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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Rushton Landfill is located between the village of Rushton and the town of Corby in Northamptonshire. The landfill is operated by Mick George Ltd. (‘the Applicant’) under a number of planning consents and includes for a soil bioremediation operation and a waste pre-treatment and sorting operation and building. Under the various landfill permissions, the landfill must be restored to the approved restoration scheme by the end of 2031.

1.1.2 The Proposed Development Areas broadly refer to proposals adjacent to the existing site entrance off Oakley Road, associated with the existing Waste Reception Building and adjacent to the existing main internal haul road, immediately north of the Existing Landfill Gas (LFG) management compound.

1.1.3 The Applicant wishes to extend (laterally) the existing Waste Reception Building by 25m to the north and build a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) facility immediately adjacent and to the east of the proposed extended Waste Reception Building. This will enable the Applicant to expand the landfill site’s current waste pre-treatment and sorting operation to meet current demand and provide a complementary facility for the conversion of suitable waste streams to a combustible fuel source for reuse until 2031 (at which point the development will be decommissioned and the areas restored (i.e. the Proposed Development is not permanent).

1.1.4 The Applicant also intends to establish a Concrete Batching Plant and mineral storage bays to the north of the existing LFG management compound, adjacent to the main internal haul route.

1.1.5 The Site location and main areas relating to the Proposed Development are indicated on Figure L1.

1.2 Appointment and Scope of Work

1.2.1 Crestwood Environmental Ltd. is an environmental consultancy employing two landscape architects, including a chartered landscape architect with extensive experience in the minerals and waste management industry and of undertaking Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs).

1.2.2 The Company has been instructed by Mick George Limited to undertake a LVIA for the Proposed Development to accompany the planning application(s). This report describes the LVIA undertaken.

1.2.3 For the purposes of this report, the Proposed Development means all aspects related to the proposed changes summarised in paragraphs 1.1.3 to 1.1.4 and section 1.5.

1.3 LVIA Structure

1.3.1 This report is divided into the following sections as described below.

1.3.2 Section 2 (Methodology) describes the terminology used to define the status of views and the landscape around the Site and the procedure used to assess the impacts.

1.3.3 Section 3 (The Baseline Situation) provides a description of the existing features within the Site, elements that affect the visibility of the development and the character of the landscape at the Site and locality. It provides an analysis of landscape quality and value and summarises the landscape designations and landscape planning policies relevant to the Proposed Development.

1.3.4 Section 4 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) presents the results of the landscape and visual assessments, illustrating discrete and cumulative impacts on specific visual and landscape receptors and the significance of these impacts.

1.3.5 Section 5 (Glossary) provides a description of the intended use/meaning of the terms used in this assessment.

1.3.6 A list of references is provided and the drawings referred to in the assessment are located in the Appendices.
1.4 General Terminology

1.4.1 The following terms and associated definitions are used in this report (see Figure L1 also):

- ‘the Site’ – The land containing the areas of proposed built development and landscape mitigation, as well as the adjacent landfill infrastructure to be used in the operation of the proposals including the existing Waste Recycling Building, the Existing Landfill entrance, main internal haul route, weighbridge, wheel wash and offices;
- ‘the Proposed Development’ – All aspects related to the proposed changes summarised in paragraphs 1.1.3 to 1.1.4 and section 1.5.
- ‘the Existing Landfill’ – The approved infilling area and ancillary areas at Rushton Landfill, including the approved Storefield Brook Diversion and adjacent landscape works;
- ‘the Waste Reception Building’ – The existing building (and operations within), near to the entrance to Rushton Landfill Site, where waste is pre-treated and sorted prior to being transferred for further recycling or to the landfill. The building is c. 10m high to the eaves and 12m high to the ridgeline;
- ‘the Concrete Batching Plant’ – The proposed concrete batching plant north of the LFG management compound consisting of a circa 11.3m high batching tower and two 11m high silos;
- ‘the SRF Building’ – The proposed solid recovered fuel facility to the east of the existing Waste Reception Building incorporating, to be c. 12m high to the ridgeline;
- ‘the Applicant’ is Mick George Ltd; and
- ‘the Planning Authority’ is Northamptonshire County Council (or NCC).

1.5 Summary of Proposals

1.5.1 In summary, the proposals are as follows:

- To extend the existing Waste Reception Building by 25m northwards, to the same height and design (including colour and cladding) as the existing building (c. 10m high to the eaves and c. 12m high to the ridgeline), to expand the current waste pre-treatment and sorting operations to meet demand.
- Build and operate a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) facility adjacent and to the east of the proposed extension to the Waste Reception Building, for conversion of suitable waste streams into a combustible fuel source, diverting waste away from landfill. The building will be to the same height (c. 10m high to the eaves and c. 12m high to the ridgeline), build style and colour as the Waste Reception Building. Two mobile Glen Farrow biomass boilers will also be located within the Site near to the proposed SRF facility. The units will have a maximum height of 2.0m, with an overall length of 2.5m. The unit uses an air curtain, a roof and deflector to significantly reduce smoke and other emissions rising in to the air.
- Inclusion of a bioremediation area adjacent to the SRF and Waste Reception Building.
- The installation of a wet and dry concrete batching plant, to the north of the existing LFG management compound. The plant will be c. 35.8m in length, consisting of three load cells and a batch conveyor that leads to a batching tower c. 11.3m high. Two silos will be positioned adjacent to the conveyor, each with a maximum height of 11m.
- Modifications to the internal haul route, including new hard surfacing, within the site entrance area and the repositioning of offices and other relevant infrastructure to allow for the inclusion of a second weighbridge.
- Additional on site wheel wash with a new wheel bath north of the proposed Concrete Batching Plant.
- Expansion of the Site car park north of the Site access.
- Landscape mitigation proposals include for a shallow gradient bund (c. 1m high) to be constructed along the western boundary of the Existing Landfill, to the west of the proposed batching plant adjacent to Oakley Road. This will be planted to broadleaf woodland. Broadleaf woodland planting will also be undertaken on the embankment to east of existing Waste Reception Building, up to the Existing Landfill boundary, adjacent to the Waste Reception Building (and the proposed extension) and the proposed SRF facility. Alterations to the junction layout (as consented) will be undertaken at the Site entrance.

- The new built elements will be operated until the completion of landfill operations at the Landfill Site and subsequent restoration, at which time the buildings will be decommissioned, expected to be in 2031.
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 General

2.1.1 This assessment has been undertaken, in parallel with the evolving development proposals, in accordance with:

- The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (second edition), published April 2002 by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; and
- Landscape Character Assessment, Guidance for England and Scotland, published April 2002 by the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage.

2.1.2 This assessment was started prior to the publication of The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, third edition, (Landscape Institute, 2013) and so followed the second edition (Landscape Institute, 2002); but has since been updated and the assessment results checked for consistency with the new guidelines.

2.1.3 The assessment considers two separate (but inter-related) components:

- Effects on the Landscape; and
- Effects on Views.

As the two components are inter-related, the assessment of one has been undertaken alongside the other and this resultant document referred to as the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

2.1.4 The assessment process aims to:

1. Establish the baseline situation;
2. Identify potential sources of direct and indirect impact;
3. Identify impact receptors and estimate their sensitivity;
4. Estimate the magnitude and nature of effects;
5. Appraise alternatives and indicate additional/alternative measures of impact avoidance, mitigation or offset, where possible;
6. Re-estimate the magnitude and nature of effects; and
7. Provide an assessment of the significance of the mitigated effects and relate this back to the relevant Landscape Planning Policies.

2.1.5 In the presentation of this assessment, item 5 in the list above has been summarised only, in the interests of conciseness, i.e. the assessment of alternativeness is not presented in detail within this Chapter.

2.1.6 The assessment includes a combination of objective and subjective judgements. Subjective judgements are avoided where possible, focusing on what is experienced rather than making assumptions regarding people’s expected responses.

2.1.7 The assessment allows for worst-case scenarios, although indications are given as to the effects under ‘normal conditions’ also, e.g. seasonal effects of vegetation.

2.1.8 No specific assessment has been made of impacts on the historic landscape character of the area.

2.1.9 The detailed assessment process and terminology used is specific to this assessment. This is further described below with the intended meaning of some specific terms explained in the glossary provided in Section 5.
2.2 Baseline Situation – General

2.2.1 Both the landscape and visual assessment components have been undertaken against a set of Baseline Conditions (the Baseline Situation), which has been established during the first stage of the assessment process, using a combination of desk study and field survey work. This provides a transparent basis from which assessment results have been determined and against which professional judgements have been made.

2.2.2 The baseline used may be different for the landscape and visual impact assessment of specific development proposals assessed:

- In isolation (i.e. where development is assessed on its own effects); and
- In combination with other developments creating a similar effect (i.e. the cumulative landscape and visual effects of a number of similar developments).

The baseline used has been detailed in the assessment assumptions in the relevant section.

2.2.3 The study of the Baseline Situation includes a review of available document sources (e.g. published Landscape Character Assessments, Biodiversity Action Plans and landscape policy guidance), Ordnance Survey map data, historical maps, aerial photographs and the undertaking of a field survey.

2.2.4 During the field survey, the principal landscape elements and features are recorded, which, depending on their prominence and importance, contribute to the overall character of the area. Typical elements may include landform, land use, watercourses, vegetation and built development/infrastructure.

2.2.5 A check of the likely visibility of the Proposed Development is also made during the field survey, with a photographic record made and visual receptor information noted.

2.2.6 Information pertinent to the cumulative assessments is also recorded.

2.3 Baseline Situation – Landscape Aspects

2.3.1 A description of the landscape characteristics is provided in relation to the Site itself and the surrounding landscape. Further analysis of the existing landscape is also made to determine aspects such as Landscape Quality, Landscape Value (non-monetary) and site visibility (see Glossary) to assist in the determination of landscape sensitivity.

Historic Landscape Aspects

2.3.2 Research of historic aspects of the landscape in this document is limited to sites designated for historic-related reasons and changes observed between older maps and aerial photographs.

Landscape Quality

2.3.3 Landscape Quality refers to the strength of expression of landscape character and condition (intactness) of constituent characteristic elements from visual, functional, ecological and cultural perspectives. This is not the same as Scenic Beauty (see Glossary).

2.3.4 An outline evaluation of the landscape quality of the Site and surrounding landscape is provided based on the basic categories provided in Table 1.
### Table 1  Categorisation Guidance for Landscape Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Quality</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptional</strong></td>
<td>Very strong representation of characteristics with very few (if any) minor incongruous elements present. Landscape elements are all in a strong functional and visual condition. Cultural patterns are clear and well preserved over a wide area. In rural landscapes, the semi-natural vegetation characteristics of the character area are well established over large areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>Characteristic elements well represented but a number of minor incongruous elements present. Landscape elements are mostly in a strong functional and visual condition. There is a pattern of historic components sufficient to suggest a common pattern of development. In rural landscapes, the semi-natural habitats are fairly large, closely clustered and frequent allowing relatively easy cross-interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordinary</strong></td>
<td>Characteristic pattern of elements but sometimes masked or disrupted by incongruous elements. Visual and functional condition of characteristic elements generally (but not necessarily entirely) ok. Cultural pattern fairly undisturbed but lack of consistent pattern prevents categorisation as a significant example of an historic landscape type. In rural landscapes, the semi-natural habitats are in relatively discrete but medium-sized units with some opportunity for cross-interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>Weak or degraded landscape character with a small number of characteristic elements present and at least as many incongruous elements present. Visual and functional condition of landscape elements generally poor. In rural landscapes, the semi natural habitats are of limited area and patchy, providing limited opportunity for cross-interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very poor</strong></td>
<td>Heavily degraded landscape character dominated by incongruous elements. Land has been subject to extensive alteration of distinctive landscape components removing its historical and cultural significance. In rural areas, there are only fragments of semi-natural vegetation present, too isolated to allow natural repopulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Landscape Value**

2.3.5 Judgements on the value or importance of the affected landscape are provided together with the basis of this judgement in relation to the scale of importance (e.g. local, regional or national), to whom the landscape is valued and to the particular aspects that are valued. Landscape designations provide an indication of areas where the landscape is considered to be of higher value to the community (locally, regionally or nationally). Descriptions of landscape value would be based on the category guidelines in the Table 2.

**Table 2 Categorisation Guidance for Landscape Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>▼ Criteria</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare &amp; very limited scope to mitigate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare but some scope to mitigate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent but scope to mitigate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly common with scope to mitigate</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very common and easy to mitigate</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.4 Baseline Situation – Visual Aspects**

**Zones of Visual Influence (ZVIs)**

2.4.1 The visual baseline includes Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) calculations, cross-section analyses and the use of photographic records from field studies, limited to an area within which there lies the potential for significant visual effects to be caused. The initial study area for this assessment covered an area up to a distance of approximately 3 kilometres from the Site boundary.

2.4.2 ZVI calculations have been determined using computer-aided ground modelling software and 3D Ordnance Survey Profile data and allows for both:

- Curvature of the earth; and
- Atmospheric refraction.

2.4.3 The ZVI map was produced using source points from which sightlines are sent out across the modelled landscape (digital terrain model or DTM) and assumes a 1.7m high eye level for the visual receptor. Major woodland shown on the OS map and aerial photographs has been assumed to provide a visual screen up to 10m in height (although in many cases the trees forming the woodlands were significantly higher).

2.4.4 The ZVI does not allow for prevalent weather conditions (i.e. assumes ‘clear visibility’) and unless stated on the illustrated ZVI map, does not account for localised screening effects of hedges or buildings. The calculated ZVI does not specifically illustrate visibility from upper floors of buildings.
**Representative Viewpoints**

2.4.5 During the field study, a photographic record was made to represent the full range of potential views towards the Site, from available viewpoints within the study area. These locations are mapped, the visual receptor types recorded and viewpoint context described. Limited access to private locations has been obtained during the field study but the majority of photographs have been taken from as close to the properties as possible, from public locations. Where estimates of visibility have been made (using cross-section analyses, for example), this is noted.

2.4.6 The photographs have been taken using a Samsung GX-10 SLR camera using a focal length of approximately 50mm (35mm format equivalent). The focal lengths used in the photographs to illustrate the views are noted alongside the photographs on the Figures.

2.4.7 From the record of identified visual receptors and general visibility, principal representative viewpoints have been selected. These have been included to reflect the locations most likely to incur significant visual effects within the ZVI and also to represent the typical views in the vicinity of the viewpoint and the range of visual receptor types affected. Where and if stated, specific and illustrative viewpoints have also been included for their importance as key viewpoints within the landscape.

2.4.8 The photographs used to illustrate the assessment have been ‘stitched’ together using digital imaging software to provide a ‘panorama image’, thus providing a visual context to the focus of the centre photograph. The photographs have been corrected for lens distortion (based on the EXIF data (Exchangeable Image File data) recorded with the image) and to correct changes of scale across the photograph and a spherical projection used to ensure consistency of scale across the panorama, vertically and horizontally.

2.4.9 When viewing the panorama, the image should be kept flat and viewed face-on. The viewing distance (i.e. the distance between the eye and the illustrated panorama for each viewpoint) that should be used to view the image is marked against each photograph included in the figures. Using this viewing distance helps to more accurately replicate the scale of the elements in the view to that which would be seen in the field, such that a more representative impression of potential effects can be gained by the reader.

2.4.10 Where photographs could not be obtained or where helpful to the understanding of visual effects or proposed mitigation strategies, cross-sections may have been used to assist in determining the visibility and assist in the mitigation design-assessment process.

**2.5 Assessment of Landscape Effects**

**General**

2.5.1 Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape (landscape elements), which may give rise to change in how the landscape is experienced (together with landscape elements these are termed ‘landscape characteristics’). Areas with similar landscape characteristics can be described as having a certain landscape character or of being a particular landscape character type. These can be described and categorised at different scales depending on criteria used.

2.5.2 The context of a location, in its wider setting, can influence the experience of the landscape and therefore its landscape character. Therefore, changes in the landscape character at one location can potentially affect the context of another landscape character type. In certain situations this can have an effect on the setting of valued or important landscape elements (e.g. registered parks and gardens or listed buildings).

2.5.3 The landscape impact assessment describes the likely nature and scale of changes to individual landscape elements and characteristics and the consequential effect on the landscape character in relation to the development site itself and on the wider landscape. Due to the inherently dynamic nature of the landscape, it can be accepted that change arising from a development may not necessarily be significant.

2.5.4 A ‘significant’ landscape impact results when a landscape capacity ‘threshold’ is exceeded, resulting in a change to the landscape character (either in a positive or negative direction). The landscape capacity is related to landscape sensitivity.
Landscape Sensitivity

2.5.5 Landscape sensitivity primarily relates to the sensitivity of the landscape elements to change (i.e. the condition and value of the landscape elements together with the strength/importance of contribution they make towards the landscape character and how resilient to change or replicable they are individually).

2.5.6 Landscape sensitivity also relates, in a more holistic sense, to the sensitivity of the landscape character to change (landscape character sensitivity) – i.e. the landscape value of the landscape character and the degree to which the combination of landscape characteristics (including landscape structure and quality) present can resist or recover from change or be replicated. Some indication of this can be gained from local landscape policy guidance.

2.5.7 Landscape sensitivity ratings have been categorised as described in Table 3.

Table 3 Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Landscape Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>A large number of key elements are susceptible to change and are very difficult to replace without affecting the existing character</td>
<td>Typically internationally recognised landscape with strong landscape structure and many distinct features worthy of conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>A number of key elements/characteristics are susceptible to change and fairly difficult to replace without affecting the existing character</td>
<td>Typically of national or regional recognition with recognisable landscape structure and some features worthy of conservation; may contain occasional detracting features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>A number of elements/characteristics are susceptible to change but there is scope to replace these elements without adversely affecting the character</td>
<td>Typically of county or district recognition or non-designated, but value expressed through consensus, demonstrable use or non-official publications. Distinguishable landscape structure, few or no features of conservation; some detracting features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A small number of elements/characteristics are potentially susceptible to change but are easily replaced and potentially enhanced</td>
<td>Typically of local recognition, non-designated areas with no features worthy of conservation. Weak landscape structure or transitional in nature; some evidence of degradation and frequent detracting features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Remaining elements/characteristics are not susceptible to change. High probability to mitigate or replace the lost elements and to enhance the existing landscape</td>
<td>Typically areas identified for recovery. Damaged landscape structure, evidence of severe disturbance or dereliction; detracting features dominate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Magnitude of Landscape Effects

2.5.8 The Magnitude of change (in the landscape) is concerned with the number of changes and scale of change to the landscape characteristics and their duration. The magnitude of landscape effects has been categorised as follows in the Table 4.

Table 4 Magnitude of Landscape Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Landscape Effect</th>
<th>Landscape Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Typically, large scale changes and/or numerous changes to important landscape characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Typically, large scale changes to some landscape characteristics, or a high number of medium scale changes to the landscape characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Typically, some medium scale changes to some landscape characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Typically, a low number of medium scale changes to landscape characteristics, or a number of small scale changes to landscape characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Typically, occasional, small scale changes to unimportant landscape characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.9 In general, the duration weighting applied to magnitude is as follows:

- Very Long term effect: 20+ years
- Long term effect: 10-20 years
- Medium term effect: 3-10 years
- Short term effect: 1-3 years
- Temporary effect: Less than 1 year

2.5.10 Where variations between relevant criteria, duration etc. occur, reasoned professional judgement is applied and described in the assessment to determine the magnitude of effect.

Nature of Landscape Effect

2.5.11 Changes to landscape characteristics can be of a positive, negative or neutral nature. The determination of the nature of effect on landscape receptors is related to the Baseline Situation and what is recognised to be either a desirable or an undesirable change (e.g. from assessments of landscape quality, landscape policy guidance and biodiversity action plans). A neutral effect may occur, for example, if a characteristic element is replaced with a different but equally characteristic element. Therefore, it is possible for there to be a large magnitude of change but with a neutral effect overall.
Significance of Landscape Effects

2.5.12 The significance of a landscape effect (impact) is a function of the sensitivity of the affected landscape receptor, the magnitude of change and the nature of effect. While the methodology is designed to be robust and transparent, professional judgement is ultimately applied to determine the significance of each effect.

2.5.13 The degree of landscape significance is defined in Table 5. These are different for beneficial and adverse effects. Generally, an effect, which is of ‘Major’ significance or above, is likely to be a pertinent ‘material consideration’ in the decision-making process.

2.5.14 Neutral effects are considered to be of ‘Negligible’ significance.

Table 5 Significance of Landscape Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adverse Landscape Effects</th>
<th>Beneficial Landscape Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Overall, typically, there may be some Small scale, Short-term impacts but virtually no lasting adverse effect on existing landscape character.</td>
<td>Overall, typically, there may be some Small scale Short-term positive impacts but virtually no lasting beneficial effect on existing landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Typically:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Small-Medium scale effects on existing poor landscape character and quality.</td>
<td>Overall, typically, landscape character and quality is slightly improved via strengthening of some valued characteristic landscape elements for a Long-term duration, in high and Very High sensitivity landscapes where limited scope to provide improvement exists, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Small or Temporary changes to Medium sensitivity landscape.</td>
<td>Some shorter duration improvements to landscapes of lower sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal effect on landscape character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Typically:</td>
<td>Overall, typically, landscape character and quality is improved via the introduction of characteristic landscape elements and the removal of incongruous landscape elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large scale and Long term changes to landscapes of low sensitivity.</td>
<td>Permanently and greatly in highly sensitive areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Medium scale changes to Medium sensitivity landscape.</td>
<td>For a number of characteristics for a Medium-Long-term duration in areas of Medium landscape sensitivity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Small or Temporary changes to highly sensitive landscape.</td>
<td>For a small number of characteristics for a Short-Medium-term duration in lower sensitivity landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noticeable effect on the landscape without exceeding the landscape capacity threshold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Typically:</td>
<td>Overall, typically, landscape character and quality is significantly improved via removal of some existing incongruous landscape elements and introduction/restoration of some valued characteristic landscape elements in lower and Medium sensitivity landscapes where much scope to provide improvement exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerous Long-term effects on Medium sensitivity landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small permanent effects on highly sensitivity landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape character and quality is affected to a significant degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Proposals are at complete variance with many key characteristics of a highly valued and high quality landscape and affect the landscape for a significant period.</td>
<td>Proposals would remove substantial numbers of existing incongruous landscape elements and introduce a number of highly desirable landscape elements to substantially restore an area of landscape character of high potential landscape value and quality for a Very Long-term period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Assessment of Visual Effects

General

2.6.1 Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views due to changes in a landscape scene, to people’s responses to the changes and to the overall effects with respect to visual amenity. They are defined as the relationship between the visual sensitivity, the magnitude of visual effect and the nature of visual effect.

Visual Sensitivity

2.6.2 The sensitivity of the visual receptor will be influenced by the following factors:

- Location and context of the viewpoint and the significance of the view in relation to valued landscapes or features;
- Characteristics of the view, e.g. whether it is continuous or intermittent and static or transient;
- The importance of the view and the activity or expectations of the receptor at the viewpoint;
- Numbers of people affected and whether the viewpoint is publicly accessible (viewpoints at public locations are normally considered more sensitive than those at private locations although where many private residential locations are affected, a community may be affected);
- The ‘popularity’ or value of the view (e.g. as noted in guidebooks).

2.6.3 Locations (rooms) used in daylight hours are normally considered more sensitive than locations used during night hours.

2.6.4 The terminology in Table 6 was used to describe sensitivity with regard to visual receptors:
### Table 6  Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Sensitivity</th>
<th>Relevant Criteria</th>
<th>Typical Receptor Types/Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
<td>Nationally well recognised and advertised location for high visual amenity. Prominent location or vista with high visual amenity. Very high expectations of visual amenity. May affect many receptors.</td>
<td>Nationally recognised, well known and used long distance footpath users. Visitors to nationally recognised, well known and used attractions (e.g. important National Trust sites) where visual amenity is very important to its enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>Well-known area locally/regionally for high visual amenity. Open areas of recognised public access where primary enjoyment is of the views of the landscape. High expectations of visual amenity. May affect a number of visual receptors.</td>
<td>Users of local advertised circular or well-used footpath routes where primary enjoyment is from the landscape and visual amenity and there are few route options. Locations where direct views from daytime residential rooms/gardens can be gained. Public houses, restaurants etc. with direct views towards the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>Locations provide visual amenity and some open views, but amenity not well recognised beyond locality. Moderate expectations of visual amenity. Moderate numbers of people may be affected.</td>
<td>General recognised public access routes with some landscape interest although there is some choice of route. Views from recreational sports areas where amenity is gained from the landscape setting but is not essential to the activity. Residential rooms used primarily during night hours but with direct views towards the development, or residential properties with indirect views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>Viewpoint context and location does not provide many open views. Fairly low numbers of people may be affected. Low expectations of visual amenity</td>
<td>People travelling from one place to another (e.g. general road) Other recognised public access routes where little landscape or visual amenity present. Places of work where some enjoyment from landscape context and relevant to type of work undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low</strong></td>
<td>Viewpoint context is such that current visual amenity is lacking Expectations of visual amenity are very low. Numbers of people affected may be low. Activity at viewpoint is largely incidental to the view.</td>
<td>People at their place of work where visual amenity currently lacking. People travelling along direct fast routes where context and view changes rapidly (e.g. train, motorway)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Magnitude of Visual Effects

2.6.5 The magnitude or scale of visual change is described by reference to elements such as:
- The extent/proportion of change within the view;
- The duration of the effect;
- The angle of view and backdrop (e.g. skyline);
- The distance of receptor (viewpoint) from the development; and
- The area where changes will be visible.

2.6.6 The extent of contrast or integration of any new features or changes in the landscape scene with the existing or remaining landscape elements and characteristics in terms of form, scale and mass, line, height, colour and texture is also considered.

2.6.7 Viewpoint proximity to the source of impact was classed as follows:
- Close-range: Within 250m
- Medium-range: Between 250m and 1,000m
- Long-range: Between 1,000m and 2,500m
- Very Long-range: Over 2,500m

2.6.8 In general, the duration weighting applied to magnitude is as follows:
- Very Long term effect: 20+ years
- Long term effect: 10-20 years
- Medium term effect: 3-10 years
- Short term effect: 1-3 years
- Temporary effect: Less than 1 year

2.6.9 The terminology in Table 7 was adopted for the definition of magnitude for visual effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Visual Effect</th>
<th>Visual Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Where the proposals become the only dominant feature in the scene and to which all other elements become subordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Where the proposals would form a significant and immediately apparent element of the scene and would affect the overall impression of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Where proposals would form a visible and recognisable new development which may have an effect on visual amenity but is not intrusive within the overall view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Where proposals constitute only a minor component of the wider view, which the casual observer could miss or where awareness only slightly affects the overall visual amenity afforded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Where only a very small part of the development is discernible or that it is at such a distance that the effects are scarcely appreciated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.10 Where variations between relevant criteria, duration etc. occur, reasoned professional judgement is applied and described in the assessment to determine the magnitude of effect.

**Nature of Visual Effect**

2.6.11 Changes to view can be of a **positive**, **negative** or **neutral** nature. The determination of the nature of effect on view is related to the Baseline Situation and what is considered to be either a desirable or an undesirable change. The assessment of the nature of visual effect focuses on what is experienced, although some professional judgement has (by necessity) been applied to consider the subjective matter of whether the change could generally be received by the visual receptors as positive, negative or neutral. The assumptions and judgements made are reasoned in the text.

2.6.12 A neutral effect may occur, for example, if a large number of elements in the landscape scene, forming a large proportion of the view, are changed but the resultant change in the composition, character and make-up of the view is small. Therefore, it is possible for there to be a large magnitude of change but with a neutral effect overall.

**Significance of Visual Effects**

2.6.13 The significance of visual effects (impact) is a function of the sensitivity of the affected visual receptor, the magnitude of change and the nature of effect. While the methodology is designed to be robust and transparent, professional judgement is ultimately applied to determine the significance of each effect.

2.6.14 The results of the assessment have been presented by providing a brief description of the existing view from each principal representative viewpoint, followed by a description of changes to the view and the landscape scene and an analysis of the magnitude and nature of the effects.

2.6.15 The significance of visual effects is defined in the table given below. These are different for beneficial and adverse effects. Generally, an effect which is of ‘Major’ significance, or above, is likely to be a pertinent ‘material consideration’ in the decision-making process.

2.6.16 Neutral effects are considered to be of ‘Negligible’ significance.

See Table 8:
### Table 8  Significance of Visual Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Adverse Visual Effects</th>
<th>Beneficial Visual Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Adverse effect has minimal significance due to low visual amenity even from otherwise sensitive viewpoints. Produces only very slight deterioration to views.</td>
<td>Beneficial effect has minimal significance due to limited scope to improve existing view even from sensitive viewpoints. Provides only very slight improvement to views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Typically: Large-very large scale deterioration to low sensitivity views of low quality. Small scale deterioration to lower and Medium sensitivity views of high quality. Very Small-Medium scale deterioration to higher sensitivity receptors with low existing visual amenity.</td>
<td>Typically: Medium scale improvements to existing views with high visual amenity and Medium sensitivity. Small scale improvements to views of low visual amenity from low sensitivity viewpoints. Very Small scale improvements to low quality high sensitivity views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Typically: Noticeable Long-term or Large scale deterioration in low sensitivity but high quality views. Medium scale deterioration to Medium sensitivity high quality views and Very Large changes to low quality views. Small scale and Temporary deterioration in Highly sensitive and high amenity value views and larger scale deterioration in low quality views.</td>
<td>Typically: Noticeable large-scale improvement in unimportant views with low existing visual amenity and visual sensitivity. Small to Medium scale improvements to views from Medium and High sensitivity viewpoints with low existing visual amenity. Very Small scale improvements in existing low visual amenity from Very High sensitivity viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Typically: Medium scale deterioration in High sensitivity, high quality views, or larger scale deterioration in High sensitivity but lower quality views. Small scale deterioration to higher sensitivity views of high quality. Considerable Long-term deterioration in Medium sensitivity views of high amenity value.</td>
<td>Typically: Large to Very Large scale improvements at Medium to High sensitivity locations. Medium to Large scale improvements to High sensitivity viewpoints with low existing visual amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Clear and obvious Very Large-scale adverse changes resulting in considerable and Long-term deterioration in Highly sensitive and important views for large numbers of receptors</td>
<td>Clear and obvious very large scale changes resulting in considerable and Long-term improvement in existing poor view for large numbers of High sensitivity receptors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.7 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

**General**

2.7.1 The cumulative landscape and visual effects of two or more developments may be more or less than the sum of the individual effects and therefore may need to be assessed in addition to the assessment of effects of a proposed development undertaken in isolation of other similar developments.
2.7.2 The assessment of cumulative effects may require different baseline assumptions to be made, to allow the assessment to differentiate between isolated and cumulative effects. For example, the assessment of an extension to a quarry would normally assume the existing permitted quarry development and its associated approved scheme of working and restoration to be part of the Baseline Situation.

In this example situation the assessment of the proposed extension may result in effects of lower significance than if the original quarry and the extension had been assessed together at the same time. The test of cumulative effects is to determine whether this cumulative effect is significant, or significantly different to the isolated assessment.

2.7.3 Justification of the assumed Baseline Situation is provided to allow a transparent assessment process, as the permutations of possible baseline situations are potentially numerous. For example, an extension to a quarry which has been in place for many decades may not be considered in the same way as a quarry which has only been in place for a couple of years – the baseline situation for each in terms of cumulative assessment therefore needs to be adjusted to reflect the individual situation. Consideration may need to be given to results of previous assessments, e.g. to find out if a proposal was given permission despite there being significant landscape/visual effects.

2.7.4 Cumulative effects may take into account:
- Other existing (built or partially built) developments;
- Other approved developments that have not yet been built; and
- Other proposed developments awaiting determination of approval.

This assessment takes into account existing developments creating potential cumulative effects of a similar nature only. The existing developments that are likely to occur at the same time as the Proposed Development only have been considered.

2.7.5 As only the Baseline Situation may be changed for the cumulative assessment, the assessment process remains the same and so the same terminology is applied.

**Cumulative Visual Effects**

2.7.6 Cumulative visual effects can be gained in combination (i.e. where two or more similar developments are visible from one viewpoint) and sequentially (i.e. when two or more similar developments are visible from different viewpoints along a route (e.g. a railway line, recognised tourist route or recreational footpath). Cumulative visual effects can be further categorised as follows:

**Table 9 Categorisation of Cumulative Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Visual Effect</th>
<th>Sub-type of Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Effect</td>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td>Two or more developments visible from one viewpoint in field of view gained from looking in one direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successive</td>
<td>Two or more developments visible from one viewpoint only by changing orientation of viewing direction (i.e. by turning round)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Effect</td>
<td>Frequently sequential</td>
<td>Where similar visual effects are experienced along a route, from different viewpoints separated by short distances or short time gaps (e.g. along a motorway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally sequential</td>
<td>Where similar visual effects are experienced along a route, from different viewpoints separated by large distances or long time gaps (e.g. along a long distance footpath)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7.7 A cumulative **perceived** effect may occur due to a receptors' knowledge of developments' proximity to one another, even though they may not be visible.

**Cumulative Landscape Effects**

2.7.8 Cumulative landscape effects can occur in relation to landscape elements individually and also in combination (landscape character). For example, a quarry development may have resulted in the partial loss of a particular habitat, but in such a way that the habitat's contribution to the landscape character is not significantly affected. The change would still create a new Baseline Situation for a proposed extension to the quarry than if the quarry and extension had been proposed together as one development. I.e. in the example, the landscape effects of the extension may not be significant but the combined landscape effects of the quarry and extension may be significant (due to differing Baseline Situations).

2.7.9 The cumulative effects on landscape elements of the Proposed Development have been assessed (in this assessment) in relation to the baseline development **at the Site only**, i.e. not in relation to the effects of other developments in the area.

2.7.10 The cumulative effects on landscape character take into account the wider area and the effects of developments within.
3 THE BASELINE SITUATION

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The Baseline Situation represents the existing situation both within the Site and within the locality. The description is confined to those elements that could affect, or be affected by, the visibility and landscape character of the Proposed Development.

3.1.2 Figure L1 illustrates the principal features within the local landscape for which a description has been provided below.

3.1.3 Relevant Landscape Character Assessments are described first followed by more specific field observations and analysis of the characteristics of the local landscape. An outline analysis of the landscape quality and value is provided, referencing landscape designations where applicable.

3.1.4 Relevant Biodiversity Action Plan targets, planning policies and guidance from the Development Plan and the findings of the other relevant environmental impact assessments undertaken have been used to identify common objectives in relation to the Proposed Development.

3.2 Site Location

3.2.1 The Existing Landfill is approximately 420 metres northeast of the village of Rushton at the nearest point to the boundary. The Existing Landfill is also 3.1 kilometres east, 2.7 kilometres northeast and 3.1 kilometres west-northwest of the larger villages of Desborough, Rothwell and Geddington respectively. Great Oakley, on the fringes of Corby Town is around 1.5 kilometres north-northeast of Rushton Landfill and Kettering town is 2.8 kilometres south-southeast of the Site, at the nearest points to the boundary.

3.3 Landscape Character

3.3.1 A number of published landscape character assessments will be used as references to inform the design and assessment of the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment process and the formation of the restoration proposals. Relevant references are:

- Countryside Agency (1999), Countryside Character - Volume 4: East Midlands;
- Natural England (April 2010), East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment;
- Northamptonshire County Council (2006), Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment;
- Northamptonshire County Council (2007), Northamptonshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment;
- Northamptonshire County Council (2007), Northamptonshire Biodiversity Character Assessment;
- Northamptonshire County Council (2006), Northamptonshire Environmental Character Assessment; and
- English Nature (Sept 1999), Rockingham Forest Natural Area Profile;

3.3.2 The Site (Proposed Development Areas) falls within the:

- ‘Rockingham Forest’ National Landscape Character Area;
- ‘Rockingham Forest’ Regional Landscape Character Area;
- ‘Forest Hills and Ridges’ Regional Landscape Character Type;
- ‘Wooded Clay Plateau’ County Landscape Character Type;
- ‘Geddington Chase’ County Landscape Character Area;
- ‘Upper Valleys’ Country Landscape Character Zone (as defined in 1992)
• ‘Rockingham Forest’ English Nature Natural Area;
• ‘Reinstated Mineral Extraction’ County Historic Landscape Character Type;
• ‘Newton - Ruston’ County Historic Landscape Character Area; and
• ‘Rockingham Forest’ Countryside and County Environmental Character Area.

3.3.3 The Site is on the boundary between ‘Boulder Clay Woodlands’ and ‘Liassic Slopes’ County Biodiversity Character Types and on the boundary between ‘Geddington Chase’ and ‘Ise Valley Liassic Slopes’ County Biodiversity Character Areas.

**National Character Area:**

3.3.4 The Site is situated in the southwestern part and towards the edge of ‘The Rockingham Forest’ National Character Area. In summary, the area comprises:

- Undulating landform rising to prominent scarp along edge of Welland Valley in Rockingham Forest;
- Large woodlands on higher ground enclose the landscape;
- High historic and nature-conservation interest in woodlands;
- Remnants of unimproved grassland throughout, with limestone heaths and fragments of acid bogs in the Soke of Peterborough;
- Foreground views are occupied by large arable fields with low hedges;
- Large mature landscape parks and country houses;
- Dry stone walls around villages, becoming more common in open countryside in Soke of Peterborough;
- Nucleated villages often in sheltered streamside locations;
- Distinctive buildings constructed in local stone: ironstone in west, limestone in east;
- Undisturbed, deeply rural quality despite nearby towns and adjoining trunk roads;
- Prominent, disused ironstone quarries (gullies) and abandoned Second World War airfields; and
- A sharp transition between the countryside and the main towns of Kettering, Corby and Peterborough (lying just outside the area) which have developed rapidly in recent years.

**Regional Landscape Character Area and Type:**

3.3.5 The Site is situated in the southwestern part of ‘The Rockingham Forest’ Regional Landscape Character Area and the ‘Forest Hills and Ridges’ Regional Landscape Character Type. The description for this area is summarised as follows:

- Broad, elevated plateaux and ridges with undulating landform;
- Till deposits overlie many parts of the Landscape Character Type, obscuring variations in the underlying bedrock geology and imparting a unity of character linked to the predominance of slowly permeable clay soils;
- Extensive areas of woodland of scenic and nature conservation value, including semi-natural and ancient woodlands, with many woodlands forming important remnants of former Royal Forests;
- Where drift deposits are absent, the underlying Middle Jurassic limestones which predominate, together with sandstones and mudstones, have resulted in well drained calcareous and loamy ferruginous soils, and influenced vegetation types including woodland species;

---

1 Countryside Agency (1999), Countryside Character - Volume 4: East Midlands
2 Natural England (April 2010), East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment
Woodlands on elevated ground form a backdrop to farmland with predominantly medium and large arable fields, often with low and well clipped hedges and intermittent hedgerow trees;

Many areas of mature designed parkland and estates add to the wooded character of the landscape; and.

Sparsely populated with a quiet and tranquil character across central plateaux areas and ridges with dispersed settlement pattern of distinctive villages, many constructed in local stone, mainly located in sheltered locations and along valleys.

**County Landscape Character Type**

3.3.6 The Site falls wholly within the ‘Wooded Clay Plateau’ County Landscape Character Type\(^3\). The key characteristics are listed as:

- Boulder Clay deposits overlie almost the entire landscape, obscuring variations in the underlying geological framework and giving a unity of character;
- broad, elevated undulating plateau dissected and drained by numerous valleys with convex profile valley sides;
- undulating landform, extensive views and sense of exposure on some prominent locations;
- large woodlands on elevated ground form a backdrop to foreground farmland and provide an intimate human scale landscape;
- woodlands are of high scenic and nature conservation value and an important remnant of the Royal Hunting Forest of Rockingham;
- foreground views are occupied by productive arable fields with low hedges and intermittent hedgerow trees;
- productive arable farmland in medium and large scale fields predominates on elevated land although sheep and cattle pastures also prevalent, often in smaller fields adjacent to watercourses and villages;
- hedgerows are often low and well clipped and emphasise the undulating character of the landscape;
- mature landscaped parks and gardens add to wooded character of the landscape;
- sparsely populated central plateau areas;
- larger settlements and urban areas fringe the plateau landscapes;
- distinctive stone villages in sheltered locations; and
- deeply rural quality despite proximity of large urban areas.

3.3.7 The character assessment’s comments on ‘Aesthetic and Perceptual Qualities’ of the landscape character type are:

“Despite the extensive areas of productive arable farmland interspersed with numerous farms and small villages, the landscape still retains a remote character within many areas. Where particularly long distance views are possible, a sense of exposure and openness prevails. However, where woodland and tree cover is more extensive the apparent scale of the landscape is reduced with the vegetation cover combining to impart a more intimate character and human scale. Colours and textures are generally simple, as a result of the arable farming occupying much of the undulating landscape. Trees and woodlands are important features, however, adding textural elements and colours that change with the seasons. Associations with the Royal Hunting Forest are strong and add to the landscape’s appeal. This is strengthened by the nature conservation value of many woodlands across the landscape.”

3.3.8 The character assessment’s comments on ‘Local Distinctiveness, Landscape Condition and

---

\(^3\) Northamptonshire County Council (2006), Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment
Landscape Change’ are:

“The Wooded Clay Plateau landscape retains a productive rural character, but it is also of scenic and historic interest. Ancient woodlands, historic forest villages, and productive farmland combine to make this a distinctive landscape. On the whole, it is well maintained and appears intensively managed. Although the landscape generally retains a strong character, this diminishes in areas of open farmland where woodlands and trees do not reduce the scale of the landscape, and where hedgerows are in decline and being replaced with post and wire fencing.

Many of the remaining areas of coppice are falling into neglect. The practice of coppicing has largely ceased due to the rising cost and lack of markets. There has been no replacement with other forms of woodland management, and deer damage is an increasing problem. The ‘Ancient Woodland Project’ has been recently established, with the purpose of restoring semi-natural broadleaved woodland and traditional management practices. Other woodlands have been replanted with conifers, which reduces their visual appeal and nature conservation value. Beyond the woodlands, areas of unimproved grassland have been lost through improvement and cultivation. Hedgerow removal is also a significant factor. These are important as they contribute to local character through the field patterns they create. They also provide green links between areas of woodland.”

County Landscape Character Area

3.3.9 The Site lies in the ‘Geddington Chase’ County Landscape Character Area which is described as:

“Geddington Chase Character Area forms the westernmost section of the Wooded Clay Plateau and extends from the eastern edge of Market Harborough, along the southern boundary of Corby, and extends in the southeast to Islip, adjacent to the Nene Broad River Valley Floodplain. The largely flat plateau area is drained by a number of streams and tributaries creating localised minor undulations in the landscape, the most notable of which is Harper’s Brook, which flows through the centre of the area.

There is a general predominance of large and medium to large arable fields regular and sub regular in shape, although smaller improved and semi improved pastures often with grazing cattle is evident. These are most prominent along watercourses, the railway line, and in close proximity to settlements, in particular Braybrooke, Great Oakley and Little Oakley and southwest of Brigstock. Pastoral fields also occur around Drayton Park, a Grade I listed park and garden incorporating approximately 100 hectares of landscaped parkland with a medieval park dating from 138, early formal gardens and gardens dating from the 17th Century. Areas of neutral grassland are also evident in the character area north of Eleven Acre Spinney and northwest of Newton. Woodland cover on the plateau is extensive, with significant areas such as Geddington Chase having once formed part of the old Rockingham Forest, a popular hunting area for royalty during the middle ages and now forming part of Boughton Park, a Grade I listed park and garden. The majority of large woodland blocks are ancient woodland. They frequently have a broadleaved composition with small pockets of coniferous plantation and areas of mixed woodland. Sections of Brampton Wood provide the most significant area of coniferous planting within the character area. Whilst a number of woodlands incorporate public rights of way, Grafton Park Wood, used for shooting and game rearing, includes facilities such as picnic areas, waymarked walks and car parks. Located on upper slopes and tops of undulations, many woodlands provide distinctive horizon features, framing views and creating an intimate and enclosed character, despite the elevated nature of the plateau.

The landscape is moderately well settled, the villages of Braybrooke, Pipewell, Little Oakley, Great Oakley, Stanion, Geddington and Islip occupying, in general, the lower valley slopes above watercourses. Whilst villages such as Pipewell and Little Oakley have developed in a linear form, others such as Braybrooke have developed around the junction of several roads. Stanion and Geddington also have evidence of post-war development on their outer edges. Geddington and Little Oakley also form two of the estate villages to Boughton House and Park situated in the Kettering and Wellingborough Rolling Ironstone Valley Slopes to the south. Geddington, although famous for the Eleanor Cross, which lies within the surrounding landscape type, also provided a major settlement in the heart of Rockingham Forest and has been populated since prehistory and

Northamptonshire County Council (2006), Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment
mentioned in the Domesday Book. In medieval times it gained importance through housing a
medieval royal hunting lodge, and although there are no remains of this today, nearby cottages
around the church of Mary Magdalene are thought to date from a similar period. Such villages
within the character area were also dependent on timber and other resources associated with
woodland that formed part of the Royal Forest for their survival. Beyond the village settlement are
scattered farmsteads and individual dwellings. The urban area of Corby that extends into the
plateau is prominent in a number of views and in places results in a transitional rural edge.
Particularly visible and intrusive in the landscape are large industrial units and chimneys.

Due to the elevated nature of the Wooded Clay Plateau, a number of disused airfields are
situated within the area. The most notable is at Grafton Underwood, which was built in 1941
covering 500 acres, north of the village after which the Airfield was named. It provided a base for
the US 8th Army Air Force and from early 1942 until 1945 units were posted here. Adjacent to the
airfield is a granite memorial, which stands on the site of the former runway, now under
agricultural use. A second airfield located to the west of Pipewell is again under arable cultivation.

Landmarks on Geddington Chase are varied. Geddington church spire is a prominent vertical
feature on the horizon with the original church dating back to Saxon times, reinforcing the long
settlement pattern of the area. Islip church provides an additional feature in the southeast of the
area with Braybrooke church also being prominent. A number of high voltage pylon lines cross
the plateau area and are particularly prominent to the east of Corby. Water towers are also visible
both within and beyond the area.”

**County Biodiversity Character Type**

3.3.10 The Site lies on the boundary between the ‘**Boulder Clay Woodland**’ and ‘**Liassic Slopes**’
County Biodiversity Character Type⁵. Key characteristics of the Boulder Clay Woodlands include:

- Boulder clay forms the surface geology;
- Heavy, stony, slowly permeable clay soils;
- Many woodland SSSI and Wildlife Sites, with biodiversity as a management priority;
- Extensive ash-field maple woodland;
- Limited areas of mesotrophic (neutral) grassland;
- Few watercourses and springs;
- Some seasonal ponds; and
- Key species include black hairstreak and white wood butterfly, breeding woodcock and
  nightingale and dormouse.

3.3.11 Key characteristics of the Liassic Slopes Biodiversity Character Type include:

- A narrow band of Northampton Sand Formation on the upper slopes with Lias Group
  Clays;
- On the lower slopes;
- Soils are generally slightly acidic;
- Retention of all unimproved semi-natural habitats is low;
- A range of woodland types occur, influenced by the sandy or clay soils;
- Occasional acid grasslands and acid variants of mesotrophic grasslands are retained;
- Concentrations of small ponds are found in some areas; and
- Springs issue at the interface between the Sands and the Clay.

---

⁵ Northamptonshire County Council (2007), Northamptonshire Biodiversity Character Assessment
**County Biodiversity Character Area**

### 3.3.12 The Site lies on the boundary between the ‘Geddington Chase’ and the ‘Ise Valley Liassic Slopes’ County Biodiversity Character Areas**. Geddington Chase is described as:

“The southern extent of the Rockingham Forest, occupying 50km2 of Boulder Clay to the south of Corby and the north and east of Kettering. The boundary of this area is defined by the River Ise and Harpers Brook valleys and the heavily quarried valley side north of the Alledge Brook.

There are extensive areas of broadleaved woodland of ancient origin, but unlike the wooded clays to the north east much of the woodland is in private ownership. As public access is limited many of the woods are used for pheasant rearing and cover species, such as snowberry (Symphoricarpos albus), have been planted. There is also a strong element of coniferous planting in most of the woodlands. Key woodland sites include Geddington Chase SSSI and Alder Wood SSSI. There are only fragments of other unimproved semi-natural habitats.

Geddington Chase is the third largest extant ancient wood in Northamptonshire and was formerly part of the once extensive Royal Forest of Rockingham. The bulk of the Chase is now commercially reafforested and the SSSI comprises the largest discrete block of remaining semi-natural broadleaved woodland. The site is a good example of the wet ash (Fraxinus excelsior) - maple (Acer campestre) woodland, a type that has declined significantly in the county since the Second World War. In places the original coppice with standards structure is well preserved and, elsewhere, oak (Quercus robur) - ash (Fraxinus excelsior) high forest provides a contrasting habitat. The tree canopy is predominantly pedunculate oak (Quercus robur) and ash (Fraxinus excelsior) over a mixed shrub and coppice layer of hazel (Corylus avellana), Midland hawthorn (Crataegus oxyacanthoides), field maple (Acer campestre), blackthorn (Prunus spinosa), dogwood (Cornus sanguinea) and grey willow (Salix cinerea). Mixed plantations occur in some areas.

The ground flora is typically diverse with bluebell (Hyacinthoides non-scriptus), dog’s mercury (Mercurialis perennis), tufted hair-grass (Deschampsia cespitosa), ramsons (Allium ursinum) and yellow archangel (Galeobdolon luteum) all locally dominant. The wild daffodil (Narcissus pseudonarcissus), which is rare in Northamptonshire, occurs sparsely. Some of the rides contain botanically-rich permanent grassland with characteristic species such as sweet vernal-grass (Anthoxanthum odoratum), field woodrush (Luzula campestre), hairy lady’s mantle (Alchemilla filicaulis), cowslip (Primula veris) and pignut (Conopodium majus).

Alder Wood is also of the wet ash Fraxinus excelsior - maple Acer campestre type and has been managed as coppice with standards, but now, although there are areas of young growth, much of the coppice is over-mature. The canopy is predominantly ash Fraxinus excelsior with occasional oak Quercus robur, and the coppiced shrub layer consists of hazel Corylus avellana and field maple Acer campestre.

The ground flora is typical of base rich wet soil with much tufted Hair-grass (Deschampsia cespitosa), dog’s mercury (Mercurialis perennis), enchanter’s nightshade (Circaea lutetiana) and bluebell (Hyacinthoides non-scripta) with other species such as common spotted-orchid (Dactylorhiza fuchsii), twayblade (Listera ovata) and sanicle (Sanicula europaea) also present. Herb Paris (Paris quadrifolia) and giant bellflower (Campanula latifolia), both rare in Northamptonshire, also occur.

Other unimproved semi-natural habitats are poorly represented, but there are some outstanding examples of mesotrophic grassland. The best is Alder Meadow, adjacent to Alder Wood. Together they comprise Alder Wood and Meadow SSSI. The meadow is an agriculturally unimproved, ridge and furrow hay field. Variation in soil properties and in past management has led to the development of several grassland types of which the most common is that characterised by the presence of common knapweed (Centaurea nigra) and crested dog’s-tail (Cynosurus cristatus). This is a diverse type and many plant species are found such as lady’s bedstraw (Galium verum), red fescue (Festuca rubra), cowslip (Primula veris), tufted hair-grass (Deschampsia cespitosa), quaking-grass (Briza media) and meadow vetchling (Lathyrus pratensis). In damper parts of the field the grassland is characterised by meadow foxtail Alopecurus pratensis and great burnet Sanguisorba officinalis or by betony (Stachys officinalis) and devil’s-bit scabious (Succisa pratensis).

---

6 Northamptonshire County Council (2007), Northamptonshire Biodiversity Character Assessment
Another important grassland is Great Oakley Meadow, a fragment of ancient meadow now managed as a reserve by the Wildlife Trust and lying where the Boulder Clay deposit is thinning. The higher, southwest corner of the site has ridge and furrow with a low botanical diversity in the damp furrows, which are dominated by tufted hair-grass (Deschampsia cespitosa). The tops of the ridges are much more diverse, with quaking-grass (Briza media), cowslip (Primula veris), tormentil (Potentilla erecta) and common knapweed (Centaurea nigra). The richest flora is on the flat lower ground near the brook where some areas appear more calcareous than neutral, with dwarf thistle (Cirsium acaule), salad burnet (Sanguisorba minor) and hoary plantain (Plantago media). The wettest parts of the lower slopes have a flood-meadow structure, with hairystalk (Carex hirta), cuckooflower (Cardamine pratensis) and great burnet (Sanguisorba officinalis)."

3.3.13 The Ise Valley Liassic Slopes are described as:

"An area of 107km² that forms the catchment of the River Ise. Land use is a combination of larger arable fields interspersed with agriculturally improved grassland. Former ironstone and limestone quarries are a feature of the Finedon area. Retained unimproved semi-natural habitat is relatively low, but there are a variety of vegetation types. Woodlands are small and isolated, apart from a concentration on the Kelmarsh Estate. Various woodland types occur. Some are associated with lighter soils and others with heavy clays. A unique example of wet ash-wych elm woodland can be found at Ragsdale Spinney, part of Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI. Unimproved grasslands tend to be mesotrophic, with a more acidic influence in places and some examples of damper grassland are retained. However, on quarried sites the grasslands have a calcareous influence. Areas of standing open water also occur in several quarries.

Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI lies in a small valley and comprises a unique mixture of wildlife habitats. Birch Spinney is an unusual woodland type partly developed on peat and no other examples are known in the county. Unimproved and botanically rich grassland adjoins one of the finest remaining Northamptonshire marshes. The variety of vegetation types is due to the complex geology and hydrology. Birch Spinney is a variant of ash Fraxinus excelsior- field maple Acer campestre woodland developed on light soils with poor drainage. The canopy is of ash Fraxinus excelsior, pedunculate oak Quercus robur and downy birch Betula pubescens over a shrub layer of hazel Corylus avellana, elder Sambucus nigra and goat willow Salix caprea. The ground flora is notable for the abundance of ferns. Ragsdale Spinney is by contrast a heavy soil form of wet ash - wych elm woodland. Its situation on a spring-line gives rise to a rich ground flora, including the locally rare giant bellflower Campanula latifolia.

The grassland is of a geographically widespread calcareous loam type. The sward comprises a large number of herbs and grasses characterised by sweet vernal grass Anthoxanthum odoratum, crested dog’s tail Cynosurus cristatus, quaking grass Briza media, yellow oat-grass Trisetum flavescens, harebell Campanula rotundifolia, dwarf thistle Cirsium acaule and salad burnet Sanguisorba minor. There are several damp flushes on the slopes that enhance the botanical interest. Mawsley Marsh lies outside the character area, on the valley floor, and is described under the section on the River Ise Floodplain.

Sunderland Wood is one of a group of woodlands on the Kelmarsh Estate, all of which overlie Whitby Mudstone Formation. It is apparently replanted ancient woodland with ash Fraxinus excelsior, sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus, oak Quercus robur and larch Larix decidua. Some older oaks and old ash coppice stools remain. The substrate is mainly clay, and most of the site is poorly drained, however, the more elevated areas are on more acidic sandy soils largely dominated by bracken Pteridium aquilinum and bramble Rubus fruticosus. This change in the soils demonstrates the variability of the Whitby Mudstone Formation. Species on the rather wet, grassy rides are a mixture of ruderal and typical woodland species, and include rough meadow-grass Poa trivialis, meadow fox-tail Alopecurus pratensis, soft rush Juncus effusus, cuckooflower Cardamine pratensis, creeping buttercup Ranunculus repens, wood avens Geum urbanum, ramsoms Allium ursinum, meadowweet Filipendula ulmaria, marsh bedstraw Galium palustre and nettle Urtica dioica. Creeping soft-grass Holcus mollis is locally abundant in the vicinity of the bracken Pteridium aquilinum and the sander parts of the rides. The scrub layer is open but rather neglected in appearance, and mostly consists of hawthorn Crataegus monogyna and elder Sambucus nigra.

Corner Meadow adjacent to the Brampton Valley Way in the upper reaches of the Ise Valley is a fragment of mesotrophic grassland, more typical of a floodplain, with tussocks of tufted hair-grass Deschampsia cespitosa, cock’s-foot Dactylis glomerata and abundant crested dog’s-tail grasses.
Alopecurus pratensis. There is also red fescue Festuca rubra, Yorkshire fog Holcus lanatus, common bent Agrostis capillaris, creeping bent A. stolonifera and jointed rush Juncus articulatus. The herb content is high, with abundant great burnet Sanguisorba officinalis, marsh thistle Cirsium palustre, sorrel Rumex acetosa, lady’s bedstraw Galium verum, tormentil Potentilla erecta, germander speedwell Veronica chamaedrys, meadowsweet Filipendula ulmaria and patches of the rarities sneezewort Achillea ptarmica and saw-wort Serratula tinctoria.

A series of grasslands with a calcareous influence have developed on the former ironstone and limestone quarries around Finedon, many of these sites have associated ponds. The grassland at White Lodge Quarry, a typical site, includes red fescue Festuca rubra, sheep’s fescue F. ovina, crested dog’s-tail Cynosurus cristatus, glaucous sedge Carex flacca, common knapweed Centaurea nigra, abundant bird’s-foot-trefoil Lotus corniculatus, self heal Prunella vulgaris, fairy flax Linum catharticum, dwarf thistle Cirsium acaule and wild carrot Daucus carota. The pools are surrounded by hawthorn Crataegus monogyna scrub, with some grey and goat willow Salix spp and young ash Fraxinus excelsior. The pools are dominated by common spike-rush Eleocharis palustris and with frequent tubular water-dropwort Oenanthe fistulosa, a county rarity. Other emergent species include common club-rush Schoenoplectus lacustris, jointed rush Juncus articulatus and water plantain Alisma plantago-aquatica, with abundant amphibious bistort Persicaria amphibia, rigid hornwort Ceratophyllum demersum and broad-leaved pondweed Potamogeton natans in the water.

Natural Area Profile

3.3.14 Natural Areas have been formally defined as “biogeographic zones that reflect the geological foundation, the natural systems and processes and the wildlife in different parts of England, and provide a framework for setting objectives for nature conservation” (Biodiversity: The UK Steering Group Report, HMSO, 1995).

3.3.15 Natural Areas provide a regional scale at which to view the wildlife resource, from both a national and local perspective and they are used by Natural England as an ecologically coherent framework for setting objectives for nature conservation.

3.3.16 The Site falls within the ‘Rockingham Forest’ Natural Area. The profile details the habitats and species that characterise the area (and assist in guiding the Proposed Development towards a suitable restoration goal) and include:

- Ancient, semi-natural broadleaved woodland;
- Unimproved calcareous grassland;
- Unimproved mesotrophic grassland;
- Unimproved flood meadows;
- Bryophyte dominated springs;
- Marshes and Swamps;
- Valley mires; and
- Flowing waters.

Historic Character

3.3.17 The Northamptonshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment (dated 2005) “outlines the main human elements and processes that have influenced the physical character of the (Northamptonshire) county and is intended to serve as a background to the accompanying descriptions of the Historic Landscape Character Areas (HCLA)”. The Site lies in the ‘Reinstituted Mineral Extraction’ Historic Landscape Character Type and in the ‘Newton – Rushton’ Historic Landscape Character Area, described as:

“The area is located immediately to the north of Kettering town and is bisected by the River Ise, which runs from west to east through the parishes of Geddington and Rushton. Areas of high ground at the north and south of the Ise are covered by Boulder Clay whilst limestones, Whitby Mudstone Formation (Upper Lias) clays and Northampton Sand Formation Ironstone deposits are exposed in the valley sides. At the south of the area the area embraces Weekley parish and small parts of Rothwell and Desborough parishes which including small tributary brooks and streams draining into the main Ise valley at the south. Ironstone extraction has taken place both

7 English Nature (Sept 1997), Rockingham Forest Natural Area Profile
8 Northamptonshire County Council (2007), Northamptonshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment
within the river valley and on the higher Boulder Clay areas.

Geddington and Weekley were enclosed in the first decade of the 19th century under Parliamentary Act whilst Rushton and Newton were enclosed earlier in the 16th and 17th centuries. With the exception of the Glendon Iron Works, large-scale mineral extraction did not start in the area until after the 1880s but once begun continued well into the latter half of the 20th century. The reinstatement of these areas has resulted in the removal of the earlier enclosure pattern and the establishment of large irregular shaped modern fields.

The area is crossed by a number of branches of the Midland Railway, leading out from Kettering, a communication system, which aided the development of the mining industry. Rushton is the only settlement within the area and this has generally retained its small 19th century size, however earthworks at the west of the village suggest it may have been slightly larger in medieval times. The former medieval village of Glendon lies within the now landscaped grounds of Glendon Hall. The earthwork remains are slight and represent a settlement, which was largely depopulated at the time of enclosure.

Small parts of Boughton and Rushton parks extend into the area. The latter including the 16th century Triangular Lodge, an architectural profession of Thomas Tresham's Catholic faith, whilst the former area including vestiges of the once extensive tree-line avenues, expressions of the Duke of Buccleuch's temporal power."

3.4 Landscape Characteristics

The Site

3.4.1 The Existing Landfill entrance is located on Oakley Road, approximately 330m northeast of the junction between this road and Station Road and lies at around 105m AOD. Either side of the landfill entrance are 2-3m high hedgerows leading north and southwards.

3.4.2 Adjacent to the entrance, around 40 metres inside the Site, is the Waste Reception Building. It is a large steel-clad building, currently open on its northern side, with a pitched roof. The cladding is mid to dark green in colour. Various waste recycling activities are undertaken in the building.

3.4.3 Immediately to the north of the existing Waste Reception Building is a large area of hardstanding, with a number of skips and temporary storage areas.

3.4.4 The existing weighbridge and offices are located around 100m from the entrance, immediately adjacent to the main development areas, along the main internal access road that runs north-northeastwards from the entrance and is surrounded by land at least 3m higher than this area. Immediately inside and south of the entrance is a small parking area (covered in limestone scalplings) with welfare facilities.

3.4.5 Further north along the main internal access road is the LFG management compound with flare and other infrastructure. The compound is surrounded by palisade fencing. To the north of the compound is a flat area of compacted ground with soil stockpile areas to the north and east, running adjacent to Oakley Road.

3.4.6 Overall, the Proposed Development Areas primarily consist of areas of hardstanding and bare earth, with ancillary equipment/buildings located within the proposed development areas or immediately adjacent.

The Surrounding Landscape

3.4.7 The main landscape characteristics of the surrounding landscape, including the Existing Landfill are summarised below.
**Landform**

3.4.8 The landform to the immediate northeast of the Site is that associated with the Existing Landfill operations. The approved landform consists of the centre of the Site being the high point at around 122m AOD with slopes around the Site having a maximum 1:4 gradient, that marry in to the existing levels around the periphery of the Existing Landfill Area.

3.4.9 The current landfill area landform consists of the currently tipped areas (up to c. 122m AOD) with Storefield Brook flowing from west to east along the northern boundary of the current tipping areas along a fall from 105m AOD to 100m AOD (past the landfill). The area to the north of the existing tipped areas is currently subject to regrading works associated with the approved Storefield Brook diversion, to accommodate the approved the Rushton (Northern) Landfill extension.

3.4.10 The landform to the north and west of the Existing Landfill has a gently undulating or rolling appearance ranging from around 100m AOD to 135m AOD elevation, the latter forming the higher areas of land in the locality. South of the Site, the landform slopes down to the River Ise, approximately 850m south of the centre of the Site (and south of Station Road), lying in a valley around 80m AOD. The River flows eastwards, running south of the villages of Desborough and Rushton then further across through to Geddington, before heading south on the eastern side of Kettering.

3.4.11 The landform to the south is generally more undulating, with slopes being slightly steeper and ranging in elevation from around 80m to 110m AOD. Land to the east of the Site tends to be slightly lower than land found to the north and west, ranging from around 90m AOD to 105m AOD, again gently undulating. Where Storefield Brook flows northeast away from the Site, levels gently fall from around 100m to 85m AOD.

**Landuse and Vegetation**

3.4.12 The Existing Landfill lies to primarily to the north and east of the existing Waste Reception area and primarily consists of bare ground and exposed waste cover with areas that has been capped, depending on the phase of works. This is interspersed with sporadic vegetation on stretches of previously disturbed land that are currently not being worked. Vegetation consists of tall ruderal species and occasional small scrub species. This is particularly prevalent along the northwestern flank of the landfill, adjacent to the soil bioremediation area, known colloquially as ‘The Gullet’.

3.4.13 The existing landfill area varies in terms of levels depending on the phasing of work, and as such the landform and landscape is dynamic. Some ‘cells’ have been capped and are at their top pre-settlement levels whilst other are still being worked. There are also some temporary soil mounds present. In the northwestern corner is an area with mounds of stone and soil present (the soil bioremediation area).

3.4.14 Some restoration of the landfill has been undertaken, with one of the southern cells (Cell 4) having been partially restored to agricultural grassland. This is still developing and is under aftercare management.

3.4.15 The surrounding landscape is a mixture of (mainly arable and permanent pasture) agricultural fields, and broadleaved woodlands. Many of the woodlands in the area being ancient or semi-natural. Fields are mostly of large scale, often bounded by hedgerows. Hedgerows tend to be smaller in terms of height on higher ground to the northwest of the height, often maintained so.

3.4.16 The land to the north of the existing tipping area, is currently subject to brook diversion works associated with the permitted northern extension to the landfill, with much of the land being bare earth and subject to regrading works. The northern landscape bund has already largely been formed and is awaiting planting.

**Settlement and Infrastructure**

3.4.17 There are a number of transport routes passing through the immediate area including local (minor) roads, an ‘A-class road’ and two railway lines. The western boundary of Rushton Landfill is immediately adjacent to the Oakley Road (minor road), that runs in a northeast – southwest alignment. Station Road (minor road) lies nearby, to the south of the Site, running along a west-to-east alignment. The road runs between Ruston village and the A6003.
3.4.18 The A6003 (Rockingham Road) is the nearest major road, running along a north-south alignment between Kettering and Corby. It is a dual carriageway, with the southbound carriageway elevated higher than the northbound carriageway, for a distance of around 460m, (separated by a large central reservation), east-southeast of Rushton Landfill. The road is 65m from the landfill boundary at its nearest point.

3.4.19 The Midlands Railway Line is approximately 320m southeast of the landfill boundary at its nearest point. This railway line runs in westerly and southeasterly directions from Rushton. The Midlands Railway Line is in cutting west of Rushton Village. East of Rushton and directly south of the landfill (where it meets the Oakham to Kettering Railway Line) the rail line is on an embankment, with mature woodland present along this section.

3.4.20 The Oakham to Kettering Railway Line runs on a northeast-southwest alignment (circa 290m southwest of the landfill boundary at its nearest point), joining the Midlands Railway Line approximately 1.5 kilometres to the south of the Existing Landfill. This line is in cutting when passing the Site to the east, with woodland also present here.

3.4.21 The immediate area is relatively sparsely settled. Rushton Village is the nearest settlement, 420m from the landfill boundary at its nearest point and separated by the Midlands Railway Line. Oakley Hay Industrial Estate (Great Oakley) is 1.5 kilometres north of the landfill (at the nearest point to the Site boundary) with Pipewell hamlet located circa 1.8 kilometres northwest of Rushton Landfill.

3.4.22 A number of properties lie in close proximity to the landfill boundary, including:

- Storefield Lodge (immediately north of the Site - owned by the same landowner as the landfill site);
- The Bungalow and an adjacent property - at the junction of Station and Oakley Road, southeast of the Site;
- Whitegates Farm - located immediately south of Station Road;
- Storefield Cottages (several residences) - on a small access road to the east of the A6003, opposite Station Road; and
- Keepers Lodge - around 50m east of the landfill, circa 1.2km from the Proposed Development Areas.

3.4.23 It is also noteworthy, that on 11th January 2010, Kettering Borough Council granted permission for New Albion Wind Farm, consisting of seven wind turbines (maximum height of 100m at tip of blades) and a permanent 80m high anemometer mast. The wind farm is immediately north and east of New Wood and the nearest turbine(s) will be around 250 to 300 metres from the boundary of the landfill.

3.4.24 There are also a number of electricity and telegraph overhead cables crossing the landscape, with associated pylons and poles.

Public Rights of Way and Permitted Access

3.4.25 There are few Public Rights of Way close to the Site (see Figure L1). A footpath (Definitive Map footpath no. GT10) runs east-northeast from the A6003 Rockingham Road (the opposite side of the road from Storefield Wood) to Mill Hill for a distance of around 1.2 kilometres.

3.4.26 A public bridleway (Definitive Map footpath no. GY01) runs south to north between Rushton and Pipewell, around 730m west of the landfill boundary at its nearest point. The bridleway covers a distance of around 2.5 kilometres.

3.4.27 This Public Right of Way is also publicised via the Pocket Pub Walk Series of books, by Countryside Books9, and is walk 6 (Rushton) for the Northamptonshire area. This walk is also publicised and used by the Northamptonshire Ramblers Association.

3.4.28 There is a public footpath (Definitive Map footpath no. GY02) that runs parallel with this bridleway, on average, a further 95m to the west. This is connected to GY01 via footpath no. GY17.

---

9 Countryside Books (May 2008), Pocket Pub Walks in Northamptonshire
3.4.29 Other Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of the Site are:

- A Public Bridleway (footpath no. GY05) running eastwards from Rushton towards the Midlands Railway Line and runs south-eastwards along the rail line;

- Footpath GY13 running eastwards from where the bridleway (footpath no. GY05) meets the Midlands Railway Line towards the Wildlife Trust Reserve covering the River Ise and Meadows SSSI and Barford Meadows SSSI; and

- Footpath GY14 running south-westwards from Rushton for a distance of 600m.

3.4.30 The footpaths noted above are also interconnected by shorter Public Rights of Way through Rushton.

3.4.31 There are no other Public Rights of Way within 1.5 kilometres of the Site and there is no Access Land in the surrounding area.

3.4.32 Permissive Access, provided under the Dept. for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ farm conservation schemes, as managed by Natural England, is granted to the Wildlife Trust Reserve and SSSI’s south of the Site and, in conjunction with Footpath GY13, there is a Country Walk publicised by Natural England. The reserve is 770m south of Rushton Landfill at its nearest point to the boundary.

3.4.33 No National Cycle Network routes or other specific cycleways pass close to the Site.

**Historical Land-use and Cover**

3.4.34 The area was historically part of Rockingham Forest, and it has been due to the expansion of agriculture throughout the area that a mosaic of fields and woodlands has developed across the area.

3.4.35 The historical mapping data for 1887 to 1891 shows the Site as being agricultural fields. The surrounding landscape is covered by agricultural land and pockets of woodland. Storefield Lodge is on the mapping data (north of the Site) and a couple of buildings (The Mount and Keepers Lodge) are shown along the road that is now the A6003.

3.4.36 According to 1901 historical mapping data highlights a quarry immediately west of the Site, on the west side of Oakley Road and quarries are also shown as being present around 1 kilometre southeast of the Site, otherwise the overall agricultural system and woodlands are relatively unchanged from previous maps.

3.4.37 The 1938 to 1952 historical mapping data, again shows few changes to the landscape aside from more plantation woodland appearing around 1 kilometre southeast of the Site (where quarries are also highlighted) and this is the period when Storefield Cottages along the A6003 appear. Again the overall agricultural system and woodlands are present.

3.4.38 It is clear that in areas adjacent to and relatively close to the Site, quarrying has been undertaken, especially from Victorian times onwards. OS mapping data indicates that there was a previous disused quarry at the Site. The entire area to the South of the Site, up to Whitegates Farm, is a former Ironstone Pit.

3.4.39 The Site does not lie within a Conservation Area and there are no Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or close to the Site.

3.5 **Landscape Quality**

3.5.1 The Site (the areas of Proposed Development) and immediately adjacent areas are dominated by the existing site infrastructure associated with the ongoing permitted landfill operations, including the internal access road, site offices and Waste Reception Building. The land immediately to the north and northeast of the Proposed Development Areas consists of the existing landfill area with the current landform a result of these operations and the current landscape character can be said to be degraded. There are very few characteristic landscape elements present and the visual condition of the Site area is poor, with little in the way of semi-natural habitats present. The vast majority of the Proposed Development Areas consist of bare ground and hardstanding.

3.5.2 Agricultural grassland is present on restored areas to the east of the Waste Reception Building, with a mature line of trees to its south and mature 2-3m high hawthorn hedgerows adjacent to
Oakley Road. Currently, there is limited potential for cross-interaction between habitats. The landscape quality of the Site can be said to be **Very Poor to Poor**.

### 3.5.3 Existing Landfill

The overall Existing Landfill is heavily influenced by ongoing landfilling operations, with much of the area dominated by bare earth and tipped areas, interspersed by rough grassland and areas of restoration. The landscape quality of the Existing Landfill is Poor.

### 3.5.4 Wider Landscape

The wider landscape (beyond the landfill boundary) consists of a number of characteristic landscape elements that are both in a strong functional and visual condition. There is uniformity across the landscape of agricultural fields interspersed with woodlands. Woodlands are fairly large and frequent in the landscape, and with the presence of hedgerows delineating the field system, there are good opportunities for cross-interaction between habitats. The wider landscape has an Ordinary to Good landscape quality.

### 3.6 Landscape Policies and Designations

#### 3.6.1 Current Development Plan Documents

- Documents contained within the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework;
- The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (Adopted June 2008) – part of the developing North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework; and

#### 3.6.2 Kettering Borough Local Plan

The Kettering Borough Local Plan is currently being reviewed in preparation of the new North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework. The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy has already been adopted and supersedes much of the Kettering Borough Local Plan, with only the saved policies of the Local Plan being active and relevant to the Local Plan map.

#### 3.6.3 Minerals and Waste Local Plans

All policies within the Minerals and Waste Local Plans (adopted in 2006) of Northamptonshire have been superseded upon the adoption of relevant documents within Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF).

#### 3.6.4 Northamptonshire Structure Plan

The Northamptonshire Structure Plan 1996 – 2016 was superseded by The East Midlands Regional Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)), which was revoked as of 12th April 2013. Where no emerging policies have been sufficiently developed to replace the Structure Plan and RSS, national policy has been used in deference.

#### 3.6.5 Northamptonshire Environmental Character Assessments

In addition to the Development Plans above, the Northamptonshire Environmental Character Strategy and Green Infrastructure Strategy also provides landscape strategic policies and guidance for Northamptonshire. These have been developed based on the Northamptonshire Environmental Character Assessment comprising the Northamptonshire Current Landscape Assessment, Historic Landscape Character Assessment and Biodiversity Character Assessment.

#### 3.6.6 Natural Area Profiles

Natural Area Profiles also provide additional objectives in relation to the key habitats present, alongside objectives and recommendations from National Landscape Character Assessments.

#### 3.6.7 Biodiversity Partnership

The Northamptonshire Biodiversity Partnership has also produced a number of species and habitat action plans (local Biodiversity Action Plans (or BAPs)) with targets for their conservation\(^\text{10}\).

---

\(^{10}\) Northamptonshire Biodiversity Partnership (2008) - Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan 2nd Edition
3.6.9 There are no landscape designations cited in the Core Strategy DPD for the Site. The Site lies within a ‘Limestone Safeguarding Area’. Relevant policies include:

- Policy CS13 – Restoration and After-use of Minerals and Waste Developments; and
- Policy CS14 – Addressing the Impact of Proposed Minerals and Waste Development.

3.6.10 The most relevant key objective, with regard to this LVIA, in the Core Strategy is:

- Objective 10: Conserving and enhancing Northamptonshire’s built and natural environment - Recognise Northamptonshire’s environmental systems and landscape linkages in order to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment through ensuring sensitive working, and where necessary high standards of mitigation of potentially adverse impacts of minerals and waste development.

3.6.11 The Control and Management of Development (CMD) DPD also sets out policies in relation to development expanding on those from the Core Strategy DPD. Relevant policies include:

- Policy CMD7 – Natural Assets and Resources;
- Policy CMD8 – Landscape Character;
- Policy CMD9 – Historic Environment;
- Policy CMD10 – Layout and Design Quality;
- Policy CMD11 – Mineral Safeguarding Areas – Requirements for Non-Mineral Related Development; and
- Policy CMD13 – Restoration and After-use.

3.6.12 As with the Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, the county MWDF cites the Northamptonshire Environmental Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy as the basis for the environmental and landscape response to development.

3.6.13 There is also the Development and Implementation Principles Supplementary Planning Document (adopted September 2011) that provides best guidance for Minerals and Waste development, with Box SPD3: Design principles for minerals and waste development being most relevant to the proposals, in terms of limiting landscape and visual impacts of development.

North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy

3.6.14 The strategy does not cite any landscape designation for the area and Local Development Framework Documents are awaited for Kettering Borough.

3.6.15 Relevant policies, in terms of landscape issues, from the core strategy include:

- Policy 5 – Green Infrastructure; and
- Policy 13 – General Sustainable Development Principles.

3.6.16 Policy 13 states that development should seek to protect assets and that it should “Conserve and enhance the landscape character, historic landscape designated built environmental assets and their settings, and biodiversity of the environment making reference to the Environmental Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy”

Kettering Borough Local Plan

3.6.17 Only a few saved policies remain active from the Kettering Borough Local Plan with the most relevant policy being No. 7 – Protection of the Open Countryside.

3.6.18 The Site was not designated under the previous local policy of Special landscape Areas (Policy 9).

3.6.19 There are no national or local nature conservation designations relating to the Site. A number of SSSIs and local wildlife sites lie within 2 kilometres of the Site. Alder Wood and Meadows SSSI is approximately 1.1 kilometres northwest of the Site boundary at its nearest point. To the south of the Site the River Ise and Meadows SSSI and Barford Meadows SSSI are almost contiguous with

---

11 North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (June 2008), North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy
each other falling within a Wildlife Trust Reserve, the edge of the reserve being 770m south east of the centre of the Site at its nearest point. The reserve is separated from the Site by a railway line and Station Road.

Northamptonshire Environmental Character and Green Infrastructure Suite

3.6.20 In Northamptonshire, the “Environmental Character and Green Infrastructure Suite was developed to provide technical guidance for the environmental policies in the Core Spatial Strategies for North and West Northamptonshire.”

3.6.21 The Environmental Character Assessment combines the findings of the Current Landscape Character Assessment, Biodiversity Character Assessment and Historic Landscape Character Assessment. Key issues are identified for each character area and are intended to guide planning authorities and guide the Proposed Development. Rushton Landfill falls within the Rockingham Forest Environmental Character Area with relevant issues being summarised as:

- Rockingham Forest is one of the most well-known landscapes in the county, taking its name from the royal hunting forest that existed across the area from the 11th to the 19th centuries;
- Today, what is identified as Rockingham Forest is only a fragment of a much larger area. As such, the remaining forest area is sensitive to any further loss or degradation of characteristic features and woodland resource;
- New development should be sensitive to settlement morphology and its relationship to landform features;
- Coppicing practices, the principal method of woodland management throughout the medieval period, has declined and should be reintroduced as a management tool;
- Ancient woodlands and areas of tree cover are a unifying characteristic of the area and should be protected for their cultural and nature conservation value in conjunction with a woodland planting programme; and
- Increased arable cultivation in recent decades has been mirrored by hedgerow removal and field amalgamation, which should be prevented.

3.6.22 Study B of the Green Infrastructure Guidance outlines the situation and proposals for North Northamptonshire in terms of connecting landscape, habitats and leisure areas. The North Northamptonshire Strategic Green Infrastructure Framework Plan shows how this will be delivered through a number of Sub-Regional and Local Green Infrastructure Corridors.

3.6.23 The Existing Landfill lies just north of the Ise Valley Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Corridor identifying the following relevant priorities for action:

- The potential for water storage and flood risk management should be established in close combination with growth area development;
- In biodiversity terms there is a need to enhance and link the calcareous grassland habitats through the green corridor;
- Wetland and neutral grassland habitat creation and enhancement would also provide important linkages between Nene Valley and Rockingham Forest area; and
- Continuous recreation routes throughout the green corridor, to provide access to the strategic destination and support sustainable movement options for local users are needed.

---

12 Northamptonshire County Council (2006), Environmental Character and Green Infrastructure Suite – Policy and Context
Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan

3.6.24 This document\(^\text{13}\) provides the local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) priorities and targets for Northamptonshire, in terms of the conservation of priority habitats and species in the county. These are further developed in to Habitat and Species Action Plans based on areas or boroughs throughout the county. It also sets General Action Plans in terms of promoting biodiversity at a policy and strategic level.

3.6.25 Priority Habitats in the area of the Site are:
- Hedgerows;
- Lowland Calcareous Grassland;
- Lowland Fens;
- Lowland Meadows;
- Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland;
- Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land;
- Ponds;
- Rivers;
- Traditional orchards;
- Wet Woodland; and
- Wood Pasture and Parkland.

National Character Area Recommendations

3.6.26 Recommendations are given in the national Countryside Character Assessment document\(^\text{14}\) to ‘shape the future’ of this area and can be summarised by:
- Restoring the Forest landscape through the conservation, enhancement and appropriate extension of natural habitats and landscape features;
- Conservation of traditional features and habitats, such as managing and restoring ancient woodlands, unimproved grasslands and meadows and historic parkland restoration;
- Enhancement of agricultural landscapes, including managing and planting new woodlands to accentuate the wooded appearance of the landscape and enhancing linkages, as well as recreating limestone grasslands and the management and planting of hedgerows;
- Managing and establishing green corridors as visual and wildlife links across the agricultural landscape; and
- Recreation in developed landscapes including the management of disused quarried for landscape and nature conservation purposes.

Natural Area Profile Key Objectives

3.6.27 In this document, the relevant key objectives listed against the Rockingham Forest Natural Area, include:
- The sustainable management of characteristic wildlife habitats and species in order to maintain the character of the Natural Area;
- The restoration of characteristic wildlife habitats and species where these have been lost, in order to enhance the essential character of the Natural Area; and

\(^{13}\) Northamptonshire Biodiversity Partnership (2008) - Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan 2nd Edition
\(^{14}\) Countryside Agency (1999), Countryside Character - Volume 4: East Midlands
3.7 Landscape Value

3.7.1 The Site has no statutory or local landscape designations or Tree Preservation Orders attached to the land.

3.7.2 There are no areas of ancient woodland or veteran trees within the Site and no statutory nature conservation designations apply to the Site. The habitats within the Site are not highly valued on a national or regional scale, are heavily degraded by existing operations associated with the active landfill and are easily replicated or improved. Upon cessation of landfilling operations at Rushton Landfill, the Site will be restored, resulting in improvements to the landscape and the habitats present. The Site is also in the context of progressive restoration of the wider landfill resulting in ongoing habitat improvements.

3.7.3 A number of sites designated locally for their nature conservation importance lie close to Rushton Landfill, including Storefield Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS), and the SSSI’s of Alder Wood and Meadows, River Ise and Meadows and Barford Meadows are within 2 kilometres of the Site. Opportunities exist to improve inter-connectivity between sites of nature conservation value across the Site, through the restoration of the wider landfill area.

3.7.4 Public Right of Way Footpath (Bridleway) No. GY1, some 700 plus metres west of the landfill, is a publicised local circular walk.

3.7.5 There are no ancient monuments or other features protected for their historical or cultural heritage at the Site. The cultural heritage value at the Site has been adversely affected by current and past mineral and landfill working, including the associated built elements, and by agricultural operations and is not considered highly valued.

3.7.6 The Proposed Development will not result in the loss of any important or highly valued characteristic landscape elements, with the majority of the development areas currently being on hardstanding and bare earth and subject to landfill and associated waste operations. The landscape value of the Site (i.e. the proposed development areas), in this overall context can be described as being of a Very Low level.

3.8 Visual Baseline

3.8.1 The visibility of the land within the Site itself is currently limited by hedgerows at the periphery of the Site and by the landform (including that of the current landfill) and woodland components in the wider landscape. Adjacent tall features (e.g. the existing waste reception building) are more readily visible from the surrounding landscape and the proposed development has the potential to be visible from similar locations.

3.8.2 In order to represent the potential visibility of the proposals a theoretical ZVI of 11 metres above the existing ground levels (for the proposed Concrete Batching Plant) and 12 metres above the existing ground levels (for the proposed SRF building) has been illustrated separately on Figure L2. This assumes that woodland shown on the OS map is 10m high and that the visual receptor is 1.7m above ground level (using OS Panorama data for the digital terrain model).

3.8.3 Views from the South towards the Site are restricted by mature hedgerows and woodland belts and the existing waste reception building, such that only specific views from generally higher slopes south of the River Ise valley are achieved. Views from the South, off Station Road, are further restricted by a 3-4 metre high hedgerow along the verge. The railway lines are also generally well tree lined such that views are generally not afforded except where breaks in vegetation and the landform allow.

3.8.4 Views of the Site from the north are heavily restricted by the Existing Landfill landform and ongoing operations at Rushton Landfill and are primarily available from agricultural fields immediately west Storefield Lodge and to the west of Oakley Road; generally areas without public access. Views from further North are further restricted by Storefield Wood, Forty Acre Spinney (wood) and the existing landform.

• The maintenance of the diversity of geological and geomorphological interest found within the Natural Area.
3.8.5 Views of the Site from the east are primarily from specific points along the A6003 road. The A6003 road is well lined by a 2-3 metre high hedgeline that screens views from road level. The southbound carriageway is a few metres higher than the northbound carriageway and glimpsed views across to the Site can be observed, filtered through a young, developing block of trees in the central reservation and are not considered to be significant. The nearby railway line is also well lined by trees that screen the majority of views.

3.8.6 Views from the northbound carriageway are significantly more restricted. The first floor front windows of Storefield Cottages, just off the A6003, have the potential for filtered views across parts of the southern part of the Site and of the Waste Reception building, over an interlying block of developing woodland. Views of the Site are obscured by the interlying landfill landform from Keepers Lodge. Views from further east and southeast are theoretically possible from within a narrows section of the visual envelope. In the field, these locations were found not to provide open views of the Site, being obscured by a number of localised features in the landscape such as hedgerows.

3.8.7 Views from Oakley Road, immediately west of the landfill boundary, are largely restricted to a small stretch of this road near the access point to Storefield Lodge, due to the presence of a 2-3 metre high hedgerow. Views of the Site could be gained from specific points further to the west, where breaks in the vegetation allow, with the theoretical visibility primarily covering agricultural fields without public access. Views from north of New Wood along the bridleway are completely obscured by mature hedgerows. Fieldwork confirmed that views from further west of the Site along Pipewell Road are generally screened by hedgerows and interlying landscape elements.

3.8.8 Views of the Site are generally not afforded from Rushton village due to the presence of the interlying rail line and trees. Further southwest, the theoretical visibility of the Site primarily covers agricultural fields with no public access. Fieldwork confirmed that southwest of the Site, views are not generally afforded due to interlying trees and woodland and other landscape elements, with hedgerows further screening / filtering views from along Desborough Road and a circa. 2m high wall and adjacent woodland screening views for east bound users of Rushton Road leading from Rothwell. Views from the northern edge of Rothwell are also generally not afforded due to localised screening and interlying woodland.

3.8.9 Many of the views will be affected by the consented New Albion Wind Farm, such that the context will change markedly upon its implementation, especially views from footpaths to the west.

3.8.10 In general, filtered, glimpsed and sporadic views of parts of the Site, can be achieved through field access points and gaps in hedgerows, from a small number of specific private and publicly accessible locations near the Site.
4 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Assumptions

4.1.1 The assessment is made against a baseline situation that the ‘do nothing scenario’ would effectively result in the existing Rushton Landfill Site being restored to the approved restoration plan, including removal of the existing Waste Reception Building. The existing landfill has approval to be in operation until c. 2030, with the planning permission (consisting of the northern extension to the landfill, the Storefield Brook diversion and adjacent landscaping) being implemented in full.

4.1.2 It is assumed that the Site entrance will be widened and reconfigured as is consented.

4.1.3 It is assumed that the proposed SRF building and Waste Reception Building extension will be of a similar colour to the existing Waste Reception Building, with the Concrete Batching Plant to be similar in colour to the LFG compound infrastructure.

4.1.4 It is assumed that the areas of woodland close to the Site will not be felled during the life of the Proposed Development and that the New Albion Wind Farm is constructed before 2017.

4.1.5 Fieldwork was undertaken in late August, 2012. The assessment of effects is based on the situation at that time.

4.2 Predicted Sources of Impact

4.2.1 The potential sources of impact include those outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Impact</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of land cover and landscape elements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new built elements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operations associated with proposed buildings, including a temporary construction period and vehicle movements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Mitigation Measures

Alternatives Considered and Incorporated Mitigation

4.3.1 The Proposed Development allows the continued use of existing infrastructure at Rushton Landfill and for the co-location of similar infrastructure at the Site, reducing the need for the construction of new access roads, Site offices, processing plant and the land take that this would require if operated as 2 sites or if the waste was managed at an alternative site.

4.3.2 The Proposed Development allows the use and retention of important screening features, including the landform of the consented landfill and makes good use of the natural screening features present in the landscape, such that adverse visual effects are reduced from certain locations.

4.3.3 Existing permitted landscape mitigation such, as the approved landscape bund and woodland planting adjacent to the entrance to Storefield Lodge, will also be effective at mitigating adverse visual effects as they develop.

4.3.4 Early planting of the woodland scrub (as approved on restoration plan) will help to incorporate the proposals in to the landscape as well as providing screening potential.

4.3.5 Where additional (secondary) visual screening is required beyond that already incorporated into the operational landfill development, an assessment of alternatives has been undertaken to help ensure that adverse effects of the screening options available are minimised whilst achieving the
required level of screening.

4.3.6 The main screening options considered were temporary soil mounds, hedgerows and woodland planting belts and management of existing vegetation to promote improved screening. This has been undertaken on the basis of trying to retain or promote desirable visual character at a viewpoint (e.g. openness, or long-range views into the distance).

4.3.7 Screening mounds have an instant screening effect, but their height generally needs to be limited to prevent these features from creating adverse visual impacts in their own right.

4.3.8 Woodlands take time to become effective and can screen views from higher viewpoints, but can limit desirable long-range views once the trees grow beyond the necessary height. Professional judgement has been applied to determine the most appropriate mitigation technique.

4.3.9 Woodland features will be planted using native species to mimic local hedgerow and woodland characteristics, providing positive landscape and ecological effects.

4.3.10 Mitigation measures, used to limit the identified adverse impacts are summarised in Table 11, with reference to the visual or landscape basis, or both:

**Table 11  Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early planting of woodland adjacent to the Waste Reception Building to help integrate this element and the Proposed Developments into the landscape.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising the new northern landscaped area (bund) with native broadleaved woodland planting previously permitted to help screen the development from the north.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the duration of the Proposed Development as much as possible (e.g. limiting the duration of operations), such that the buildings will be decommissioned upon completion of landfilling at Rushton Landfill.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the existing landform to screen as much of the Proposed Development as possible.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise retained woodlands to limit visibility of the Proposed Development.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the heights and footprint of the buildings as far as is operationally practical, such that the Waste Reception Building extension and SRF buildings are no higher than the existing Waste Reception Building and take up the least amount of space, having regard to effects on the skyline.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicate the style of the existing Waste Reception Building and give consideration to the colour of the buildings to limit visual impact, subject to discussion with the local planning authority, such that effects on the skyline and contrast with adjacent landscape elements are reduced where possible.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make use of existing haul road and access routes, infrastructure etc. to limit cumulative impacts of multiple features</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate woodland planting (including 2m high tree planting) on the slopes to the east of the Waste Reception Building to incorporate the proposals in to the landscape and provide screening of the lower halves of the buildings in the Medium to Long-term</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate a shallow bund along the western boundary of the Site adjacent to the Concrete Batching Plant and plant to native woodland to provide visual screening and a long-term visual backdrop to the plant.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that night-lighting is as low as possible and is directed downwards and generally away from potential visual receptors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glen Farrow biomass boilers have been selected to be compact and are designed to reduce smoke and other emissions rising in to the air</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure new woodland planting compliments the existing restoration scheme and landscape characteristics of the wider area to provide landscape benefit and habitat corridors across the area</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Landscape Impact Assessment

Assessment of Effects on Existing Landscape Elements

4.4.1 The proposed development areas within the Site do not contain sensitive land cover elements, consisting primarily of bare earth and hardstanding. These elements are not sensitive in the context of the surrounding landscape, are readily replicable and there is much scope for potential improvements.

4.4.2 The landscape value of the Site has been described as being of a Very Low level. The landscape quality of the Site has been described as Very Poor to Poor. The landscape sensitivity is 'Very Low - Low'.

4.4.3 The proposed development is to occur entirely in the context of existing operations at Rushton Landfill. The proposed new built elements are positioned adjacent and near to the existing Waste Reception Building, the existing Site entrance and associated main haul route, offices, weighbridge, gas plant, etc. which are all in themselves incongruous landscape elements.

4.4.4 The proposed development areas are almost entirely consisting of bare earth and hardstanding, land cover not in keeping with the wider landscape.

4.4.5 The proposed development, primarily consisting of a 25m extension to the existing Waste Reception Building, the erection of the SRF building (of the same building height and type as the existing Waste Reception Building) and the introduction of the concrete batching plant, will result in some large magnitude changes to low sensitivity existing landscape elements, which are not in keeping with landscape elements in the wider landscape setting beyond the boundary of the Existing Landfill. The proposed changes and operational period will last for a Long-term duration.

4.4.6 The significance of adverse effects from the proposed development is Moderate.

4.4.7 Woodland scrub planting as shown on the approved restoration plan for the Site, will be planted within 12 months of commencement of the proposed developments, with additional woodland planting (for screening purposes) planted to the east of the proposed SRF building and existing Waste Reception Building, adding characteristic landscape elements to the Site at the earliest opportunity. The woodland elements will mature due the operational lifetime of the proposals.

4.4.8 Upon cessation of landfilling operations at Rushton Landfill, all the existing and proposed built elements will be decommissioned and the Site restored generally in accordance with the approved restoration plan for the landfill. The beneficial effects upon restoration are considered neutral in this context and generally unchanged from the beneficial effects previously considered.

Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character

4.4.9 There is a strong existing influence on the landscape character from landfill operations on the immediate area, including from the presence of the existing Waste Reception Building. The effects of the landfill will diminish as the wider landfill is progressively restored. The experienced effect on the landscape character is severely limited by the restricted visibility of the development, and thus exerts an effect on a limited area of the landscape character area only. The Site (and immediate area) has historically been subject to quarrying activities and the character across the wider area is influenced by a number of other man-made elements (railways, major roads, pylons, a large mast, large modern industrial buildings on the southern edge of Corby etc.), which is in contrast to the more tranquil mature woodland and agricultural landscape that lies between these areas. This will be further adversely affected upon construction of the New Albion Wind Farm.

4.4.10 The sensitivity of the Landscape Character to the Proposed Development in this context is Low-Medium. In relation to landscape character, the adverse landscape effects during the operational period are, overall, typically of Medium magnitude, occurring for a Long-term duration. The Proposed Development will only remove low sensitivity elements from generally heavily degraded operational areas of Rushton Landfill. The proposals will add two new built elements to the landscape and increase the size of the existing Waste Reception Building by around 50%.

4.4.11 The proposals will occur entirely in the context of other existing detracting landscape characteristics at Rushton Landfill, over the smallest practical development area to limit the influence the new built elements will exert on the wider rural landscape character. The proposed buildings are not permanent features within the landscape and will be decommissioned upon the closure and restoration of Rushton Landfill. This is in contrast to the more permanent built
elements in the wider landscape and the approved New Albion Wind Farm. Generally, visibility of the proposals is largely limited to extended existing elements (rather than new features) reducing the magnitude of influence on the wider landscape character.

4.4.12 The capacity of the landscape is sufficient to accept the Proposed Development without incurring significant effects on landscape character during the operational period, due to the context in which the new built elements are proposed and the limited influence they will exert on the prevalent surrounding landscape character. The wider landscape character will also improve as the influence of the landfill operations diminishes and phased restoration is completed and landscaping matures.

4.4.13 The adverse effects on the prevalent landscape character during the operational period are of Moderate significance.

4.4.14 The Site will be restored generally in accordance with the approved restoration plan for the landfill, with additional characteristic landscape elements incorporated as part of the mitigation strategy for the proposals. In this context the Very-Long term beneficial effects on landscape character upon restoration will be unchanged from those previously assessed and still realised.

4.4.15 The beneficial effects (over a very long-term duration) of the restored site will not be compromised by the proposed development (remaining a neutral effect), these being consistent with the characteristics and objectives of the character area.

Cumulative Landscape Effects

4.4.16 The proposals will create additional built elements within a Site that is already heavily influenced by the presence of the Waste Reception Building and other landfill infrastructure. The proposals and existing built elements are temporary in nature, in the sense that they will be decommissioned upon cessation of landfilling and the Site restored as per the approved situation.

4.4.17 There are no similar developments within 1.5 kilometres of the Site. This ensures that disruption to the landscape, and the associated cumulative landscape impact, is not significantly different to the stand-alone landscape impact. The main difference is a massing of buildings within the Rushton Landfill Site entrance area. This cumulative effect exert a stronger influence on the prevalent landscape character than is the current situation, and is of Minor significance over and above the stand alone effects of the individual assessment of effects, for a long-term duration until the buildings are decommissioned and the Site restored.

4.5 Visual Impact Assessment

Introduction

4.5.1 The presentation of the assessment of visual effects has focused on representative principal viewpoints which represent sensitive locations with the potential to be affected to a significant level and the range of potentially sensitive views available across the area. A number of illustrative views have also been presented to demonstrate the visual effect from these locations.

4.5.2 Views from beyond approximately 1.5 kilometres distance of the Site boundary were found to be secondary to the effects on locations within this distance, or more readily represented as a worse case situation by alternative locations.

4.5.3 Six principal representative viewpoints have been selected to best represent the sensitive viewpoint locations and main effects within the ZVI and the situation observed during fieldwork and are illustrated using photographs in Figures L3 to L8. The representative viewpoints are shown on Figure L2 and listed in Table 12 below:
### Table 12  Principal Representative Viewpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint No.</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Receptors Represented</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oakley Road (junction of Storefield Lodge access), adjacent to boundary of the permitted landfill area</td>
<td>Residents (first floor)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oakley Road, adjacent to existing Site access and Waste Reception Building</td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Off Station Road, 380m southeast of Site boundary</td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Junction of Station Road and A6003 approximately 1km east of the Site boundary</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents (first floor)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Right Of Way No. GY13 1km south-southeast of Site boundary</td>
<td>Footpath users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permissive access users</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Right Of Way No. GY01 825m west of Site boundary</td>
<td>Footpath / Bridleway users (locally promoted route)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All distances are from the location of where the photograph was taken to the Site, not from the façade of the nearest dwelling house for example.

**Assessment from Viewpoint 1**

4.5.4 Viewpoint 1 is from Oakley Road, on the junction with the access road to Storefield Lodge, adjacent to the northern boundary of the permitted landfill area, circa 565m north-northeast of the proposed Concrete Batching Plant, i.e. Medium range, (see Figure L3). The photograph primarily represents a very specific glimpsed view between gaps in the hedgerow by local road users and also partly represents first floor views towards the Proposed Development obtainable by the residents of Storefield Lodge. The visual sensitivity is Medium for residents at Storefield Lodge and Low for local road users.

4.5.5 The existing view takes in the existing partially constructed northern landscape bund (awaiting planting) as permitted as part of the northern Rushton Landfill extension. The landscape bund currently screens views of the western half of the Existing Landfill area. Beyond the landscape bund lies a predominantly bare area of earth currently subject to landscaping works associated with the permitted Storefield Brook diversion, with the northern edge of the current landfill area in the background.

4.5.6 A 2-3m high hedgerow runs adjacent to Oakley Road in the right hand part of the view. In view, between the current landfill area and the hedgerow, lies the 'bioremediation area' with large spoil mounds and stockpiles of material present. Beyond, the soil stockpiles the top third and roofline of the existing Waste Reception Building is visible.

4.5.7 The view is representative of transient, glimpsed views through gaps in the hedgerow (or over the hedgerow where the topography allows) along this road route when heading southwards only and filtered views through the hedgerow during winter (when passing at close-range to the proposals).

4.5.8 The skyline is mainly comprised of the northern landscape bund in the foreground and the Existing Landfill in the background, along with some woodland and tree cover in the distance.

4.5.9 The proposals will visually consist of the existing Waste Reception Building extending 25m towards the viewpoint, with a new SRF building, to the same height, being constructed adjacent to the existing building. From the viewpoint, the Existing Landfill and landform will screen the SRF building from view.
4.5.10 As the extension to the Waste Reception Building is primarily northwards towards the viewpoint, the proportion of the building forming part of the view will not increase significantly from the current situation and will not be significantly discernible. The top third of the tallest elements of the proposed Concrete Batching Plant (the batching tower and silos) may be discernible against the backdrop of the Waste Reception Building and adjacent tree lines (including proposed planting), not breaking the skyline. The bottom half of the proposed batching plant, such as the loading cells and any mineral storage bays, will not be visible, as the base of the plant will be c. 3 - 4m below the level of Oakley Road and the relatively flat nature of the interlying land between the proposed plant and viewpoint, does not afford views of lower parts of the plant.

4.5.11 Both the proposed extension to the Waste Reception Building and the Concrete Batching Plant will be progressively screened from view by the landscape bund (once fully constructed) and associated planting in the medium-term.

4.5.12 The hedgerow along Oakley Road, and the one adjacent to the Storefield Lodge access road (in the left hand part of the view), are currently being allowed to grow to at least 3m in height. The current hedgerow height already screens the majority of the current landfill operations and associated infrastructure from views along Oakley Road and will continue to do so. Additional woodland planting (atop a shallow bund) will be undertaken along the western boundary of the Existing Landfill, adjacent to the concrete batching plant.

4.5.13 The Proposed Developments will take up a very small proportion of the view, and are only achieved from very specific viewpoints, with the hedgerow along Oakley Road obscuring views toward the proposals from most locations along Oakley Road. The additional woodland planting (atop a shallow bund) along the western boundary of the Existing Landfill will further screen views in the Medium-term (when passing at close-range to the Concrete Batching Plant) to ensure that transient, filtered, glimpsed views of the tops of proposed built elements where gaps in the hedgerow occur and in winter when shrubs are not in leaf, are not generally achieved.

4.5.14 There will be a temporary construction period which will be of a very limited visual impact. The new buildings will be removed upon cessation of operations at Rushton Landfill, currently permitted to be around 2030, with subsequent restoration. Continued development of the hedgerow along Oakley Road and the establishment of woodland atop the northern landscape bund will limit the visual impact of the proposed buildings to a Short to Medium-term duration. Progressive restoration of the landfill and upon completion of the Storefield Brook diversion will result in more woodland planting being planted between viewpoint and Proposed Development Areas, further screening views.

4.5.15 There is low existing visual amenity afforded from this viewpoint. With the view being glimpsed and very specific for a limited period of time, the effects on this viewpoint are of Very Small magnitude. For local road users, of Low visual sensitivity, the significance of adverse visual effects will be Negligible.

4.5.16 Ground floor views towards the proposed Waste Reception Building extension and SRF facility from Storefield Lodge are obscured by the northern landscape bund, with first floor views obscured by Existing Landfill landform. Oblique views of the tallest elements of the Concrete Batching Plant may be visible from first floor windows over the northern landscape bund and interlying landfill landform. These views will be progressively screened by developing woodland planting atop the northern landscape bund in the medium-term and entirely screened by the northern landfill extension landform once implemented. The batching plant will be set against a backdrop of existing woodland features and the proposed woodland planting along the landfill western boundary.

4.5.17 The proposals are likely to create a Very Small magnitude of visual effect to Medium sensitivity visual receptors at Storefield Lodge, having an adverse visual effect of Negligible significance.

4.5.18 Upon decommissioning of the proposals, upon cessation of landfill operations, the Site will be restored in accordance with the current permitted Restoration Plan. The beneficial visual effects upon restoration are not considered to have altered from those previously assessed.
### Table 13 Viewpoint 1 – Visual Impact Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Residents at Storefield Lodge)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only limited views of the highest points of the Concrete Batching Plant for medium-term duration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Local road users)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some discernible built elements visible from very specific viewpoint with progressive screening by current, permitted and proposed landscape elements limiting the adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 1:

4.5.19 No additional sites (of similar development type) will be visible in combination or sequentially past this viewpoint location. Cumulative effects potentially relate to additional built elements being added to the landfill site, broadly collocated in the existing waste reception area, at the same time as works are ongoing in relation to the diversion of Storefield Brook and the future permitted northern extension of the landfill. The age of the Site is such that the significance of changing visual amenity would diminish over time due to expectations of the visual receptors, with the proposed building in keeping with ongoing operations at the landfill.

4.5.20 Local Road Users will also sequentially take in views of the permitted New Albion Wind Farm to the west of Oakley Road, which will be a more prominent view than that towards the proposals and Existing Landfill due to the continued development and screening by the hedgerow and additional woodland planting along Oakley Road. Due to the limited duration of the views achieved by Local Road Users of the proposals, the cumulative visual effects are not considered significantly different to the individual effects or those previously assessed for other developments.

4.5.21 Limited views from Storefield Lodge towards the proposals are already heavily mitigated for by the permitted landscape bund (and associated woodland planting), such that the proposals will only be seen in combination with the ongoing operations of the northern landfill extension for a short to medium-term duration and will not be readily discernible. The significance of the cumulative effects of seeing the proposed Batching Plant in combination with ongoing operations at the landfill are **Negligible** at worse and would be secondary to the Very-Long term adverse visual effects of the New Albion Wind Farm.

**Assessment from Viewpoint 2**

4.5.22 Viewpoint 2 (figure L4) is from adjacent to the existing Site entrance, on Oakley Road, i.e. Close-range. It shows the existing access and the Waste Reception Building, which forms a large proportion of the right hand part of the view inside of the Site entrance. Hedgerows lead both south and north of the access with a high grass verge. The view also shows the presence of telegraph wires and power lines crossing the view. The visual amenity is low and the visual sensitivity is **Low** for local road users. The existing access is to be widened and reconfigured (as consented), resulting in the loss of the existing part of the hedgerow on the northern side of the existing junction.

4.5.23 The skyline in the right hand part of the view is defined by the mature hedgerow / treeline and the existing Waste Reception Building, with the southern end of the existing building screened by the existing boundary vegetation. The skyline in the left part of the view is defined by the boundary hedgerow along Oakley Road, with the central portion of the view extending in to the Site.

4.5.24 Upon completion of the permitted junction improvements, the proposed extension to the Waste Reception Building will form a large proportion of the central part of the view, lifting the skyline. The proposed extension will also obscure views further in to the Site and of the proposed SRF building, which may only be glimpsed from the northern most side of the revised junction once.
constructed. Some glimpsed views of working areas in front of the Waste Reception Building (e.g. the Bioremediation Area) may also be achieved.

4.5.25 From south of the Site entrance, northbound users of Oakley Road will obtain specific, transient, glimpsed views towards the Concrete Batching Plant, beyond the existing LFG compound, where the existing hedgerow on the northern side of the junction is to be removed as is already permitted. North of the viewpoint, the Concrete Batching Plant will become predominantly screened from view by the existing boundary hedgerow leading northwards along Oakley Road, with only potential glimpsed views of the top of the batching plant achieved where the hedgerow is lower or gaps allow, with filtered views in winter. The existing hedgerow will also largely screen the proposed car park extension from transient roadside views.

4.5.26 Slightly further north along Oakley Road, the existing 2 – 3m high hedgerow and proposed new woodland planting (atop a shallow bund) will be effective in screening the proposals, with only occasional filtered views over the top of the hedgerow of the roofline of the Waste Reception Building extension and the higher parts of the batching tower and silos potentially achieved where the hedgerow is slightly shorter or during winter months, for a short to medium term duration.

4.5.27 The construction period will lead to an intensification of activities within the Site entrance area in conjunction with ongoing waste reception operations, taking up a medium to large proportion of the view for a temporary duration. There is also likely to be a discernible increase in operational activity with additional vehicles and machinery potentially being visible in close proximity (such as additional waste deliveries and cement trucks) to the Site entrance. These effects are considered to be secondary to the overall effects of the proposed buildings.

4.5.28 Views of the proposals will be transient and glimpsed, for low sensitivity road users when passing in close proximity to the existing Site entrance. The proposed extension to the Waste Reception Building will form a large proportion of the view, with only partial glimpsed views of the SRF building achieved where a gap between the retained hedgerows and Waste Reception Building extension allow. Specific transient views of the upper parts of the Concrete Batching Plant may be achieved, with views becoming increasingly filtered and screened by the existing hedgerow and new woodland planting, between the westernmost landfill boundary and the batching plant, heading north past the Site entrance.

4.5.29 Overall, the proposals will have a Large magnitude adverse visual impact for a long-term duration, until the buildings are decommissioned and the landfill restored. The significance of the adverse visual impact from the proposals is considered to be Moderate, at worst.

4.5.30 The visual effect of the restoration scheme is the same as the approved situation.

### Table 14 Viewpoint 2 – Visual Impact Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Large: Proposals would lead to a large proportion of the view being taken up by the Waste Reception Building extension, along with partial views of the SRF and Concrete Batching Plant, for a long-term duration</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 2:

4.5.31 No additional similar developments will be visible in combination or sequentially past this viewpoint location. Cumulative effects relate to the addition of new built elements to the existing Site entrance area of Rushton Landfill, adjacent to the existing Waste Reception Building. The views are transient and are already heavily degraded by the presence of the existing Waste Reception Building. The proposals will not significantly impact upon the prevalent visual amenity from the viewpoint. The combination of the proposed extension to and existing Waste Reception Building, as well as the SRF building, take up a very large proportion of the view and will last for a Long-term duration. In this context, the cumulative effects are considered to be of a Negligible – Minor significance over and above the individual proposals.
4.5.32 The permitted northern extension to Rushton Landfill will not be visible from the viewpoint. Sequential views from along Oakley Road of the New Albion Wind Farm Turbines will be possible with the effects of the proposals being secondary in nature.

Assessment from Viewpoint 3

4.5.33 Viewpoint 3 is from a field access point off Station Road, around 380m southeast of the Site, i.e. Medium-range (see Figure L5). The view is of an agricultural field with the land rising towards the Existing Landfill. The tops of the New Albion wind turbines (once constructed) are likely to be visible over the interlying landform, creating dynamic elements against the skyline. The skyline currently is defined by the Existing Landfill and the Waste Reception Building. There is a high hedgerow and trees along Station Road that screen much of the view towards the landfill for local road users, with views only glimpsed through field access points. Whitegates Farm to the south of Station Road has no views of the Site. A hedgerow leading north from the viewpoint also screens views of the Existing Landfill further east. The visual sensitivity is Low.

4.5.34 The proposals will not affect the existing field, the existing hedgerows and treelines nor the existing landfill area.

4.5.35 There will be a temporary construction period associated with the development, considered to be of Very Small – Small magnitude of impact.

4.5.36 The land to the south of the existing Waste Reception Building will be planted to woodland scrub (as shown on the permitted restoration plan), with additional woodland planting along the southern boundary of the landfill on the slopes east of the current waste reception area, adjacent to the proposals. Woodland planting on the highest parts of the slope will comprise a proportion of larger planted stock (i.e. trees up to circa 4m high), to provide some initial added maturity and height to the planting.

4.5.37 The proposed woodland planting along the southern landfill boundary will progressively filter and screen views (as the planting matures) of the lower half of the proposed Waste Reception Building extension the proposed SRF building as well as the existing Waste Reception Building, such that in the long-term the overall proposals will only form a medium proportion of the view, with the proposed building breaking and redefining the skyline.

4.5.38 The top of the Concrete Batching Plant tower and silos may just be visible over the interlying landform, where other temporary positions of skips and containers do not obscure views, taking up a very-small proportion of the view, but marginally breaking the skyline until planting beyond develops. The proposals will last for a long-term duration, before being decommissioned and the landfill restored.

4.5.39 Vehicle movements associated with the operations of the proposals will generally be screened from view by the proposed buildings. There may also the opportunity to use the buildings to screen other operational elements within the Site, such as any skips and containers.

4.5.40 The restoration woodland planting will begin to define the skyline in the medium – long-term, helping to limit the relative impact on the skyline by the proposals and existing Waste Reception Building.

4.5.41 Overall, with only transient glimpsed views for local road users (Low sensitivity) achievable, the proposals will have a Medium - Large magnitude of effect. The significance of adverse visual effect is considered to be Minor - Moderate.

4.5.42 The proposals will also have the beneficial effect of adding additional characteristic woodland planting to the view, of Negligible significance over and above the existing permitted restoration of the Existing Landfill. There is also the opportunity of screening other detracting operational features, such as skips and machinery behind the proposed buildings.
Table 15  Viewpoint 3 – Visual Impact Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Medium - Large: glimpsed specific views of new built elements within the Site, against the skyline, taking up a medium proportion of the view for a long-term duration.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 3:

4.5.43 No additional sites will be visible in combination or sequentially past this viewpoint location. Cumulative effects relate to the addition of new built elements to the existing buildings and infrastructure. Overall, the combination of the proposals in addition to the existing Waste Reception Building, will form a medium - large proportion of the view lasting for a long-term duration. The viewpoint is achievable to low sensitivity local road users, where the visual amenity is not anticipated to be particularly high. In this overall context, the combination of the proposals and the existing built elements within the Site would create cumulative visual effects of Minor significance, over and above the individual effects of the proposals.

4.5.44 The permitted Rushton Landfill northern extension will be screened from view by the existing southern landfill area, progressively being restored, exerting no adverse impact on the viewpoint.

Assessment from Viewpoint 4

4.5.45 Viewpoint 4 is from the junction of Station Road and the A6003. At this point hedgerows are discontinued from along Station Road and the A6003, allowing a view of a large agricultural field with the landform rising away from the viewpoint. The tops of the New Albion wind turbines (once constructed) may be visible over the landform, creating dynamic elements against the skyline. The existing skyline is defined by the top of the Existing Landfill meeting the crest of the existing landform.

4.5.46 The existing landfill is visible along with the Waste Reception Building and plant (present on site at the time of the photograph) on high points of the landfill. Woodland is present south and beyond the Waste Reception Building, forming the high points on the skyline, to which the Waste Reception Building is secondary in influence. The viewpoint represents local road users (whose visual sensitivity is Low) and, partly, the first floor views from Storefield Cottages (further from the viewpoint - sensitivity: Medium). Views from Storefield Cottages will be filtered over existing maturing trees.

4.5.47 The field in the foreground will be unaffected by the proposals. The Waste Reception Building has also been extended to its full permitted size since the time of this specific photograph.

4.5.48 The Proposed Developments will occur over one kilometre from the viewpoint, i.e. views will be Long-range. The Concrete Batching Plant will be predominantly screened from view by the Existing Landfill landform and interlying landform, and is unlikely to be a discernible element of the proposals from the viewpoint.

4.5.49 Due to the position and orientation of the proposed buildings, the proposed SRF building will almost entirely obscure views of the Waste Reception Building extension, limiting the overall proportion of the view the proposals take up. The bottom third of the proposed SRF building will be screened by the interlying landform, with the visible parts of the buildings, marginally raising a skyline already punctuated by a number of mature trees.

4.5.50 Establishment of restoration woodland, hedgerows, hedgerow trees and trees immediately adjacent to the Waste Reception Building and the proposals as early as possible will reduce the visual effect of the buildings and will progressively screen and filter views of the lower and middle parts of the buildings in the medium – long-term.

4.5.51 First floor views from Storefield Cottages are also influenced by maturing trees in front of the properties that will progressively filter views during the operational period.
4.5.52 The construction period will take up a small proportion of the view for a temporary duration. Vehicle movements associated with the ongoing operations are unlikely to be very discernible, primarily screened by the proposed buildings.

4.5.53 Overall, the proposals will take up a small proportion of the view for a Long-term duration, until the buildings are decommissioned and the Site restored as approved. The magnitude of adverse visual effect is considered to be **Small** for Low sensitivity local road users, where only transient, glimpsed views are afforded and **Small** for residents with first floor views from Storefield Cottages, over the baseline situation.

4.5.54 The significance of adverse visual impact is considered to be **Negligible – Minor** for local road users and **Minor – Moderate** for residents at Storefield Cottages. The beneficial effects upon restoration are not considered to be significantly different from those that have been assessed before for the approved restoration plan.

### Table 16  Viewpoint 4 – Visual Impact Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> (Road users)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Small: Transient, glimpsed views of SRF building, which will be discernible feature of the development for long-term duration.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Negligible - Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> (First floor views from Storefield Cottages)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Small: SRF building will be discernible feature of the development for long-term duration, via glimpsed specific views.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 4:

4.5.55 No additional sites will be visible in combination or sequentially past this viewpoint location. Cumulative effects relate to the addition of new built elements to the existing Site entrance area of Rushton Landfill, adjacent to existing buildings and infrastructure. The proposed SRF building will obscure parts of the existing Waste Reception Building, as well as the proposed extension. Overall, the combination of the proposals in addition to the existing Waste Reception Building, will only form a small proportion of the view lasting for a long-term duration and the cumulative effects are only considered to be of an additional **Negligible** significance.

4.5.56 The permitted Rushton Landfill northern extension will be screened from view by the existing southern landfill area, progressively being restored, exerting no adverse impact on the viewpoint.

### Assessment from Viewpoint 5

4.5.57 Viewpoint 5 (figure L7) is from the Public Right of Way – footpath number GY13 around one kilometre south-southeast of the Site, i.e. Medium – Long-range. The view is representative of footpath users (**Medium** sensitivity), rail users (**Low** sensitivity) and specific views for users of the Barford Wood and Meadows Nature Reserve permissive open access and country walk as promoted by DEFRA (**High** sensitivity).

4.5.58 The view takes in a large pastoral area in the foreground, with the land gently falling away to the mid-ground, dominated by tree belts and additional mature woodland copses. The background to the view consists of the existing Rushton Landfill and agricultural fields to the west of the Site. The skyline is defined partially by the landfill landform, the adjacent landscape landform and the large woodlands in the background (such as New Wood, Forty Acre Spinney and Storefield Wood), punctuated by mature trees in the middle ground. Other detracting landscape elements are present within the view, including a railway gantry and mobile phone mast. The New Albion wind turbines (once constructed) beyond the Site will be visible from the viewpoint, creating dynamic elements against the skyline.

4.5.59 The slopes to the south and east of the existing Waste Reception Building will be planted to woodland as permitted by the approved restoration plan for Rushton Landfill and the landscape
mitigation being incorporated as part of the proposals. This woodland will progressively screen the lower half of the existing and proposed buildings in the medium to long-term. The Waste Reception building extension and proposed SRF building, will only marginally, but not discernibly break the skyline, taking up a small proportion of the overall view.

4.5.60 Views of the upper third of the Concrete Batching Plant batching tower and silos, may just be possible, framed between the proposed SRF building and the Existing Landfill landform. The batching plant will not break the skyline. Woodland planting on the southern boundary of landfill (adjacent to the waste reception area) will progressively screen views of the Concrete Batching Plant in the medium to long-term, with additional woodland planting adjacent to the batching plant will form the backdrop, helping to ensure the highest elements will only be of limited discernibility.

4.5.61 Specific views from within the Barford Wood and Meadows Nature Reserve can be achieved, where the absence of woodland planting allows and where away from the Public Right of Way on higher slopes. Views are generally from over one kilometre from the Site, i.e. Long-range. Views from the Nature Reserve generally do not break the skyline, and are set against the backdrop of woodland and agricultural fields, taking up a small proportion of the overall view.

4.5.62 Vehicle movements associated with the ongoing operations of the proposals will generally be screened by the proposed buildings and not readily discernible. There is also the opportunity to screen other detracting operational features of the landfill by the proposals, such as any skips and containers, etc.

4.5.63 The magnitude of adverse visual effect is considered to be Small for users of footpath GY13 and the permissive open access land as promoted by DEFRA. The transient, glimpsed views of the proposals afforded to local rail users are considered to be of a Very Small – Small magnitude of impact.

4.5.64 The significance of adverse visual effects is considered to be Minor - Moderate for users of footpath GY13, Moderate for users of the permissive open access land and Negligible for local rail users.

4.5.65 The proposals also include for additional woodland planting adjacent to the proposals, which is considered to be of Negligible beneficial significance over and above the permitted restoration scheme. The residual view upon restoration will be similar to that consented for Rushton Landfill.

**Viewpoint 5 – Visual Impact Assessment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong>&lt;br&gt;(footpath users)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Small: The Proposed Development would form a minor component change in the view.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong>&lt;br&gt;(permissive access promoted by DEFRA)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Small: The Proposed Development would form a minor component change in the view.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong>&lt;br&gt;(rail users)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Very Small: &lt;br&gt;Small: The Proposed Development would form a minor component change in the view.</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 5:**

4.5.66 No additional sites will be visible in combination or sequentially past this viewpoint location.

4.5.67 Cumulative effects relate to the addition of new built elements to the existing Site entrance area of Rushton Landfill, adjacent to existing buildings and infrastructure. Overall, the combination of the proposals in addition to the existing Waste Reception Building, will form a small - medium proportion of the view lasting for a long-term duration, with permitted and proposed woodland planting progressively screening and integrating the existing and proposed buildings in to the view and landscape. The buildings are also temporary, to be decommissioned upon cessation of
landfilling as per the permitted situation. The combination of the existing built elements and the proposed elements are considered to be of an additional **Minor** significance adverse visual effect over and above the individual proposals assessment above.

4.5.68 The permitted Rushton Landfill northern extension will be screened from view by the existing southern landfill area, progressively being restored, exerting no adverse impact on the viewpoint. The New Albion Wind Farm turbines will be discernible elements within the view lasting for a longer duration than the existing and proposed buildings.

**Assessment from Viewpoint 6**

4.5.69 Viewpoint 6 (figure L8) is from around a quarter of the way from Rushton along the Public Right of Way (Bridleway) – number GY01 (which forms part of a locally promoted circular footpath route). No views are available from Rushton itself. The viewpoint is c. 690m from the Site boundary, i.e. Medium-range. The view is representative of recreational footpath users: **High** sensitivity.

4.5.70 The view is largely limited to fore and mid-ground views an agricultural field bounded by hedgerows and trees. Only the top of the existing landfill and the top half of the Waste Reception Building are visible. These are framed by woodland (of varying distances from the viewpoint) on either side of the Site. The existing Site takes up only a small proportion of the existing view. The skyline is entirely defined by the background to the view consisting of the prevalent topography and landscape cover such as woodland, punctuated by mature hedgerow trees in the mid-ground of the view. The New Albion Wind Farm turbines, once erected, will be clearly visible in the scene, in conjunction with the Proposed Development, dominating the visual and focal interest present.

4.5.71 From the viewpoint, the proposed Waste Reception Building extension and the SRF building, will take up a Very Small of the view (with the Waste Reception Building extension obscuring most of the SRF building), entirely set against the backdrop of the existing landscape and not breaking the skyline. Interlying vegetation, such as hedgerows, would screen the base of the proposed buildings and ground based operations. The green cladding of the buildings will also make them less discernible in the view from this location.

4.5.72 The Concrete Batching Plant would be primarily screened from view by the existing interlying landform and vegetation, with additional woodland planting along the western boundary of Rushton landfill ensuring that the high points of the batching tower and silos do not become readily discernible elements within the view, in the medium – long-term.

4.5.73 Vehicle movements associated with the ongoing operations of the buildings will not be readily discernible and will be primarily screened from view by interlying hedgerows and trees etc.

4.5.74 The buildings will be decommissioned and removed in line with the permitted situation at Rushton Landfill. Overall, the proposals are considered to have a **Small** magnitude adverse visual effect, being of **Minor – Moderate** significance.

4.5.75 As opposed to viewpoints to the east and southeast of the Site, the proposals will generally not break the skyline from viewpoints along the bridleway. As such, dark green cladding and a dark green colour to the western facing roof pitches would be most suitable at incorporating the proposals in to the view, making them less discernible, further limiting the visual impact.

4.5.76 The residual view upon restoration of those parts of the Site that are visible, in accordance with the proposed landscape restoration plan will create a mix of agricultural land, grassland and hedgerows. This is in keeping with the surrounding visual character and will be present for a Very Long–term duration.

**Table 17** Viewpoint 6 – Visual impact Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Small:</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td><strong>Minor - Moderate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative Effects on Viewpoint 6:

4.5.77 Cumulative effects mainly relate to additional operational buildings within the Rushton Landfill Site entrance/waste reception area. The existing Waste Reception Building is already partially screened and is of limited discernibility against the backdrop of surrounding woodland elements. Overall, the combination of existing and proposed built elements will only take up a small proportion of the view, set against the backdrop of the existing landscape, limiting discernibility. These effects are not considered to be significantly different to the individual effects assessed above.

4.5.78 In the background of the view, beyond the Site, set against the backdrop of existing woodland, there is an existing large building of limited discernibility. Specific, successive, glimpsed views of the buildings at the industrial estate northwest of Kettering may be achieved, where breaks in the vegetation allow, with the buildings over 2km from the viewpoint.

4.5.79 The permitted northern landfill extension will form a part of transient views along the bridleway, with limited intervisibility with the individual proposals.

4.5.80 In this context, the overall cumulative effects are considered to be of a Minor significance over and above the individual proposals assessment above.

4.5.81 Once constructed the, the turbines of New Albion Wind Farm will be dominant visual features within the view, present for a longer term duration than the proposals.

Table 18 Visual Impact Significance – Summary of Effects (Operational Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Receptor Types</th>
<th>Highest Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude (operational period)</th>
<th>Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Effects</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium - Large</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Negligible - Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents (first floor)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Footpath users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permissive access users</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rail users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Small - Small</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Footpath/Bridleway users</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Minor - Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Comment and Conclusions

Landscape Impacts

4.6.1 The Site does not lie within an area of statutory landscape designation or local landscape designation. The landscape value of the Site has been described as being of a Low level. The landscape quality of the Site has been described as Poor to Ordinary. The sensitivity of the landscape character and landscape characteristics of the Site is Very Low to Low.

4.6.2 The Proposed Developments have been designed to be collocated alongside existing operational infrastructure at Rushton Landfill, being of a similar or lesser scale and similar style in keeping with the existing prevalent character within the Site and to exert the minimal adverse influence as possible on the surrounding landscape character as is operationally possible.

4.6.3 The proposals will not compromise the progressive restoration of the wider landfill area, with additional characteristic landscape elements incorporated as part of the landscape mitigation strategy for the Site. The proposed built developments are temporary and will be decommissioned at cessation of landfilling and subsequent restoration of Rushton Landfill, with the beneficial effects of the Very Long-term afteruse for the Site, in terms of improved landscape character and as a biodiversity resource aiding connectivity across the area, being undertaken as approved.

4.6.4 In relation to landscape character, the adverse landscape effects during the operational period are typically of Medium magnitude, occurring for a Long-term duration. Only Low sensitivity elements are being removed from the landscape. The adverse effects on the prevalent landscape character during the operational period are of Moderate significance.

4.6.5 The beneficial effects (of Very Long-term duration) upon restoration are considered to be unchanged from those assessed for the approved situation.

4.6.6 The capacity of the landscape is sufficient to accept the Proposed Development without incurring significant effects on landscape character during the operational period, due to the existing development in the context of the existing landscape situation and the proposals are collocated with the Existing Landfill infrastructure that will collectively be removed from the Site and the Site restored as per the permitted situation.

Visual Impacts

4.6.7 The visibility of the Site is currently limited primarily by the existing landform, hedgerows and woodland components at various points in the landscape (both near and far features). The Proposed Developments are generally well-screened although views can be gained of various parts of the Proposed Developments from immediately adjacent to Rushton Landfill and from higher ground to the west and south. The proposals will also be well-screened by the Existing Landfilled areas at many locations.

4.6.8 Mitigation measures have been devised to limit the adverse visual effects of the Proposed Developments including advance woodland planting, making use of the screening effects of the existing landform and landscape elements and limiting the size of the buildings as much as operationally practical.

4.6.9 A number of representative viewpoints have been assessed and the significance of visual effects (taking mitigation into account) was found to be restricted to a Moderate level, with the impact at the majority of viewpoints Minor - Moderate or less. The conclusion born from this LVIA is that the Proposed Developments would not result in overall significant adverse visual effects (individual or cumulative), with the buildings to be temporary long-term visible features.
5 GLOSSARY

5.1.1 For the avoidance of confusion, the terms used in this report follow the definitions given below:

Landscape

An area, as perceived by people (in relation to past experiences, education etc.), whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. Landscape may comprise areas of rural land, urban fringe, urban land (townscape), coastal land, the sea (seascape) etc.

Landscape Element

A component part of the landscape (e.g. landform, roads, hedges, woods).

Landscape Feature

A prominent eye-catching element (e.g. wooded hilltop or church spire).

Landscape Characteristics

Combinations of elements and experiential characteristics (e.g. noise, smell) that make a particular contribution to a Landscape Character Type.

Landscape Scene

The landscape characteristics discernible from a given viewpoint/location. The visual aspects of this can be illustrated in a static two-dimensional manner in photographs to represent a sample view of the landscape scene.

Landscape Character

The distinct recognisable pattern of elements that occurs consistently in a particular landscape and how people perceive this, creating a particular sense of place.

Landscape Character Types (LCTs)

Refers to multiple areas of the same character.

Landscape Character Areas (LCAs)

Refers to specific geographical locations of a particular character type. These can be described and categorised at different scales depending on criteria used.

Landscape Value

The desirability of landscape characteristics (including scenic beauty, tranquillity, wilderness, cultural associations, conservation interests etc.) and the acceptability of their loss to different stakeholders (i.e. valued for different reasons by different people and on different scales, e.g. local, national).

Landscape Quality

The strength of expression of landscape character and condition (intactness) of constituent characteristic elements from visual, functional, ecological and cultural perspectives. This is not the same as Scenic Beauty.

Landscape Capacity

The threshold at which change to the landscape resource results in significant change to its landscape character. This is directly related to landscape sensitivity.

Landscape Sensitivity

The level of stability, robustness and resilience of the landscape elements present and their ability to be replicated based on their quality, condition and value.

Landscape Character Sensitivity

The landscape value of the landscape character and the degree to which the combination of landscape characteristics (including landscape structure and quality) present can resist or recover from change or be replicated.

Landscape Receptor

Landscape element, characteristic or character that would potentially receive/experience an effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visual Receptor</strong></th>
<th>Individuals, special interest groups, a community or population that would potentially experience an effect on their view.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Beauty</strong></td>
<td>Subjective value attributed to the emotional response of an individual to a landscape scene, which, although heavily influenced by intrinsic quality, is conditioned by an individual's perception (memories, associations, cultural influences and preference).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Amenity</strong></td>
<td>The subjective value attributed to the degree of pleasure gained from what is seen in a given view (quality of view).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td>The estimated level of susceptibility or likely viewer's response to a change in view from a given viewpoint in relation to its context, the existing visual amenity, the activity and expectations of the viewer and the number of viewers affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>Subjective experience from being at a location that provides individuals with the space and conditions to relax, achieve mental balance and a sense of distance from stress. <strong>Tranquil areas</strong> are often associated with quiet, remote (or appearing remote), natural, non-developed (non-built) and non-busy areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Impact</strong></td>
<td>A landscape or visual impact that is likely to be a pertinent ‘material consideration’ (i.e. an important matter that should be taken into account in deciding a planning application) due to the context and intensity of the effect. This is directly related to set criteria and terminology as set out within the assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site visibility</strong></td>
<td>The areas within which the subject site can be seen, the amount of site visible and the numbers able to see the subject site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)</strong></td>
<td>Also known as a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), Visual Envelope Map (VEM) and Viewshed. This represents the area over which a development can theoretically be seen, based on a DTM. The ZTV usually presents a ‘bare ground’ scenario - that is, a landscape without screening structures or vegetation. This information is usually presented upon a map base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Terrain Model (DTM)</strong></td>
<td>Also known as a digital elevation model (DEM). This is a digital representation of the ground surface (landform or terrain) created by linking co-ordinate points of surveyed elevation values to create a 3D ‘model’ which computers can use to undertake calculations relating to slope angles, point visibility, flood risk etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field of View (FOV)</strong></td>
<td>Term used to describe the height and width of a view as represented by an image. These constitute the horizontal field of view and vertical field of view and are expressed as angles in degrees. Humans have an extreme horizontal field of view of about 200°, but only 6-10° will be in focus at any one time. Thus a viewer moves their eyes and head around to see a view over a wide area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDICES:

Appendix 1  Figures L1 to L8
Notes: Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) calculation using OS Panorama data combined with site survey data and woodland digitised from Ordnance Survey maps (assumed to be 10m tall). Source points for the ZVI are at taken to be at 11m above the existing ground level for the proposed Concrete Batching Plant and 12m above the existing ground level for the proposed SRF / Waste Reception Building extension. Visual receptor eye-level assumed to be 1.7m high. Atmospheric refraction and curvature of the Earth accounted for in the calculation. ZVI not shown within the existing permitted landfill boundary. Proposed landscape bund and advanced planting not included as a visual screen.
**VIEWPOINT 1:** Oakley Road (entrance of Snowfield Lodge Access), on the boundary of the permitted landfill area, looking south. Photograph viewing distance: 332mm, Horizontal FOV: 65°, Vertical FOV: 24°.

**Consented landscape bund (in preparation)**

**SRF building screened from view beyond landfill boundary**

**Approximate location of proposed Concrete Batching Plant (c. 11.3m high) beyond material stockpiles (existing bioremediation area), with shallow bund and woodland planting along eastern boundary of Rushton Landfill, adjacent to batching plant, to be implemented**

**VIEWPOINT 1 (showing wider context):** Photograph viewing distance: 166mm, Horizontal FOV: 134°, Vertical FOV: 20°.

**Existing landfill**

**Consented landscape bund (in preparation)**

**New woodland elements to be added between the viewpoint and the Proposed Development through progressive restoration as permitted**

**Existing Waste Reception Building**

---

**Notes:**
- Camera: Samsung GX-10
- Focal Length: 53mm (35mm format equivalent)
- Date of Photograph: 31/08/12
- FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note: photographs will never exactly replicate an individual's view with the naked eye, they are an aide memoir.

---

**ILLUSTRATED VIEW MAP**
1:25,000
VIEWPOINT 2: Oakley Road, adjacent to existing site access and western most landfill boundary, looking northeast. Photograph viewing distance: 323mm. Horizontal FOV: 66°. Vertical FOV: 24°.

Proposed Concrete Balancing Piles predominantly screened from view behind hedge/tow, with additional woodland planting along the landfill boundary.


Notes:
Camera: Samsung GX-10
Focal Length: 53mm (28mm format equivalent)
Date of Photograph: 31-08-12
FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note - photographs will never exactly replicate an individual’s view with the naked eye, they are an aide memoire.


Notes:
- Camera: Samsung GX-10
- Focal Length: 52mm (23mm format equivalent)
- Date of Photograph: 31.09.12
- FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note: photographs will never exactly replicate an individual's view with the naked eye, they are an aide memoire.


Notes:
Camera: Samsung GX-10
Focal Length: 54mm (23mm format equivalent)
Date of Photograph: 29-09-10
FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number.

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note - photographs will never exactly replicate an individual’s view with the naked eye, they are an aide memoire.


Notes:
- Camera: Samsung GX-10
- Focal Length: 54mm (28mm format equivalent)
- Date of Photograph: 31-08-12
- FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number.

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note - photographs will never exactly replicate an individual’s view with the naked eye, they are an aide memory.


Notes:
- Camera: Samsung GX-10
- Focal Length: 55mm (23mm format equivalent)
- Date of Photograph: 31/08/12
- FOVs and Focal Length given to nearest whole number

Viewing distances indicate distance for image to be held from eye to represent approximate scale of features within the photograph as would be seen by the naked eye. Note - photographs will never exactly replicate an individual's view with the naked eye, they are an aide memoire.