



CAS-03463-R2W9C2 - Kronospan Low Carbon CHP Facility

Environmental Statement

Vol2: Chapter 7.0 – Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Prepared for



December 2025
DNS5-2-007



Document Control

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed / Approved By
DNS5-2-007	December 2025	AM	JM/BC
DNS5-2-007 Rev 1			
DNS5-2-007 Rev 2			

© AXIS P.E.D. Ltd 2025. All rights reserved.

This document and its accompanying documents contain information which is confidential and is intended only for the use of the client. If you are not one of the intended recipients any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information is strictly prohibited.

Unless expressly agreed, any reproduction of material from this document must be requested and authorised in writing from AXIS P.E.D. Ltd. Authorised reproduction of material must include all copyright and proprietary notices in the same form and manner as the original and must not be modified in any way. Acknowledgement of the source of the material must also be included in all references.



Well House Barns, Chester Road, Bretton, Chester, CH4 0DH
1st Floor, Barfield House, Alderley Road, Wilmslow, SK9 1PL
Maling Exchange, Studio 307, Hoults Yard, Walker Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE6 2HL

T: 0344 8700 007
enquiries@axis.co.uk
www.axis.co.uk

CONTENTS

7.0	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	1
7.1	Introduction	1
7.2	Planning Policy, Legislation and Guidance	1
7.3	Consultation	6
7.4	Assessment Methodology	19
7.5	Baseline Environment	24
7.6	Initial Development Design and Impact Avoidance/Reduction Measures	38
7.7	Assessment of Potential Effects	40
7.8	Inter-Relationship of Potential Effects	64
7.9	Further Mitigation and Monitoring	65
7.10	Summary of Potential Residual Effects	65
7.11	Cumulative Effects	65
7.12	Enhancement Measures	71
7.13	Conclusions	72

TABLES

Table 7.1 – Summary of (LVIA) Scoping Direction Responses	7
Table 7.2 - Summary of (LVIA) Scoping Direction (Addendum) Responses	12
Table 7.3 – Summary of Stakeholder Engagement with National Trust	17
Table 7.4 – Summary of (LVIA) Pre-Application Consultation Responses	19
Table 7.5 – Viewpoint Locations	35
Table 7.6 – Construction Phase Landscape and Visual Effects	41
Table 7.7 – Effects on Landscape Character	44
Table 7.8 – Effects on Viewpoints	47
Table 7.9 – Appraisal against the Special Qualities of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape	58
Table 7.10 – Assessment of Cumulative Landscape and Visual Effects	67

FIGURES

Figure 7.1a-b – Landscape and Visual Context
 Figures 7.2a-t – Viewpoints
 Figures 7.3a-d – Cumulative Viewpoints
 Figure 7.4 – Existing and Cumulative Landscaping



APPENDICES

Appendix 7A – LVIA Methodology

Appendix 7B – Visualisation Methodology

Appendix 7C – Landscape Character Baseline

Appendix 7D – Construction Phase Effects

Appendix 7E – Effects on Landscape Character

Appendix 7F – Effects on Viewpoints



7.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 Introduction

Introduction

- 7.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES), along with the accompanying Figures and Appendices comprises the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) of the Proposed Development and addresses the potential landscape and visual effects during the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. A description of the Proposed Development is provided in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)**.

Competence

- 7.1.2 This chapter has been prepared by Andy Martin. Andy is a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI), with over twenty years' experience in the landscape and visual assessment of major infrastructure projects.
- 7.1.3 The chapter has been reviewed by Jon Mason, also a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute, with over thirty years' experience in landscape and visual impact assessment. Jon has provided expert witness evidence in relation to landscape and visual matters at multiple public inquiries across the UK.

7.2 Planning Policy, Legislation and Guidance

National Planning Policy

Future Wales: The National Plan to 2040

- 7.2.1 Future Wales¹ is the national development plan for Wales and sets out a strategy for achieving key national priorities through the planning system.
- 7.2.2 Policy 17 sets out the strong support of the Welsh Government for renewable energy development, noting that all proposals should demonstrate that they would not have

¹ Welsh Government, 2021. *Future Wales: The National Plan 2040*



an unacceptable effect on the environment. New strategic grid infrastructure should be designed to minimise visual impact on nearby communities.

- 7.2.3 Policy 18 focuses specifically on Development of National Significance (DNS) applications and confirms that DNS schemes should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the surrounding landscape or result in unacceptable adverse visual impacts on nearby communities and individual dwelling.

Planning Policy Wales

- 7.2.4 Planning Policy Wales² (PPW) is the principal source of national planning policy across Wales.

- 7.2.5 Paragraphs 5.9.19-5.9.23 of PPW highlight factors that should be considered by planning authorities when determining applications for renewable energy development proposals. Factors relevant to LVIA include:

“The need to minimise impacts on local communities; the impact on the natural and historic environment; cumulative impact; and grid connection issues where renewable (electricity) energy developments are proposed”.

- 7.2.6 Paragraph 5.9.21 of PPW is clear that:

“Prior to an application being submitted, developers for renewable and low carbon energy developments should, wherever possible, consider how to avoid, or otherwise minimise, adverse impacts through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures”

- 7.2.7 Paragraphs 6.3.5-6.3.11 of PPW address National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), now renamed ‘National Landscape’³ (i.e. statutory landscape designations), noting that the special qualities of designated areas should be given weight in the planning process.

² Welsh Government, 2024. *Planning Policy Wales Edition 12*

³ Whilst the designation was rebranded as a ‘National Landscape’ in November 2023, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty remains the correct legal definition.



- 7.2.8 Paragraphs 6.3.20-6.3.21 of PPW identify LANDMAP as a key resource that informs landscape planning and assessment across Wales, highlighting specifically that this can be used to inform development management decisions.
- 7.2.9 Paragraphs 6.8.1-6.8.4 of PPW discuss issues related to lighting. The need to retain dark skies where possible and to take into account recognised dark sky landscapes is highlighted.

Local Planning Policy

Overview

- 7.2.10 The adopted local development plan for Wrexham County Borough Council (WCBC) comprises the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 (the UDP)⁴ which was adopted in February 2005. However, the local development plan has been through significant upheaval in recent years. WCBC adopted the Local Development Plan 2013-2028 (the LDP)⁵ on 20 December 2023, however, the decision to adopt the LDP has subsequently been quashed by a High Court Order issued on 12 June 2025. The LDP has therefore been returned to unadopted status and the UDP has been returned to being the adopted development plan. Further information regarding the status of the UDP and LDP is provided in the Planning Statement (**DNS4-001**).
- 7.2.11 In the above context, relevant policies from the UDP and LDP are set out below.

Unitary Development Plan

- 7.2.12 Policy PS2 of the UDP requires that development should not materially detriment landscape/townscape character.
- 7.2.13 Policy GDP1: Development Objectives requires that built development should accord with the character of the site and contribute positively to the appearance of the nearby locality.
- 7.2.14 Policy EC5: Special Landscape Areas requires that within areas designated as Special Landscape Areas (SLA), priority will be given the conservation and

⁴ Wrexham County Borough Council, adopted 2005. *Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011*

⁵ Wrexham County Borough Council, adopted 2023. *Wrexham County Borough Local Development Plan 2013-2028*



enhancement of the landscape. Development is required to conform to a high standard of design and landscape, and special attention will be paid to minimising its visual impact.

Local Development Plan

7.2.15 Objective SO9 of the LDP is to:

“Protect, manage and enhance the natural and historic landscape”.

7.2.16 Policy SP14: Natural Environment requires that development should protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment, with specific reference made to the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).

7.2.17 Policy NE4 provides further detail regarding the National Landscape, noting that:

“...Development proposals that are outside, but closely interlinked with the AONB must not have an adverse impact on the natural beauty of the AONB”.

7.2.18 Policy DM1 sets out a series of considerations that development proposals should accord with. These include factors such as according with local character, distinctiveness and appearance, and safeguarding from the adverse effects of light pollution.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

7.2.19 WCBC has prepared supplementary planning guidance covering a range of subjects. Of particular relevance to the LVIA are:

- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Clwydian and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the National Landscape SPG)⁶;
- Planning for Dark Night Skies (the Dark Skies SPG)⁷.

⁶ Denbighshire County Council, Flintshire County Council, Wrexham County Borough Council, and Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB, 2018. *Supplementary Planning Guidance Note Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)*

⁷ Denbighshire County Council, Flintshire County Council, Wrexham County Borough Council, Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB, and Cadwyn Clwyd, 2021. *Planning for Dark Night Skies. Supplementary Planning Guidance for lighting in the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty*



7.2.20 The National Landscape SPG provides guidance relating to development that may affect the National Landscape, including how the special qualities of the designation relate to the planning process.

7.2.21 The Dark Skies SPG is concerned with issues related to light pollution within the National Landscape and the aspiration that the National Landscape can be formally recognised as a ‘dark sky community’. It includes guidance regarding the contents of lighting assessments, and best practice in the design of new lighting schemes.

Legislation and Guidance

7.2.22 The following key pieces of legislation and guidance are considered relevant to this assessment:

Legislation

Statutory Landscape Designations

7.2.23 The Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape is approximately 550m west of the Site at the closest point (refer to **Figure 7.1a** for location). National Landscapes are designated under *Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000*. The primary purpose of a National Landscape, as set out in the *Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000*, is to ‘conserve and enhance the natural beauty’.

European Landscape Convention

7.2.24 The UK Government is a signatory of the European Landscape Convention (ELC), which became binding in March 2007. The Convention is aimed at the protection, management and planning of all landscapes and raising awareness of the value of a living landscape. It relates chiefly to public bodies and to the policies, plans and programmes produced by these.

7.2.25 The LVIA is a development specific process which accords with Article 6C of the ELC. The LVIA is informed by extant Landscape Character Assessment studies (described in **Section 7.6** below), which more directly relate to the provisions of Article 6C.



Guidance

7.2.26 The LVIA has been undertaken with regard to the following guidance documents:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment⁸ (the GLVIA).
- Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Technical Guidance Note 06/19⁹ (TGN 06/19).
- Assessing landscape value outside national designations. Technical Guidance Note 02/21¹⁰ (TGN 02/21).
- Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition (GLVIA3)¹¹ (LITGN-2024-01).

7.2.27 The GLVIA is the principal document setting out good practice guidelines in LVIA. The other documents listed above play a supplementary role and give further guidance on particular aspects of LVIA.

7.2.28 The detailed methodology followed in undertaking the LVIA is set out in **Appendix 7A**. The methodology followed in the production of visualisation materials included in the LVIA is set out in **Appendix 7B**.

7.3 Consultation

EIA Scoping Direction

7.3.1 In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Wales) Regulations 2017 (The EIA Regulations), a formal request for a Scoping Direction was submitted to Planning and Environment Decisions Wales (PEDW) on 30 May 2024 and was accompanied by a Scoping Report (**Appendix 1C**) which set out the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.

⁸ Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (3rd edition 2013). *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*. Abingdon: Routledge

⁹ Landscape Institute (2019). *Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Technical Guidance Note 06/19*

¹⁰ Landscape Institute (2021). *Assessing landscape value outside national designations. Technical Guidance Note 02/21*

¹¹ Landscape Institute (2024). *Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition (GLVIA3)*



- 7.3.2 A formal Scoping Direction (**Appendix 1D**) was issued by PEDW on 31 July 2024 which confirmed that the Proposed Development would fall under Schedule 1, Part 10 of the EIA Regulations (and would therefore require EIA) and provided PEDW's opinion regarding the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.
- 7.3.3 A response to the Scoping Direction setting out how each matter is addressed in the ES and details of where areas of disagreement are clarified and/or resolved is provided at **Appendix 1G**.
- 7.3.4 A summary of the Scoping Direction responses (and the Applicant's response) relevant to LVIA is provided at **Table 7.1** below.

Table 7.1 – Summary of (LVIA) Scoping Direction Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
NRW	The LVIA should reference Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB as including evidence regarding the special qualities of the designation.	The SPG document is referred in Sections 7.2 and 7.5 . Special qualities are discussed in Section 7.5 .
NRW	We note the LVIA will include an assessment of the visual impact of the additional plume from the proposed stack and agree this is appropriate. The cumulative impact of this plume in combination with the other plumes should be considered.	The presence of a visible plume from the CHP stack is discussed in ES Chapter 6.0 (Air Quality and Odour) . The visual effects of this are discussed in Section 7.7 .
NRW	We advise that the cumulative assessment should also consider the overall cumulative impact of the proposed development and the existing Facility on the AONB/NL and visual receptors within the AONB/NL in combination, particularly as the existing Facility will be reflected in the assessment baseline and is likely to be used to justify the individual impacts of the proposed development.	The GLVIA is specific as to what should be included in cumulative assessments, and that existing development forms part of the main LVIA baseline; the approach set out in the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) and followed in the LVIA accords with this. The presence of the existing facility has not been used to justify the impacts of the Proposed Development.

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		<p>All conclusions made regarding the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development reflect that it is an addition to the existing facility - i.e. they reflect the change to a baseline including the existing Kronospan structures resulting from the effects introduced by the proposed facility, and the increased influence of the overall assemblage of structures at Kronospan).</p> <p>See Table 7.2 for further discussion.</p>
NRW	<p>We consider that the development would increase the overall bulk and mass of the industrial facility, potentially increasing its prominence in views from locations within the AONB/NL. We note it is proposed to undertake further analysis regarding the size, scale and appearance of the proposed structures to determine the potential for reduction of landscape and visual effects (para. 8.4.3). We advise that the findings of the preliminary LVIA should inform this analysis.</p>	<p>Refer to ES Chapter 3.0 (Alternatives) for details of alternative design approaches.</p>
NRW	<p>We note provisional proposals are to finish the proposed structures in 'goosewing grey' to match the existing Facility. In seeking to reduce the perceived scale/mass and impact on views from within the AONB/NL, we advise testing the impact of different colour / treatments to visually fragment the overall massing of the proposed development / Facility. The use of a darker colour / finish on the proposed boiler building, for example, may assist in reducing the perceived increase in building mass. This testing could be done</p>	<p>Refer to ES Chapter 3.0 (Alternatives) for details of alternative design approaches and to ES Appendix 3A (Colour Study) for visualisation material presenting different treatments for the appearance of the proposed CHP building and proposed stack. This includes consideration of darker coloured cladding for the CHP building.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	through the preparation of visualisations.	
NRW	<p>At VP Q, a tree obscures the view towards the site. Walking a short distance to the north of this viewpoint would have avoided this issue. VP R is the only viewpoint from which no wireframe or photomontage is proposed, but it offers largely unobstructed visibility towards the site and therefore would be a more useful viewpoint for the preparation of a wireframe than VP Q.</p> <p>There is a similar issue with VP X, where trees in the mid-ground obscure the view of the site. Views of the site and development are expected from locations east along the road from VP X, and this should be considered.</p>	<p>Photography from Viewpoint Q and Viewpoint X has been reshot to reflect the comments. All views from the vicinity of Viewpoint Q are well screened by tree cover.</p> <p>Viewpoint X reflects views from the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail in addition to views from the minor road (a promoted recreational route of national importance, where the views available form a key part of the user experience) (as set out in Table 8.1 of the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) and in Table 7.3 of the LVIA).</p> <p>Photography has been reshot from a section of the National Trail, north of the minor road, rather than elsewhere along the road itself (users of the National Trail are more sensitive than road users).</p> <p>Viewpoint R is not the only Viewpoint from which neither a wireframe nor a photomontage is proposed. There are six such Viewpoints (including Viewpoint R and Viewpoint Q), which are set out in Table 8.2 of the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) and Table 7.4 of the LVIA.</p> <p>Viewpoint Q reflects the views from the entrance to Chirk Castle and is directly adjacent to the listed lodge (notwithstanding that alternative photography has been taken from slightly further north in line with NRW's request). Whilst views of the Proposed Development are likely to be well screened (hence no wireframe or photomontage being proposed) it is a more sensitive location than Viewpoint R, which is within a field within the Castle grounds where few if any</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		members of the public are likely to be present. Other locations within the Castle grounds include Viewpoints L and W, along the driveway and permissive path respectively, and changes in view are more likely to be experienced by people from these two locations (hence photo matched wireframes are proposed from both of these locations).
NRW	We note that some of the baseline photographs are presented at a smaller page size than other viewpoint photographs e.g. VP H. This issue should be corrected in the final application so that all photographs are presented at an appropriate size.	<p>The Viewpoint Figures included in the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) were either presented as single frame images at A3 size, or as panoramic images at double A3 width. This accords with the Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (Landscape Institute, 2019). All baseline photography was presented at the same size.</p> <p>See Table 7.2 for further discussion.</p>
Glandŵr Cymru	The Llangollen Canal and its users (boaters and towpath users) should be recognised as visual receptors with high sensitivity within the LVIA.	<p>The LVIA acknowledges that canal users are high sensitivity receptors. In the vicinity of the Kronospan Site, the existing structures at the site and the adjacent railway embankment detract from the views available, and this reduces sensitivity to further visual change from a relatively short section of the canal where these well-established industrial features are conspicuous.</p> <p>For reference, in planning applications for various developments at the Kronospan Site made to WCBC (recent examples include WCBC Application Reference P/2022/0765 and WCBC Application Reference P/2022/1080), the accompanying LVIAs have identified the sensitivity of viewpoints along the canal corridor (which reflect the views available to all canal users) consistently as either 'medium' or</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		<p>'medium to high'. No concerns were raised in respect of this by either WCBC or by consultees including Glandŵr Cymru.</p> <p>See Table 7.2 for further discussion.</p>
Glandŵr Cymru	<p>It is unclear how any identified adverse impact from the development can be effectively mitigated given the scale/height of the development, especially as the stack has been determined principally by ecology/air quality modelling factors and as such a reduction in height would not be possible.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 7.6 for details of mitigation measures, ES Chapter 3.0 (Alternatives) for details of alternative design approaches (including reduction in stack height) and to ES Appendix 3A (Colour Study) for visualisation material presenting different treatments for the appearance of the proposed development.</p> <p>As demonstrated by the viewpoint visualisation presented on Figures 7.2a-t and Figures 7.3a-d, the stack would be a slender feature and would be less prominent than other proposed structures and existing structures, and consequently its particular influence upon the surrounding area would be limited.</p>

EIA Scoping Direction – Addendum

- 7.3.5 Following receipt of the Scoping Direction (**Appendix 1D**), formal pre-application advice from PEDW (received 19 June 2024), further informal discussions with PEDW and informal pre-application discussions with WCBC, the Applicant issued (on 15 October 2024) a document to PEDW entitled 'EIA Scoping Direction Clarification and Update to the Proposed Development Design' (**Appendix 1E**). This document provided details of the proposed changes to the Proposed Development which arose since the initial pre-application advice was sought, as well as setting out broad areas of agreement and disagreement/clarification with the EIA Scoping Direction referred to above. A summary of the main Proposed Development design changes made at this point is provided below:

- The status of the existing K7 Biomass Plant would change from ‘remaining in operation’ to ‘remain in situ but be used as a back-up biomass plant only’ – as a result, the existing K7 Biomass Plant feedstock would be re-directed for use in the proposed Low Carbon CHP Facility.
 - A detailed review of CHP Facility feedstock generated on-site was undertaken to understand the maximum wood residue feedstock that would be generated from existing and planned manufacturing operations.
 - The proposed use of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) was removed.
- 7.3.6 The proposed change to the Proposed Development design also confirmed that the proposed electrical generating capacity of the proposed Low Carbon CHP Facility would increase from 30 megawatts (MW) to 40MW.
- 7.3.7 An EIA Scoping Direction Addendum (see **Appendix 1F**) was issued by PEDW on 14 January 2025 and provides PEDW’s updated opinion regarding the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.
- 7.3.8 A response to the Scoping Direction Addendum setting out how each matter is addressed in the ES and details of resolution of areas of disagreement is provided at **Appendix 1G**.
- 7.3.9 A summary of the Scoping Direction responses (and the Applicant’s response) relevant to LVIA (and where they differ to those received in the initial Scoping Direction) is provided at **Table 7.2** below.

Table 7.2 - Summary of (LVIA) Scoping Direction (Addendum) Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
PEDW	PEDW welcome confirmation in the EIA Scoping Clarification Report that the cumulative assessment undertaken as part of the LVIA will include existing features, consented and proposed development. The applicant’s attention is drawn to comments from NRW at appendix 1, which confirm that the cumulative assessment should consider the cumulation	<p>The approach requested by PEDW has been followed in the cumulative landscape and visual assessment, and is the approach set out in the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) and the subsequent Scoping Clarification Request. The approach followed accords with the good practice guidance set out in the GLVIA.</p> <p>Refer to ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology) and to Section 7.11</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	of effects of the proposal in combination with relevant existing developments. PEDW highlight that whilst developments that have already been built and are operational will form part of the baseline, this does not mean that they should be excluded when considering cumulative effects. Paragraph 5 of Schedule 4 of the 2017 Regulations makes it clear that consideration of cumulative effects should include existing Development.	for further details of the approach to the cumulative assessment.
PEDW	PEDW welcome confirmation from the applicant that they will reshoot photography from Viewpoint Q and Viewpoint X from nearby alternate locations. PEDW continue to advise that viewpoint locations should be optimised and relevant to this application and should be selected for the purpose of assessing the impact of this development. The applicant should provide their methodology and rationale for the selection of viewpoints in the Environmental Statement	Viewpoint photography has been reshot on the basis set out in Table 7.1 and Section 7.5 . Justification for the selection of viewpoints is set out in Section 7.5 .
PEDW	The applicant's attention is drawn to NRW's comments at appendix 1, within which they confirm their preference for the presentation for the photographs and visualisations. PEDW recommend the baseline photography is presented at the same scale as the wireframe and photomontage visualisations to allow like-for-like comparison. Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (Landscape Institute, 2019)	All viewpoint visualisation material included in the LVIA has been presented in accordance with the requirements of Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (TGN 06/19).

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	which supports GLVIA3 states that the baseline photography should be presented at a size and relative position, on a corresponding sheet, to allow like-for-like comparison with the visualisations	
PEDW	<p>The applicant does not agree that users of the canal are of high sensitivity. The applicant's attention is drawn to comments from the Canal and Rivers Trust at appendix 1, within which they set out that the users are considered high sensitivity based on the scale of the development and the proximity to the canal. Previous applications referred to in the SCR were for alternative schemes. I see no reason to disagree with the Canal and Rivers Trust. Sensitivity should be determined on a case-by-case based on the development type, for example where key characteristics and qualities of the receptor are highly sensitive to change from the development type. The sensitivity of each receptor should be determined in accordance best practice guidance and reasoned justifications provided to support the assessment. The applicant should continue to liaise with the Canal and Rivers Trust on the methodology to inform the assessment. Should the applicant be unable to reach agreement it is essential the ES contains a robust rationale for the approach adopted, giving detail about the application of professional judgment where relevant</p>	<p>As part of the LVIA, the sensitivity of each receptor has been determined in accordance with the methodology included in Appendix 7A, with reasoned justifications provided for all judgements that are made. This reflects the approach promoted by the GLVIA and also reflects the methodology that was appended to the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C).</p> <p>Appendix 7A is clear that the presence of detracting features in the view may reduce susceptibility to change, and thus also reduce sensitivity. We note that the EIA Scoping Direction responses (including responses to the EIA Scoping Direction Addendum) make no comment upon the proposed methodology and thus are assumed to be in agreement with it.</p> <p>As set out in the GLVIA, the sensitivity of visual receptors does not relate to the type of development proposed but rather is informed by the activities of those receptors (i.e. people) and the visual amenity they are likely to experience at a given location, and the value placed upon the views available. Previous conclusions made regarding the sensitivity of canal users are thus relevant, as sensitivity is unlikely to change over time. Nevertheless, in the interests of avoiding unnecessary disputes with</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		Glandwr Cymru, a 'high' sensitivity has been allocated to canal users.
NRW	<p>We note that Section 4.2.4 of the EIA Scoping Direction Clarification Document submitted on 22/10/2024 states <i>"The presence of the existing Kronospan facility is a well-established part of the landscape and visual context into which the Proposed Development would be introduced and thus is part of the assessment baseline (reflecting the requirements of the GLVIA as quoted above). All conclusions made regarding the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will reflect its addition to the existing facility - i.e. the increased influence of the enlarged facility. This is not a 'cumulative' effect, rather it is the effect of the Proposed Development introduced into the existing landscape and visual context."</i></p> <p>However, we continue to advise that a cumulative assessment should report on the cumulation of effects of the proposals in combination with any existing developments that are likely to interact with the proposals. The existing facility is therefore relevant in this regard. If the assessment is only premised on the existing facility justifying or reducing the impact of the proposed change, then the overall change to the landscape, which may not be acceptable, would not be assessed. This can be avoided by providing a commentary on the overall</p>	<p>As set out in the Scoping Clarification Request, all conclusions made regarding the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will reflect its addition to the existing facility - i.e. the increased influence of the enlarged facility. This will inherently consider the overall effects of the enlarged facility upon the landscape and upon views – contrary to what NRW state. There is no other approach that could be followed in relation to the assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The approach requested by NRW would entail double counting of effects. The effects of adding the Proposed Development to the existing facility would be assessed in the main LVIA and then repeated again in the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>The purpose of the cumulative assessment is to consider effects against a cumulative baseline, where in addition to existing features (which in accordance with the GLVIA includes development under construction), other consented and proposed development is also present.</p> <p>The approach followed in the cumulative landscape and visual assessment, is that requested by PEDW (see the above response in the first row of Table 7.2), and is also the approach set out in the EIA Scoping Report and the subsequent Scoping Clarification Report. The approach followed accords with the good practice guidance set out in the GLVIA.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	cumulative effect of the two developments (existing and proposed) in combination.	Refer to ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology) and to Section 7.11 for further details of the other cumulative projects and the approach to the cumulative assessment.
NRW	We advise that the photographs and visualisations should be presented on the paper size at which the image is intended to be printed (i.e. 841mm width x 420mm height, as stated on the Applicant's photographs). This will also allow interested parties who wish to view the images on screen to be able to view them at the correct scale when they are viewed at 100% / 'actual size	All the visualisation material, including baseline photography presented on Figures 7.2a-7.2t is presented at the intended paper size, which is clearly stated at the bottom left of the image.
Glandŵr Cymru	The applicant does not agree with our comments on the LVIA sensitivity of receptors to be attributed to waterway users. Our comment that waterway users would be of high sensitivity was based on the proximity to the proposed development and scale of development proposed. At paragraph 4.2.17 the applicant appears to be relying on previous planning applications to establish and justify the sensitivity. We do not agree that this is the correct approach, not least because those are for different developments. Application P/2022/1080 was for a lorry park and associated development and was offset from the canal corridor and P/2022/0765 was a development for raw material silos up to 33m in height. If these were assessed as either 'medium' or 'medium to high' as	<p>As part of the LVIA, the sensitivity of each receptor has been determined in accordance with the methodology included in Appendix 7A, with reasoned justifications provided for all judgements that are made. This reflects the approach promoted by the GLVIA and also reflects the methodology that was appended to the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C).</p> <p>It is noted that the EIA Scoping Direction responses (including the EIA Scoping Direction Addendum) make no comment on the proposed methodology and thus are assumed to be in agreement with it.</p> <p>As set out in the GLVIA, the sensitivity of visual receptors does not relate to the type of development proposed but rather is informed by the activities of those receptors (i.e. people) and the visual amenity they are likely to experience at a given location, and the value placed upon the views</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	part of the LVIAs for those developments, then the development on the scale now proposed should rightly be assessed as 'high' for canal users. This is especially given the scale of the development now proposed as part of this project and proximity to the canal corridor, with a building up 44m high and stack up to 95m and the associated likely visual impact from the canal corridor.	<p>available. Previous conclusions made regarding the sensitivity of canal users are thus relevant, as sensitivity is unlikely to change over time.</p> <p>The comments from Glandŵr Cymru in respect to the size/scale of proposed structures relate to the magnitude of change in view that would occur, rather than to the sensitivity of the receptor. Nevertheless, in the interests of avoiding unnecessary disputes with Glandŵr Cymru, a 'high' sensitivity has been allocated to canal users.</p>

Other Engagement with Stakeholders

- 7.3.10 Ongoing consultation has been undertaken with National Trust (largely from a biodiversity effects/mitigation/enhancement perspective) to ensure that key issues were identified and discussed prior to the completion of the EIA. A summary of the discussion is provided in **Table 7.3** below.

Table 7.3 – Summary of Stakeholder Engagement with National Trust

Date	Summary of Key Discussion Points
24 June 2024	National Trust is not a statutory consultee and is not able to formally contribute to the EIA scoping process. The Applicant subsequently shared the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1C) and the EIA Scoping Direction (Appendix 1D) later issued by PEDW.
	Concern was expressed by National Trust regarding the intended use of RDF as a feedstock.
	National Trust previously requested off-site Priority Habitat enhancements on the land to the west of the existing Kronospan Facility to be secured as enhancements for the North Access Road planning permission (P/2022/1080). Those enhancements were not deemed to be necessary or proportionate by the Applicant or WCBC in determining that planning application. National Trust requested that the Applicant reconsider these off-site enhancements for the Proposed Development; the Applicant committed to further investigation as to the proportionality, relevance and requirement for such enhancements which would be influenced by the draft ES and the initial impact assessments.

Date	Summary of Key Discussion Points
	The Applicant committed to keeping National Trust up to date with respect progress with the DNS application prior to submission and key timescales/milestones.
13 August 2025	National Trust is not a statutory consultee and is not able to formally contribute to the EIA scoping process. The Applicant subsequently shared the EIA Scoping Direction Addendum issued by PEDW.
	National Trust objective is for the SSSI to be holistically managed (regardless of landownership) and retained in favourable condition/status. The Maesgwyn Estate tenant farmers apply the same principles and work in partnership with NRW (as part of their tenancy agreements).
	National Trust is writing up a detailed Estate Management Plan (EMP) which sets out how the SSSI land is to be maintained in favourable condition; this was shared with the Applicant.
	The Applicant and National Trust agreed to arrange a meeting to discuss the extent to which current SSSI management approaches align and to discuss any potential for the Applicant to adopt practicable measures to align with the National Trust EMP.

Statutory Pre-Application Consultation

- 7.3.11 Section 7, 8, 9, and 11 of the Developments of National Significance (Procedure) (Wales) Order 2016 (as amended) (the DNSPWO) and Section 61Z of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require the Applicant to undertake statutory consultation prior to submitting a DNS application. The statutory pre-application consultation period was between (insert date) and (insert date). **THIS PARAGRAPH IS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE FINALISED UPON COMPLETION OF PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION – THE PAC REPORT IS NOT YET AVAILABLE.**
- 7.3.12 A series of responses from consultees received in month 2024 identified issues relating to LVIA matters, as set out in **Table 7.4** below. Full consultee responses (and how each has been addressed) is provided in the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report (**DNS4-009**). **THIS PARAGRAPH IS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE FINALISED UPON COMPLETION OF PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION – THE PAC REPORT IS NOT YET AVAILABLE.**

Table 7.4 – Summary of (LVIA) Pre-Application Consultation Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES

7.4 Assessment Methodology

Study Area

- 7.4.1 The Study Area for the LVIA has been determined based upon the LVIA team's prior knowledge of the existing Kronospan Facility and its surroundings, and previous experience of similar developments elsewhere. It is considered that, given the industrial context of the Site, there would be little scope for significant effects to extend over a wide area.
- 7.4.2 As such, the LVIA considers effects over a radius extending up to approximately 2.5km from the Proposed Development. A single viewpoint along the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail (Viewpoint G – see below), approximately 3.26km south-west of the Proposed Development, has also been included in the LVIA to include visual effects from a more distant elevated section of this sensitive route. The extent of the Study Area and viewpoint locations are both illustrated on **Figures 7.1a-b**.

Scope of Assessment

- 7.4.3 The scope of the LVIA reflects that proposed in the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 1C**), modified as necessary to take into account the Scoping Direction (and Scoping



Direction Addendum) and the outcomes of the post-scoping consultation reported in **Section 7.3**.

7.4.4 The LVIA assesses the landscape and visual effects which could arise from the following:

- Views of the new structures from the surrounding area, affecting the visual amenity of local residents in their properties, users of the public rights of way network and other routes/land with public access, visitors to Chirk Castle and road and rail users.
- The influence of these upon the character of the surrounding landscape, with potential changes in the characteristics of those Landscape Character Areas (LCA)/Landscape Types (LT) where visibility is predicted.
- The presence of a visible plume from the proposed emissions stack, which could draw further attention to the presence of the Proposed Development.
- The night-time landscape and visual effects of the proposed aviation lighting that would be mounted to the proposed emission stack.
- The presence of the Proposed Development upon the identified purposes and qualities of landscape designations.
- Temporary activities associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, including the temporary presence of construction plant.
- Cumulative effects that would occur because of interactions between the Proposed Development and other existing, consented and proposed schemes.

7.4.5 As set out in the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 1C**), and agreed where relevant during post-scoping consultation, the following matters have been scoped out of the LVIA:

- Effects upon the physical landscape fabric of the Site.

Methodology and Guidance

7.4.6 The overarching approach to the ES is set out in **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)**.

7.4.7 LVIA is a tool used to systematically identify and assess the nature and significance of the effects of a proposed development upon the landscape and upon views and



visual amenity. The purpose of the LVIA is to identify the level and nature of effect arising from a proposed development and if necessary, through an iterative design process, to inform changes to the development and evolution of mitigation strategies which minimise effects wherever possible.

7.4.8 As noted in **Section 7.2**, this LVIA has followed a methodology which has been developed using the published good practice guidelines set out in the GLVIA. The detailed methodology followed in undertaking the LVIA is set out in **Appendix 7A**.

7.4.9 The LVIA aims to establish the following:

- A clear understanding of the Site and its context, in respect of the physical and perceived landscape and of views and visual amenity.
- An understanding of the Proposed Development in terms of how this would relate to the existing landscape and views.
- An identification of the likely effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape and upon views, throughout its life-cycle, including cumulative interactions with other developments.
- Those mitigation measures necessary to reduce or eliminate any potential adverse effect on the landscape or views arising because of the Proposed Development.
- A conclusion as to the residual likely significant effects of the Proposed Development.

7.4.10 In accordance with the requirements of the GLVIA, the LVIA is proportionate to the likely effects of the Proposed Development.

7.4.11 Given the generally qualitative nature of landscape and visual effects, professional judgement is a very important part of the LVIA process at every stage of the assessment. This judgement is exercised within an assessment framework that transparently sets out the steps in the assessment process which have led to the overall conclusions.

7.4.12 To ensure the transparency of the assessment and judgements made, the LVIA process follows a standard approach, namely:



- The establishment of the baseline conditions against which the effects of the Proposed Development will be assessed.
- The determination of the nature of the receptor likely to be affected, i.e. its sensitivity.
- The prediction of the nature of the effects likely to occur, i.e. the magnitude of impact/change.
- An assessment of whether a likely significant effect would be experienced by any receptor, by considering the predicted magnitude of change together with the sensitivity of the receptor, taking into account any proposed mitigation measures.

7.4.13 A separate methodology describing how visualisation material has been produced is set out in **Appendix 7B**.

Assessment of Significance / Assessment Criteria

7.4.14 As described above, the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development have been determined by a consideration of the predicted magnitude of change together with the sensitivity of the receptor, taking into account any proposed mitigation measures. **Appendix 7A** includes details of the criteria used to determine the sensitivity of each receptor and the magnitude of change that would occur upon each receptor.

7.4.15 The purpose of EIA is to determine the likely significant effects of a development proposal. Not all landscape and visual effects arising because of a particular proposal will be significant. It should be noted that there is no statutory definition of what constitutes a significant effect and there is often not a single, definitive, correct answer as to whether an effect is significant or not. However, it is considered that a significant effect is one which is likely to be a material factor in the decision-making process.

7.4.16 Where a significant effect is identified, this does not necessarily mean that such an effect is unacceptable to decision-makers. The acceptability or otherwise of effects is a matter to be weighed in the planning balance alongside other factors. What is important is that the likely effects of any proposal are transparently assessed and described in order that the relevant determining authority can bring a balanced and well-informed judgement to bear as part of the decision-making process.



- 7.4.17 The judgement for this LVIA is that greater than ‘moderate’ effects are more likely to be significant. This is because they would generally result from larger magnitudes of change on higher sensitivity receptors. This does not preclude a ‘moderate’ effect or lower being significant or a greater than ‘moderate’ effect not being significant. This judgment will depend on the specific circumstances being considered. The methodology for the LVIA is informed by guidance contained within the GLVIA. Refer to **Appendix 7A** for further details regarding the assessment of significance of effect, and as to how judgements relating to significance have been made in this LVIA.

Limitations

- 7.4.18 The assessment baseline has been ascertained in part from review of a series of published documents. These documents have been assumed to be accurate at the date of their publication but may not necessarily reflect more recent changes in the landscape or take account of more recent changes in policy or in best practice. Where relevant, any post-publication changes are described in the LVIA.
- 7.4.19 Assessment work reflects the level of vegetation cover present at the time of the field visits to the Study Area (January 2022, March 2022, June 2022 and February 2025). Most of the viewpoint photography was shot in 2022. Where relevant to its conclusions, the LVIA makes assumptions as to the likely visibility of the Proposed Development at other times of year.
- 7.4.20 Fieldwork was typically undertaken from publicly accessible areas. Permission to access to Chirk Castle roof was granted by the National Trust, as part of assessment work undertaken in 2022 in relation to the LVIA for the North Access Road development. Professional judgement has been used to assess any impacts experienced from private properties. This has been aided by fieldwork observations made from the surrounding area and via analysis of online aerial imagery.
- 7.4.21 Where distances and measurements are given, these are approximate and generally calculated from the nearest point of the Site boundary (or as otherwise stated) to the feature in question.

7.5 Baseline Environment

Data Sources

7.5.1 The LVIA team has extensive data relating to the Study Area because of work undertaken in relation to previous planning applications. This includes:

- Extant landscape character assessment studies published by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and by WCBC.
- Baseline photography from the proposed viewpoint locations (shot in 2022), comprising:
 - a. Winter photography from all locations.
 - b. Additional summer photography from several viewpoints.
- Other fieldwork to identify sensitive receptors.
- Topographic and arboricultural surveys.

7.5.2 Further fieldwork was carried out in September 2024 and February 2025 to confirm if there have been any changes within the Study Area subsequent to 2022 (i.e. to ensure a contemporary baseline), and to reshoot photography from several Viewpoints in accordance with consultee comments (see **Table 7.1** and **Table 7.2**, and the sub-heading 'Visual Baseline' below).

The Site and its Surroundings

7.5.3 The Proposed Development would be within the existing Kronospan Facility, which covers an area of approximately 41.2 hectares at the western edge of Chirk.

7.5.4 Kronospan is a well-established industrial facility in operation since the 1970s, and which includes several large industrial process buildings (some with emissions stacks), storage areas for raw materials, warehouse buildings, offices and car parking. Some of the existing structures are large in scale and height. The tallest structures on site are the CHP emissions stack (70m), the WESP stack (65.5m), the MDF cyclones (57m), and the dryer exhaust stack at the WESP Chip Dryer (50m). The great majority of the structures are goosewing grey in colour (RAL 7038). The locations of these features (where visible) are annotated on the baseline viewpoint photography included in **Figures 7.2a-t**. Emission plumes from these stacks are often clearly visible from the surrounding area.



- 7.5.5 The Proposed Development would be located towards the north-western boundary of the wider Kronospan Facility. It would be surrounded by a series of existing structures and structures that are under construction (comprising the Chipper and Flaker (max. height 11.5m) and the OSB Facility (max. height 33.2m)). Refer to **Figure 1.2** for a plan showing the context of the Site within the wider Kronospan Facility. Further discussion of other consented development at the existing Kronospan Facility is set out in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)** and **Section 7.11**.
- 7.5.6 Chirk is a small town located off the A5, just north of the England-Wales border (within Wales). The residential areas of the town mostly lie east of the B5070, with the Kronospan Facility to the west of this road. On the western side of the B5070, to the south-east of the Kronospan Facility is an area of greenspace comprising a private sports club (immediately south of the Kronospan car park) and Chirk Recreation Ground. The larger structures within the Kronospan Facility are visible from the recreation ground, but other structures are very well screened from view by intervening vegetation cover. Chirk town centre lies south-east of the Kronospan Facility and includes various commercial and community buildings and areas of public open space.
- 7.5.7 The wider area is rural. The landform falls steeply, from the hills to the west towards the much lower-lying Shropshire Plain to the east. Local variations in topography are evident, with a marked rise to a ridge east of the town.
- 7.5.8 To the west of the Kronospan Facility, the land rises towards the foothills of the Welsh mountains. The Llangollen Canal (the Canal) forms part of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site (WHS). In addition to the recognised heritage value, the canal corridor is an important recreational route, and National Cycle Route 84 follows the towpath. Beyond the Canal, settlement is sparse, and land cover comprises a mixture of pasture and small woodlands. Chirk Castle and its associated grounds (Grade 1 Registered Park and Garden (RPG)) are a notable feature within the landscape. The Castle is owned by the National Trust and is a well-known and well-frequented visitor destination. The Offa's Dyke Path National Trail runs in a broadly north-south direction further to the west, with views available east over the lower ground. Much of this area falls with the boundary of the Clwydian

Range and Dee Valley National Landscape (as referenced in **Section 7.2** above and discussed in greater detail below).

- 7.5.9 To the north, the land undulates before falling into the steep valley of the River Dee some 1.6km north of the Site. The Canal runs due north before turning westwards along the southern lip of the valley. The northern side of the valley is urbanised, with a string of contiguous small villages at Cefn.
- 7.5.10 To the east, an undulating agricultural landscape extends east of Chirk. The A5 corridor runs north-south in what is almost a straight line along the eastern edge of a ridge approximately 1km east of the Site. The Brynkinallt estate (RPG) is bisected by the road. The wholly separate Brynkinallt Park lies west of the road, at the eastern edge of Chirk, on reclaimed colliery land.
- 7.5.11 The steep sided valley of the River Ceiriog cuts through the surrounding hills 1.8km to the south of the Kronospan Facility. Parts of the valley slopes are well wooded. The Canal crosses the valley via the Chirk Aqueduct, which forms part of the WHS. The Ceiriog Trail recreational route runs along the southern lip of the valley.

Designations

Statutory Landscape Designations

- 7.5.12 As noted in **Section 7.2**, the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape is approximately 550m west of the Site at the closest (refer to **Figure 7.1a** for location). The special qualities of the National Landscape are set out in the Management Plan 2014-2019¹² as follows:

- Tranquillity.
- Remoteness and Wildness, Space and Freedom.
- Heather Moorland and Rolling Ridges.
- Broadleaved Woodlands and Veteran Trees.
- River Valleys and the River Dee.
- Limestone Grasslands, Cliffs and Screes.
- Historic Settlement and Archaeology.

¹² Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, undated. *Management Plan 2014-2019*.

- Industrial Features and the World Heritage Site.
- Historic Defence Features.
- Small Historic Features.
- Traditional Boundaries.
- Iconic Visitor and Cultural Attractions.
- The Offa's Dyke National Trail and Promoted Routes.
- The Built Environment.
- People and Communities.

7.5.13 The Welsh Government intends to designate a new North East Wales National Park (NEWNP), incorporating the full extent of the National Landscape and extending further south to cover land that is presently undesignated. Consultation regarding this is ongoing, with statutory consultation anticipated to take place during autumn and winter 2025. Timescales for final designation are not known.

7.5.14 The purposes of National Parks are, as defined in the NPAC Act 1949 (as amended by the Environment Act 1995), to:

“conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Parks; and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Parks by the public”.

7.5.15 Within the Study Area, the proposed boundary for the NEWNP would be no different to that of the National Landscape. In purely landscape and visual terms, designation as a National Park would not provide any additional protection over and above that provided by the National Landscape designation, with the statutory requirement to conserve and enhance the natural beauty remaining unchanged. As such, it is considered that any conclusions made in the LVIA regarding effects upon the National Landscape would remain equally applicable should the NEWNP ultimately be designated.

Non-statutory Landscape Designations

7.5.16 The Site lies within the non-statutory local-level Special Landscape Area (SLA) designation (refer to **Figure 7.1a** for location). Much of the SLA overlaps the National Landscape discussed above, and for the purposes of the LVIA, it is considered that



the National Landscape takes precedence over the SLA in these areas of overlap. The SLA is protected by Policy EC5 of the UDP, which states:

“Within Special Landscape Areas, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape. Development, other than for agriculture, small-scale farm-based and other rural enterprises, and essential operational development by utility service providers, will be strictly controlled. Development will be required to conform to a high standard of design and landscaping and special attention will be paid to minimising its visual impact from both nearby and distant viewpoints”.

- 7.5.17 SLA boundaries were revised as part of preparation of the LDP, and the revised boundary excludes land immediately north and west of the wider Kronospan facility. The boundary revision process was underpinned by a supporting document, namely the Special Landscape Areas Study¹³, and has been undertaken to comply with the requirements of PPW in order to:

“...state which features, characteristics or qualities require extra protection, and explain how the policy or designation will achieve this protection...”

- 7.5.18 As such, following the boundary review, it can be concluded that the landscape in the vicinity of the Site does not have any features, characteristics or qualities that require extra protection, and that this is demonstrated by the findings of the Special Landscape Areas Study.

Other Designations

- 7.5.19 There are a range of heritage assets within the Study Area. Further details of these, and details of how effects upon them or their settings would be assessed are set out in **ES Chapter 8.0 (Historic Environment)**.
- 7.5.20 However, some of these assets do have an inherent landscape component, and where relevant their presence is reflected in the judgements made in the LVIA. Of particular relevance are the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS and the Chirk Castle RPG. The location of these two features (including the essential setting of the WHS), and of other RPGs is illustrated on **Figure 7.1a**.

¹³ TACP, 2017. *Special Landscape Areas Study*. Wrexham County Borough Council

Landscape Character Assessment

National

- 7.5.21 There are 48 National Landscape Character Areas (NLCA) identified by NRW across Wales. The broad geographic reach of the NLCAs means that the key characteristics identified as typical of a particular character area may not necessarily apply to a specific location within that character area. However, they do provide background context for more detailed studies and assessments.
- 7.5.22 The Study Area overlaps two NLCAs as follows (refer to **Figure 7.1b** for location):
- NLCA13: Deeside and Wrexham.
 - NLCA16: Berwyn.
- 7.5.23 **Appendix 7C** summarises the key characteristics and other relevant information for the two NLCAs within the Study Area.

Local

- 7.5.24 The NRW LANDMAP study is the formally adopted methodology for landscape assessment in Wales and, as such, forms the baseline for landscape character assessment. The Wrexham LANDMAP Supplementary Planning Guidance¹⁴ (the LANDMAP SPG) uses LANDMAP data to subdivide the WCBC area into a series of four broad landscape types and twenty-seven geographically distinct landscape character areas (LCA).
- 7.5.25 The Proposed Development would be within the Rural/Urban Villages landscape type and within LCA 7a: Chirk. The land in the western part of the Study Area is largely within the Uplands landscape type and within LCA 5a: Chirk Estate to Froncysyllte. The influence and visual dominance of industrial structures upon LCA7a is specifically noted in the LANDMAP SPG.
- 7.5.26 A total of six LCAs are located within the Study Area, as follows (refer to **Figure 7.1b** for the location):

¹⁴ Wrexham County Borough Council, adopted 2007. *Wrexham LANDMAP Supplementary Planning Guidance*

- LCA4: Ceiriog Valley.
- LCA5a: Chirk Estate to Froncysyllte.
- LCA7a: Chirk.
- LCA9d: Froncysyllte to Newbridge.
- LCA12a: Dee/Ceiriog Wooded Valley.
- LCA13a: Welsh Maelor.

7.5.27 Management guidance for LCA 5a and LCA 7a highlights the need to mitigate the impact of industry via strategic landscaping. A condition was attached to several planning permissions for development at the existing Kronospan Facility, which required the preparation of a landscape strategy to mitigate the visual effects of the existing Kronospan Facility from public viewpoints. As such, the Applicant submitted the Kronospan Landscape Strategy to WCBC in 2017 setting out planting proposals within the area surrounding the existing Kronospan Facility. The Kronospan Landscape Strategy was approved in 2019, and planting has subsequently been carried out within land owned by Kronospan. This planting is beginning to become effective in screening views, including views towards the Site. Further similar planting is required by several more recent (i.e. post 2019) planning permissions. **Figure 7.4** illustrates the locations of all of this landscaping, as well as further landscaping that would be required as part of the cumulative developments discussed in **Section 7.11**. Baseline photography from Viewpoints I and Q (see below) presented on **Figure 7.2i** and **Figure 7.2o** illustrate the degree to which proposed planting has become established to date.

7.5.28 **Appendix 7C** summarises the key characteristics and other relevant information for the LCAs within the Study Area.



National Landscape

7.5.29 The National Landscape SPG¹⁵ identifies a series of landscape types within the designation. That part of the Study Area within the National Landscape overlaps three separate landscape types, namely (refer to **Figure 7.1b** for location):

- Hillslopes.
- Rolling lowland.
- River valleys.

7.5.30 Key characteristics and development management considerations are set out for each. In all cases, a key focus is placed upon the visual relationship of the landscape type with its surroundings. **Appendix 7C** summarises the key characteristics and other relevant information for the LCTs within the Study Area.

7.5.31 The National Landscape SPG also discusses factors for landscape change and is clear that:

“...It will also be important to ensure that urban encroachment or other development outside the AONB does not impact adversely on its landscape character and quality, setting or sense of tranquillity...It will be important to analyse the impact of larger proposals close to the AONB boundary and, if necessary to seek mitigation measures...”¹⁶

7.5.32 And that.:

“Any new development should be assessed against its immediate environment and within its wider landscape setting. This is especially true in a protected landscape where long distance views are important and need to be protected. Higher ground opens wider vistas over the surrounding countryside allowing the eye to scan greater distances. Very often the visibility of development from greater distances is overlooked and although scale is diminished by distance, from certain viewpoints, development can look out of place and prominent. The same can apply when looking

¹⁵ Denbighshire County Council, Flintshire County Council, Wrexham County Borough Council, and Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB, 2018. *Supplementary Planning Guidance Note Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)*.

¹⁶ Ibid, paragraph 7.4

up at higher ground which is visible from valley bottoms. Care should therefore be taken to steer development away from the skyline, open elevated ground or sites overlooked from higher ground. The visible impact of new development will be minimised if sited in more enclosed landscapes, hidden by existing landforms and a screen of hedgerows, trees and woodland. Development should work with the contours/flow of the landform and prevailing patterns of land cover to minimise disturbance. Whilst elements of the landscape may be locally changed to accommodate development, the prevailing character of the landscape should remain intact. Visual prominence is when development forms a new focal point in the landscape which detracts from the general scene, visual focus and sense of place.

*In this context, new development outside the AONB but close to the boundary can impact on the setting of the AONB and its natural beauty. Consideration should therefore also be given, as stated in Planning Policy Wales (2016)¹⁷, to development outside the AONB which can have an impact on the designated area. The extent of the impact is likely to depend on scale and proximity to the boundary. In some instances, the accumulation of development can, over time, begin to have an adverse impact on setting...*¹⁸

Shropshire

7.5.33 The southern part of the Study Area is within Shropshire. The Shropshire Landscape Typology¹⁹ identifies a series of landscape types (LT) within the County. Those within the Study Area are:

- Riverside meadows.
- Wooded river gorge.
- Pasture hills.
- Principal settled farmlands.

¹⁷ Note PPW has been updated subsequent to the publication of the National Landscape SPG. The current version of PPW is referenced in Section 7.2 of this chapter.

¹⁸ Denbighshire County Council, Flintshire County Council, Wrexham County Borough Council, and Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB, 2018. *Supplementary Planning Guidance Note Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)*. Paragraphs 8.41 and 8.42

¹⁹ Shropshire County Council, 2006. *The Shropshire Landscape Typology*. Available at <https://www.shropshire.gov.uk/environment/landscape/shropshire-landscape-assessment/> [Accessed 29 October 2024]



- 7.5.34 **Appendix 7C** summarises the key characteristics and other relevant information for the LTs within the Study Area.

Summary

- 7.5.35 The landscape character of the Study Area has been classified at national level, at local authority level and at National Landscape level. The local authority level classifications published by WCBC and Shropshire Council are the finest grain of all the various characterisation documents discussed above, and these form the basis for the assessment of effects on landscape character.
- 7.5.36 As the Wrexham LCAs have been identified by WCBC based upon LANDMAP data, it is considered that they provide an appropriate baseline that accords with the requirements of PPW.
- 7.5.37 The assessment is also informed by any changes in the landscape after the publication of the WCBC and Shropshire classifications, and any ‘in the field’ observations that reflect the actual contemporary character of the Study Area. Full regard is also had to the contents of the National Landscape SPG, and to relevant key characteristics of the NLCAs.

Visual Baseline

ZTV

- 7.5.38 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping of the Proposed Development is presented on **Figures 7.1a-b**, reflecting the theoretical visibility of the roof of the proposed boiler house building (height 44m) and the top of the proposed emissions stack (height 75m).
- 7.5.39 The ZTV was produced using a free 1m LIDAR Digital Surface Model (DSM) available from NRW under the terms of the Open Government Licence. The data was captured between 2020 and 2022.
- 7.5.40 The ZTV produced using the DSM reflects the presence of screening features in the landscape. However, it does not distinguish between the ground surface and the surface of structures and vegetation. Subsequently, the ZTV output may indicate visibility from areas known to be occupied by woodland and buildings (i.e., views from treetops and roofs). Ordnance Survey open mapping data (OS Zoomstack



Woodland) datasets have been added to the ZTV Figures, as a solid white hatch on top of the ZTV information (but beneath base mapping), to mask out mapped areas of tree cover and buildings, noting this is unlikely to be exhaustive but helps refine the ZTV.

- 7.5.41 **Appendix 7B** includes a detailed methodology explaining how the ZTV was produced and sets out any inherent limitations in the process.

Viewpoints

- 7.5.42 The LVIA includes a detailed assessment of visual effects from a series of pre-determined viewpoint locations. Viewpoints fall into three categories, as set out in the GLVIA:

- Representative viewpoints (which represent the experience of different types of receptors in the vicinity).
- Specific viewpoints (a particular view, for example a well-known beauty spot).
- Illustrative viewpoints (which illustrate a particular effect/issue, which may include limited/lack of visibility).

- 7.5.43 It should be noted that the viewpoint itself is not the receptor. Rather it is the people that would be experiencing the view from it. People within the Study Area that are likely to experience views of the Proposed Development include:

- Local residents.
- Users of public rights of way, and other routes/land with public access, including the Llangollen Canal.
- Visitors to Chirk Castle.
- Road users.

- 7.5.44 The LVIA team have been involved with a range of different development proposals at the existing Kronospan Facility over a period of more than ten years. Part of this previous work included the identification of a set of 26 viewpoint locations (agreed with WCBC, and with other consultees including the National Trust), which provide a full and representative coverage of locations and receptor types within the Study Area.



- 7.5.45 The majority of these viewpoints have been used in the LVIA. Views of the Proposed Development would not be available from all these locations. Viewpoint locations are illustrated on **Figures 7.1a-b**, with a distinction between locations proposed to be included in the LVIA and locations proposed to be omitted.
- 7.5.46 The six viewpoints omitted from the LVIA (Viewpoints O, P, S, T, Y and Z) are all locations from which views towards the Proposed Development would be screened by vegetation cover, and in some cases by existing structures. These viewpoints are all outside the ZTV of the Proposed Development. As such, there would be no change in view because of the Proposed Development.
- 7.5.47 **Table 7.5** lists the 20 viewpoints that are included in the LVIA. Viewpoints U and V at Chirk Castle both lie outside the ZTV, but given the sensitivity of views from these locations, it is considered of value to include them in the LVIA to demonstrate the lack of visibility.
- 7.5.48 Most viewpoint photography was shot in 2022, as set out in the Scoping Report (**Appendix 1C**) and reflect winter views toward the Site.
- 7.5.49 Photography from Viewpoints Q and X were reshot in February 2025 following comments made by NRW as part of the Scoping Direction (**Appendix 1D**). Photography from Viewpoint I was also reshot at the same time, to illustrate the degree to which woodland planted as part of the Kronospan Landscape Strategy provides screening of views (the woodland has grown noticeably since 2022).

Table 7.5 – Viewpoint Locations

Viewpoint	British National Grid Co-ordinates	Receptor Type	Visualisation Type
A: Chirk Recreation Ground	329040, 337815	Representative of views from public open space in Chirk village centre.	Type 4 Photomontage
B: Offa's Dyke Path near Fron Isaf	327302, 339844	Representative of views from the National Trail, north-west of the Site. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomontage
C: N edge of Chirk	328921, 339165	Representative of views available to residents and road users at the edge of Chirk	Type 4 Photomontage

Viewpoint	British National Grid Co-ordinates	Receptor Type	Visualisation Type
D: Chirk Castle Gates	328106, 337680	Specific view from the Castle gates. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
E: Green Lane	329696, 338817	Illustrative of the degree to which the Proposed Development would be screened by other features in views from elevated locations.	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
F: B5070 north of Chirk	328869, 339668	Representative of the views available from the road leading into Chirk.	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
G: Offa's Dyke Path west of Bronygarth	325714, 336544	Representative of views from the National Trail, south-west of the Site. Within National Landscape.	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
H: Chirk Castle Terrace	327158, 338969	Specific view from the garden terrace at the Castle. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
I: New Hall	327559, 338815	Representative of views from the adjacent road network and nearby property, and also from the entrance to Chirk Castle	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
J: Canal towpath near marina	328604, 339624	Representative of views available to canal and towpath users (including those at the marina)	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
K: Canal towpath north-west of site	328520, 338945	Representative of views available to canal users	Type 4 Photomontage
L: Chirk Castle driveway	327234, 338569	Representative of views available to visitors on their way to the Castle itself. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
M: Canal towpath north of site	328562, 339101	Representative of views available to canal users	Type 4 Photomontage

Viewpoint	British National Grid Co-ordinates	Receptor Type	Visualisation Type
N: Canal towpath north of site	328564, 339152	Representative of views available to canal users	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
Q: New Hall South Lodge (Chirk Castle Entrance)	327511, 338790	Specific view from the entrance to Chirk Castle, adjacent to the listed lodge building. Within National Landscape.	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
R: Eastern edge of Chirk Castle Estate	327544, 338701	Illustrative of views from the eastern edge of the Chirk Castle Estate. Within National Landscape.	Type 1 Annotated Photograph
U: Chirk Castle entrance	326900, 338130	Specific view from outside the main entrance to Chirk Castle (the castle itself, and not the wider estate). Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
V: Chirk Castle roof	326864, 338121	Specific view from the roof of Chirk Castle. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
W: Footpath, Chirk Castle	327284, 338262	Specific view from the permissive path that runs through the Chirk Castle Estate. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe
X: Offa's Dyke Path north of Chirk Castle	326888, 339457	Representative of views available to users of the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail. Within National Landscape.	Type 4 Photomatched Wireframe

7.5.50 Baseline photography from each of the viewpoints that are included in the LVIA is presented on **Figures 7.2a-t**.

7.5.51 Wireframe and photomontage visualisations illustrating how the Proposed Development would appear have been prepared from specific viewpoints agreed as part of the scoping process (locations stated in **Table 7.5**) and are presented on the same set of Figures as stated immediately above. Separate cumulative visualisation

from Viewpoints C, I, K and M are presented separately on **Figures 7.3a-d** (refer to **Section 7.11** for details of the cumulative landscape and visual assessment).

- 7.5.52 Refer to **Appendix 7B** for a methodology explaining how photography was taken and how the visualisations were produced.

Future Baseline

- 7.5.53 In the absence of the Proposed Development, is assumed that the Site would remain in its current status, i.e. existing structures and hardstanding.
- 7.5.54 Nevertheless, given the location it is likely that alternate proposals to redevelop the Site for industrial development associated with the wider Kronospan Facility would come forward. As set out in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)**, the silos that form part of the Proposed Development, benefit from planning permission under a separate permission (planning reference P/2022/0765), and could thus be built regardless of whether or not the Proposed Development is consented.

7.6 Initial Development Design and Impact Avoidance/Reduction Measures

Overview

- 7.6.1 General design measures to avoid or minimise the potential for significant effects are described in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)**.
- 7.6.2 Mitigation measures can be broken down into three types as follows:
- Primary Mitigation: measures which form an inherent part of the project design.
 - Secondary Mitigation: measures that require further activity to achieve the anticipated outcome (e.g. details provided via planning condition).
 - Tertiary Mitigation: measures required by legislation or typical best practice.
- 7.6.3 Clarification 3(5) of LITGN-2024-01 is clear that:

“...Statements of significance should be reported post primary (designed-in) mitigation, and this includes considering effects during the growth of mitigation planting as set out in paragraph 4.31 of GLVIA3. Secondary mitigation that has not been designed into the scheme but consists of measures to be taken later (which is

relatively rare for landscape and visual mitigation) should not be taken into account when reporting significant effects, although a final statement of residual effects (post-secondary mitigation) may be helpful”.

- 7.6.4 Initial landscape and visual mitigation measures are described in turn below. No tertiary mitigation has been identified in relation to landscape and visual effects.

Construction and Decommissioning

- 7.6.5 A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (**DNS4-003**) is provided with this DNS application and presents the approach to and the application of environmental management and mitigation for the construction of the Proposed Development. A series of phase specific CEMP documents (as required) which define specific measures to be adopted during the construction of the various components of the Proposed Development would be produced (post-consent) by the Principal Contractor (PC).
- 7.6.6 Items addressed by the CEMP that pertain to landscape and visual effects include measures to limit the effects of temporary construction lighting.
- 7.6.7 The decommissioning phase will be supported by a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) which will include measures similar to those proposed as part of the CEMP.

Operation

- 7.6.8 A series of measures have been identified as an inherent part of the design of the Proposed Development to reduce or eliminate potentially adverse landscape and visual effects. These measures are described in more detail at **ES Chapter 3.0 (Alternatives)** and **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)** and include:
- Goosewing grey colour scheme for the proposed structures, to match with existing structures at Kronospan and avoid making the proposed structures unnecessarily conspicuous. A colour study examining the potential visual effects of different colour cladding was undertaken and is included as **Appendix 3A**.
 - Location of the proposed structures as far as reasonably practicable from the nearest residential receptors, to minimise potential visual effects.

- Location of the proposed structures close to existing larger structures at the Kronospan Facility to minimise any perceived increase in the spread of such structures when seen in views from the surrounding area.

7.7 Assessment of Potential Effects

Introduction

- 7.7.1 The following section sets out the assessment of effects taking into consideration the initial development design and impact avoidance/reduction measures detailed in **Section 7.6** above.

Construction Phase

Overview

- 7.7.2 Refer to **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)** for a description of the construction stage of the Proposed Development, including the approach to the removal or relocation of existing features. Construction would be managed in accordance with a CEMP as noted above. The overall construction period is anticipated to last for a period of up to approximately 30 months. Different activities would take place at different times during this period and, as such, landscape and visual effects would vary over time and would not occur on a consistent basis throughout the construction phase but rather are likely to vary in intensity with specific effects of shorter duration occurring at different times. In particular, cranes would be present for approximately 18 months.
- 7.7.3 Construction sites feature distinctive elements that are likely to draw attention, including temporary signage and fencing, and site operatives wearing high-visibility clothing. Construction also, by necessity, requires the use of suitable vehicles and other plant, some of which would potentially be readily apparent by virtue of their colour, form and movement.
- 7.7.4 Temporary lighting would be required to ensure the health, safety and welfare of those on site during poor light conditions, and in particular at the beginning and end of the working day in winter. This may require temporary lighting rigs or in some instances mobile task lighting. Some use of low-level lighting of compounds for security purposes may be required through the night. Measures to reduce or

eliminate adverse effects upon amenity arising from such lighting are, as stated above, set out in the Framework CEMP (**DNS4-003**).

Construction Phase Landscape and Visual Effects

- 7.7.5 Construction activities including traffic movements would be temporary, variable in their location and intermittent. Much of the construction plant and equipment would be relatively low in height and would not be visually conspicuous over a wide area. The chief exception to this would be the presence of cranes whilst existing structures are removed and proposed structures are erected.
- 7.7.6 As construction of certain areas and elements is completed, the operational landscape and visual effects of these areas would begin to be experienced alongside the construction activity and would be a precursor to the subsequent more static operational effects, experienced alongside ongoing construction of other elements and areas.
- 7.7.7 A breakdown of construction phase effects upon the landscape character of the LCAs/LTs within the Study Area, and upon the twenty viewpoints included in the LVIA is set out in **Appendix 7D** and is summarised in **Table 7.6** below and the subsequent text.

Table 7.6 – Construction Phase Landscape and Visual Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
Landscape Character				
WCBC LCA4: Ceiriog Valley	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
WCBC LCA5a: Chirk Estate to Froncysyllte	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
WCBC LCA7a: Chirk	Medium to High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
WCBC LCA9d: Froncysyllte to Newbridge	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
WCBC LCA12a: Dee/Ceiriog Valley	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
WCBC LCA13a: Welsh Maelor	Medium	No Change	No Effect	N/a
Shropshire LT: Riverside Meadows	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
Shropshire LT: Wooded River Gorge	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
Shropshire LT: Pasture Hills	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	No
Shropshire LT: Principal Settled Farmlands	Medium	Negligible	Negligible Neutral	No
Viewpoints				
A: Chirk Recreation Ground	Medium	Small to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
B: Offa's Dyke Path near Fron Isaf	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
C: N edge of Chirk	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
D: Chirk Castle Gates	Medium to High	Small	Minor Adverse	No
E: Green Lane	Low to Medium	Small to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
F: B5070 north of Chirk	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	No
G: Offa's Dyke Path west of Bronygarth	High	Small	Minor Adverse	No
H: Chirk Castle Terrace	High	Small	Minor Adverse	No
I: New Hall	Medium to High	Negligible	Negligible Neutral	No

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
J: Canal towpath near marina	High	Negligible	Negligible Neutral	No
K: Canal towpath north-west of site	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
L: Chirk Castle driveway	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
M: Canal towpath north of site	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
N: Canal towpath north of site	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
Q: New Hall South Lodge (Chirk Castle Entrance)	High	Negligible	Negligible Neutral	No
R: Eastern edge of Chirk Castle Estate	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
U: Chirk Castle entrance	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
V: Chirk Castle roof	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
W: Footpath, Chirk Castle	High	Small	Minor Adverse	No
X: Offa's Dyke Path north of Chirk Castle	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No

7.7.8 Low-level construction activities would be very well screened by a combination of existing structures at Kronospan, by vegetation cover in the surrounding landscape, and by landform. As such, the influence of construction upon landscape character and upon views would be limited to that resulting from the erection of taller proposed structures, and the presence of the cranes required to do this. The effects of construction would thus typically be very similar in their extent and nature to the operational effects of the Proposed Development and would form a precursor to these effects as new structures are progressively introduced into the landscape and the views available across it. At Viewpoints D, H, I and Q, effects would be less than

during the operational period due to the limited period during which cranes would be present within the view, and thus the relatively short duration of change in view from their presence (as opposed to the much longer duration of the operational presence of the proposed stack). In all cases, effects would **not be significant**.

- 7.7.9 Night-time construction effects resulting from lighting would be limited and would **not be significant**. Lighting would generally not be operational outside of normal working hours, other than low-level security lighting triggered by motion sensors. As set out above, the Framework CEMP (**DNS4-003**) includes measures to minimise adverse effects upon the amenity of the surrounding area.

Operational Phase

Landscape Effects

- 7.7.10 A detailed assessment of effects on landscape character upon the LCAs identified by WCBC and the LTs identified by Shropshire Council is set out in **Appendix 7E**. The conclusions of the assessment are summarised in **Table 7.7** below and the subsequent text.

Table 7.7 – Effects on Landscape Character

Landscape Character Area/Landscape Type	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
WCBC LCA4: Ceiriog Valley	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
WCBC LCA5a: Chirk Estate to Froncysyllte	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
WCBC LCA7a: Chirk	Medium to High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
WCBC LCA9d: Froncysyllte to Newbridge	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
WCBC LCA12a: Dee/Ceiriog Valley	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
WCBC LCA13a: Welsh Maelor	Medium	No Change	No Effect	N/a

Landscape Character Area/Landscape Type	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
Shropshire LT: Riverside Meadows	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
Shropshire LT: Wooded River Gorge	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
Shropshire LT: Pasture Hills	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	N/a
Shropshire LT: Principal Settled Farmlands	Medium	Negligible	Negligible Neutral	No

- 7.7.11 Within the Study Area there are a total of six WCBC LCAs and four Shropshire LTs. None of these would experience significant effects upon their character, and six would not experience any effect whatsoever. Effects are described for each LCA/LT below, with those that would experience the greatest level of effect discussed first.
- 7.7.12 Within WCBC LCA5a: Chirk Estate to Froncysyllte, extending over much of the hillsides west of Chirk and the Llangollen Canal, the presence of the Proposed Development would result in an incremental increase in the well-established influence of the Kronospan Facility upon outwards views from within the LCA, i.e. the visual context of the LCA would change slightly. The Proposed Development would be apparent from more exposed locations within the LCA such as the eastern and north-western parts of Chirk Castle RPG and the hillsides west of Chirk marina, in the context of the existing industrial structures. The proposed structures would be amongst the largest present. This change in visual context would not increase the influence of Kronospan to such a degree that there would be any noticeable change in character from baseline. The character of the LCA would continue to be defined by rural land uses and landcover, including historic parkland, and with long views outwards to the east including a large-scale industrial facility that contrasts with other visible features. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.

- 7.7.13 Within WCBC LCA7a: Chirk, covering the town, the Llangollen Canal corridor and the surrounding farmland, the presence of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of development at Kronospan upon the character of the landscape/townscape, but not to such a degree that this would noticeably change character from baseline. The Proposed Development would be added to the existing assemblage of structures at Kronospan, and the new structures would be amongst the largest present. Their presence would be apparent from much of the LCA but would often be locally screened by existing structures or by vegetation cover. The character of the LCA would continue to be defined by urban development within Chirk, including a large-scale industrial facility at Kronospan, set in the context of surrounding rural land uses, and often significant vegetation cover (especially along the canal corridor). Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.14 Within Shropshire LT: Pasture Hills, on the slopes to the south of the valley of the River Ceiriog, the Proposed Development would be visible from more exposed/elevated locations in the context of the expansive northward views that are characteristic of the LT, and which already include the existing Kronospan facility. There would be a very limited increase in the influence of large-scale industrial development upon the visual context of the LT, but the underlying character would not change from baseline to any appreciable degree. Effects would be **minor adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.15 Within Shropshire LT: Principal Settled Farmlands, the presence of the Proposed Development would result in some very limited change in view from scattered locations within the LT. this would not result in any appreciable change in the baseline character of the landscape. Effects would be **negligible neutral** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.16 Within the following six LCAs/LTs the Proposed Development would barely visible or would not be visible at all, and thus there would be **no effect** on landscape character:
- WCBC LCA4a: Ceiriog Valley.
 - WCBC LCA9d: Froncysyllte to Newbridge.
 - WCBC LCA12a: Dee/Ceiriog Wooded Valley.
 - WCBC LCA13a: Welsh Maelor.
 - Shropshire LT: Riverside Meadows.

- Shropshire LT: Wooded River Gorge.

Visual Effects

ZTV

- 7.7.17 The ZTV presented on **Figures 7.1a-b** demonstrate that theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development would be most extensive to the north, north-east and north-west of the Site, and would be more fragmented to the south, south-east and south-west where built development and the much lower-lying landform of the Ceiriog Valley would break up views. Woodland cover within the Chirk Castle Estate is also predicted to provide screening.

Viewpoints

- 7.7.18 A detailed assessment of visual effects from each of the twenty viewpoints included in the LVIA is set out in **Appendix 7F**. The conclusions of the assessment are summarised in **Table 7.8** below and the subsequent text.

Table 7.8 – Effects on Viewpoints

Viewpoint	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
A: Chirk Recreation Ground	Medium	Small to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
B: Offa's Dyke Path near Fron Isaf	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
C: N edge of Chirk	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
D: Chirk Castle Gates	Medium to High	Small to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
E: Green Lane	Low to Medium	Small to medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
F: B5070 north of Chirk	Medium	Small	Minor Adverse	No

Viewpoint	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
G: Offa's Dyke Path west of Bronygarth	High	Small	Minor Adverse	No
H: Chirk Castle Terrace	High	Small to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
I: New Hall	Medium to High	Small (short term) No Change (medium and long term)	Minor Adverse (short term) No Effect (long term)	No
J: Canal towpath near marina	High	Small (short term) No Change (medium and long term)	Minor Adverse (short term) No Effect (long term)	No
K: Canal towpath north-west of site	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	Yes
L: Chirk Castle driveway	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
M: Canal towpath north of site	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
N: Canal towpath north of site	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No
Q: New Hall South Lodge (Chirk Castle Entrance)	High	Small (short term) No Change (medium and long term)	Minor Adverse (short term) No Effect (long term)	No
R: Eastern edge of Chirk Castle Estate	High	Small to Medium	Moderate Adverse	No
U: Chirk Castle entrance	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
V: Chirk Castle roof	High	No Change	No Effect	N/a
W: Footpath, Chirk Castle	High	Small	Minor Adverse	No

Viewpoint	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Significant Effect
X: Offa's Dyke Path north of Chirk Castle	High	Small	Minor to Moderate Adverse	No

- 7.7.19 None of the 20 viewpoints included in the LVIA would experience a significant visual effect, and two would experience no effect. Effects are described for each viewpoint below, with those that would experience the greatest level of effect discussed first.
- 7.7.20 At Viewpoint C: N edge of Chirk, the Proposed Development would be introduced into a view that includes the existing assemblage of structures at Kronospan. The overall mass of these would increase because of the new structures and the influence of structures on the skylines would also undergo a limited increase due to the greater perceived height of the new buildings. However intervening tree cover would provide a considerable degree of screening, and only a small proportion of what is a much wider view looking westward toward the hills would be affected. Effects would be **moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.21 At Viewpoint K: Canal towpath, north-west of Site, the Proposed Development would result in some increase in the influence of built development at Kronospan upon views southwards from this section of the Canal corridor, but this influence is well-established. The horizontal extent of visible development at Kronospan would not increase. Whilst the Proposed Development would be relatively close to the Viewpoint, changes would occur in the background of the view, and the railway corridor would continue to provide a clear visual separation between Kronospan and the canal corridor in the foreground of the view. The nature of the view would not change greatly from baseline, and the view would remain one defined by the Canal corridor in the foreground, the long views north-west to the hills, and the presence of the Kronospan Facility beyond the railway embankment to the south-west. Effects would be **moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.22 At Viewpoint L: Chirk Castle Driveway, the Proposed Development would be well screened by the intervening landform. The roof of the proposed boiler house, the upper elevations of the proposed silos, and the proposed stack would be visible. The presence of the Proposed Development would result in an increase in the influence of built development upon views. The underlying nature of the large-scale panoramic

view, with the Kronospan Facility largely screened by landform, but with some structures partially visible in the middle ground would not change. Effects would be **moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.

7.7.23 At Viewpoint M: Canal towpath, north of Site, the Proposed Development would result in some increase in the influence of built development at Kronospan upon views southwards from this section of the Canal corridor, but this influence is well-established. The horizontal extent of visible development at Kronospan would not increase. Whilst the Proposed Development would be relatively close to the Viewpoint, changes would occur in the background of the view, and the railway corridor would continue to provide a clear visual separation between Kronospan the Canal corridor in the foreground of the view. The nature of the view would not change greatly from baseline, and the view would remain one defined by the Canal corridor in the foreground, and the presence of the Kronospan Facility beyond the railway embankment to the south-west. Effects would be **moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.

7.7.24 At Viewpoint R: Eastern edge of Chirk Castle Estate, the Proposed Development would result in an incremental increase in the well-established influence of industrial development in the middle ground of the view. The lower elevations of the new structures would be screened by intervening woodland cover along the Canal corridor. The horizontal spread of development would not increase. The view would remain open and long-range in character, with dense woodland cover continuing to screen much of the Kronospan Facility. Effects would be **moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.

7.7.25 At Viewpoint A: Chirk Recreation Ground, the Proposed Development would introduce new large scale industrial structures into a well-established assemblage of similar structures at Kronospan. The proposed stack would be the tallest structure in the view. The new structures would reduce the degree to which some existing structures, notably the WESP Chip Dryer Stack are visible. The overall influence of the Kronospan Facility upon the view would undergo an incremental increase. The nature of the view would not change greatly from baseline and would continue to be defined by the Recreation Ground in the foreground, by Kronospan in the middle ground and by the partially wooded hills in the background. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.

- 7.7.26 At Viewpoint B: Offa's Dyke Path, near Fron Isaf, the Proposed Development would result in a very incremental increase in the well-established influence of the Kronospan Facility in views out across the lowlands from this section of the National Trail. The nature of the view would not change appreciably from baseline and would continue to be predominantly rural in character with a large industrial facility in the middle ground. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**. It should be recognised that views toward Kronospan would be far better screened should landscape enhancements required as part of the consented North Access Road and Lorry Park development be implemented, which would increase the height of the adjacent hedgerow. Ultimately therefore, effects may be less than stated.
- 7.7.27 At Viewpoint D: Chirk Castle Gates, the Proposed Development would be well screened by woodland cover, with only the proposed stack visible. The existing view includes several stacks breaking the skyline above the trees. The proposed stack would be taller than the existing ones, but also less bulky than most of them. There would be an incremental increase in the influence of existing features, but the nature of the view would not change appreciably from baseline. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.28 At Viewpoint E: Green Lane, the Proposed Development would introduce new large scale industrial structures into a well-established assemblage of similar structures at Kronospan. The overall influence of the Kronospan Facility upon the view would undergo an incremental increase. The nature of the view would not change greatly from baseline and would continue to be defined by the views looking over Chirk (including Kronospan) to the hills beyond. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.29 At Viewpoint H: Chirk Castle Terrace, the Proposed Development would be well screened by intervening vegetation cover. The roof of the proposed boiler house and the proposed stack would be visible above the trees, and the stack would be the tallest structure visible. There would be an increase in the influence of built development upon views from the Castle terrace. However, most of the new structures would be screened by vegetation. The underlying nature of the large-scale panoramic view, including the limited presence of structures at Kronospan

- would not change. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.30 At Viewpoint N: Canal towpath, north of Site, the Proposed Development would be introduced into the background of the view. The new structures would be well screened by a combination of tree cover along the Canal, and existing structures at Kronospan. Their presence would have little influence upon the nature of the views along the Canal corridor from this location. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would not **be significant**.
- 7.7.31 At Viewpoint X: Offa's Dyke Path, north of Chirk Castle, the Proposed Development would be partially visible, with lower elevations screened from view by intervening vegetation cover. New structures would be visible above this, and the presence of the proposed boiler house would increase the perceived mass of visible built structures at Kronospan. The receiving view is large in scale, and change would be very limited, with only an incremental increase in the influence of built development. The Proposed Development would represent small scale change to a large-scale view. The nature of the existing view, namely a long-range view out across the lowlands, with the Kronospan Facility partially visible in the middle distance, would not change. Effects would be **minor to moderate adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.32 At Viewpoint F: B5070 north of Chirk, the Proposed Development would be well screened by vegetation and would not be clearly visible. Its presence would result in some very incremental increase in the influence of built development upon the view. The nature of the existing view, namely a narrow and transient view of industrial structures from the B5070 when travelling southwards into Chirk would not change. Effects would be **minor adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.33 At Viewpoint G: Offa's Dyke Path west of Bronygarth, the Proposed Development would be a very limited addition to a large-scale view, and its presence would not result in any change of note from baseline. The Kronospan Facility would remain a very limited and small-scale presence within a large-scale view. Effects would be **minor adverse** and would **not be significant**.
- 7.7.34 At Viewpoint W: Footpath, Chirk Castle, the Proposed Development would be a very limited addition which would be very well screened by intervening vegetation cover.

The top of the proposed stack would be visible above the trees. From further west, where the path is more elevated, glimpses of the other proposed structures are likely to be available through the trees. Effects would be **minor adverse** and would **not be significant**.

7.7.35 At Viewpoint I: New Hall, Viewpoint J: Canal towpath, near Chirk Marina, and Viewpoint Q, close to New Hall South Lodge and the entrance to the Chirk Castle estate initial visual effects would be **minor adverse** and would **not be significant**. The Proposed Development would be very well screened from these viewpoints by intervening vegetation cover, with glimpses of the proposed stack available through the trees. Much of the woodland close to the viewpoints was planted as part of the Kronospan Landscape Strategy and comprises young trees. As the trees continue to grow, and the woodland becomes more established, views towards the Proposed Development would be wholly screened, and thus there would be **no effect** in the medium and longer-term.

7.7.36 At Viewpoint U and Viewpoint V, at the entrance to Chirk Castle and on the Castle roof respectively, the Proposed Development would be wholly screened by the intervening landform and woodland cover. There would be no change in view, and therefore **no effect**.

Pattern of Visual Effects

7.7.37 The Proposed Development would introduce large-scale industrial structures into a context where similarly large-scale structures are well-established and are visible from many locations in the surrounding area. There are no locations where the Proposed Development would be visible and where existing structures at Kronospan would not be.

7.7.38 The degree to which the Proposed Development would be visible would be dependent upon features present in the surrounding landscape. Buildings and other structures, earthworks, vegetation cover and changes in the landform itself often provide considerable screening of views toward the Site and would often wholly or partially screen the Proposed Development from view.

7.7.39 In views from the north, the Proposed Development would not be widely visible due to changes in landform north of the A5 and to the presence of vegetation cover along transport corridors. Narrow views of the Proposed Development would be available



as people travel into Chirk along the B5070 (refer to Viewpoint F), and more consistent visibility would be available from c.400m of the same road further to the south (refer to Viewpoint C). Visibility is likely to be more consistent from the railway, which is less well screened.

- 7.7.40 Views from the Canal corridor to the north of the Proposed Development would be very well screened by vegetation cover along much of its length. From approximately 1km of the Canal south of the A5 as far as Viewpoint N, vegetation would heavily filter views such that only glimpses of the new structures would be available, and in some places this screening would increase over time as young woodland planted as part of the Kronospan Woodland Strategy establishes (refer to Viewpoint J and Viewpoint N).
- 7.7.41 From a short section of the Canal, covering approximately 250m immediately north-west of the wider Kronospan Facility, views of the Proposed Development would be clearer. The proposed new structures would be visible within the existing industrial facility and separated from the Canal corridor by the intervening railway embankment (refer to Viewpoint K and Viewpoint M). Views from this short section of the Canal are already defined by the presence of the railway and the Kronospan Facility and the further presence of the Proposed Development would, whilst representing adverse change in view, not give rise to any notable change in the amenity experienced by users, including walkers and cyclists on the towpath.
- 7.7.42 Views from Chirk to the east of the Proposed Development would be defined by the juxtaposition of buildings within the town, and by existing screening along the B5070. A combination of screening earthworks and dense tree cover along the eastern boundary of the Kronospan Facility would screen views from the road and from properties along it. At the north-western edge of town, this screening is absent and views across the adjacent fields towards the Proposed Development would be available, set in the context of the visibility of existing structures at Kronospan, and of longer views west and north-west to the hills (refer to Viewpoint C).
- 7.7.43 From elsewhere within the residential areas of Chirk, east of the B5070, views towards the Proposed Development would be determined by the location of property windows and by the orientation of side roads. Where visible, the proposed new structures would always be seen in the context of existing structures at Kronospan. From some locations therefore, views are likely to be relatively clear, but where clear

views are available, these would already include the existing structures at Kronospan.

- 7.7.44 From the road running along the ridge east of the town, views towards the Proposed Development would be restricted by roadside hedgerow vegetation. Where gaps in this occur, clear views of the existing Kronospan Facility are available, and the Proposed Development would be similarly visible in the context of the existing industrial development (refer to Viewpoint E).
- 7.7.45 From the south, the Proposed Development would be added to existing views of the Kronospan Facility which are available from Chirk Recreation Ground and from some sections of Station Road (refer to Viewpoint A). Industrial development already forms a backdrop to views north from this area, and the addition of the new structures would only result in limited change in the views from central Chirk.
- 7.7.46 South of Chirk, the abrupt change in landform would prevent any views of the Proposed Development from within the Ceiriog Valley. From the higher ground further south, some visibility of the Proposed Development would be available in the context of long-range expansive panoramic views, which already include the existing Kronospan Facility as a minor presence (refer to Viewpoint G).
- 7.7.47 Views of the Proposed Development from the section of railway running immediately west of the Kronospan Facility would be available at close range. Existing structures and boundary features are prominent, and the proposed new structures would be added to these views. Views from the train would be transient, and the amenity of travellers would not undergo any change of note.
- 7.7.48 To the west of the railway, the Llangollen Canal runs through a densely wooded cutting. There are no views towards the Kronospan Facility from within the cutting, and the Proposed Development would similarly not be visible.
- 7.7.49 Views of the Proposed Development would be available from along the road that skirts the eastern edge of the Chirk Castle Estate. The woodland along the Canal corridor would provide partial screening of views, but the proposed stack would be visible above this (refer to Viewpoint D, Viewpoint I, and Viewpoint Q), and the roof of the proposed boiler house may also be available from some stretches of the road. Near the New Hall entrance to Chirk Castle, young woodland planting implemented as part of the Kronospan Landscape Strategy largely screens views towards

Kronospan. As this woodland becomes more established, the level of screening provided will increase and views of both the existing structures at Kronospan and the Proposed Development would not be available (refer to Viewpoint I and Viewpoint Q).

- 7.7.50 From within the Chirk Castle RPG (both within the estate managed by the National Trust, and those parts of the RPG further to the north), visibility of the existing Kronospan Facility is determined largely by the presence of woodland cover on the east-facing hillsides west of the canal corridor. This woodland provides considerable screening of views, including from the Castle itself, and would similarly screen views of the Proposed Development (refer to Viewpoint U, Viewpoint V and Viewpoint W).
- 7.7.51 Views of the Proposed Development would be available from the Castle terrace (refer to Viewpoint H), from stretches of the permissive path that runs through the parkland, from stretches of the Castle driveway (refer to Viewpoint L), from the eastern edge of the Estate (refer to Viewpoint R) and from the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail in the northern part of the RPG (refer to Viewpoint X). In all cases, the new structures would be visible in the context of the existing structures at Kronospan within expansive panoramic views, and both existing and new structures would be partially screened by a combination of landform and vegetation.
- 7.7.52 Further to the north, visibility of the Proposed Development is predicted to be more consistent, as there is less extensive vegetation cover outside of the RPG. Long panoramic views outward are available from the hillsides west of Chirk Marina, including from sections of the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail. These views include existing structures at the Kronospan Facility, and the proposed new structures would be seen in the context of these existing features (refer to Viewpoint B).

Plume Visibility

- 7.7.53 As set out in **ES Chapter 6.0 (Air Quality and Odour)**, there would be no visible plume emitted by the proposed CHP stack, other than in the very infrequent instances than when the existing MDF dryers are shut down (i.e. for maintenance). The very occasional presence of a visible plume from the proposed CHP stack would not result in any visual effects greater than **negligible** (due chiefly to the very limited duration it would be visible and the context of the far more conspicuous existing plumes). The effects of plume visibility would **not be significant**.

Night-time Landscape and Visual Effects

- 7.7.54 As set out in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)**, the only proposed new lighting would be the aviation lighting that would be mounted on the proposed stack. However, as described in **Appendix 4B**, this would comprise infra-red lighting which would not be visible to the human eye. As such, no night-time landscape and visual effects would occur.

Effects on Landscape Designations

Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape

- 7.7.55 The Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape was extended in 2011 to cover the area west of the Kronospan Facility. The presence of large-scale industrial structures at Kronospan or of other urban development at Chirk thus did not preclude the inclusion of land a short distance to the west within the National Landscape
- 7.7.56 The Proposed Development would not be within the boundary of the National Landscape but would be apparent in outward views from some locations within the designation. 11 of the 20 viewpoints included in the LVIA are either within the National Landscape or at its boundary. None of these viewpoints would experience significant visual effects (and the Proposed Development would not be visible from three of the viewpoints). Refer to Viewpoints B, D, H, I, L, Q, R, U, V, W, and X).
- 7.7.57 Any intrusion upon views towards the National Landscape from locations outside its boundary would be very limited, and the presence of the Proposed Development within such views would not result in significant visual effects (refer to Viewpoints A, C and E).
- 7.7.58 The proposed new structures would be added to the existing assemblage of industrial development at Kronospan, and whilst their presence would result in an increase in the influence of the Kronospan Facility upon views, this would not result in any notable change in the nature of views looking out from within the National Landscape across the lower-lying and predominantly agricultural landscape to the east. There would be no increase in the spread of development outside the footprint of the existing development, and thus the horizontal proportion of the view occupied by industrial development would not increase.

- 7.7.59 The character of the landscape within the National Landscape would not experience significant effects because of the Proposed Development. The presence of development in outward views is an established part of the visual context of this part of the designation, and this would not appreciably change because of the Proposed Development. Other characteristics of the landscape within the designation boundary would be wholly unaffected.
- 7.7.60 The lighting of the Proposed Development would not have any implications for the aspirations for the AONB to become a 'dark sky community'. As noted above, infra-red aviation lighting would be mounted to the proposed stack, which would not be visible to the human eye, and no other lighting is proposed.
- 7.7.61 **Table 7.9** provides an appraisal of how the Proposed Development would perform against each of the special qualities of the National Landscape (as set out in **Section 7.5**).

Table 7.9 – Appraisal against the Special Qualities of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape

Special Quality	Description (from National Landscape Management Plan)	Appraisal of the Proposed Development
Tranquillity	Tranquillity is associated with an atmosphere of calm and stillness; peace and quiet; and with dark night skies	<p>From locations within the designation where the Proposed Development would be visible, views of the existing Kronospan facility, are already well-established. Vehicles accessing Chirk Castle, including occasional coaches are also present at times. Effects upon landscape character and upon views within the designation would not be significant.</p> <p>The Proposed Development would not result in any significant effects resulting from changes in noise levels (refer to ES Chapter 5.0 (Noise and Vibration)). The noise assessment includes consideration of effects upon receptors within the designation (properties close to the entrance and exit points to the Chirk Castle estate).</p> <p>Proposed aviation lighting would be infra-red and thus not visible to the</p>

Special Quality	Description (from National Landscape Management Plan)	Appraisal of the Proposed Development
		<p>human eye. The Proposed Development would not have any material effect upon the aspirations for the designation to become a Dark Sky Park.</p> <p>Given the above, the introduction of the Proposed Development would not result in any changes that would materially reduce the tranquillity of the designation.</p>
Remoteness and Wildness, Space and Freedom	<p>Remoteness and wildness are associated with a feeling of trepidation and sometimes even danger. The sublime. Space and freedom are related to access to the landscape and the uninterrupted and extensive views from the high places within it.</p> <p>Bro and the link between communities and their landscape</p> <p>A sense of belonging and attachment to the landscape.</p>	<p>Changes in view within the designation would be relatively limited and would be experienced from locations relatively close to the boundary where these qualities are not strong and where views of development outside the designation, including the existing Kronospan facility are already available.</p> <p>The presence of the Proposed Development would not result in any reduced sense of remoteness, wildness, space and freedom from locations where these qualities are experienced within the designation.</p> <p>The relationship between people and communities and the designation landscape would be unaffected</p>
Heather Moorland and Rolling Ridges	The dramatic moorland ridges of the central Clwydian Range, expansive Llandegla and Ruabon Moors. Llantysilio and North Berwyn	The Proposed Development would not affect these features or how people experience them
Broadleaved woodland and veteran trees	Bishops Wood, Cwm and Wheeler Valley. Ash dominated Alyn Valley woods and the small copses of the upper Alyn and upland oak woods of the Dee Valley	The Proposed Development would not result in any loss of woodland within the designation
River valleys and the River Dee	The dramatic and powerful River Dee contrasted with the	The Proposed Development would not be visible from any of the nearby river

Special Quality	Description (from National Landscape Management Plan)	Appraisal of the Proposed Development
	smaller twisting and winding River Alyn and River Wheeler	valleys, and would not affect how people experience them
Limestone grassland, cliffs and screes	Graig Fawr, Loggerheads and Bryn Alyn – Llanarmon yn Ial and the spectacular Eglwyseg Escarpment	The Proposed Development would not affect any of these features or how people experience them
Historic Settlement and Archaeology	Historic settlement patterns and conservation areas. The diverse patterns and features in the landscape left by previous generations	The Proposed Development would not affect the historic settlement pattern or archaeological interest within the designation
Industrial Features and the World Heritage Site	Limestone quarrying and lead mining, slate quarries and associated tramways and workings – the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and canal, Horseshoe Falls	Within the Study Area, the WHS is not readily apparent from land within the designation. The presence of the Proposed Development would not affect any inter-relationship between land within the designation and the WHS. Industrial features located within the designation would be unaffected
Historic Defence Features	The dramatic chain of Iron Age Hillforts of the Clywdian Range, Castell Dinas Bran and Chirk Castle and medieval Mote and Baileys at Tome y Rhodwydd, Tome y Fadre and Glyndwr's Mount, Carrog	The Proposed Development would not be visible from any historic defence features. In particular, views from Chirk Castle would be screened by intervening woodland within the surrounding parkland.
Small historic features	Often unlisted or scheduled a rich mixture of small historic features that are an important part of rich cultural layer of the landscape – wells, village pumps, boundary stones, waymarkers, milk stands and K6 telephone boxes	The Proposed Development would not affect any small historic features within the designation
Traditional boundaries	Drystone walls and hedges reflecting traditional skills and craftsmanship and often reflecting local styles	The Proposed Development would not affect any boundary features within the designation

Special Quality	Description (from National Landscape Management Plan)	Appraisal of the Proposed Development
Iconic Visitor and Cultural Attractions	Sites that have helped to shape the identity of the AONB as a visitor destination – Loggerheads, Moel Famau, Castell Dinas Bran, Valle Crucis Abbey, the Horseshoe Pass and Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Horseshoe Falls	Limited change in view from the Llangollen Canal, from the Chirk Estate Castle (with views from the Castle itself wholly screened by vegetation) and from the Offa's Dyke Path, none of which would have any influence of note upon the amenity of visitors
The Offa's Dyke National Trail and Promoted Routes	Stretching from Prestatyn Hillside in the north to Llangollen in the south, the National Trail makes the AONB particularly accessible. The Dee Valley Way, North Berwyn Way and a network of community paths. Together with extensive areas of Access Land, the landscape of the AONB is particularly accessible	Limited change in view from short sections of the National Trail north and west of Chirk Castle, which would not have any influence of note upon the amenity of walkers. Similarly limited change from other recreation routes within the designation.
The Built Environment	The villages and towns, hamlets and scattered settlements	The Proposed Development would not affect the built environment within the designation
People and Communities	A rich mix of culture and strong sense of community – the facilities and services that are essential to sustaining rural life	The Proposed Development would not affect the culture of sense of community experienced by people living within the designation

7.7.62 None of the special qualities of the designation would be affected by the presence of the Proposed Development. In particular, the tranquillity of the National Landscape would not be materially affected by any change in landscape character or visual change (including at night-time from proposed lighting), or changes in noise levels. Nor would the natural beauty of land within the designation boundary be affected by change resulting from the Proposed Development. The presence of large-scale industrial structures is a well-established presence in views looking out of the National Landscape from locations within the Study Area. Any additional change resulting from the Proposed Development would be limited and incremental and would not result in any appreciable change in how people experience the landscape of the designation.

- 7.7.63 As such, it can be concluded that the statutory purposes of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape would not be materially affected by the presence of the Proposed Development. As set out in **Section 7.5**, it is considered that these conclusions would remain equally valid should the land covered by the National Landscape be designated as the NEWNP at some point in the future.

Special Landscape Area

- 7.7.64 The Proposed Development would not be located within the SLA. It would be apparent from locations within the SLA to the north and west of the Kronospan Facility but would always be experienced in the context of the existing assemblage of structures at Kronospan. The Proposed Development would therefore result in an incremental increase in the well-established influence of large-scale industrial structures.
- 7.7.65 6 of the 20 viewpoints included in the LVIA are either within the SLA or at its boundary (excluding areas covered by the SLA designation that are within the National Landscape discussed above). None of these viewpoints would experience significant visual effects. Refer to Viewpoints (C, F, J, K, M, N).
- 7.7.66 The character of the landscape within the SLA would not experience significant effects because of the Proposed Development. The presence of development in outward views is an established part of the visual context of this part of the designation, and this would not appreciably change because of the Proposed Development.
- 7.7.67 As such, it is concluded that the SLA based upon the boundary defined in the UDP would not be materially affected by the presence of the Proposed Development.
- 7.7.68 Given the amendments to the SLA boundary, that were included in the LDP, underpinned by a supporting study, little weight should be given to the current SLA boundary.

Heritage Assets

- 7.7.69 As noted in **Section 7.5, ES Chapter 8.0 (Historic Environment)** considers effects upon the setting of heritage assets. The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS and the Chirk Castle RPG both have an important landscape component, and brief discussion of landscape and visual effects upon these two assets is set out below.



- 7.7.70 In landscape character terms, the WHS is within WCBC LCA7a and the RPG is within WCBC LCA5a. Neither of these LCAs would experience significant effects on their character (as set out above).
- 7.7.71 The character of the WHS would remain one of a historic transport corridor that is enclosed by vegetation and in places also by landform, and where there are very few opportunities for views outwards to the east. Where outward views are available these already include the presence of large-scale industrial structures at the existing Kronospan Facility, and the further presence of the Proposed Development would not have any influence of note upon the character of the canal corridor in this context.
- 7.7.72 The character of the RPG would remain one where from exposed parts of the RPG, long outwards views looking east include a cluster of urban development at Chirk, including prominent industrial structures at Kronospan.
- 7.7.73 Views from the WHS would remain well screened by the combination of landform and vegetation cover adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Canal corridor. There would be few locations from which views towards the Proposed Development would be available, and such views would be often heavily filtered through vegetation (refer to Viewpoint J). Recent woodland planting implemented by the Applicant as part of the Kronospan Landscape Strategy, would wholly screen views from the Canal corridor on a year-round basis, when it becomes more established.
- 7.7.74 Clearer views towards the Proposed Development would be experienced from a short section of the Canal, covering approximately 250m immediately north-west of the wider Kronospan Facility. The proposed new structures would be added to these views of the existing industrial facility, which is separated from the Canal corridor by the intervening railway embankment (refer to Viewpoint K and Viewpoint M). Views from this short section of the Canal are thus already defined by prominent industry and infrastructure and the further presence of the Proposed Development, whilst a clearly visible addition, would not result in any strong change in the nature of views from the Canal.
- 7.7.75 Visual effects experienced by users of the Canal corridor would not be significant.
- 7.7.76 Localised views of the Proposed Development would be available from within the RPG. Views from Chirk Castle itself and from some sections of the permissive path running east from it would be screened by intervening woodland (refer to Viewpoint

U, Viewpoint V, and Viewpoint W). Limited visibility of the new structures would however be available from the Castle Terrace (refer to Viewpoint H), from the Castle Gates (refer to Viewpoint D), and from stretches of the permissive path that runs eastwards from the Castle. More extensive areas of visibility would be in the more exposed areas at the eastern and northern edges of the RPG (refer to Viewpoint R and Viewpoint X). Views from the New Hall Lodge entrance would be very well screened by recent planting implemented as part of the Kronospan Landscape Strategy (refer to Viewpoint Q). In all cases, the new structures would be visible in the context of the existing structures at Kronospan within expansive panoramic views, and both existing and new structures would be partially screened by a combination of landform and vegetation. Significant visual effects would not occur, and the amenity of visitors to the Castle would not change appreciably.

Decommissioning Phase

- 7.7.77 Landscape and visual effects experienced during the decommissioning stage would, by and large, be similar in nature to those that would occur during construction. Infrastructure would be removed, using plant similar to that utilised during construction. As discussed in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development)** and in **Section 7.6** above, decommissioning activities would be managed via a bespoke DEMP. It is considered that landscape and visual effects associated with decommissioning would be as reported in **Table 7.6**.
- 7.7.78 It should also be noted that the decommissioning stage would result in a reversal of the effects associated with the operation of the Proposed Development, i.e. the adverse effects of the proposed Low Carbon CHP Facility and associated infrastructure upon landscape character and upon views described above would cease and all structures would be removed, unless otherwise agreed with WCBC.

7.8 Inter-Relationship of Potential Effects

- 7.8.1 Change in view has potential to affect the setting of heritage assets. The relationship is not linear and a change in view does not automatically imply an equivalent effect on setting. There are many heritage assets in the vicinity of the Site, including the WHS and the Chirk Castle Estate, and effects on these are assessed in **ES Chapter 8.0 (Historic Environment)**.



7.9 Further Mitigation and Monitoring

7.9.1 Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures will be implemented to increase the resilience of the ecological habitats to air quality impacts. This includes new native woodland planting adjacent to existing woodland to the west of the canal corridor, and further new native woodland along the eastern side of the minor road (Llwyn-y-Cil) which forms the eastern boundary to the Chirk Castle Estate. Further details of the mitigation and enhancement proposals are contained in the Biodiversity Assessment Report (**DNS4-007**) and are illustrated on the drawing provided at **DNS3-012**.

7.9.2 No further mitigation measures are deemed necessary over and above those described in **Section 7.6**.

7.10 Summary of Potential Residual Effects

7.10.1 In the absence of any further mitigation measures (as set out in **Section 7.9**), residual effects would remain as described in **Section 7.7**.

7.11 Cumulative Effects

7.11.1 There is the potential for the effects of the Proposed Development to interact with the effects of other projects or activities in the surrounding area. These are 'inter-project' cumulative effects and includes projects that are under construction, projects that are approved but awaiting implementation, and projects awaiting determination within the planning process with design information in the public domain. Such projects are required to be within a geographical scope where environmental impacts could act together to create a more significant overall effect on a receptor and where sufficient environmental information is available.

7.11.2 The method for identifying other projects and activities is provided within **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)**; this includes a list of the specific projects and activities identified, which also takes into consideration the other Kronospan development proposals that are being progressed separately by the Applicant. The cumulative effects Study Area and the locations of the other projects and activities are illustrated on **Figure 2.1** and **Figure 2.2** respectively.

- 7.11.3 Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment (AN17)²⁰ is clear that the criteria by which schemes included in a cumulative assessment should be determined with regard to relevant guidance (i.e. the GLVIA in the case of cumulative landscape and visual effects) and is also clear that professional judgement may be used to supplement this. The inclusion/exclusion of schemes within the cumulative landscape and visual assessment, as set out below, accords with this approach.
- 7.11.4 Some of the cumulative schemes (Nos 1.1 and 1.2) are under construction, and for the purposes of the LVIA form part of the main assessment baseline (i.e. they are not cumulative development for LVIA purposes). This approach reflects good practice guidance as set out in the GLVIA.
- 7.11.5 The cumulative landscape and visual assessment is thus concerned with the effects of the Proposed Development introduced into a cumulative baseline scenario where, in addition to existing development and development under construction (which form part of the main LVIA baseline as discussed above), other consented development and development that is the subject of a formal planning application (or where formal Pre Application Consultation has commenced in the case of DNS schemes) is also present, subject to the caveats set out below. See **Appendix 7A** for further details.
- 7.11.6 Scheme 1.8 is an allocation in the WCBC LDP, with no specific development proposal currently extant. Therefore, there are no details against which any reasonably foreseeable cumulative effects can be considered. Scheme 1.8 is therefore not considered in the cumulative landscape and visual assessment. This approach reflects good practice guidance as set out in the GLVIA. The presence of an allocation suggests that change within the Scheme 1.8 site, and the influence of this upon the surrounding area is broadly acceptable to WCBC.
- 7.11.7 Scheme 1.5 includes a series of new silos, the largest two of which are also proposed as part of the Proposed Development. As such, the two larger silos are not

²⁰ Planning Inspectorate, 2024. last updated 25 Mar 2025. *National Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment* <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-cumulative-effects-assessment> [accessed 04 Jul 2025]

considered as a component of cumulative scheme 1.5 to avoid any potential double counting of effects.

7.11.8 **Table 7.10** below provides a summary of each of the cumulative developments set out in **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)** and draws a conclusion as to whether cumulative landscape and visual effects would occur, and if so whether these would be significant effects. Further commentary is provided in the text below **Table 7.10** where deemed necessary.

Table 7.10 – Assessment of Cumulative Landscape and Visual Effects

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
1.1	P/2017/0699. Kronospan Chipper and Flaker. Consented and under construction.	N/A The scheme is under construction and is thus not a cumulative development for the purposes of the LVIA.
1.2	APP/H6955/A/19/3227571. Kronospan OSB Facility. Consented and under construction	N/A The scheme is under construction and is thus not a cumulative development for the purposes of the LVIA.
1.3	P/2022/0336. Kronospan Covered Loading Yard. Consented	No. The scheme would comprise relatively limited change to structures towards the south-eastern boundary of the Kronospan Facility, which would have little influence upon the surrounding area. Existing intervening structures would limit any intervisibility with the Proposed Development. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects.
1.4	P/2022/0615. Kronospan Engineering Store. Consented	No. The scheme would comprise a relatively limited extension to the Kronospan Facility and would be similar in height and appearance to the far more extensive existing building immediately to its north. Existing intervening structures would limit any intervisibility with the Proposed Development.

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
		There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects.
1.5	<p>P/2022/0765. Kronospan Chip Preparation Building Extension and Storage Silos. Consented.</p> <p>Two of the consented silos form part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The remainder of the scheme would include three smaller new silos (height 24m) and an extension to an existing building (height 29m)</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The scheme would introduce new structures and extend an existing structure, immediately adjacent to the Proposed Development. They would comprise a limited addition to the Kronospan Facility, and would result in only localised, limited and incremental change to the influence of this established industrial development.</p> <p>Cumulatively, when the further presence of the Proposed Development is also considered, there would be a greater, but still incremental increase in the influence of development at Kronospan upon the surrounding area, but the combined influence of the two schemes along with the existing structures would not result any change in landscape character or upon views that would give rise to significant effects.</p>
1.6	<p>P/2022/1080. Kronospan North Access Road.</p> <p>Consented, subject to signed legal agreement for off-site enhancement measures.</p> <p>The scheme would comprise a new access road and HGV parking area for the Kronospan Facility, new external storage areas, a new weighbridge building and a new 132kV substation.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The scheme would introduce new structures to the north of the existing Kronospan Facility, and a new HGV park and access road further to the north. These would be well enclosed by perimeter earthworks and planting and would be less prominent than existing larger structures. Mitigation and enhancement measures would reduce the visibility of Kronospan generally.</p> <p>Cumulatively, when the further presence of the Proposed Development is also considered, there would be a very incremental increase in the influence of development at Kronospan upon the surrounding area, but the combined influence of the two schemes along with the existing structures would not result in any change in landscape character or upon views that would give rise to significant effects.</p>

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
1.7	P/2022/0066. Extension to Lady Margaret's Caravan Site, Chirk. Consented.	<p>No.</p> <p>The caravan site extension would be small in extent and would comprise structures that are low in height. Additionally, it would be relatively well enclosed by existing vegetation cover. Whilst only c.800m from the Site, there is a considerable amount of existing industrial development, including large structures in the intervening landscape.</p> <p>There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects.</p>
1.8	Allocation for 180 housing units in the WCBC LDP.	<p>N/A</p> <p>There is no development proposal for the allocation. As such there are no details of any scheme against which reasonably foreseeable cumulative effects can be considered.</p>
1.9	<p>Kronospan 132kV underground cable from Scheme 1.6 to the existing overhead line.</p> <p>An application for this scheme has yet to be submitted. It is assumed to be predominately within the existing highway corridor.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Change would be confined to temporary change within the highway corridor whilst the cable route is laid. Effects would be unremarkable and would not be experienced outside the immediate vicinity of the highway corridor.</p> <p>There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects.</p>
2.1	22/03924/FUL. Demolition of existing industrial development at Weston Rhyn, and replacement with 61 no. residential dwellings. Consented.	<p>No.</p> <p>The scheme would be at an existing developed site within a corridor of built development c.2.45km from the Site, and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development.</p> <p>There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects</p>

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
2.2	24/01380/FUL. 1.13MW solar array at Rhoswel, Weston Rhyn. Refused. 25/01572/FUL. 1.28MW solar array at Rhoswel, Weston Rhyn. Consented.	No The solar array would be small in extent and would comprise structures that are low in height, c.2km south of the Site and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects
2.3	21/01230/FUL. 12 no houses, 10 no. bungalows and 18 no. apartments at Weston Rhyn. Consented.	No. The scheme would comprise a limited addition to the southern edge of an existing village over 2.5km from the Site, and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative landscape and visual effects.

7.11.9 Most of the cumulative schemes (Nos. 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, and 2.1-2.3) would be small in footprint and would comprise structures that are limited in size and scale, and whose specific landscape and visual effects would be very localised. They would be separated from the Proposed Development by far larger existing structures at Kronospan, and in some cases by other development as well. There would be no relationship of note with the Proposed Development that would give rise any cumulative landscape and visual effects.

7.11.10 Schemes 1.5 and 1.6 would comprise more extensive development. Scheme 1.5 would include an extension to any existing building and a series of new silos (two of which also form part of the Proposed Development) immediately adjacent to the Proposed Development. Scheme 1.6 would comprise smaller structures and a new HGV parking area and access road to the north of the existing Kronospan Facility. In addition, Scheme 1.6 would include a series of mitigation and enhancement measures which would screen views of that scheme and of the wider Kronospan

Facility (including the Proposed Development) from the surrounding area. Visualisations illustrating how the presence of these two schemes and the Proposed Development would result in cumulative change in view have been prepared from Viewpoints C, I, K and M, and are presented on **Figures 7.3a-d**. **Figure 7.4** illustrates the location of landscaping required as part of Schemes 1.5 and 1.6.

7.11.11 Cumulatively, should either or both of Schemes 1.5 and 1.6 be present, along with the Proposed Development, there would be an incremental increase in the influence of development at Kronospan upon the surrounding area. Cumulative change in landscape character and cumulative change in view would be very limited and would not differ materially that that stated in **Section 7.7**. The surrounding landscape would remain defined by urban development within Chirk, including a large-scale industrial facility at Kronospan, set in the context of surrounding rural land uses, long views out from the higher ground to the west, and often significant vegetation cover (especially along the Canal corridor). The schemes would typically be visible from the same locations, and the majority of visual effects would be ‘in combination’. Sequential change in view would occur from along the Llangollen Canal towpath, as Scheme 1.6 would sometimes be visible from locations along this route where the Proposed Development would not. However, views would be well screened by intervening vegetation cover and would be better screened over time as additional planting associated with Scheme 1.6 becomes established. Scheme 1.6 would not be prominent from the canal corridor. Cumulative landscape and visual effects would **not be significant**.

7.11.12 The special qualities of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape would not be affected to any degree that would be materially different to that described in **Section 7.7**. Views out from locations within the designation boundary would continue to be defined by the lower-lying and predominantly agricultural landscape to the east, with the Kronospan Facility evident as a contrasting presence within such views.

7.12 Enhancement Measures

7.12.1 The biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures described in **Section 7.9** would, whilst not developed with landscape and visual concerns in mind, provide landscape enhancements, via increasing woodland cover within the Study Area.



7.13 Conclusions

- 7.13.1 The Proposed Development would be introduced at an existing brownfield location within the Kronospan Facility, at the edge of Chirk. The Kronospan Facility is a well-established industrial complex, which includes a series of large-scale industrial structures, including several prominent emissions stacks, and which is often apparent from locations within the surrounding area. The Proposed Development would include a large new building, two large silos and a new emissions stack. The proposed stack would be the tallest structure at the Kronospan Facility but would be less bulky than many of the existing stacks.
- 7.13.2 Low-level construction activities would be very well screened by a combination of existing structures, by vegetation cover in the surrounding landscape, and by landform. As such, the influence of construction upon landscape character and upon views would be limited to that resulting from the erection of taller proposed structures, and the presence of the cranes required to do this. The effects of construction would thus typically be very similar in their extent and nature to the operational effects of the Proposed Development and would form a precursor to these effects as new structures are progressively introduced into the landscape and the views available across it. Landscape and visual effects during the construction phase would not be significant.
- 7.13.3 Effects on landscape character would not be significant. The introduction of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of development at Kronospan upon the character of the landscape/townscape, but not to such a degree that this would noticeably change character from baseline. The Proposed Development would be added to the existing assemblage of structures at Kronospan, and the new structures would be amongst the largest structures present. The character of the surrounding landscape would continue to be defined by urban development within Chirk, including a large-scale industrial facility at Kronospan, set in the context of surrounding rural land uses, long views out from the higher ground to the west, and often significant vegetation cover (especially along the Llangollen Canal corridor)
- 7.13.4 Visual effects would not be significant. The Proposed Development would always be seen in the context of existing structures at Kronospan. Whilst the proposed new structures would themselves be large in scale, their presence would only result in a limited increase in the influence of the Kronospan Facility upon views. The level of

built development and vegetation cover in the surrounding area would also limit the extent to which views would change.

- 7.13.5 From most of the Llangollen Canal, views of the Proposed Development would be well screened by vegetation, with only glimpses of the new structures available. From a short section of the Canal corridor covering approximately 250m immediately north-west of the wider Kronospan Facility, views of the Proposed Development would be clearer. The proposed new structures would be visible within the existing industrial facility and separated from the Canal corridor by the intervening railway embankment. Views from this short section of the Canal are already defined by the presence of the railway and the Kronospan Facility, and the further presence of the Proposed Development would, whilst representing adverse change in view, not give rise to any notable change in the amenity experienced by Canal users, including walkers and cyclists on the towpath.
- 7.13.6 From within the Chirk Castle RPG (both within the estate managed by the National Trust, and those parts of the RPG further to the north), visibility of the existing Kronospan Facility is determined largely by the presence of woodland cover on the east-facing hillsides west of the Canal corridor. This woodland provides considerable screening including from the Castle itself and would similarly screen views of the Proposed Development. Views of the Proposed Development would be available from the Castle Terrace at the eastern edge of the formal gardens, from stretches of the permissive path that runs through the parkland, from stretches of the Castle driveway, from the eastern edge of the Estate, and from the Offa's Dyke Path National Trail in the northern part of the RPG. In all cases, the new structures would be visible in the context of the existing structures at Kronospan within expansive panoramic views, and both existing and new structures would be partially screened by a combination of landform and vegetation.
- 7.13.7 Views from Chirk would be defined by the juxtaposition of buildings within the town, and by existing screening along the B5070 and other roads. A combination of screening earthworks and dense tree cover along the eastern boundary of the Kronospan Facility would screen views from the B5070 and from properties along it. At the north-western edge of town, this screening is absent and views across the adjacent fields towards the Proposed Development would be available, set in the

context of the visibility of existing structures at Kronospan, and of longer views west and north-west to the hills.

- 7.13.8 From elsewhere within the residential areas of Chirk, east of the B5070, views towards the Proposed Development would be determined by the location of property windows and by the orientation of side roads. Where visible, the proposed new structures would always be seen in the context of existing structures at Kronospan. From some locations therefore, views are likely to be relatively clear, but where clear views are available, these would already include the existing structures at Kronospan.
- 7.13.9 From the south, the Proposed Development would be added to existing views of the Kronospan Facility which are available from Chirk Recreation Ground and from some sections of Station Road. Industrial development already forms a backdrop to views north from this area, and the addition of the new structures would only result in limited change in the views from central Chirk.
- 7.13.10 None of the statutory purposes or special qualities of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape would be materially affected by the presence of the Proposed Development. In particular, the tranquillity of the National Landscape would not be materially affected by any change in landscape character or visual change (including at night-time from proposed lighting). Nor would the natural beauty of land within the designation boundary be affected by change resulting from the Proposed Development. The presence of large-scale industrial structures is a well-established presence in views looking out of the National Landscape from locations within the Study Area. Any additional change resulting from the Proposed Development would be limited and incremental and would not result in any appreciable change in how people experience the landscape of the designation.
- 7.13.11 Cumulative landscape and visual effects that could occur in a scenario where other consented and proposed development schemes are also present would not be significant. The presence of other developments within the existing Kronospan Facility close to the Proposed Development, namely the consented Chip Preparation Building Extension and Storage Silos and the consented (subject to legal agreement) North Access Road developments would incrementally increase the influence of the Kronospan Facility upon the surrounding area. The additional presence of the Proposed Development would result in a further incremental increase of this

influence, but cumulative change in landscape character and cumulative change in view would not differ appreciably from the non-cumulative change described above. Cumulative landscape and visual effects would not be significant.

Appendix 7A – LVIA Methodology



Appendix 7B – Visualisation Methodology



Appendix 7C – Landscape Character Baseline



Appendix 7D – Construction Phase Effects



Appendix 7E – Effects on Landscape Character



Appendix 7F – Effects on Viewpoints

