

Golf Clubhouse Development, Boundary Lakes Golf Course,

Landscape and Visual Appraisal

J01149/V1

Client: Land & Development Advisory Ltd

Date: December 2023

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Report prepared for:

Land & Development Advisory Ltd

Main contributors:

Jason Holmes BA(Hons) DipLA PG Cert. (Urban Design)

Principal Landscape Architect

Reviewed by:

Matt Johns, BSc MSc CEnv MCIEEM MIFM

Director

Issued by:

Jason Holmes BA(Hons) DipLA PG Cert. (Urban Design)

Principal Landscape Architect

Green Tree House, 11 St Margaret's St, Bradford on Avon, Wiltshire, BA15 1DA
T: 01225 723652 | E: info@johnsassociates.co.uk | W: www.johnsassociates.co.uk

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Details	Date
V1	Final	December 2023

Third party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Johns Associates at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Johns Associates excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) assesses the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed golf clubhouse and ancillary buildings and facilities within the existing Boundary Lakes Golf Course, located immediately to the northeast of Botley Road ('the Site').

It supercedes the LVA submitted to support a previous planning application in 2020 and is based on a revised proposal for the proposed golf clubhouse. Details of the revised proposals are included in Appendix C.

The description of the development is as follows:

'Erection of golf course clubhouse and ancillary facilities, car parking area, together with internal access roads, landscaping, SuDs and 1no. entrance signs'.

This report does not constitute a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) but follows the same principles and processes and is deemed appropriate for the nature of this development.

Due to local topography, existing vegetation and limited public access within the Study Area, the Site is well contained in visual terms. Thus, the area that could potentially be affected by the proposals in landscape and visual terms is considered to be relatively small.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	Appointment	7
1.2	Site & Project	7
1.3	Objectives	8
1.4	Scope and Timing	8
2	METHODOLOGY	9
2.1	Guidance and Terminology	9
2.2	Appraisal Methodology	10
2.2.1	Baseline Assessment	10
2.2.2	Landscape Assessment Methodology	10
2.2.3	Visual Assessment Methodology	19
2.2.4	Assessment of likely effects	19
3	PLANNING AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT	29
3.1	Relevant Planning Policy	29
3.2	National Level	29
3.2.1	National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF)	29
3.3	Local Plan	31
3.3.1	Local Plan: Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036)	31
3.4	Landscape Character	34
3.4.1	Landscape Character Assessment	34
3.4.2	National Landscape Character Assessment	34
3.4.3	County Landscape Character Assessment	34
3.4.4	District Landscape Character Assessment	36
4	LANDSCAPE BASELINE	38
4.1	Character of the Site and Study Area	38
4.2	Topography, Geology and Soils	38
4.3	Boundaries	38
4.4	Vegetation on Site	39
4.5	Land Use & Built Form	39
4.6	Landscape Designations	39
4.7	Settlement Gap	41
4.8	Summary	41
4.9	Potential Landscape Receptors - Summary	41
5	VISUAL BASELINE	42
5.1	Visibility within the study area	42
5.1.1	Viewpoint Analysis	42
5.2	Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints	43
5.3	Potential Visual Receptors - Summary	44
6	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	45
6.1	Site Layout	45
6.2	Site Access	45
6.3	Buidling Design and Elevations	46

6.4	Lighting.....	46
6.5	Existing Vegetation	46
6.6	Landscape Strategy	46
7	LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS	48
7.1	Overview.....	48
7.2	LR1: Effects on Landscape Character.....	48
7.3	LR2: Effects on Soils	49
7.4	LR3: Effects on Existing Vegetation	49
7.5	LR4: Effects on Land Use & Built Form.....	49
7.6	LR5: Effects on Access & Circulation	50
7.7	LR6: Effects on the Settlement Gap	50
8	VISUAL ANALYSIS	51
8.1	VIEWPOINT ANALYSIS.....	51
8.1.1	Overview.....	51
8.1.2	Potential Visual Receptors Summary.....	52
8.1.3	VR1: Receptors Using Moorhill Road (A27).....	52
8.1.4	VR2: Residential Property at Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow	53
9	SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS	54
9.1	Summary & conclusions.....	54
10	REFERENCES	55

APPENDICES

Appendix A

- J00656-001 Site Location & Study Area Plan
- J00656-002 Site Context Plan
- J00656-003 Landscape Designations and Character Areas
- J00656-004 Environmental Designations – Local & National and Heritage
- J00656-005 Surface Water Flood Risk
- J00656-006 Flood Zones
- J00656-007 ZVI and Photoview Locations Plan

Appendix B: Photographic Viewpoint Sheets

Appendix C: Reference Drawings / Documents

- J01149-GA-01 Landscape Masterplan (Johns Associates)
- Building Elevations (TMF Architecture)

Appendix D: Reference Drawings / Documents

- Extract from EBC Local Plan Policy Map (South)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 APPOINTMENT

Johns Associates Ltd have been commissioned by Land & Development Advisory Ltd to undertake a Landscape and Visual Appraisal to support a planning application for proposals relating to the construction of a golf course clubhouse, ancillary facilities and parking at the Boundary Lakes Golf Course, West End, Hampshire.

1.2 SITE & PROJECT

Extending to approximately 1.18 hectares, the Site comprises an area of land within the existing Boundary Lakes Golf Course. There is an existing access to the Site from Moorhill Road to the southwest, via an access road that continues through the Site and extends all the way through to the Ageas Bowl cricket ground and adjoining facilities, which are located to the northeast.

Boundary Lakes is an established 18-hole golf course which forms part of the wider Ageas Bowl complex.

The course does not currently provide a dedicated club house and off course facilities are provided at the Hilton Hotel and the stadium (at the far end of the golf course to the north-east of the Site).

The Proposed Development includes the erection of a new golf course clubhouse, with a dedicated parking and related ancillary facilities. The clubhouse would include a bar / lounge, kitchen, changing rooms, 'pro-shop' and a steward's flat.

A new car park would provide 84no. spaces for private cars and collection and drop off areas for golf cart buggies. Additionally, a golf cart storage area is proposed to allow the buggies to be secured when not in active use.

Access would be achieved from Moorhill Road, off the existing junction although the route of the existing access road within the Site would be modified slightly (locally widened) to accommodate the proposals. The proposals also incorporate landscaping, sustainable urban drainage (SuDs) features and biodiversity enhancements.

The approximate National Grid Reference is SU 4713 3217. For more detailed information, refer to Section 4.0 Landscape Baseline.

This Landscape and Visual Appraisal is based on Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA), Third Edition, Landscape Institute and IEMA, 2013; providing a robust assessment of the likely potential visual and landscape effects resulting from the development.

We have endeavoured to provide sufficient information, level of detail and analysis to explain the likely effects of the Proposed Development at a level suitable for the proposal and its location. This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- Planning Statement (Boyer Planning)
- Design & Access Statement and supporting proposals (TMF Architecture)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Mulberry – Tree Management Consultants)
- Ecological Appraisal (Johns Associates Ltd)
- Drainage Strategy (Sustain Environmental)
- Lighting Strategy (CMCe)
- Cultural Heritage Constraints Desk Based Assessment (RPS)

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this appraisal are:

- To identify the existing landscape and visual character of the Site and its surroundings, thus establishing a landscape and visual baseline.
- To assess the likely effects of the Proposed Development on the existing landscape and visual character within the Site and its surroundings.

1.4 SCOPE AND TIMING

This report is based on the proposals as per the latest revision of the proposed site layout as shown on the latest Landscape Masterplan and supporting Sections and GA drawings (Appendix C).

The report describes the landscape and visual baseline of the Site and its surroundings and the potential effects of the proposals on the landscape and visual baseline.

The landscape assessment deals with any effects on landscape as a resource, including its physical, aesthetic and perceptual qualities, whereas the visual assessment relates to effects on views and visual amenity as experienced by people (visual receptors).

The geographical area that has been considered for the purpose of this report is defined by the Study Area, which has been established as part of the assessment (see Appendix A).

A site visit was undertaken on the 24th of November 2020. The weather was dry and clear. This assessment therefore evaluates 'winter' conditions and thus represents the worst-case scenario regarding visibility.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 GUIDANCE AND TERMINOLOGY

This report is a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and although does not constitute a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) it follows the same principles and processes set out in the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (GLVIA), Landscape Institute, third edition, 2013).

The approach to the Appraisal has involved the following steps:

- Recording and analysis of the existing landscape character and visual amenity associated with the Site and surrounding area through desk-based study and field appraisal.
- Appreciation of the nature, form and scale of the Proposed Development having regard to the landscape and visual baseline context.
- Identification and evaluation of the sensitivity of the existing landscape and visual receptors likely to be affected by the Proposed Development.
- An assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development.

Certain assumptions have been made regarding plant growth and maintenance heights for any proposed mitigation planting measures associated with the Proposed Development, and these are set out below:

Native tree / understorey planting to reinforce site boundaries as indicated on the Landscape Masterplan (Appendix C). Planted as transplants 0.6m -0.8m tall in year 1 with an overall density at 1.5m centres, typical growth height ranges are as follows:

- 3.5 - 5m tall in year 7.
- 5 – 8m tall in year 15.

Specimen trees: Larger specimen trees would be included within the planting to provide some additional initial impact and height variation as indicated on the plan including:

- 10-12cm girth / 2.5-3.5m
- 12-14cm girth / 3.0-4.0m
- 16-18cm girth / 4.0-4.5m

Growth rates for specimen stock are likely to be less than the woodland / hedgerow mix planting ranging from 3 - 4m after 10 years (depending on species). It should be noted, however, that plant heights will vary with species and are made on the assumption that planting and maintenance (watering etc) is to a high specification and that shocks to plant physiology (drought etc) are avoided.

For the avoidance of doubt:

- 'Km' means kilometre/s; 'm' means metre/s.
- All distances are approximate.
- All references to points of the compass are generalised and are used for descriptive purposes only.
- 'Site' refers to the Application Site within the boundary shown on the Site Location drawing no. J00656-001, a copy of which is found within Appendix A.

2.2 APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

By nature, the process of assessing landscape and visual character is to some extent subjective - what appears beautiful to one person may be unattractive to another. This methodology does not, and cannot, remove this subjectivity, but explains the process of assessment, in order to make it easy for the reader to follow. The general process for both landscape and visual impact assessment is the same.

The assessment is divided into two main sections, the **baseline assessment** and the **assessment of likely effects**.

2.2.1 Baseline Assessment

In order to be able to assess the potential effects of the Proposed Development, an existing baseline condition is established, against which the potential effects of any Proposed Development can be measured. The baseline is investigated through a combination of desktop study and field visits. The baseline assessment reflects the present condition of the Site and Study Area.

The Study Area for this assessment was centred on the Site and included all areas within a 2km radius where the Proposed Development could potentially have an effect on landscape character and visual amenity.

The Study Area is then tested in the field to take into account localised landform features, built form and the presence of significant areas of vegetation. This enabled a **Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)** for the Proposed Development to be mapped; identifying the areas where the Proposed Development is likely to be seen and is shown on drawing J00656-007 (Appendix A).

Whilst the estimated ZVI is mapped to a good degree of accuracy and takes into consideration the screening effects of topography, built form and significant areas of vegetation as noted from site work, it should be understood that there will still be locations within the mapped ZVI where the complexity of landscape (such as intervening vegetation / buildings) or lack of public access makes it impossible reasonably to determine the exact visibility of the Proposed Development. In reality, there will be some areas within the mapped ZVI where the Proposed Development will not be visible, and there may be some un-mapped areas where glimpses of the Proposed Development would be.

2.2.2 Landscape Assessment Methodology

Landscape character

In this section, existing Landscape Character Assessments and other relevant documents are reviewed in order to give an understanding of the landscape within the Study Area.

The character of a landscape is defined by its key **constituent elements** which are considered under three broad headings of:

- Physical Influences eg geology, soils, topography, water bodies.
- Influences of Human Activity eg heritage assets, land use, buildings, settlements and field patterns.
- Aesthetic and Perceptual eg complexity, degree of enclosure / openness, tranquillity, remoteness.

The combination of the above elements will influence how a landscape is perceived eg openness, scale, complexity, tranquility and wilderness. Together, these landscape elements and the perception of them is used to inform the division of the landscape into distinct landscape character types and / or character areas; helping to define their key characteristics.

In order to assess the baseline landscape character of the Site and Study Area, a desktop study is used to identify relevant designations and planning designations as well as existing landscape character assessments. With the help of site visits, these existing character descriptions are then tested and reviewed.

All landscapes have value, whether designated or undesignated. Having considered the key landscape characteristics of the Site and Study Area as a whole, value is then attributed to each key constituent element and an **overall landscape value** established.

Identification of landscape receptors

Landscape receptors are those **constituent elements** of the landscape which are considered likely to be affected by the Proposed Development either directly or indirectly. This can include local landscape character areas, designated landscapes or individual landscape features eg the setting of heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments. The assessment seeks to identify and evaluate the sensitivity of the existing landscape receptors that are likely to be affected by the Proposed Development. This is based on a combination of desktop analysis and field study.

Determining the sensitivity of landscape receptors

Each landscape receptor selected for assessment is evaluated according to:

- The value attached to them (established in the baseline)
- Their susceptibility to change (ability to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development)

Susceptibility refers to the ability of a receptor to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

Landscape effects are particular to both the specific landscape and the specific nature of the Proposed Development. The assessment of susceptibility is therefore tailored to a particular project. For example, a landscape already dominated by housing development is likely to be less susceptible to additional housing than a landscape in which housing development is not present.

To reach an assessment of the **sensitivity** of each receptor, **susceptibility and value** are then combined to establish whether a receptor is **high, medium or low sensitivity**.

Susceptibility of visual receptors is primarily a function of the expectations and occupation or activity of the receptor.

Susceptibility of landscape receptors is an assessment of the ability of a receptor to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

Landscape effects are particular to both the specific landscape and the specific nature of the Proposed Development. The assessment of susceptibility is therefore tailored to a particular project.

For example, a landscape already dominated by housing development is likely to be less susceptible to additional housing than a landscape in which housing development is not present.

A location may have different levels of sensitivity according to the types of visual receptors at that location and any one receptor type may be accorded different levels of sensitivity at different locations.

A degree of professional judgement is required to make a judgment regarding the susceptibility for both landscape and visual receptors.

Determining the sensitivity of landscape receptors

Tables 1 & 2 provide an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a landscape receptor is judged within this assessment and considers both **value** and **susceptibility** independently.

Table 1 – Value of Landscape or Landscape Element

	Value
High	Important components or landscape / townscape of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and/or rarity, typically of national or regional scale. <u>Guidance:</u> • Landscapes designated for the preservation of the beauty of the countryside / townscape at a national or international level (National Parks, AONB's and National Scenic Areas (Scotland), World Heritage Sites, Heritage Coasts). • Landscapes highlighted as being of high scenic value in local Landscape Character Assessments or given elevated status by virtue of the beauty of the landscape at the local level (AGLV). • Landscapes with stated preservation aim in planning policy. • Landscapes / components of historic importance or that form part of their setting¹ (e.g. Registered Historic Parks and Gardens / Archaeological sites of importance (Scheduled Ancient Monuments & Battlefields) / Listed Buildings / Conservation Areas). • <u>Designated</u> components of acknowledged value such as Tree Preservation Orders; Geological SSSI's; etc. • Undesignated components which have value at a national or regional scale such as national trails / long distance routes etc. • Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. • Components or landscapes referred to in nationally famous art or literature. • Landscapes valued highly for aesthetic or perceptual factors such as wildness or tranquillity or sense of place. • Limited potential to recreate or replace the landscape / elements.
Medium	Valued components or landscape/townscape of moderate importance and rarity typically of regional or local scale. <u>Guidance:</u> • Landscapes designated locally or identified as of moderate scenic value in local Landscape Character Assessments. • Landscapes with stated conservation aim in planning policy – possibly identified for enhancement. • Landscapes / components particularly valued at the local level eg / village greens / allotments / certain local green spaces etc. • Undesignated components which nevertheless have value locally (eg significant but unprotected trees; general Public Rights of Way / undesignated heritage assets etc.). • Grade 3 agricultural land. • Components or landscapes referenced in local guidebooks / on tourist maps or in locally well-known literature. • Landscapes valued moderately for aesthetic or perceptual factors such as scale, complexity, degree of openness / enclosure, wildness, tranquillity, or sense of place. • There is moderate potential to recreate or replace the landscape / elements.

Low	Components or landscape/townscape of relatively low importance and rarity or degraded, typically of local scale. May have some redeeming features. <u>Guidance:</u> • Landscapes identified as of limited scenic value in local Landscape Character Assessments. • Landscapes identified for improvement in planning policy. • Undesignated components with limited value locally. • Grade 4 and 5 agricultural land. • Landscapes with limited aesthetic or perceptual value for factors such as wildness, tranquillity, or sense of place. • Components that are easily replaced.
------------	--

Table 2 – Susceptibility of Landscape or Landscape Element

	Susceptibility
High	Landscape character / component particularly susceptible to <u>change of the nature proposed</u>. The landscape / component has limited ability to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.
Medium	Landscape character / component moderately capable of accepting <u>change of the nature proposed</u>. The landscape / component has moderate ability to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.
Low	Landscape character / component tolerant to substantial <u>change of the nature proposed</u>. The landscape / component has potential to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

Determining the sensitivity of visual receptors

Table 3 provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a **visual receptor** is judged within this assessment and considers both **value** and **susceptibility** independently.

For **visual receptors**, judgements of susceptibility and value are closely interlinked considerations. Visual receptors include people who could potentially experience changes to a view or visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development. Visual receptors can therefore be private residential areas as well as the public domain, such as places of work, public rights of way, roads, train lines or noted viewing points. It should be noted that the visual impact from the public domain is afforded greater weighting in terms of sensitivity (due to the potential for greater numbers of individuals to be affected by an impact).

Visual receptors at each Viewpoint selected for assessment are identified and evaluated according to:

- Their **susceptibility** to change in a view and visual amenity.
- The **value** attached to each particular view.

Susceptibility is a function of the occupation / activity of the receptor at that particular location and, as a consequence, the extent to which their attention / interest may therefore be focused on the view and the visual amenity they experience.

Value takes account of value attached to views in relation to heritage assets; planning designations; and value attached to views by visitors (eg those associated with art and literature) and by the provision of facilities for the enjoyment of the views (eg sign boards / interpretative materials / parking areas and benches).

Table 3 – Susceptibility and Value of Visual Receptors

	Susceptibility	Value
High	Viewers whose focus is primarily on the landscape setting: - Viewers using designated Public Rights of Way (Roads / Footpaths / Bridleways / Restricted Byways / Byways open to all traffic (BOAT's)); Access Land; or railways for <u>the enjoyment of the countryside / townscape</u>. - Viewers within gardens and living areas of residential properties (rooms normally occupied during waking / daylight hours).	- Viewers within landscapes designated for the preservation of the beauty of the countryside at a national level (National Parks, AONB's). - Viewers within Conservation Areas. - Viewers from the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument or Listed Building or Registered Parks and Gardens. - Nationally famous Viewpoints referenced in art or literature. - Viewpoints shown on Ordnance Survey maps – or which are locally well-known and may also be referenced in guidebooks / on tourist maps. Facilities may be provided for the enjoyment of the view (such as sign boards / interpretative materials).
Medium	Viewers whose focus is not primarily on the landscape setting, but who may value the setting as part of the activity in which they are involved: - People engaged in outdoor recreational sports. - Viewers using roads <u>for local access</u>. - Viewers accessing residential properties. - Viewers using Public Rights of Way and other areas with public access other than for specific enjoyment of the countryside / townscape (eg for local access). - Recreational area user groups. - Viewers within sleeping areas of residential properties.	- Viewers within landscapes judged to be of moderate or good strength of character (potentially identified in local Landscape Character Assessments). - Viewers within areas with local landscape / townscape designations. - Viewpoints where locally valued features are a major component of the scene. - Viewers within residential areas. - Viewpoints where limited facilities may be provided for the enjoyment of the view (such as / parking areas / benches), but no references on Ordnance Survey maps.
Low	Viewers whose focus is primarily on the activity in which they are involved and not on the landscape setting and / or whose view may be transitory: - Viewers travelling <u>through an area</u> on trains or in vehicles on major roads. - Viewers working in commercial premises. - Viewers working in and around industrial premises - People engaged in formal sports.	- Viewers within landscapes judged to be of limited strength of character / no particular merit (potentially identified in local Landscape Character Assessments). - No national or townscape designations. - No specific references to the location in art / literature / guidebooks / tourist maps. - No facilities provided. - Views dominated by negative elements in the scene or negative experiential aspects of the Viewpoint (for example a Viewpoint dominated by a noisy road).

When there are visual receptors of differing susceptibility to change to consider in one particular location, the estimated frequency of use by each receptor will normally determine the overall **susceptibility** of receptors from that location. For instance, when local roads are frequently used by walkers as part of a popular walk or a National Trail, the high susceptibility receptor (viewers using designated Public Rights of Way for the enjoyment of the countryside) will take precedence. However, when local roads are only used by occasional walkers then the medium sensitivity receptor (viewers using roads for local access) will take precedence. Only in specific situations will both be assessed.

To reach an assessment of the sensitivity of each receptor, ‘**Susceptibility**’ and ‘**Value**’ are then combined using Table 4 below. For example, a receptor playing a football match (low susceptibility) in a National Park (high value) would have a medium level of sensitivity.

Table 4 Sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors

		Value		
		High	Medium	Low
Susceptibility	High	High sensitivity	High sensitivity	Medium sensitivity
	Medium	High sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Low sensitivity
	Low	Medium sensitivity	Low sensitivity	Low sensitivity

The tables above offer a template for assessing overall sensitivity of any landscape or visual receptor as determined by combining judgements of their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape as set out at paragraph 5.38 of GLVIA 3rd Edition (2013).

For example, a **high susceptibility** to change and a **low value** may result in a **medium overall sensitivity**, unless it can be demonstrated that the receptor is unusually susceptible or is in some way considered more valuable. A degree of professional judgement applies in arriving at the overall sensitivity for both landscape and visual receptors.

2.2.3 Visual Assessment Methodology

Identification of visual receptors

Visual receptors include people who could potentially experience changes to a view or visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development. Visual receptors can therefore be private residential areas as well as the public domain, such as places of work, public rights of way, roads, train lines or noted viewing points. It should be noted that the visual impact from the public domain is afforded greater weighting in terms of sensitivity (due to the potential for greater numbers of individuals to be affected by an impact).

Visual receptors have been identified through a desktop study and verified by visiting the Study Area. For the purposes of this assessment, visual receptors have been grouped where effects are likely to be similar, in order to keep this report proportionate to the nature of the proposals.

Selection of photographic viewpoints

To help assess the potential change in view for different receptors, several representative photographic viewpoints were chosen. Where different receptors are likely to experience a similar change in view, these are represented by the same viewpoint. Viewpoints are principally taken from publicly accessible areas. Professional judgement is used to draw conclusions for private receptors. At each viewpoint, baseline conditions are recorded.

Site visibility within the Study Area

Views of a Site within a Study Area are categorized as follows:

- Close range: Up to 300m
- Middle distance: 300 to 2000m
- Long distance: Over 2000m.

Where the extent of the Study Area is restricted in terms of visibility, views of the Site may be restricted to short and middle-distance views only.

2.2.4 Assessment of likely effects

Once the baseline has been established, the potential effects of the Proposed Development are identified and compared with those of the baseline conditions in respect of the identified receptors.

Appraisal of likely landscape effects

An appraisal of the likely **magnitude** of effects of the Proposed Development on each identified landscape receptor are described and takes into consideration the nature of the likely changes in the view, as well as their size and scale, when they would occur, how long they are likely to last and whether they are reversible. The **sensitivity** of the landscape receptor to potential changes is also assessed. This depends on the presence or absence of other developments nearby, man-made features or detractors, the maturity and stability of the landscape, the topography, scale and openness of the landscape and its degree of remoteness and tranquility. Any existing relevant sensitivity and capacity studies are also referred to.

Appraisal of likely visual effects

An appraisal of the likely **magnitude** of effects of the Proposed Development on identified visual receptors are described and takes into consideration the nature of the likely changes in the view, as well as their size and scale. Consideration is given to the length of time a view is likely to be experienced as well as other factors such as whether the views are filtered or screened, the distance from the viewpoint to the Site and the angle of view.

The **sensitivity** of the visual receptor to any potential changes is also taken into consideration. Consideration is given to the type of pursuit visual receptors are likely to be engaged in and thus how much their focus lies on the experience of the view. For example, residents, holidaymakers or people participating in recreational outdoor activities are likely to be more susceptible to change of a view than people working or travelling to / from work.

Limitations of Assessment

The assessments undertaken are based on certain assumptions and actions and therefore have certain limitations. Whilst the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) calls for assessments to be appropriate and proportionate to the nature of the development proposed these limitations should be recorded. For this study these have been identified as follows:

- The assessment only assesses effects on visual receptors on publicly accessible land and from private residences (estimated). Whilst this is entirely normal it should be noted that Visual effects from locations on surrounding fields are not covered.
- The visibility of the Site from residential Viewpoints has been estimated both by looking towards the Site from public areas, and by standing on the Site and looking outwards. No attempt has been made to access private property for more detailed assessment.
- For the visual assessments made, it has been assumed that there will be no significant change (growth or loss) in offsite / foreground vegetation.
- Finally, whilst the estimated Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) is mapped to a good degree of accuracy and takes into consideration the screening effects of topography, built form and significant areas of vegetation as noted from site work, it should be understood that there will still be locations within the mapped ZVI where the complexity of landscape (such as intervening vegetation / buildings) or lack of public access makes it impossible reasonably to determine the exact visibility of the Proposed Development.

In reality, there will be some areas within the mapped ZVI where the Proposed Development will not be visible, and there may be some un-mapped areas where glimpses of the Proposed Development would be.

Defining Magnitude of Change

The magnitude of any landscape or visual change is determined through a range of considerations particular to each receptor. The three attributes considered in defining the magnitude are:

- Scale of change;
- Geographical extent; and
- Duration and reversibility/proportion.

Receptor locations from which views of the Proposed Development are not likely to occur will receive no change and therefore no effect. With reference to the Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) and site survey, the magnitude of change is defined for receptor locations from where visibility of the Proposed Development is predicted to occur.

Determining the magnitude of landscape effect

The **magnitude** of landscape effect predicts the degree to which changes will occur to the physical landscape elements or overall landscape character because of the Proposed Development. Change may arise from built form, engineered forms and / or from soft landscape elements of the development.

The magnitude of effect is initially considered (in accordance with the criteria set out in Table 5 below) for each key element of the landscape chosen for assessment; and then the magnitude of effect on the overall landscape character is concluded (in accordance with Table 6). In both cases, considering the magnitude of effect involves careful consideration of the complex interrelationships between the landscape elements set out below. An informed professional judgement is made on these relationships and whether effects are positive or negative (or neutral) and their consequences for landscape character / the landscape component in question.

A consideration in terms of duration is a factor in making judgments. In this way, the effectiveness of mitigating measures over time is considered within the assessment process and typically considers Year 1 through to Year 15 and beyond.

Table 5 – Magnitude of effect on individual elements of the landscape

Magnitude of effect	Criteria for assessing magnitude of landscape effects on individual elements of the landscape
High adverse	The proposals are very damaging to the landscape / townscape component in question in that they will cause substantial loss or substantial adverse change to that component.
Medium-high adverse	The proposals are very damaging to the landscape / townscape component in question in that they will cause major loss or major adverse change to that component.
Medium adverse	The proposals are damaging to the landscape / townscape component in that they will cause moderate loss or moderate adverse change to that component.
Medium-low adverse	The proposals are damaging to the landscape / townscape component in that they will cause slight loss or slight adverse change to that component.
Low adverse	The proposals cause minimal damage to the landscape / townscape component in that they will cause very slight loss or very slight adverse change to that component.
No change / Neutral	The proposals will cause no change to the component in question; or The proposals are in keeping with the existing landscape despite changes that occur; or Positive effects balance the negative effects of change.
Low beneficial	The proposals will be of minimal benefit to the landscape / townscape component in that they will cause only very slight enhancement to that component.
Medium-low beneficial	The proposals will be of benefit to the landscape / townscape component in that they will cause slight enhancement to that component.
Medium beneficial	The proposals will be of moderate benefit to the landscape / townscape component as they will cause moderate enhancement to that component.
Medium-high beneficial	The proposals will be of major benefit to the landscape / townscape component as they will cause major enhancement to that component.
High beneficial	The proposals will be of substantial benefit to the landscape / townscape component as they will cause substantial enhancement to that component.

In the case of overall landscape character, the assessment of magnitude takes account both the landscape elements individually assessed at the detailed level; and those for which individual assessment was not deemed necessary. The whole landscape resource is considered at this stage.

For example, in terms of magnitude of effect a development could have a **high adverse** effect on a single element of the landscape but minimal effects on all other components whilst another may have lots of less significant effects.

By considering all aspects of the landscape at this stage a considered assessment of the overall landscape character is made.

Table 6 – Magnitude of effect on overall landscape character

Magnitude of effect	Criteria for assessing magnitude of landscape effects on overall landscape character
High adverse	The proposals are extremely damaging to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause total loss of, or substantial alteration to, key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ they create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Is at total variance with the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the landscape / townscape. ○ Will introduce components considered to be totally uncharacteristic of the attributes of the receiving landscape / townscape. ○ Will be severely damaging to a high quality or highly vulnerable landscape / townscape, causing it to change and be substantially diminished in quality. ○ Is likely to destroy the integrity of a range of characteristic features and components and their setting. ○ Destroys existing sense of place. ○ Mitigation has little effect.
Medium-high adverse	The proposals are very damaging to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause major loss of, or major alteration to, key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ They would create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Is at considerable variance with the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the landscape / townscape. ○ Will introduce components considered to be substantially uncharacteristic of the attributes of the receiving landscape / townscape. ○ Will be substantially damaging to a high quality or highly vulnerable landscape / townscape, causing it to change and be considerably diminished in quality. ○ Is likely to degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic features and components and their setting. ○ Substantially damages existing sense of place. ○ Cannot be adequately mitigated.
Medium adverse	The proposals are damaging to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause partial loss of, or moderate alteration to, key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ They would create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Is out of scale or at odds with the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the existing landscape / townscape. ○ Will introduce components considered to be considerably uncharacteristic of the attributes of the receiving landscape/townscape. ○ Will have an adverse effect on a landscape / townscape of recognised quality or on vulnerable and important characteristic features or components. ○ Moderately damages existing sense of place. ○ Cannot be largely mitigated – mitigation will not prevent the scheme from impacting the landscape / townscape in the longer term.

Medium-low adverse	The proposals are slightly damaging to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause minor loss of, or slight alteration to, key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals are slightly damaging to the landscape in that they create a landscape whose character: ○ Does not quite fit into the layout, mix, scale and character of the landscape / townscape. ○ May introduce components that may not be characteristic of the attributes of the receiving landscape/townscape. ○ May have a slight adverse effect on a landscape / townscape of recognised quality. ○ Slightly damages existing sense of place. ○ Cannot be completely mitigated due to the nature of the proposal itself or the character of the landscape.
Low adverse	The proposals cause minimal damage to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause very minor loss or alteration to key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals cause minimal damage to the landscape/townscape in that they cause little effect on character, or incorporate measures for mitigation that balance any adverse effects and therefore create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Largely matches the layout, mix scale and appearance of the existing landscape/townscape. ○ Introduces components not considered uncharacteristic of the surrounding landscape/townscape. ○ Largely maintains existing landscape / townscape quality and character. ○ Largely maintains existing sense of place.
No change / Neutral	The proposals will cause no change to key components of the receiving landscape/townscape; or The proposals are in keeping with the existing landscape despite changes that occur; or Positive effects balance the negative effects of change.
Low beneficial	The proposals will be of minimal benefit to overall landscape / townscape character in that they will cause very minor enhancement to key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals cause minimal benefit to the landscape/townscape in that they cause little beneficial effect on character, and incorporate measures for mitigation that balance any adverse effects and therefore create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Matches or fractionally improves the layout, mix scale and appearance of the existing landscape/townscape. ○ Introduces components that are broadly characteristic or fractionally improve the characteristics of the surrounding landscape/townscape. ○ Maintains or fractionally improves existing landscape / townscape quality and character. ○ Maintains or fractionally improves existing sense of place.

Medium-low beneficial	The proposals will be of slight benefit to overall landscape / townscape character as they will cause minor enhancement to key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals will slightly enhance the landscape/townscape as they create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Slightly improves the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the surrounding landscape / townscape. ○ Introduces components that slightly improve the characteristics of the receiving landscape/townscape. ○ Slightly enhances existing landscape / townscape quality and character. ○ Will enable some sense of place and quality to be restored or enhanced through beneficial and sensitive design. ○ Incorporate measures for mitigation to ensure they will blend in well with the surroundings.
Medium beneficial	The proposals will be of moderate benefit to overall landscape / townscape character as they will cause moderate enhancement to key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals will moderately enhance the landscape/townscape as they create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Moderately improves the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the landscape / townscape. ○ Introduces components that moderately improve of the attributes of the receiving landscape/townscape. ○ Will have a moderately positive effect on existing landscape / townscape quality and character. ○ Enables the restoration of some characteristic features or components. ○ Will enable moderate sense of place and quality to be restored or enhanced through beneficial and sensitive design.
Medium-high beneficial	The proposals will be of major benefit to overall landscape / townscape character as they will cause major enhancement of key components of the baseline landscape / townscape. <u>Guidance:</u> ▪ The proposals will significantly enhance the landscape/townscape as they create a landscape / townscape whose character: ○ Considerably improves the layout, mix, scale and appearance of the landscape / townscape. ○ Introduces components that considerably improve the attributes of the receiving landscape/townscape. ○ Will have a considerably positive effect on a high quality or highly vulnerable landscape / townscape, causing it to be considerably enhanced in quality. ○ Enables the restoration of several characteristic features or components. ○ Will enable the sense of place and quality of a landscape of recognised quality to be considerably restored through beneficial and sensitive design.

Table 7 – Magnitude of visual effects

Magnitude of effect	Guidance for assessing magnitude of visual effects
High adverse	The development proposals have a substantially detrimental effect on the character of the scene, becoming the dominant feature to which all other elements are subordinate.
Medium-high adverse	Where the development proposals will have a considerably detrimental effect on the character of the scene.
Medium adverse	Where the development proposals will have a moderately detrimental effect on the character of the scene.
Medium-low adverse	Where the development proposals will have an appreciably detrimental effect on the character of the scene.
Low adverse	Where the development proposals will have a slightly detrimental effect on the character of the scene.
Neutral	Where the development proposals will, on balance, have little effect on the scene and are neither adverse or beneficial: • The development cannot be seen or • The development will be scarcely appreciated in the overall view, and/or • The view may have changed but the overall effect is no worse or better than the existing.
Low beneficial	Where the development proposals will cause a slight improvement in the overall scene.
Medium-low beneficial	Where the development proposals will cause an appreciable improvement in the overall scene.
Medium beneficial	Where the development proposals will cause a moderate improvement in the overall scene.
Medium-high beneficial	Where the development proposals will cause a considerable improvement in the overall scene.
High beneficial	Where the development proposals will cause a substantial improvement in the overall scene / sense of place restored.

The final factor in determining the predicted magnitude of change is duration and reversibility. Duration and reversibility are separate but linked considerations. Duration is judged according to the defined terms set out below, whereas reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of any identified effects being reversed. The categories used in this assessment are set out below.

Duration:

- Long term (20 years+);
- Medium to Long term (10 to 20 years);
- Medium term (5 to 10 years);
- Short term (1 year to 5 years).

Reversibility:

- Permanent with unlikely restoration to original state e.g. major road corridor, power station, urban extension etc.;
- Permanent with possible conversion to original state e.g. agricultural buildings, retail units;
- Partially reversible to a different state e.g. mineral workings;
- Reversible after decommissioning to a similar original state e.g. wind energy development; and
- Quickly reversible e.g. temporary structures such as solar farms.

In order to consider the likely level of any effect, the sensitivity of each receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to determine the level of effect, with reference also made to the geographical extent, duration and reversibility of the effect within the assessment. Having taken such a wide range of factors into account when assessing sensitivity and magnitude at each receptor, the level of effect can be derived by combining the sensitivity and magnitude in accordance with the matrix in Table 8.

Table 8 – Landscape effect significance matrix

		Sensitivity of landscape / visual receptors		
		High	Medium	Low
Magnitude of effect	High adverse	Severe adverse effect	Substantial adverse effect	Major adverse effect
	Medium-high adverse	Substantial adverse effect	Major adverse effect	Moderate adverse effect
	Medium adverse	Major adverse effect	Moderate adverse effect	Slight adverse effect
	Medium-low adverse	Moderate adverse effect	Slight adverse effect	Very slight adverse effect
	Low adverse	Slight adverse effect	Very slight adverse effect	Negligible adverse effect
	No change / Neutral	Neutral effect	Neutral effect	Neutral effect
	Low beneficial	Slight beneficial effect	Very slight beneficial effect	Negligible beneficial effect
	Medium-low beneficial	Moderate beneficial effect	Slight beneficial effect	Very slight beneficial effect
	Medium beneficial	Major beneficial effect	Moderate beneficial effect	Slight beneficial effect
	Medium-high beneficial	Substantial beneficial effect	Major beneficial effect	Moderate beneficial effect
	High beneficial	Abundant beneficial effect	Substantial beneficial effect	Major beneficial effect

When concluding the overall impact on landscape character, it is important that the focus does not become purely on a single or limited number of “Significant” effects, when the bigger picture may be one of generally minimal effects (and may also include beneficial as well as adverse effects).

3 PLANNING AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

3.1 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

The Site is located within West End Civil Parish, and falls within Eastleigh Borough Council boundary, in the County of Hampshire.

The following paragraphs summarise the planning aspects, which are considered relevant to the landscape and visual character of the Site and its surroundings.

3.2 NATIONAL LEVEL

3.2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF)

This document sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

A revision of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on in Sept 2023 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and involves the pursuit of three objectives which are mutually supportive and interdependent: economic, social and environmental. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the taking of decisions.

The following sections and paragraphs are highlighted as of direct relevance to the Site, Proposed Development and issues of landscape and visual impact:

- Paragraph 100 seeks the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access. Opportunities should also be sought to provide better facilities for users.
- Section 12 'Achieving well-designed places', Paragraph 126 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. It also encourages effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interested parties throughout the process.
- Paragraph 130 requires developments to function well and add to the overall quality of the area in the long-term; are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history; establish or maintain a strong sense of place; optimise the potential for sites to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible which promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- Section 15 – 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment', Paragraph 174, requires contributions to and enhancements of the natural and local environment. This can be achieved by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils; recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services; minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity including developing coherent ecological networks; preventing new and existing development from

contributing to or being put at risk from pollution; and remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

- Section 16 – ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ seeks the protection, conservation and enhancement of historic assets and requires proposals to assess the potential impacts on the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- Paragraph 190 states that plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay, or other threats. This strategy should take into account:
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
 - d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

For detailed commentary on relevant NPPF planning policies please refer to the Planning Statement (Boyer Planning).

3.3 LOCAL PLAN

A detailed review of the planning policy context is contained within the Boyer Planning Statement. Those considered relevant to the landscape and visual issues associated with the Proposed Development in planning policy terms are summarized below.

3.3.1 Local Plan: Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036)

The following policies are considered relevant to this Landscape & Visual Appraisal.

Strategic Policies

Policy S6 Protection of Settlement Gaps

Policy S6 aims and objectives can be summarised as follows:

'Development within a Settlement Gap as set out in the policies map will be permitted provided that:

- a. it would not undermine the physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements; and*
- b. it would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to:*
 - i. The character of the countryside; or*
 - ii. The separate identity of the adjoining settlements.*

The defined settlement gap considered relevant to the LVA is 'Hedge End, West End and Southampton'.

'The Council considers that designating areas between settlements as settlement gaps to be kept free of urbanising development is the best way of preventing further loss of local identity. Following a review of the boundaries of settlement gaps and consideration of the extent of land required to prevent coalescence of settlements, the Council has defined a number of such gaps.

Any new development within a settlement gap should not physically and/or visually undermine the gap between settlements. Any new development including the intensification or redevelopment of existing activities within gaps should seek opportunities to enhance the function of the gap. Consideration will be given to how the proposed siting, design, colours, materials and any storage of materials, lighting, boundary treatment, landscape features, landscape improvements and/or appropriate long term management arrangements serves to ensure the Proposed Development meets the criteria in policy S6'.

Policy S9 Green Infrastructure

'Green infrastructure in the Borough includes a network of natural and semi-natural habitats, green spaces and features linked by green and blue corridors. Other evidence will explore more detailed aspects of green infrastructure relating to the Borough's landscape and biodiversity, and the Council's work on sport and recreation'.

Through new development and other initiatives, the Borough Council will seek to achieve the provision, retention and/or enhancement of the following forms of multi-functional green infrastructure, including the following:

- *Green infrastructure incorporated into all new development with multifunctional spaces connected by primary, secondary and tertiary green links;*
- *Interconnected urban green infrastructure within the fine grain of existing and new development including green, cycle ways, paths and linkages between community facilities and open spaces to link community facilities;*

- *green stepping stones such as street trees, green roofs and walls, pocket parks and urban copses;*
- *connected habitats linking the network of designated sites and existing priority habitats, taking account of the Hampshire ecological network map;*
- *incorporation of historic buildings and landscapes, including historic parks and gardens within the wider Green Infrastructure to protect their setting.'*

Para 4.48 states:

'Green infrastructure incorporates spaces and habitat with varying functions which are connected by green and blue links that can be accessed by people and wildlife. Green infrastructure can include accessible countryside and coast, publicly owned land, cemeteries, community allotments and orchards, nature reserves, sustainable urban drainage etc. The aim of green infrastructure is to link these areas for people and wildlife by using linear corridors such as rivers, paths, cycle ways roads, railway, green verges and green links and stepping stones such as green roofs, street trees, pocket parks and village greens'.

Development Proposals and Special Policies

Policy WE4, Land at Ageas Bowl and Tennis Centre, Botley Road, West End

This policy has evolved during the Local Plan examination process following extensive dialogue with officers at Eastleigh Borough Council and is discussed in more detail within the Planning Statement (Boyer Planning).

Policy WE4 aims and objectives can be summarised as follows:

'Development will be supported where it facilitates the site's important role in meeting sporting needs in the Borough and wider area; complements the high quality design and open setting of the site; and protects the settlement gap. Taking these aims into account, development will be permitted if it meets all of the following criteria:

- a. buildings or structures must be appropriate in scale, form and location to the predominantly green and open character of the area, taking account of the different characteristics of the site; and should only be visible from the surrounding area in the context of the wider landscape setting;*
- b. development achieves a high-quality design by paying careful attention to detailing, hard landscaping and planting;*
- c. outside the urban edge (as defined by the policies map) development is for outdoor sports/ recreational purposes only (including ancillary facilities of appropriate location, scale and design to protect the settlement gap, such as a golf clubhouse);*
- d. inside the urban edge (as defined by the policies map) development is for outdoor or indoor sports/recreation; leisure; hotel or office/research use provided that:*
 - i. any development creates a high quality of design and takes the form of distinctive individual buildings each set within an open and high quality landscape setting; the extent of development and the boundary treatment of that development (built design and landscape) creates a high quality, distinctive, green and open setting to the Ageas Bowl;*
 - ii. in addition to meeting criterion d i., any residential development is located solely in the north west corner of the site (as defined on the policies map); the development provides an appropriately designed access directly to/from the settlement of West End rather than via Marshall Drive for pedestrians/cyclists and also, unless demonstrated otherwise, for vehicles; and the layout and design of the development ensures an appropriate level of residential amenity in respect of the cricket ground and events venue;*
 - iii. enables the enhancement of sporting facilities on the site;*

- iv. does not compromise the function of the Ageas Bowl as an international cricket ground and events location;*
- e. any leisure, hotel or office/research use meets the sequential test by demonstrating there are no suitable, available and viable sites in city, town or district centres;*
- f. proposals for floodlighting on any part of the site must be of a scale, form, location and luminosity that would not affect the predominantly open character of the area or the biodiversity interests of the adjacent SINC or protected/priority species. The hours of use of any floodlighting may be limited in order to minimise its impact on nearby residential property;*
- g. the number of non-sporting events such as concerts, and their operation (including hours of operation) will be strictly controlled and any intensification of sporting events managed where practicable in order to minimise the impact on nearby residential properties;*
- h. proposals must be accompanied by satisfactory arrangements for vehicular access and must include provision for improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport;*
- i. any areas of the site to be used for temporary or occasional car parking must be provided with an appropriate soft surface treatment;*
- j. surface water drainage will not increase flood risks downstream and within the river corridor; and*
- k. there will be no adverse impact on the adjacent Telegraph Woods SINC with appropriate environmental buffers from development.*

General Criteria for New Development

Policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM5, DM6, DM11, DM12, DM13, DM14, DM34, DM36 ('Development Management')

These policies set out a range of general development management policies and relate to urban design, environmental sustainability and climate change, sustainable drainage, nature conservation, the protection of heritage assets and transport and parking matters.

3.4 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

3.4.1 Landscape Character Assessment

Landscape Character Assessment is the process of identifying and describing variations in the character of the landscape. It seeks to identify and explain the unique combination of elements and features (characteristics) that make landscapes distinctive.

The landscape character of the Site and Study Area has been analysed at a number of scales. Brief outlines are included here to bring out elements and features relevant to the proposal and Site environs.

3.4.2 National Landscape Character Assessment

The application Site is located within National Character Area (NCA) 128 - South Hampshire Lowlands. The NCA profile states that *"The South Hampshire Lowlands National Character Area (NCA) is a low lying plain between the chalk hills of the Hampshire and South Downs and Southampton Water. The NCA is dominated by the city and port of Southampton and its adjoining towns and suburbs – 29 per cent of the area is urban. In the more rural areas, it is a mixture of farmland, particularly pasture, and woodland."*

This is a high-level description with little direct relevance to the Site however it notes several key characteristics that provide some broad level insight as follows:

- *"Well-wooded farmed landscape (particularly to the east of Southampton) characterised by ancient woodland such as Botley Wood and West Walk, the remnants of the Royal Hunting Forest of Bere."*
- *Mixed agricultural landscape dominated by pasture with small pockets of horticulture and arable."*
- *In parts, a very urban NCA dominated by the city and port of Southampton and other large towns such as Waterlooville and Havant."*
- *Fragmented by major transport links, including the M3 to London and the M27 to Portsmouth which cross the NCA."*

3.4.3 County Landscape Character Assessment

The Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment (2012) identifies that the application site is located within the Mid Hampshire Open Downs.

This report is more detailed than the Natural England character mapping and divides Hampshire into 11 Landscape Character Areas; with boundaries adjusted to reflect the local context and subdivided areas where a finer grain was needed.

The Site is located within Landscape Character Area 2E Forest of Bere West and is described as follows: *"This character area encompasses the lowlands of the Hampshire Basin, bounded by higher chalk of the Hampshire Downs to the north and Portsdown Hill and the Coastal Plain in the south west and south east respectively. Whilst the Meon Valley forms the western boundary the east is drawn on the County boundary. The LCA in Hampshire narrows and joins almost exactly with the Funtington to Highdown Farmlands in West Sussex."*

Key Characteristics considered relevant to the Site and Study Area as follows:

- *A low-lying landscape with shallow undulations, predominantly south sloping.*
- *Varied geology with permanently saturated heavy clays in the central and southern parts and locally higher sandy outcrops which are more undulating resulting in agriculturally poor soils – conversely rich alluvial especially around tributaries of the Hamble are very high grade.*
- *Locally popular accessible woodland areas.*
- *Extensive C.20th development, including urban expansion and infilling of common-edge settlements.*
- *Rich biodiversity, including woodland, heathland, grassland and wetland sites.*

Physical Characteristics and Land use

"The topography is predominantly gently undulating but is steeper and more varied around the fringes where sand and gravel outcrops.

There are a few areas of head and river terrace deposits. Where the Lowland Mosaic Heath Associated occurs this coincides with locally elevated sand and gravel outcrops, such as Shedfield, Shirrell heath and adjacent to West End.

Urban fringe uses are more pervasive than in the Forest of Bere East (adjoining LCA), and typically include golf courses, small retail and commercial areas, horse paddocks, high voltage power lines and scattered housing in medium sized plots".

Its Component County Landscape Types (LCT) include:

- Lowland Mosaic Heath Associated
- Lowland mosaic Small Scale Wooded
- Significant sized settlement

The Site falls within the Lowland Mosaic Heath Associated LCT.

Experiential/Perceptual Characteristics

"Views are predominantly short and often with a wooded backdrop. Outside the Lowland Mosaic Medium Scale landscape housing and development is frequently in the field of view.

This landscape is full of contrasts. The well wooded core Forest of Bere area is intimate, remote and secluded, but its peripheral landscapes have more development and urbanising influences. These are greatest in the western and southern parts of the character area, e.g the M27 and feeder road network, edge of town development, high voltage power lines and horse paddocks".

Biodiversity

There are nearly 200 SINC's within this landscape character area. The majority are designated for their ancient and semi-natural woodland resource (including Telegraph Woods some 325m to the north of the Site), although a significant number are designated for their unimproved grassland resource.

3.4.4 District Landscape Character Assessment

Of more direct relevance to the Site is the Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough (2011). This is a district wide Landscape Character Assessment which sits within the framework of the national and county character assessments and forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.

It classifies the district into nineteen Local Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) which are defined by their overriding geology, landform, and landscape pattern and provides commentary regarding visual sensitivity. The Site falls within LCA Area 11: M27 Corridor which is summarised below.

Area 11: M27 Corridor

"The character area is dominated by the motorway. In the northern part of the character areas, maturing but largely linear motorway planting obscures the cuttings and embankments....

The path of the motorway fractures the field pattern, fragmenting the land use and physically dividing the east and west sides of the character area. Land directly adjacent much of the motorway consists of heath-associated pasture and woodland. This limits the visual intrusion of the motorway. The woodland is dominated by oak and birch with frequent patches of conifers; rhododendron and laurel often form the understorey. For much of its length the area is hemmed-in by development in West End, Hedge End and substantial belts of recent woodland, often with conifers at their edges.

The boundaries of this character area are defined primarily by the built edge of the settlements that run along its length.

The landform and white tensile architecture of the Rose Bowl cricket ground is a landmark that creates a distinctive feature on the hillside south of Moorgreen. The surrounding golf course is at odds with the general landform/pattern, however, blocks of woodland serve to reduce its impact.

Despite the motorway, areas enclosed by woodland or within the small steep-sided valleys have a very rural character. Nevertheless, views of roads, urban edges and pylons tend to predominate. The motorway generates significant noise intrusion".

Refer to drawing no. J00656-003, a copy of which is found within Appendix A.

Key Issues:

- *The edges of Southampton and Hedge End are in close proximity in some locations. The closure of these pinch points could result in fragmentation of the character area.*
- *Further development in the character area would be visually prominent due to the presence of the motorway and smaller highways that run throughout the character area.*
- *Parts of the landscape is degraded due to unsympathetic development associated with the urban edge.*
- *Noise and visual disturbance from the motorway and smaller highway network.*
- *Pressure for some development north of Barbe Baker Avenue, West End, south of Foord Road, west of Dodwell Lane, Hedge End and land fronting Providence Hill and Oakhill as identified in the draft Local Plan.*

Under visual sensitivity the LCA is described as follows:

"It has quite strong landforms and a varied vegetation structure of woodland and hedges. However, it forms a narrow corridor between settlements and could easily be compromised by further development".

4 LANDSCAPE BASELINE

4.1 CHARACTER OF THE SITE AND STUDY AREA

A review of the Eastleigh Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment has been carried out and the key characteristics considered relevant / applicable to the Site and Study Area have been identified (refer to Section 3.4 above). It is considered that the key characteristics described above are largely consistent with the Site and its context. The relevant Landscape Character Area (Area11: M27 Corridor) identifies the golf course to be 'at odds with the general landform/pattern' of this LCA with 'blocks of woodland serving to reduce its impact'.

This is consistent with the findings of this report, which considers the Site to be well contained visually by existing trees and woodland; and the wider golf course landscape and setting creating a series of 'discrete compartments' which give rise in places to an enclosed and intimate character; restricting more panoramic views that may be experienced elsewhere within the LCA.

In terms of remoteness and tranquillity, the Site and immediate context is mostly consistent with the assessment contained within the LCA which recognises the background noise generated by the motorway. The M27 motorway, feeder roads and associated infrastructure are a dominant feature in this part of the LCA including Charles Watts Way (A334) to the south and Moorhill Road (A27) to the west of the Site. The Site is neither remote nor tranquil.

4.2 TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Topographically, the Site is gently sloping and falls from c.73m AOD at the western boundary (Moorhill Road) to c.63m AOD at the eastern boundary. More widely, the landform continues to fall to the north-east down to c.35m AOD in the vicinity of the M27 corridor. There are localised variations in landform associated with the golf course evident with numerous banks, bunkers and ponds.

Telegraph Woods is located on a gentle ridge and creates a well wooded backdrop to this part of the LCA.

It is understood that the existing soil would be stripped and stored separately for re-use on Site for proposed landscape works. This would ensure that the existing soil characteristics are preserved and appropriate for use in this location.

The topography and geology would not be altered as a result of the proposals. Except for some minor re-grading to accommodate the proposed car park, building and attenuation pond, the existing baseline would be unaffected.

4.3 BOUNDARIES

Generally, the Site is well contained and screened by existing trees and vegetation along its western and southern boundaries. There are two Cat. A mature oak trees towards the eastern boundary with another belt of trees and dense vegetation located c.100m further to the east creating an overall strong sense of enclosure.

The northern edge of the Site currently forms part of the wider golf course (10th tee). Beyond this area, there is a residential property (Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow), and further residential properties beyond which, in combination with garden trees and the backdrop of woodland associated with the covered reservoir to the north of the residential properties forms the northern 'visual edge'. Currently, the Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow boundary is very open and defined by a post and rail fence.

4.4 VEGETATION ON SITE

The significant trees relating to the Proposed Development are on the western and southern boundaries with occasional trees within the golf course. Trees on the Moorhill Road (A27) verge and within the Site provide effective screening from the road and give the Site frontage a semi-wooded aspect. Trees on the southern boundary provide a useful separation between the Site and the adjacent property of Thorneydown Farm to the south-east. Specimen trees located within the wider golf course are large and give the landscape some maturity of character and good landscape depth. Tree species, sizes and conditions vary and include oak, beech, and sycamore.

Please refer to the AIA (Mulberry – Tree Management Consultants) for details of species.

4.5 LAND USE & BUILT FORM

The Site currently forms part of the Boundary Lakes Golf Course which extends eastwards from the Site to the Ageas Bowl cricket stadium.

With respect to neighbouring land uses, to the northwest are located three detached dwellings that are set within large curtilages off Moorhill Road (A27). Beyond this residential 'enclave' is a covered reservoir contained by significant woodland vegetation to the south and east.

Immediately to the south of the Site, is a derelict residential property off Moorhill Road. To the southwest, beyond Moorhill Road, is Moorhill Gardens, which is a planned 20th Century estate of detached bungalows, and the urban areas of Thornhill and Harefield beyond.

Road corridors and associated infrastructure associated with Moorhill Road (A27) immediately to the west of the Site, Charles Watts Way (A334) to the south of the Site and their roundabout junction (Kanes Hill) at c.160m to the south of the Site are notable land uses.

To the south of Charles Watts Way is a mixture of residential development (off Upper Northam Drive and West Road) and commercial uses including an Amazon Distribution Centre off Comines Way.

4.6 LANDSCAPE DESIGNATIONS

Please refer to relevant drawings in Appendix A for details.

Designated Landscapes

The Site is not located within an area designated for its landscape value, such as a National Park or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Habitats

The Site is not located within an ecologically designated area. An Ecological Appraisal Report (incorporating an Extended Phase 1 Habitats Survey and protected species surveys) accompanies the planning application.

The Report finds that the Site offers low ecological suitability overall ("no more than local importance"), with the woodland boundary along the southern and western edges currently representing the only notable ecological opportunities.

There is a locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) located at Telegraph Woods c.325m to the north of the Site.

Please refer to the Ecological Appraisal Report (Johns Associates) for details.

Access

There are no Public Rights of Way (PRoW) that cross the Site.

The nearest PRoW footpath is located approximately 25m to the west of the Site (HCC Ref: 506). This footpath runs parallel with and to the east of Moorhill Gardens Road in a north-south direction. It is contained to the east by existing trees and vegetation and there is no intervisibility between the route and the Site.

There is a PRoW c.635m to the northeast of the Site at its nearest point (Round Copse) which connects Telegraph Woods with Botley Road. In addition, there are publicly accessible routes within Telegraph Woods to the north. However, there is no intervisibility between these routes and the Site due to intervening vegetation and topography.

The A27 (Moorhill Road) contains the Site immediately to the west and the A334 (Charles Watts Way) is located c.125m to the south-east, with the junction between these two main roads formed by Kanes Hill roundabout c.120m to the south of the Site's entrance.

There is an existing gated access into the Site off the A27. The proposed Site access would be located here but will be carefully considered to accommodate safe access but also maintain visual amenity.

Views of the Site are therefore largely limited to glimpsed views experienced by passing vehicles along a short, localised section of the A27.

Access and circulation would not be affected by the proposals.

Heritage

There are no designated heritage assets within the Site boundary.

The nearest Listed Buildings is the Grade II Church of St James at Church Hill c.1.2km to the north-west of the Site.

There are 2 scheduled monuments within the Study Area located within Telegraph Woods to the north of the Site:

- Hickley Wood Hillfort (Monument No. 31152) located c.600m to the north of the Site
- Telegraph Woods Beacon (Monument No. 31157) located c.575m to the north of the Site

There is no intervisibility between heritage assets and the Site.

Refer to drawing no. J00656-004, a copy of which is found within Appendix A, and the Cultural Heritage Constraints Desk Based Assessment (RPS) which accompanies this application.

Watercourses

The Site does not fall within a Flood Risk Area. There are no watercourses or waterbodies on the Site. The nearest surface water features are located within the wider golf course area at c.450m to the north-east of the Site. There are some small, seasonal drainage ditches located to the north-east of the Site.

4.7 SETTLEMENT GAP

The Site is located within the Settlement Gap; the primary function of which is to sustain the separate identity of the settlements Hedge End and West End. However, there is overlap here with Policy WE4, Land at Ageas Bowl and Tennis Centre, Botley Road, West End.

Refer to Local Plan Policy Map for location in Appendix D.

4.8 SUMMARY

Having considered the characteristics of the landscape as a whole, the value of the Site and its context is assessed as **medium value**. The landscape is one that is undesignated, however, it contains valued components and is a **landscape of moderate importance and rarity, valued at the local level**.

4.9 POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE RECEPTORS - SUMMARY

From the description of the local landscape character and landscape features above, the potential landscape receptors to be considered are summarised as follows.

Receptor
LR1: Local Landscape Character
LR2: Soils
LR3: Vegetation on Site
LR4: Land Use and Built Form
LR5: Access and Circulation
LR6: Settlement Gap

5 VISUAL BASELINE

5.1 VISIBILITY WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

The site was visited on 24th November 2020 and the weather was dry with good visibility. Representative photographs were taken using a standard 50mm FFL lens at eye level. The assessment was concluded following Site inspections, a desk top research exercise, a photographic survey and assessment of Ordnance Survey plans.

Representative photographs were taken from positions where the Site is likely to be most visible where many similar viewpoints were available. The photograph viewpoint locations demonstrate the potential extent of the Proposed Development's visual envelope.

5.1.1 Viewpoint Analysis

Views of the Site are divided into two broad types:

- Close range: Up to 300m
- Middle distance: 300 to 2000m

No Long-distance views of the Site (over 2km) are possible.

The visual analysis was carried out from a range of publicly accessible points in the surrounding landscape to establish the possible extent of visual influence of the Proposed Development (Refer to Appendix A: Photoview Locations Plan and Appendix B: Photographic Viewpoint Sheets).

While public views are generally given more weight due to the greater number of people likely to experience the view, private / not publicly accessible locations have also been considered using a combination of desktop study and observation from the nearest publicly accessible location.

It should be noted that the assessment work was undertaken during the 'winter' season and thus represent the worse-case scenario in visual terms.

Visibility from the North:

Views from the north are restricted to those likely to be experienced from the residential properties of Thorneydown Barn & Bungalow. No other views of the development from publicly accessible areas are possible due to intervening topography and dense woodland vegetation associated with the covered reservoir and Telegraph Woods to the north of the Site.

Visibility from the East:

Views of the Site from the east are limited to those from within the wider golf course (private land).

Visibility from the South:

Views of the Site are restricted by the presence of mature trees and vegetation along the southern boundary and by intervening derelict buildings at Thorneydown Farm.

Visibility from the West:

Views from the west are largely restricted by the existing mature trees and dense vegetation running parallel along the western side of Moorhill Road (A27) which acts as a strong visual edge. No views are possible from the public footpath immediately to the east of Moorhill Gardens and the residential properties (bungalows) to the west of Moorhill Gardens. Fleeting / glimpsed views into the Site are possible from passing vehicles along the A27 via the Site entrance.

Summary

The Site is very well contained visually by significant vegetation and intervening topography with limited public access near the Site. There are no clear views of the Site beyond those experienced in very close proximity to the Site seen from the A27 immediately to the west and from the private residential property to the north (Thorneydown Barn & Bungalow). There are no clear public views of the Site from the south, east and north of the Site.

5.2 VISUAL RECEPTORS AND REPRESENTATIVE VIEWPOINTS

Potential visual receptors (VR) are described below, and the associated representative viewpoint (VP) locations are shown in Appendix A, Viewpoints Location Plan. Photographic Viewpoint Sheets are found in Appendix B.

VR1 – Receptors using the A27:

- Vehicular traffic and possibly cyclists travelling along Moorhill Road (A27).
- Typical view represented by VP7.

VP7 illustrates a close-range view taken from the entrance to the Site and affords a limited view of the Site at this location. However, most views would be fleeting / glimpsed only experienced from passing vehicles along a very short section of the road (c.40m) with the visual focus likely to be on the destination ahead.

VR2 – Residential property at Thorneydown Barn & Bungalow:

- Views from residential property / private garden.
- Typical view represented by VP8.

There are numerous windows and a conservatory along the southern aspect of the property that currently overlook the golf course. The existing boundary is weak in visual terms and largely defined by a timber post and rail fence.

5.3 POTENTIAL VISUAL RECEPTORS - SUMMARY

From the description of the visual receptors above, the potential visual receptors to be considered are summarised as:

Receptor
VR1: Receptors using the A27.
VR2: Residential property at Thorneydown Barn & Bungalow.

6 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

6.1 SITE LAYOUT

The Proposed Development would be located centrally within the Site and is explained within the accompanying Design and Access Statement (TMF Architecture). The Landscape Masterplan is included in Appendix C.

In summary, the development comprises the following:

- Retention of existing trees and vegetation along the Site boundaries and within the Site except for those identified for removal in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
- A two-storey clubhouse building set back c.83m from the western boundary (Moorhill Road) and located towards the centre of the Site.
- A dedicated 84no. space car park area located to the front of the building (west) with a secure golf cart storage area along the southern edge of the car park.
- A small chipping and putting green area to the west of the car park (c.600m²).
- An outdoor terraced area forms an integral part of the building to the east.
- Widening / minor realignment of the existing access road along the northern edge of the Site to accommodate access.
- A drainage attenuation pond and wildflower area are proposed within the eastern half of the Site.
- A new native buffer planting area is proposed to the north of the access road to reinforce this edge and screen views from Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow residential property to the north.
- Simple stone-filled gabions to accommodate localized level changes.

The use of visually recessive and coordinated colours are proposed materials for the clubhouse and retaining walls that draw cues from rural architecture; creating a colour palette that is subtle and understated with a mix of timber and dark grey standing seam zinc cladding. A green sedum roof is proposed on the central part of the structure. The clubhouse will therefore sit comfortably within the existing landscape.

The form and massing of the proposed clubhouse has been designed to provide visual interest and to respond sensitively to the undulating landscape of the golf course itself. This approach assists in reducing the height of the building with the height of the building up to c.8.2m above the proposed finished ground levels.

No significant level changes across the Site are proposed. The intention is to largely work with the prevailing gently sloping topography of the Site with the building and outdoor terrace responding to its proposed setting.

6.2 SITE ACCESS

Access to the Site would be via the existing entrance off Moorhill Road (A27). No existing public rights of ways would be affected by the development.

6.3 BUILDING DESIGN AND ELEVATIONS

Details of the proposed clubhouse are shown on the architectural drawings provided by TMF Architecture that accompany this application (Appendix C).

6.4 LIGHTING

A lighting strategy has been designed in accordance with best practice to minimise impact on bat populations and to minimise light spill. Minimal, uni-directional and low spill lighting would be used within the Site and along the new access road. Only narrow spectrum light sources, low-pressure sodium or LED lights would be used within the Site. Lights and associated fittings would be suitably designed and specified to ensure light spill and reflectance is minimised and no notable increase in lighting on the retained perimeter vegetation would arise as a result of the proposals.

6.5 EXISTING VEGETATION

The Site contains several established trees and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment accompanies the planning application. Mature trees are to be retained where possible with Proposed Development and surfacing measures carefully considered to avoid impact on tree root protection measures.

Trees on the southeast boundary provide useful separation between the site and the adjacent property to the south east. Occasional trees further into the golf course are large and give the landscape some maturity of character. Tree species, sizes and conditions vary however and few of the trees have individual amenity value because of their mutual proximity and the density of the lower-level shrubby foliage which screens views into and out of the site.

The trees along the western and southern boundaries create a good degree of enclosure and separation from the road and neighbouring land. Except where identified, the proposal is for all these trees to be retained and protected during development.

The AIA (Mulberry - Tree Management Consultants) shows trees in a range of conditions, with several BS 5837 Category C and U trees. The usual recommendation for trees assessed as Category U is removal; and trees of Category C may be removed, but if retained, should not be an undue or unreasonable constraint on development. For this Site there are several trees T1208 to T1213, T1215 and T1218 within the group along Moorhill Road that are in poor condition (Category U) and should be removed. Two Category U trees within the southern group, T1227 and T1233, would also need to be removed.

Overall, the AIA considers that there would be no impact on visual amenity as a result of this tree management work and that there would be no significant harm to retained trees resulting from the Proposed Development.

6.6 LANDSCAPE STRATEGY

Refer to the Landscape Masterplan which illustrates the proposals (Appendix C).

In summary, the landscape strategy for the Site has been developed to achieve the following objectives:

- The careful integration and arrangement of the Proposed Development within the existing landscape framework of the Site including the retention of existing trees along the Site boundaries.
- The creation of a landscape buffer zone comprising native tree and shrub planting to the north of the Site to reinforce this edge and mitigate views from the residential property (Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow) to the north.
- The creation of species-rich meadow grassland marginal areas associated with an attenuation pond to the east of the proposed clubhouse.
- The use of visually recessive and complementary colours and finishes for the building.
- The use of decorative and porous surfacing materials for the proposed car park area.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed landscape strategy for the Site would help to achieve good integration of the Proposed Development within its landscape setting / framework and effectively mitigate views of the development from publicly accessible areas over the long term.

7 LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

7.1 OVERVIEW

The Landscape Baseline (Section 4) identified the following potential Landscape Receptors to be taken forward for further assessment:

POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE RECEPTORS - SUMMARY

Receptor
LR1: Local Landscape Character
LR2: Soils
LR3: Vegetation on Site
LR4: Land Use and Built Form
LR5: Access and Circulation
LR6: Settlement Gap

These are described in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 LR1: EFFECTS ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Having considered the characteristics of the landscape as a whole, the value of the Site and its context is assessed as **medium value**; having valued components or landscape/townscape of moderate importance and rarity typically of regional or local scale.

Susceptibility & Value is judged to be **medium sensitivity**, with the landscape character / component tolerant to the nature of the change proposed; having the potential to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

It is considered that there would be no landscape or visual effects upon statutory designations as a result of the Proposed Development, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the setting of any Listed Buildings / heritage assets.

The Site is not located within an ecologically designated area.

There are no views possible from PRow's.

Seen within the context of the Site, the Proposed Development would not cause any loss to the defining characteristics of the Landscape Character Area (LCA) described in Section 3.4 or introduce components not considered uncharacteristic of the surrounding landscape.

It is considered that the proposals would cause minimal damage to the landscape in that they would have little effect on the overall landscape character within the Study Area, and incorporate measures for mitigation that would balance any likely adverse effects which are summarised below:

- Would maintain and reinforce the well contained and intimate character of the Site by retaining most existing trees and vegetation and introduce new native structure planting to the north of the Site.
- Very limited visual influence of the Site on the wider publicly accessible landscape context by virtue of its well contained nature.
- Would largely maintain the existing sense of place associated with the wider 'designed' golf course landscape context.

It is therefore judged that the Proposed Development, allowing for the suite of landscape mitigation measures proposed, would have no significant effects upon the existing landscape character. The magnitude of effect is assessed as low adverse resulting in an overall slight adverse effect; the proposals would cause minimal damage to the landscape component in that they will cause very slight loss or very slight adverse change to that component.

7.3 LR2: EFFECTS ON SOILS

It is understood that existing soils would be retained on Site and used for the proposed landscape mitigation / enhancement measures described in Section 6, helping to retain the existing soil's characteristics.

Overall, **no adverse effects** on Soils resulting from these changes are predicted.

7.4 LR3: EFFECTS ON EXISTING VEGETATION

The development would result in the loss of a small number of poor-quality trees (Category U) which are proposed to be removed for tree management / safety reasons. Some management / cutting back of existing dense shrub vegetation is proposed along the western boundary to accommodate the proposed car park.

Overall, **no adverse effects** on Existing Vegetation resulting from these changes are predicted.

7.5 LR4: EFFECTS ON LAND USE & BUILT FORM

The development would result in the loss of a small part of the golf course that is not currently used although a large part of the Site would be used for landscape mitigation and enhancement purposes. Of the 1.1Ha of the Site area, approximately 0.65Ha would comprise retained trees and vegetation and species-rich meadow including the attenuation basin.

The proposed clubhouse building as described in Section 6.1 has been carefully designed to break up the massing and scale of the building to achieve good integration within its landscape setting. It would be positioned to respect the existing line of built development and nestled between existing residential properties to the north and the derelict buildings of Thorneydown Farm to the south. The proposed

clubhouse would be domestic in scale and be well set back within the Site. There would be no intervisibility between the residential properties on Moorhill Gardens to the west of Moorhill Road.

Overall, a **low adverse effect** on Land Use and Built Form resulting from these changes are predicted, where the development proposals will have a slightly detrimental effect on the character of the scene.

7.6 LR5: EFFECTS ON ACCESS & CIRCULATION

With respect to access and circulation, no existing roads or public rights of way would be affected by the proposals.

7.7 LR6: EFFECTS ON THE SETTLEMENT GAP

It is considered that the nature of the Proposed Development would not result in coalescence or impact in any way on the perceived 'sense of separation' between the settlements of Hedge End and West End. The Site is well contained by established trees, woodland infrastructure, and the existing landform to create a discrete geographical area in a small corner of the existing golf course.

This is clearly demonstrated by the very localised and limited visual influence of the Site with very few visual receptors likely to experience any adverse effects resulting from the development with no 'significant' adverse effects predicted in landscape or visual terms.

In this context, it is judged that any change resulting from the Proposed Development would not detract from the overriding sense of landscape character likely to be experienced from publicly accessible areas or diminish or 'erode' any sense of separation between West End and Hedge End.

It is considered this approach would be supportive of the Settlement Gap function and would not undermine the '*physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements*' or introduce uncharacteristic features (not already present within the context of the Site and would relate positively to both the western edge (A27 Moorhill Rd) and the wider Boundary Lakes Golf Course landscape to the east.

8 VISUAL ANALYSIS

8.1 VIEWPOINT ANALYSIS

Views of the Site are divided into two broad types:

- Close range: Views up to 300m of the site boundary
- Middle distance: Views 300-2000m from the site boundary

No Long-Distance views of the Site (over 2km distance) are possible.

The visual analysis was carried out from a range of publicly accessible points in the surrounding landscape to establish the possible extent of visual influence of the Proposed Development.

While public views are generally given more weight due to the greater number of people likely to experience the view, private / not publicly accessible locations have also been considered using a combination of desktop study and observation from the nearest publicly accessible location.

It should be noted that the assessment work was undertaken during the 'winter' season and therefore represent a worst-case scenario.

For viewpoint locations refer to drawing no. J00656-007, a copy of which is found within Appendix A. Refer to Appendix B for Photographic Viewpoint Sheets.

Findings of the visual analysis are summarised below.

8.1.1 Overview

Overall, the Site is very well contained visually by the strong framework of mature trees and vegetation, dense broadleaved woodland and the nature of the Site's topography. This assessment reflects the description included in the Landscape Character Area 11: M27 Corridor (Eastleigh Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment) which states:

'The surrounding golf course is at odds with the general landform/pattern, however, blocks of woodland serve to reduce its impact'.

The visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development are therefore restricted as a result of the limited visibility associated with intervening topography and vegetation, as well as some existing development within and surrounding the Site and its landscape context.

No views of the Site would be possible from the publicly accessible Telegraph Woods to the north.

No views would be possible from any commercial properties.

There is no intervisibility between Listed Buildings and the Site. No views are possible from the scheduled monuments within Telegraph woods to the north due to intervening vegetation and topography.

No views are predicted from Public Rights of Way (PRoW). The nearest PRoW is in proximity to the Site's western boundary (to the west of Moorhill Road); however, views are restricted by dense shrub vegetation and trees along the length of this section of the route.

Residential properties:

The only residential property likely to experience effects resulting from the Proposed Development is Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow located c.50m to the north of the Site. The property would overlook the development across part of the golf course (10th hole). Currently, there is a weak boundary here defined largely by a post and rail fence. It is understood that the occupier has been consulted on the proposals. Native structure planting is proposed along the Site's northern boundary to reinforce this edge and create more enclosure to the Proposed Development in the interests of visual amenity.

No effects are predicted on other nearby residential properties including the new residential development at Holmes Manor to the north of Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow and those located to the west of Moorhill Road at Moorhill Gardens. Moorhill Gardens is a planned 20th Century estate comprising detached bungalows which are visually separated from the Site by dense trees and vegetation to the west of Moorhill Road.

8.1.2 Potential Visual Receptors Summary

The assessment has identified the following potential visual receptors:

Receptor
VR1: Receptors using Moorhill Road (A27)
VR2: Residential property at Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow to the north of the Site.

These are described in more detail in the following sections.

8.1.3 VR1: Receptors Using Moorhill Road (A27)

The Site lies adjacent to Moorhill Road (A27) with the Site entrance (existing) coming directly off this road.

Susceptibility & Value is judged to be **low to medium sensitivity**, and likely to be experienced by viewers whose focus is primarily on the activity in which they are involved and not on the landscape setting and / or whose view may be transitory.

There is no footpath along Moorhill Road along this section of the road.

The car park area would be located to the front of the Site but set back behind existing dense vegetation, with the clubhouse located to the south of the existing access road and set back c.83m into the Site. Such an arrangement would serve to largely restrict external views of the development; with views across the golf course albeit glimpsed / fleeting from passing vehicles largely uninterrupted.

Overall, it is considered that the Proposed Development would have a **low adverse magnitude of effect**, where the development proposals will have a slightly detrimental effect on the character of the scene

causing, at worse, a **very slight adverse** significance of effect on road users at Year 1 reducing to **neutral** effect as the proposed mitigation planting establishes and develops in the medium to long-term. Any such views experienced would be incidental along the generally contained road corridor with the visual focus along this section being more on the destination ahead, and for a very short section only.

No adverse effects are predicted beyond this distance.

8.1.4 VR2: Residential Property at Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow

There is no boundary definition along the northern edge of the Site which currently forms part of the wider golf course (10th hole). Currently, the Thorneydown Barn and Bungalow boundary is very open and defined by a post and rail fence.

Susceptibility & Value is judged to be **high sensitivity**, and likely to be experienced by viewers within gardens and living areas of residential properties (rooms normally occupied during waking / daylight hours).

Overall, it is considered that the development proposals would have a **medium-low adverse** magnitude of effect where the development proposals would have an appreciably detrimental effect on the character of the scene causing a **moderate adverse** significance of effect.

It is understood that the resident of this property has been consulted on the proposals which have evolved to accommodate an 3m wide native landscape buffer zone just to the north of the Site boundary (within the golf course) to mitigate views of the development from the property; effectively screening lower-level views of the proposed car park by Year 7 as the planting establishes. It is predicted that any such effects would continue to reduce further as the proposed mitigation measures continue to develop and mature in the medium to long term (Year 15 onwards).

9 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

9.1 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

In **visual terms**, it is considered that the Site has the potential to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without causing any significant adverse visual effects. There is very limited visibility of the Site with views often restricted to close-range only (within 300m distance) by existing trees and vegetation, topography and existing development or a combination of these. This is demonstrated by the very limited number of visual receptors identified.

Although it is considered that the development would be more appreciable in winter from the close-range views identified in the short-term, this is predicted to lessen as the proposed landscape mitigation measures establish and provide more effective screening; especially along the Site's northern edge as a result of the proposed mitigation planting to reinforce this edge.

In **landscape terms**, it is considered that the Site has the potential to accommodate the nature of the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

The scale of the proposed clubhouse building is domestic in scale with the proposed building being a maximum height of c.8.2m and set back towards the centre of the Site.

No significant trees would be removed. Importantly, the existing framework of existing trees and vegetation along the Site boundaries would be maintained and enhanced through additional on-site native tree and shrub planting with selective management where appropriate.

It is considered that the nature of the development would not change nor have a significant effect upon the landscape and visual resources identified.

In conclusion, the proposals have evolved to ensure that the development is carefully integrated within its landscape setting to minimise potential impacts through its careful siting and configuration, and to provide a range of mitigation measures as an integral part of the development.

Whilst the Proposed Development would result in a change to the character of the Site itself, which is unavoidable, this assessment finds no reasons why the change resulting from the Proposed Development should be found to be so harmful as to be unacceptable in terms of the effect on the landscape character or visual amenity of the wider area.

10 REFERENCES

Map References

- 1:25,000 Ordnance Survey map.
- 1:10,000 Ordnance Survey map.

General Document References

- Landscape Institute & Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; (2013); Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition.
- Landscape Institute: Landscape Advice Note 01/11, Photography and Photomontage in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Core Planning Documents

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Department for Communities and Local Government: Sept 2023.
- Local Plan: Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036).

Landscape Character Assessments & Associated Documents

- National Character Area (NCA) 128 - South Hampshire Lowlands (Natural England).
- The Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment (2012).
- Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough (2011).

Website references

- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC). Web link - <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/> Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning.
- Historic England Map Search.
- Map of Public Rights of Way, Hampshire County Council.
- Google Maps.
- Bing Maps.
- Hantsweb.