 7.9km to the north of the Proposed Development in a different landscape character area (Thornborough – Beachampton Great Ouse Tributaries) and there would be no visual connection with the Proposed Development. There would therefore be no shared landscape or visual receptors. No significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects are anticipated.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
34	20/03556/AOP Appeal ref.	Outline development of up to 60 residential dwellings with associated open space,	Proposed residential development of 45 units located approximately 2.4km to the north east of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
	APP/J0405/W/2 2/3303420	landscaping, highway and drainage infrastructure.	between the two developments and any sequential views would be very small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.		anticipated to be not significant .
35	PL/25/2877/FA	Erection of 21 dwellings, access arrangements and car parking, landscaping and other associated works at Land east of Clements Lane, Marsh Gibbon	Proposed residential development of 21 units located approximately 4.8km to the east of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any sequential views would be very small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .
36	PL/25/3733/FA	Erection of 14 dwellings together with access, open space, landscaping, drainage works and biodiversity enhancements	Proposed residential development of 14 units located approximately 0.76km to the east of the Proposed Development road improvements. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any sequential views	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

ID No	Application reference	Other existing development or approved development description	Assessment of the inter-project cumulative effect with the Proposed Development	Additional mitigation requirements	Residual inter-project cumulative effect
37	PL/25/4279/OA	Outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 36 dwellings	Proposed residential development of 45 units located approximately 2.3km to the north of the Proposed Development. There is unlikely to be any discernible intervisibility between the two developments and any sequential views would be very small in scale. There would be no new significant inter-project cumulative landscape or visual effects as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development.	No additional mitigation required.	Residual inter-project cumulative effects are anticipated to be not significant .

6. References

- **Ref. 1:** UK Government. (2017). The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/572/contents>
- **Ref. 2:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1>
- **Ref. 3:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3>
- **Ref. 4:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5>
- **Ref. 5:** Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. (2024). National Planning Policy Framework. Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- **Ref. 6:** Buckinghamshire Council (2021). Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013 – 2033 Adopted Plan. Available online: https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Aylesbury_local_plan_L46JWaT.pdf
- **Ref. 7:** Buckinghamshire County Council. (2019). Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016-2036. [Online]. Available at: <https://buckinghamshire.moderngov.co.uk/Data/BCC%20Cabinet/201907081030/Agenda/Appendix%20%20Buckinghamshire%20Minerals%20and%20Waste%20Local%20Plan%201.pdf>
- **Ref. 8:** Planning Inspectorate. (2024). Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-cumulative-effects-assessment#stage-2-establishing-a-shortlist-of-other-existing-and-or-approved-development>
- **Ref. 9:** Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. (2011). The State of Environmental Impact Assessment in the UK. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.isepglobal.org/articles/the-state-of-eia-practice-in-the-uk>



rosefieldsolarfarm.co.uk