

Osmond, Gary

From: Griffin, Tim
Sent: 28 July 2022 18:03
To: Osmond, Gary
Cc: Ellison, Mark
Subject: Re: F/22/93195 BROADWAY FARM, BROAD OAK, BOTLEY - LVIAS landscape comments

Hi Gary,

I have taken the time to read through the submitted LVIAS. Overall, the report does not alter my initial comments emailed to you earlier this month.

The LVIAS is a comprehensive document, but not the easiest to decipher, as it has been split into different sections. In places the overlap and cross-referencing is difficult to follow.

Unless I have missed something, I could not locate all the viewpoint photographs as Appendix 2 Photos Part 1 includes viewpoints 1-4, while Appendix 2 Photos Part 2 covers Viewpoints 12-17. I could not locate viewpoints 5-11? However, I did locate the most prominent viewpoint montages (noted as agreed with the Landscape Officer) Viewpoints 2, 16 & 17.

These are the plans I could find uploaded to Salesforce for this application:

LVAIS Appendix 1 Method

LVAIS Appendix 2 Photos

LVAIS Appendix 2 Photos

LVAIS Part 1

LVAIS Part 2

My comments (not in the order as above) are as follows:

LVAIS Part 1

This document provides general introductory information and helpful landscape planning context. The various extract maps clearly demonstrate the sensitive location of the site, lying almost mid-point in the Settlement Gap between Hedge End and Botley and within designated Countryside.

The executive summary provides a useful opportunity to provide my overall landscape response to the conclusions of the LVIAS report. I disagree with a number of points made, as follows (my notes in blue text for clarity):

1/ A section of the Countryside Gaps background paper is quoted, and I have highlighted in red sections, that in my view, are pertinent to this application:

*Furthermore, the Site lies within the Settlement Gap 7 - Hedge End and Botley within the Eastleigh Borough Council Countryside Gaps Background Paper (June 2018) as part of the Local Plan examination documents, but it does not lie in the narrowest part of the Gap. The paper describes that: "The gap between settlements is very fragile as experienced from Broad Oak/A334 and **would be seriously undermined by***

intensification of the existing development immediately adjoining this road corridor, or the removal of associated mature tree cover". It concluded that: "the most vulnerable parts of the gap between the two settlements are the land north and south of the Broad Oak/A334 corridor...Any intensification of built development along the Broad Oak/A334 corridor should be resisted."

2/ *'The sense of separation between the two settlements are defined by its built edge, woodland blocks and landform'. I disagree with this statement as it implies only woodland blocks contribute to the 'sense of separation'. Open fields, such as this site, are another significant contributor to the sense of separation within a Gap.*

3/ *'The proposed built form will intensify the commercial character in the part of the Gap. However, the proposed tree belt and vegetation within the Site and the wider land ownership areas of CCW Services will positively enhance the landscape character in the localised area. Therefore, the proposal contributes to defining the settlement character as the proposals will in time conceal both the existing and proposed built form and associated operations. It is interesting to note that the report accepts that the proposed built form will intensify the commercial character of the site. This is something, as noted above, that the Gaps background paper states should be resisted. Although the proposed planting may 'positively enhance the landscape character', I question how deliverable the majority of the suggested planting is, bearing in mind it is outside the application boundary? In addition, the condition and quality of previously implemented planting already on CCW land, does not set the most encouraging precedent for delivery of further successful planting.*

4/ *'Similar to the above, the Site lies in the centre of the Gap and is bound by the physical attributes surrounding the Site. Therefore, the land on its own plays little role in separation of the settlements. It may be that the land on its own plays 'little role' in the separation of the settlements, but it does play SOME role contributing to the wider physical separation of settlements. If the site is developed it will inevitably lead to a diminishing of the Gap, however small.*

5/ *'With the development in place, the distinct character and amenity of this part of the physical Gap between Hedge End and Botley will remain; I disagree. The character of the physical gap is not dependant on whether it can be seen from the public realm or not. The fact is, the proposal will see an open field replaced with a large warehouse, thus diminishing the Gap.*

6/ *'Therefore, with the development in place, the character and amenity of the perceived Gap between Hedge End and Botley will not be altered. The existing elements will remain, including the fields, the individual residential dwellings and the commercial premises. The visual separation between the two will continue to be retained and improved by the proposed tree belt vegetation in time. The 'existing elements' will remain but will be reduced in extent. Part of an open field will be lost to development. There is insufficient detail on the proposed planting and it's deliverability to state the visual separation will be retained and improved.*

LVAIS Part 2

Figure 4.5 - looking at this plan, with selected widths of the Settlement Gap indicated, the Gap is narrow (under 1km wide) and as such, resisting any further diminishing of the Gap is important.

Item 4.3.5 THE ROLE OF THE SITE WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT GAP

Although the report says the site does not form a *significant* part of the Gap, there can be no doubt the site does form 'a part' of the Gap. Bearing in mind the already diminished character of the Gap, any remaining open land contributes to the Gap as a whole, and further loss should be resisted.

'Despite the scale and mass of the warehouses of the CCW Services operating area, this area and the Site forms a discrete parcel within the Settlement Gap'. The argument appears to be that if the site is a well screened 'parcel' of land it does not contribute to the Gap. I disagree. Just because the site cannot be seen, does not mean it does not physically contribute to the Gap.

LVAIS Part 3

This part of the report focuses on the key views, especially View 2 from Woodhouse Lane from the North and Viewpoints 16 & 17 from the existing bridleway to the south of the site.

I accept the views are an accurate representation of the on-ground situation. Viewpoint 16 appears to have the most open glimpses of the new warehouses, and as such will have some impact on the wider scene.

Mitigation relies primarily on planting that is offsite (although on land within the applicant's ownership). There is insufficient detail on this planting or a programme of implementation to assess if this might effectively screen views long-term. We would need legally binding guarantees this planting would be delivered, and further work is required to ensure this planting would be implemented professionally and maintained to ensure long-term establishment.

Item 7.6 Materials - I would recommend dark grey cladding (not green as noted) is specified as this will be more recessive in views.

Item 9.2 Effects on landscape receptors

I disagree with the statement *'With the development in place, the distinct character and amenity of this part of the physical Gap between Hedge End and Botley will remain and retaining the sequence of fields, dwellings, commercial, fields, woodland and therefore all of the current elements of the gap, retaining the overall dimension of the gap between Hedge End and Botley. These two settlements will not coalesce through the implementation of the proposals.'* It is my opinion that the loss of part of an open field to development, however small, will inevitably lead to some coalescing of settlements.

LVAIS Appendix 2 Photos Part 1 & Part 2

These views demonstrate there are limited locations from which the site can be seen. Some descriptive commentary and, in places, an indication of the location of the site, would have been helpful.

Appendix 1 Methodology

This details a broadly acceptable basis for the appraisal as it follows widely adopted criteria.

In conclusion, the LVAIS report does not significantly alter my initial landscape comments on the proposal.

In particular, there is nothing presented to alter my view that in landscape terms the proposed addition of a further sizeable warehouse on an open grass field, will not only diminish the Gap physically, but would also have an urbanising effect detrimental to the wider Countryside setting.

I trust all the above is helpful but do get in touch should you require any clarification.

KR Tim

Tim Griffin

Development Management Consultant

Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Housing and Development