

Hi Gregg,

I have been asked to provide landscape comments on this permission-in-principle application.

I have not had the chance to visit the site but have viewed on-line images.

The site lies within designated Countryside, so the proposals would be contrary to Strategic Policy S5, (New development in the Countryside). There is therefore an in-principle landscape objection to this form of development unless an acceptable justification for a departure from Planning Policy can be made. Policy S5 restricts development in the Countryside principally in order to maintain its rural character and to limit urbanisation.

I have been made aware that recently the site has been cleared of the majority of vegetation and has had fencing erected around it and hardstanding put down. I understand that there is on-going enforcement action to see the site restored to its original state, which I support.

Although the site lies close to the south-eastern edge of Hedge End, it is separated from existing urban development by a number of open fields. The wider setting of the site, especially to the south and east, is of open Countryside. Although there are some occasional dwellings and small holdings along Tanhouse Lane, overall the road has a rural 'green and leafy' character. It is worth noting that the vast majority of the existing dwellings are located on the southern side of Tanhouse Lane. Along the most easterly section of the Lane, there is no development to the north of the road.

The site occupies a relatively elevated position (it lies opposite 'Hilltop Cottage') which may increase potential visual impact.

The submitted site layout plan by Pro Vision illustrates the relatively disconnected and isolated position of the site, with open fields to either side.

Bearing in mind the setting of the site and its relatively elevated position as described above, any development on this site would inevitably have an urbanising effect on the Countryside and would not maintain and enhance its rural character.

The site is not suitable for development because of the landscape harm that would result. The introduction of a dwelling within open Countryside could not fail to have significant landscape impact. The development would have an unavoidable adverse visual impact on views from Tanhouse Lane and possibly from wider viewpoints. The landscape character along Tanhouse Lane would be negatively impacted by the development.

I cannot foresee any acceptable justification for a departure from Policy S5, and therefore maintain an in-principle landscape objection to the proposal.

I trust these landscape comments are helpful but if you have any queries do get in touch.

KR Tim

Tim Griffin

Landscape Consultant

Working on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council

Mobile: 07974 900280