

LAND AT DENHAM'S CORNER

LANDSCAPE & VISUAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

MAY 2025 | DD621_LVIA | FINAL





Prepared by:

Deacon Design Ltd
Southern Office
12a The Square
Wickham
Hampshire
PO17 5JQ

01329 557820

info@deacondesign.co.uk
www.deacondesign.co.uk

Written by: Michal Nowak

DD Ref: DD621_LVIA

Document status: Final

Date: 23 May 2025

Checked by: Phil Deacon

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	LVIA Methodology	3
3	Landscape Planning Context	5
4	Landscape Baseline	11
5	Visual Baseline	21
6	Proposed Development and Mitigation Measures.....	24
7	Assessment of Landscape Effects	27
8	Assessment of Visual Effects.....	31
9	Summary and Conclusions	37
10	References.....	39

Appendices

Appendix 1	Glossary of LVIA Terms
Appendix 2	LVIA Methodology

Supporting Figures

PL01	Site Location
PL02	Designations
PL03	Landscape Character
PL04	Viewpoint Locations
VP01A – VP15A	Viewpoints 1 – 15 'Winter' Views (single images - scaled)
VP01B – VP15B	Viewpoints 1 – 15 'Summer' Views (single images - scaled)
VP01C – VP15C	Viewpoints 1 – 15 (contextual panoramas for reference)

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Deacon Design Ltd has been commissioned by Southern Strategic Land to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) of the proposed development at Land at Denham's Corner (north of Snakemoor Lane) in Horton Heath (further referred to as 'the Site'), to accompany a planning application for the Site.
- 1.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of up to 150 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, sustainable travel hub including parcel lockers and electric vehicle charging points for visitors, with associated vehicular access off Snakemoor Lane, a shared pedestrian and cycle access off Snakemoor Lane, a shared pedestrian and cycle access off Botley Road, associated infrastructure, public open space and play area, hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, sustainable urban drainage systems and provision for biodiversity net gain.
- 1.3 The location and context of the Site are shown in Figure **PL01**.

2 LVIA Methodology

Guidance and approach

- 2.1 The LVIA follows the methodology of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (GLVIA3) published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment in 2013. Whilst the GLVIA3 provides the general principles of the assessment of landscape and visual effects, the detailed assessment criteria are prepared by an assessor and are tailored to the development' nature and type.
- 2.2 A glossary of LVIA terms is provided for reference in **Appendix 1**.
- 2.3 The detailed methodology used in this LVIA, including the criteria for assessing the sensitivity and magnitude of landscape and visual impacts and the significance of effects, is provided in **Appendix 2**.
- 2.4 In accordance with the GLVIA3, the LVIA focuses only on those effects which are material for the planning application. As such, areas of the surrounding landscape which may provide views of the Site but are located too far away to receive any substantial change in views are discounted and not assessed in the LVIA.

LVIA Process

- 2.5 In the LVIA, the overall approach to the identification and assessment of landscape and visual effects is set out as follows:
- Determine the scope of the assessment;
 - Collate baseline information for landscape and visual receptors, including completing desk study research and undertaking field-based survey work;
 - Review the proposed development and identify the likely impacts of the proposed development (enabling specific judgments to be made on sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors);
 - Establish the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors (balancing judgments on susceptibility and value);
 - Determine the magnitude of impacts (balancing judgments on size/scale, duration and reversibility); and
 - The appraisal of landscape and visual effects through a balanced approach and clear description of judgments on sensitivity and magnitude.

Site Visits

- 2.6 The first site visit focusing on the LVIA issues was undertaken on 4 April 2023 when all baseline views in were recorded in good weather conditions with excellent visibility. At the date of the site visit foliage has not yet appeared on trees and shrubs and those views are considered the worst-case scenario in terms of the Site visibility in the surrounding landscape (they are further referred to as 'winter' views).
- 2.7 The second LVIA site visit was carried out on 11 September 2024 to record views from the 15 viewpoints selected for the LVIA in 2023, this time in 'summer' conditions (views with foliage, when vegetation provides most screening).

Scope of the Assessment and Study Area

- 2.8 The preliminary study area was initially set at approximately 2km from the Site, including the surrounding settlements of Horton Heath, Hedge End and Boorley Green.
- 2.9 Following the visual survey, the preliminary study area was slightly reduced due to the combination of screening factors, such as topography, built form and vegetation around the Site. Due to the limited visual envelope, it was concluded that the area where material landscape and visual effects would occur would be much smaller than the preliminary study area.
- 2.10 The final study area is defined by map extents in Figures **PL02** to **PL04**.

Assumptions and Limitations

- 2.11 It is assumed that the construction phase of the proposed development on Site would take up to 3 years (short-term) and that it would be phased. The phasing details are not known at this stage.
- 2.12 The assessment of operational effects is undertaken with the assumption that all proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature and all proposed development is operational.

3 Landscape Planning Context

Introduction

- 3.1 The development Site lies entirely within the Borough of Eastleigh, as shown in Figure PL02.
- 3.2 Landscape and other relevant designations relevant to this appraisal are discussed in the landscape baseline.
- 3.3 The proposed development including built environment and landscape proposals should be prepared in line with the relevant planning policy. The following legislation, planning policy and guidance provide the legislative and planning framework for the proposed development within the Site, where there is relevance to landscape and visual matters.

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

- 3.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in December 2024 and it sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.
- 3.5 Section 12 of the NPPF, **Achieving well-designed and beautiful places**, states in paragraph 131 that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve, that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that good design creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
- 3.6 Paragraph 135 goes on to explain how planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

'a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site 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

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁵¹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.¹

- 3.7 It goes on to say in paragraph 136 that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined (unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate), that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees.
- 3.8 Paragraph 140 also states that local planning authorities should ensure that relevant planning conditions refer to clear and accurate plans and drawings which provide visual clarity about the design of the development.
- 3.9 Section 15 on the NPPF, **Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment**, states at in paragraph 187 that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 188 of the NPPF states:
- 'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (MN note: now referred to as National Landscapes) which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues'.²*
- 3.10 The emphasis in this policy is, therefore, for protection to be commensurate with status, with protection focused on landscapes of an elevated status.

National Planning Policy Guidance

The revised National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) supports the NPPF and the key section relevant to the LVIA is Landscape. This section sets out the importance of strategic policies for the conservation and enhancement of landscapes and the need to identify

¹ NPPF (2024), pp. 39-40

² Ibid., p. 54

special characteristics of local landscapes supported by proportionate evidence. Where appropriate, landscape character appraisals can be prepared to complement Natural England's National Character Area profiles and a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal can be used to demonstrate the likely effects of a proposed development on the landscape.

Local Planning

- 3.11 The Site is subject to policies within the existing Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, which was adopted on 25 April 2022. The Local Plan sets out the policies and plans to guide future development to 2036. It is used to determine planning applications in the Borough and replaces the 'saved' policies in the Adopted Local Plan 2001-2011.
- 3.12 There are no Neighbourhood Plans relevant to the Site.

Local Plan Policy

- 3.13 The summary of key policies within the Local Plan relevant to the landscape and visual considerations in this LVIA are set out below.
- 3.14 Strategic policy S5, New development in the countryside – this policy states that a new development should 'avoid adverse impacts on the rural, woodland, riparian or coastal character, the intrinsic character of the landscape including the avoidance of adverse landscape impacts on areas adjoining national parks and their settings, the significance of heritage assets and on the biodiversity of the area'³.
- 3.15 Strategic policy S9, Green infrastructure – the policy sets out the EBC requirements for Green Infrastructure (GI) provision for new development and across the Borough in general:
- '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 provision of:*
- a. landscape scale strategic links across the Borough boundary, to and between the Borough's settlements, the countryside, the coast, and the major areas of open space including the country parks (see strategic policy S12);*
 - b. interlinked publicly accessible open space through new and existing development including for example formal sports facilities and informal amenity spaces and cemeteries (see policies DM32-DM34, Chapter 5 and detailed proposals in Chapter 6);*
 - c. green infrastructure incorporated into all new development with multifunctional spaces connected by primary, secondary and tertiary green links;*

³ Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (EBLP) 2016-2036, p. 16

- d. 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;*
- e. green stepping stones such as street trees, green roofs and walls, pocket parks and urban copses (see policy DM1, Chapter 5);*
- f. connected habitats linking the network of designated sites and existing priority habitats, taking account of the Hampshire ecological network map (see policy DM11, Chapter 5);*
- g. incorporation of historic buildings and landscapes, including historic parks and gardens within the wider Green Infrastructure to protect their setting (see policy DM12, Chapter 5); and*
- h. opportunities for local food growing including allotments, community orchards and farms (see policies DM32 to DM34, Chapter 5 and detailed proposals in Chapter 6).⁴*

3.16 Policy DM1, General criteria for new development – this policy sets out general criteria for new development including⁵:

- No unacceptable impact on residential amenities of both new and existing residents, the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast, biodiversity and/or significance of heritage assets.
- Making efficient use of the site, maximising opportunities to increase density and having regard to potential development opportunities on adjoining land.
- Taking full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood.
- Not involving the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area.
- Include a landscape scheme covering the design and layout of external space.
- Protecting and enhancing public rights of way and providing fully connected green infrastructure.
- Providing satisfactory management arrangements for all landscape, green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement.

3.17 Policy DM11, Nature conservation – this policy sets out EBC requirements regarding nature conservation. Since no national designations are located within the study area, only the General Approach and relevant sections related to Local Designations are quoted.

'General Approach

⁴ EBLP, pp. 47-48

⁵ Edited from EBLP, pp. 59-60

1. The Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers, and will determine planning applications, to:

a. protect, conserve and enhance all:

i. international, national and local nature conservation designations; and

ii. networks of natural habitats and features, including the Local Ecological Network, Priority Biodiversity Areas and Priority Biodiversity Links, watercourses, wetland complexes, woodland trees, and trees and hedgerows important to biodiversity and local character;

and facilitate their adaptation to climate change wherever possible;

b. assist in achieving national, county and local biodiversity targets as set out in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs);

c. seek a net gain of biodiversity on all development sites (including sites for redevelopment) through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing and provision of new habitats and features of nature conservation interest compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough, having regard to local geodiversity and soils; and

d. contribute to major elements of the PfSH Green Infrastructure Strategy and other strategies for the provision and enhancement of multifunctional green infrastructure including green routes, ecological networks and biodiversity enhancements (see strategic policy S9).

National and Local Designations

4. Development will not be permitted if it is likely (either individually or in combination with other developments) to have a direct or indirect adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) as shown on the policies map (or on a more recent plan provided by the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre) unless it can be demonstrated that:

a. there are no alternative solutions;

b. the adverse effects are unavoidable;

c. measures are taken to mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for the adverse effects;

d. there is an overall biodiversity net gain; and

e. if there are any residual adverse effects which cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated, the benefits of the development must clearly outweigh the adverse effects

*on the nature conservation value of the site and any broader impacts on national and local designations.'*⁶

- 3.18 The Site is not covered by a Settlement Gap designation. The most recent review of Settlement Gap policy in the Eastleigh Borough was carried out in 2020 and the site was not included in the nearby Settlement Gap F (Hedge End, Horton Heath, Boorley Green), as it is not required to maintain the sense of separation between these settlements. This is due to its location and the surrounding character, including its contained nature. The Settlement Gap policy is therefore not applicable to the proposed development.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Trees and Development SPD

- 3.19 This SPD adopted in April 2022 was developed to outline EBC's approach to trees in relation to development. Its aim is to ensure that trees are fully considered as part of the planning process, so that the multiple benefits of trees can be experienced by the Borough of Eastleigh, and by existing and future residents.

Character Area Appraisal for Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath

- 3.20 This SPD was prepared in 2008 by Roger Evans Associated for the EBC. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to development control staff and prospective planning applicants to ensure that new development in Eastleigh Borough is appropriate to its surroundings and helps to retain the character that gives each area its identity. Whilst the Site is not located in any of the character area appraisals, the document provides useful contextual information on the identity and urban fabric of Horton Heath.

Quality Places SPD

- 3.21 This SPD adopted in November 2011 was designed to provide guidance on the Council's expectations for the design of new development (both residential and non-residential) in the borough.

⁶ Edited from EBLP, pp. 78-80

4 Landscape Baseline

Introduction

- 4.1 This section of the LVIA establishes the landscape baseline for the proposed development.
- 4.2 The GLVIA3 recommends that LVIA's are 'proportionate' and focus on those impacts that are likely to be material in planning terms.
- 4.3 During our initial research and following field work we have found that most of the landscape within the study area will not be directly or indirectly impacted upon by the proposed development. Therefore, a further 'sifting' of landscape receptors that have the potential to be affected by the development was necessary. Landscape receptors that will not be impacted by the proposed development or are likely to experience a barely perceptible impact will not be brought forward to the appraisal of sensitivity or significance of effects.
- 4.4 The landscape baseline section is structured as follows:
- Analysis of landscape and other designations that may have impact on the value of the landscape;
 - Analysis of Landscape Character Areas and/or Types with reference to existing landscape character appraisal studies;
 - Description of the landscape within the Site;
 - Appraisal of the landscape value of the receptors that have the potential to be affected by the proposed development and will be brought forward to the effects appraisal stage.

Designations

- 4.5 The landscape planning context within the study area is shown in Figure PL02.
- 4.6 All landscape, heritage, nature conservation and other designations relevant to landscape and visual considerations are set out below.
- 4.7 It is not the objective of this LVIA to specifically assess the effects on the setting of Listed Buildings, ecological and/or heritage assets, as this is undertaken in separate reports. Nonetheless, the presence of these designations/features can add to the value of the landscape as well as having value in their own right. This baseline appraisal seeks to obtain an understanding of heritage features only insofar as they contribute, or give an insight into, the character and value of the landscape of the Site and its context.

Landscape designations

- 4.8 There are no landscape designations within the study area.

Heritage designations

- 4.9 Two Listed Buildings are located within the study area:
- Grade II* Church of the Holy Cross (listing ref. 1350572); and
 - Grade II Barn at Little Snakemoor Farm (listing ref. 1391166).
- 4.10 A locally Listed Park and Garden is located along Botley Road, to the south of the Site.
- 4.11 There is no intervisibility between the Site and these heritage assets.

Nature conservation designations

- 4.12 The Site is not covered by any nature conservation designation, however, it is adjacent to the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), which covers the adjacent woodland, stream and associated wetlands.
- 4.13 An area of Ancient Woodland is adjacent to the north-western boundary of the Site.

Other Designations

- 4.14 There are no Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the Site. PRoW no 069/15/1 and 085/719/1 cross the land ownership boundary connecting Snakemoor Lane and Botley Road. Whilst several PRoW are present within the administrative boundaries of Eastleigh Borough, the District of Winchester (east of the Site) has a poor PRoW coverage within the study area and is largely inaccessible to the public, except local roads.
- 4.15 The Site is located adjacent to the Hedge End/Horton Heath/Boorley Green Strategic Gap F, which is bounded by Botley Road and extends to the west, as illustrated in Figure PL02.

Existing Landscape Character Appraisals

Introduction

- 4.16 The LVIA draws information on landscape character predominantly from field appraisal but also existing landscape character appraisal studies. The following documents have been considered:
- National Character Area Profiles;
 - Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment;
 - Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough; and
 - Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment.

- 4.17 The NCA Profiles are undertaken at the national level and provide guidance for communities regarding landscape character to help inform decision-making. They are integrated studies providing information on a broad range of factors. Due to the large scale of the NCAs and the local context of the proposed development, the information on NCAs is mainly contextual.
- 4.18 For this reason, the LVIA focuses on the county and local landscape character studies which provide far greater level of detail and are more relevant in relation to the scale of the proposed development.

National Character

- 4.19 The Site and the study area are located within the National Character Area (NCA) 128 South Hampshire Lowlands. This NCA is a low-lying plain with almost 18 per cent covered by woodland, of which almost half is designated ancient woodland, which is a legacy of Forest of Bere, a Royal Hunting Forest that covered that area. The area, although highly urbanised, has a considerable biodiversity interest. It is drained by several rivers.
- 4.20 The key characteristics of the NCA 128 are:
- *'Low-lying, undulating plain abutting the chalk downs to the north and the coastal plain and Southampton Water to the south. An underlying geology of open marine, estuarine and freshwater Tertiary gravels. Soils over much of the area are heavy and clayey with localised pockets of more freely draining soils on higher land.*
 - *Fast-flowing chalk rivers in wide, open valleys with watermeadows and riparian vegetation that provide valuable wildlife habitats for species such as breeding and overwintering birds, otter, water vole, Atlantic salmon, brown trout and the endangered, native whiteclawed crayfish.*
 - *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.*
 - *An intimate and enclosed field pattern with many small and irregular fields generally bounded by mixed-species hedgerows or woodland.*
 - *In parts, a very urban NCA dominated by the city and port of Southampton and other large towns such as Waterlooville and Havant. The more rural hinterland is characterised by small, loosely clustered or dispersed settlements, intermixed with isolated farmsteads.*

- *Fragmented by major transport links, including the M3 to London and the M27 to Portsmouth which cross the NCA.*⁷

County Character

- 4.21 On the County level, the Site is located within the LCA 2E: Forest of Bare West and Lowland Mosaic Small Scale LCT.
- 4.22 The LCA 2E Forest of Bare West has the following key characteristics:
- *'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.*
 - *Permanent pasture, plantations woodland and small holdings with secluded, heavily wooded, often ancient origin but replanted, away from the major towns.*
 - *This area is strongly associated with the Royal Forest of Bere, a hunting reserve that retains wooded and to a lesser extent, open commons, assart field and woodland patterns*
 - *Hedgerows often low but with individual spreading mature oaks, sometimes of ancient origin or lines of oak with no 'understory' hedge and occasionally isolated field specimens.*
 - *Extensive C.20th development, including urban expansion and infilling of common-edge settlements.*
 - *Historically, mixed settlement pattern of very low density, tending towards nucleation along streams and around heath scattered throughout the area.*
 - *Rich biodiversity, including woodland, heathland, grassland and wetland sites.*⁸
- 4.23 Large scale settlement expansion (e.g. Hedge End) is set out as one of the key forces for change acting on the landscape.
- 4.24 The Lowland Mosaic Small Scale LCT, which the Site is located within, is a 'wooded agricultural landscape comprising improved grassland and arable land with woodland, unimproved grassland and occasional heath associated habitats'⁹. The study confirms that visibility with other landscape types is reduced due to the LCT's low-lying nature and relatively high presence of woodland. Although the LCT is located 'close to large centres

⁷ Natural England, 2014, National Character Area Profile 128. South Hampshire Lowlands, page 6

⁸ Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment, 2012, Forest of Bare West, pp. 3-4

⁹ Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment, 2010, Lowland Mosaic Small Scale, page 3

of population of central southern Hampshire, the landscape is still very rural and valued as local countryside, visible from often heavily trafficked rural roads'.¹⁰

Local Character

- 4.25 Local landscape character, as defined by the Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough and Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment, is shown in Figure **PL03**.
- 4.26 On the local level, the Site is located within LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland, which is the only LCA within the Borough of Eastleigh that has potential to be affected by the proposed development.
- 4.27 Within Winchester District, the only LCA which may be affected by the proposed development is LCA23 Durley Claylands.
- 4.28 The LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland has the following key characteristics:

- *'Undulating landform with frequent low ridges;*
- *Medium size fields usually with good hedges and hedgerow trees rather than woodlands;*
- *Intrusive urban edges in some areas;*
- *Unmanaged or inappropriately managed agricultural land.'*¹¹

- 4.29 The area has the following description:

'4.129 The unifying characteristics of this predominantly agricultural landscape are the gentle undulation of the landform and the pattern of medium-size fields, generally bounded by good hedges with mature hedgerow trees. Small blocks of woodland and copses are dispersed throughout the area. Water courses are scattered through the character area. The northeast boundary of the character area is delineated by the River Hamble and associated Alder Carr woodland.

4.130 There is a network of narrow lanes and small farms which appear to date from the enclosure of land in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Views from within the area are generally to low wooded horizons.

4.131 There are a number of quite intrusive elements, notably the often prominent built edges of Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath that form the northern boundary and ribbon development along Allington Lane in the north, including a variety of poorly screened industrial sites. Chalcroft Distribution Park is an industrial site established sometime in the first half of the 20th century as a rail distribution park. It now serves as a road haulage distribution centre. Aside from its access onto Burnetts Lane in the southeast,

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 5

¹¹ Eastleigh Borough Council, December, 2011, Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough, page 104

it is surrounded on all sides by SINC's. The railway is a prominent feature at points, but the area extends beyond it to the southwest but visually significant ridge which divides it from the M27 Corridor (Area 11).

4.132 In the south, the influence of the built-up areas of Hedge End, Botley and Boorley Green is less strong than those to the north, by virtue of a denser tree cover and more accommodating landform. The settlements do however form parts of the boundary to the character area.

*4.133 Within the area there are two sub-areas which have their own distinctive appearance. In the north-east, area 9a is well-wooded with the woodland around Quobleigh pond and the parkland trees of the former Saviour Convent particularly conspicuous. In the south-east, area 9b has a partly-wooded parkland character with some dense treebelts.'*¹²

4.30 The LCA23: Durley Claylands has the following key characteristics:

- *'Relatively low lying, gently undulating landscape with a geology ranging from a narrow strip of Reading Beds and wider strip of London Clay in the north around Colden Common, Lower Upham, Durley Street and Bishop's Waltham to the mixed clays, sands and loams of Lower Bagshot Sand and Bracklesham Beds around Durley and Durley Mill.*
- *Land in northern part of character area drains into the Itchen, whilst that to the south drains into the Hamble.*
- *Numerous ponds, streams, springs, wells and associated wetland habitats and mills, particularly relating to the Hamble which originates in the area.*
- *Varied landscape of arable and pasture agriculture, copses (including ancient woodland) and scattered settlement, historically resulting from the clearance of the Forest of Bere woodland.*
- *Small irregular fields associated with informal and piecemeal enclosure cover much of the area, although fields with more regular boundaries associated with the 18th and 19th century parliamentary enclosure acts are found around Lower Upham and Colden Common.*
- *Hedgerow and woodland network dominated by oak, ash, hawthorn, hazel, and field maple. Woodland generally assarted, and river associated species along the River Hamble.*
- *Numerous ancient narrow winding lanes, except in areas of parliamentary enclosure where the roads are straight with wide verges and clipped hedges with standard oaks.*
- *Historic parkland including park pale associated with Marwell Manor and park lug associated with Bishop's Waltham Palace.*

¹² Eastleigh Borough Council, December 2011, Ibidem, pp. 99 and 101

- *Numerous scattered farms and dwellings centred around Durley, together with the nucleated clay- chalk spring-line settlements of Colden Common and Bishop's Waltham*
- *Buildings of contrasting ages, from the historic cores of Bishop's Waltham and Durley, to the high proportion of 19th and 20th century buildings in Durley Street, Colden Common and the outskirts of Bishop's Waltham.*^{13'}

Application Site and Site-Specific Landscape

- 4.31 The Site is bounded by Snakemoor Lane to the south, vegetation and wetlands to the east and north-east, and predominantly by woodland to the north-west and west. A short section of the Site's western boundary is adjacent to Botley Road. A small cluster of residential properties is located adjacent to the Site's south-western corner.
- 4.32 The Site comprises grazing land divided into large paddocks by low post and wire fencing, which is also present along Site boundaries. A hedgerow with two large oak trees delineates the Site's boundary to Snakemoor Lane, whilst the grazing fields themselves are open and do not contain any tree planting. Significant number of trees are located along the remaining Site boundaries, however, most of them are outside the Site boundary. The only exception is a small area of undesignated woodland which is included within the western part of the Site to accommodate the future pedestrian access to Botley Road.
- 4.33 The Site has gently sloping landform from its centre towards the boundary, with a steeper drop towards the watercourse and associated wetlands which are designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).
- 4.34 The Site is accessed from Snakemoor Lane. A small area of gravel and soil / equipment storage is located near the metal field gate to the Site.
- 4.35 In terms of the adjacent roads and connections, the Site lies in proximity to Denham's Corner roundabout (to the west) and two local B-roads; Botley Road and Snakemoor Lane. Public footpaths meander adjacent to and through the Site, providing connections to Horton Heath settlement and adjoining countryside. Footpaths to the east of the Site, across the wetlands are well used by recreational walkers.
- 4.36 Large areas of woodland and shrubs which wrap around the Site to the west, north and east creating enclosed character in those directions, however, the site opens up along Snakemoor Lane, where glimpses of gently undulating private countryside are possible up to a local ridge south of Little Snakemoor Farm.

¹³ Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment, pp. 238-239

Plate 1 The Site is adjoined by mature woodland to the north-west and west



Plate 2 Wetlands / ecologically sensitive area adjoin the Site to the east



Plate 3 The Site is very well screened but provides views towards the ridgeline along Stapleford Lane (private agricultural land at Little Snakemoor Farm)



Plate 4 Managed hedgerows and mature oak along Snakemoor Lane



Assessment of Landscape Value

- 4.37 The assessment of landscape value is made with reference to the criteria set out in the Appendix 2 Methodology, paragraph 1.14-1.17.

Landscape features within the Application Site

- 4.38 The Site is located in undesignated landscape in the countryside and contains no detractors. It is in good condition and its most valuable features are located adjacent to its boundaries, which include hedgerows and mature oaks with veteran status which are not only an ecological asset, but they are of high visual quality and positively contribute to the local amenity. They are an important local feature along Snakemoor Lane.
- 4.39 For the reasons above, **the value of the Site is raised to medium**, as whilst it is undesignated countryside, the value of the individual features and elements outlined above should be taken account of in the overall value rating.

LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland

- 4.40 The landscape value of this LCA within the study area is assessed as **high**. Whilst there are no landscape designations in this area, there are areas of nature conservation interest (adjacent Site of Nature Conservation Interest and Ancient Woodland) in the vicinity of the Site. The LCA is also used for recreation thanks to a relatively well-developed network of PRow. This landscape is in good condition and whilst the character area has perceptual/scenic quality typical of the wider countryside in this area, the scenic quality of the area around the Site is slightly elevated.

LCA23 Durley Claylands

- 4.41 The LCA is not designated for its landscape value but it is in good condition and has perceptual/scenic quality typical of the wider countryside. Within the study area it has little land designated for its ecological value, however, a Grade II* Listed Church adds to the local interest and value. Overall, the landscape value of this LCA within the study area is assessed as **medium**.

5 Visual Baseline

Introduction

- 5.1 The visual baseline seeks to establish the extent of the Site's visual envelope and to identify the visual receptors (groups of people) that may be affected by the proposed development. It analyses the nature of existing views experienced by visual receptors, the location from which they experience views and their value.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and Viewpoints

- 5.2 Due to combination of topography, small scale of the development and the surrounding built form resulting in the enclosed nature of the Site it was concluded that the preparation of a ZTV is not necessary to assess the visibility of the Site (visual envelope). Instead, a field survey was carried out.
- 5.3 To establish a visual envelope, we carried out a field survey on two occasions:
- First, on 4 April 2023, in good weather conditions and general visibility appropriate for the type of the assessed views. This site visit was carried out in 'winter' conditions, as foliage has only started appearing and the recorded panoramas represent the 'worst case' scenario in terms of Site visibility.
 - The second site visit was taken on 11 September 2024 to retake photographs from the selected views in 'summer' conditions, when visibility is reduced due to leaf cover.
- 5.4 Several representative and illustrative viewpoints have been selected to aid the appraisal of landscape and visual effects.
- 5.5 The viewpoints have generally been selected to be representative of the visual receptors within the study area and locations in the general vicinity of the viewpoint from which clear views of the proposed development may be obtained. The viewpoints therefore generally represent specific locations from which the maximum effect on landscape and visual receptors will be experienced. However, due to the very limited visibility of the Site, some viewpoints have been chosen to illustrate the restricted nature of visibility towards the Site (or no visibility in some cases).
- 5.6 Based on the foregoing broad visual appraisal, 15 viewpoints have been selected which will be used to aid the appraisal. All viewpoints were taken from public vantage points.

Visibility

- 5.7 To the north the Site is obscured from the wider landscape by existing woodland, which provides an impenetrable visual barrier. The PRoVV no 085/719/1 running through the adjacent Scorey's Copse (designated as Ancient Woodland) does not provide any views

of the Site and is represented by illustrative Viewpoint 10. The Site is also almost completely screened from the settlement of Horton Heath to the north – whilst in 'winter' conditions (no foliage present) the Site can be glimpsed from the Horton Heath residential settlement edge through vegetation, in reality, those glimpses are so limited that we consider them to be non-material for the visual amenity.

- 5.8 Viewpoints 11 and 12 represent views of the Site from the easternmost edge of the adjacent SINC and the PRoW no 069/15/1, to the north-east of the Site. The footpath is located on lower elevation than the Site and provides good views of the east and north-facing slopes within the Site, filtered by mature trees. Due to levels, the central and western parts of the Site are not visible from those locations.
- 5.9 To the east, the site is screened by a woodland belt and only glimpsed views are possible in the short distance from the PRoW 069/15/1, connecting Scoreseys Copse with Snakemoor Lane (see Viewpoint 13). Farther to the east, the Site becomes completely obscured by woodland, even in winter months, from Saints Barn Business Park (Viewpoint 14) and from the Holy Cross Church at Durley Road (Viewpoint 15).
- 5.10 The Site is visible from Snakemoor Lane, however, its peripheries are screened by a thick, mature hedgerow and landform. Views from Snakemoor Lane are represented by Viewpoints 1 and 2.
- 5.11 The development area within the Site is completely screened from the B3354 (Botley Road – Winchester Road). A sequence of views from this main local road to the west and south-west of the Site is available from Viewpoints 4 (Winchester Rd to the south), 3 (Denham's Corner roundabout) and 9 (Botley Road). However, the western Site boundary characterised by woodland is visible along Botley Road and represented by Viewpoint 9.
- 5.12 Viewpoints 5, 7 and 8 represent views from the local PRoW network to the west of the Site – views of the main part of the Site are screened by woodland, however, the Site boundary along Botley Road is visible.
- 5.13 Viewpoint 6 illustrates views from Bubb Lane, which also provides only views of the Site boundary along Botley Road with no views of the Site's interior.
- 5.14 Whilst the Site is also visible from the elevated farmland to the east, south of Little Snakemoor Farm, this land is private and viewpoints were recorded from it, only from the access track to the farm, at Snakemoor Lane. There are no views of the Site from any of the surrounding settlements, such as Hedge End or Boorley Green.
- 5.15 Overall, the Site is very well contained in the surrounding landscape. There are few PRoW with views of the Site. The best views of the Site are from the adjacent Snakemoor Lane.

Visual Receptor Groups

- 5.16 As part of the wider visual survey, it was found that, due to the topography of the area and other screening factors (predominantly vegetation around the Site), any material changes in views of the development beyond the extents of the visual envelope are unlikely. The appraisal therefore focuses on likely effects rather than unnecessarily assessing all visual receptors in the local area.
- 5.17 For the purpose of the baseline study, the following receptors were included as they were considered likely to be materially affected by the proposed development:
- Users of PRoW (VP 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13);
 - Motorists and cyclists on local roads (VP 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 14);
 - Pedestrians on local roads (VP 3, 4, 6, 9, 14);
 - Local residents (properties adjacent to the Site);
 - People at their place of work (VP 14);
 - Visitors to the Holy Cross Church and cemetery (VP 15).

Value of assessed views

- 5.18 With reference to the criteria for the assessment of value (see Appendix 2 Methodology, paragraph 1.33-1.34), most views identified in the study area have been assessed as having medium value, as they are not in a designated landscape, nor have outstanding condition or scenic quality to justify the highest value rating. However, views from the elevated Holy Cross Church, a Grade II* building and an important heritage asset with wide panoramic views of the surrounding countryside is assessed as having high value.
- 5.19 Whilst most views from Public Rights of Ways have average value typical of the surrounding countryside, views from the well-used PRoW 069/15/1 which runs through the adjacent SINC have slightly higher value than others due to its scenic value and a recognition as a local recreational destination.

6 Proposed Development and Mitigation Measures

- 6.1 This section outlines the proposed development and identifies the appropriate additional mitigation measures aimed at preventing, reducing or off-setting potential adverse impacts.

Primary vs additional mitigation

- 6.2 The proposed development has been designed in an iterative process and the location, footprint and height of the proposals reflect the initial discussions about the project's landscape and visual impact and the need for its adjustments to prevent, reduce or off-set those potential impacts. This is called primary (embedded) mitigation which is described in detail in the Design and Access Statement and shown on parameter plans.
- 6.3 In addition to the primary mitigation (overall development design), additional mitigation measures can be proposed to further prevent, reduce or off-set the potential landscape and visual impacts. These may include, for example, additional boundary planting which is not necessary from the planning or urban design perspective but can help mitigate potential adverse visual impact on certain visual receptors identified in the baseline.

Design Evolution and Proposed Development

- 6.4 The proposed development comprises up to 150 dwellings with associated vehicular access off Snakemoor Lane, a shared pedestrian and cycle access off Snakemoor Lane, a shared pedestrian and cycle access off Botley Road, associated infrastructure, public open space and play area, hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, sustainable urban drainage systems and provision for biodiversity net gain.
- 6.5 The housing mix includes 2-, 3-, and 4-bedroom houses, with a height not exceeding 8m.
- 6.6 The proposed development has been designed in an iterative process since its inception in late 2022 up to the completion of this LVIA report in May 2025.
- 6.7 Each step in the design process was preceded by an analysis of Site constraints and opportunities, including input from landscape architects, ecologists, drainage specialists, arborists, urban designers and planners, and followed by team discussion about the Site parameters and design.
- 6.8 The final design has taken account of the following key constraints and opportunities related to the potential landscape and visual impact:
- Presence of woodland adjacent to the western and northern Site boundary (including Ancient Woodland – Scorey's Copse to the north). The importance of the protection of those woodland areas was agreed at the early stages of the project.

- A local SINC / wetlands area to the east of the Site – this area recognised for its local ecological, landscape and recreational value has been considered throughout the design evolution process.
- Views in and out of the development Site – we have considered both the potential adverse impact on local landscape character and impact on visual amenity (predominantly users of PRoV and local roads). To minimise those, we have adjusted the quantum of development (lowering the housing numbers compared to the original, pre-app plans), its proposed massing, height and layout. The LVIA findings have also had influence on the proposed Site layout to ensure the development contains an appropriate amount of green open spaces and structural landscape to soften its impact views from the surrounding countryside and create a pleasant countryside development.
- Existing vegetation along Snakemoor Lane comprising hedgerows and mature trees, with two mature oaks (*Quercus robur*), with high landscape and amenity value. The proposed layout was adjusted to avoid any negative impact on the root protection areas of those important trees.

6.9 The above list of constraints and the resulting design decisions was discussed and incorporated into the final design (parameter plans and the proposed Site layout). Its key elements relevant to landscape and visual considerations include:

- A maximum 2.5 storey height of the proposed built form.
- Higher density in the western part of the Site, which is less sensitive from the visual perspective due to woodland screening and lower density along the eastern and southern Site boundaries, to create a softer development edge, well integrated into its context (Snakemoor Lane / countryside).
- A central green open space incorporating a children play area connected with Snakemoor Lane and POS along the eastern Site boundary by green avenues views across the Site.
- A 15 meters wide buffer between the adjacent woodlands' Root Protection Areas (RPA) and proposed development (20 meters from the Site boundary). The orientation of the adjacent dwellings is kept at varying angles to avoid negative impact on the woodland edge.
- A wide, green buffer along the eastern Site boundary to protect the adjacent SINC and provide recreational opportunities (POS). Buildings set back from the Site boundary to minimise visual impact on users of PRoV to the east, along the eastern edge of the wetlands.
- Swales and attenuation ponds along the eastern development boundary were developed primarily to improve drainage but they would also create an attractive landscape and ecological feature.
- Swales within the development.
- Creation of discreet and small green spaces within the development that would include tree planting and break down car parking areas -all to create a pleasant and

green development. Once the proposed tree planting matures, it would help absorb the development into the wooded background in views from the elevated landscape to the east (currently private farmland).

- A network of recreational footpaths along the eastern site boundary and a footpath connecting the development with Botley Road through the adjacent woodland.

Additional Mitigation of Construction Impacts

6.10 In addition to the primary mitigation measures, the following additional mitigation measures are proposed during construction of the scheme:

- Where possible, recycling as much soil on Site as possible to minimise the impact associated with construction vehicle traffic, including the movement of lorries in and out of the Site;
- Where possible, retaining and securing topsoil excavated during construction to re-use it during Site restoration (subject to its quality – to be confirmed during further Site investigations);
- Where possible, stockpiling of materials would be kept in visually discreet locations, such as areas screened by existing vegetation or built form;
- To safeguard the existing retained vegetation, tree protection zones would be created and fenced off to ensure that development would not encroach onto the root protection areas. Existing trees and hedges would be protected in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction;
- Construction and security lighting would be shielded, where possible, and directed downwards to minimise light pollution.

Additional Mitigation of Operational Impacts

6.11 All proposed landscape and visual mitigation measures are considered to be primary mitigation, as they are embedded in the design proposal. The proposed landscape strategy has been carefully designed to reflect the character of the Site but also its surroundings, presence of vegetation and location on the edge of an existing settlement. This primary mitigation also takes account of ecological and arboricultural input.

6.12 For all design details please see the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and development parameter plans, including Proposed Site Layout Rev P-00 (dwg no. 23063-0101) issued on 8 May 2025.

7 Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 7.1 This section of the report assesses landscape effects after implementation of all mitigation measures.

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

Landscape susceptibility to change

- 7.2 The susceptibility to change of the LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland within the study area is assessed as **medium**, as the proposed development type (residential housing) is already present within the surrounding landscape (for example the recently completed Boorley Green development, ribbon development along main roads or adjacent settlement edges) and the average capacity of this LCA to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.
- 7.3 Whilst the development would introduce built form in a rural part of this LCA, it is largely contained within its existing woodland envelope and physically and visually separated from the remaining areas of this receptor. The presence of key landscape features of value along the Site boundaries requires their protection and retention. However, the development is proposed predominantly on the grazing land within the Site, which is not a rare feature in this landscape area.
- 7.4 The susceptibility to change of the LCA23 Durley Claylands, a character area to the east of the Site lying entirely within Winchester District is assessed as **low**, as the proposed development type (residential housing) is already present in this landscape and there is no potential for any physical change to this landscape area (the Site is located outside its boundary). The LCA has high capacity to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.
- 7.5 The Site and the proposed development is visually and physically separated from most of this area by a woodland belt and vegetation along the watercourse to the east of the Site and would have a potential to visually affect only a small part of this character area – a relatively small area of private farmland to the south of Little Snakemoor Farm. The remaining part of this LCA, including all land to the north and east of Stapleford Lane would not have a potential to be affected by the proposed scheme.

Sensitivity of landscape receptors

- 7.6 Table 1 summarises the relevant landscape receptors within and around the Site that have the potential to be materially affected by the proposed development.

Table 1 Landscape receptors and sensitivity

Receptor	Sensitivity
LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland	High
LCA23 Durley Claylands	Medium

Construction Effects

LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland

- 7.7 The proposed development would cause both physical and perceptual impact on the Horton Heath Undulating Farmland LCA, which occupies the western part of the study area and covers the application Site.
- 7.8 During construction, the Site will be completely transformed and almost entirely occupied by construction except its peripheral landscape to east, which adjacent to the wetlands area and the woodland within the western part of the Site, which will be largely protected. Only individual trees may be removed to facilitate the proposed pedestrian footpath that would connect the Site with Botley Road.
- 7.9 Whilst some of the landscape features, such as trees or hedgerows predominantly along the Site boundary, will be retained and protected, the proposed additional construction mitigation measures cannot meaningfully limit the transformation of the existing development into a construction zone with all the associated equipment, materials storage and construction of buildings or earthworks.
- 7.10 However, in the wider landscape of the LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland, the construction impact will be relatively limited, as it will not affect the area's most valuable landscape features (woodland, trees, wetlands and boundary hedgerows would be protected).
- 7.11 The visibility of construction activities from this LCA would be very low due to the woodland wrapping around the Site. The only material exception would be temporary views of construction from the relatively small area of farmland to the south of Little Snakemoor Farm and east of the B3354, on the opposite side of Snakemoor Lane, and – only partially – from the wetlands to the east of the Site.
- 7.12 The magnitude of construction impact on the character of the LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland is assessed as **medium** (due to the addition of urbanising features to the rural landscape but also temporary nature of this effect and its limited geographical area) and the construction effect is assessed as **moderate adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.

LCA23 Durley Claylands

- 7.13 The construction of the proposed development would cause no physical impact on the Durley Claylands LCA, which lies entirely within the Winchester District. It would, however, cause some perceptual impact on this character area due to limited changes in views.
- 7.14 During construction, the application Site will be completely transformed into a construction zone but its visibility from this character area would be very low – construction activities would be only visible from a small area of private farmland around Little Snakemoor Farm, west of Stapleford Lane.
- 7.15 The magnitude of construction impact on the character of the LCA23 Durley Claylands is assessed as **low** (due to no physical impact on this landscape, very limited change in views from the westernmost peripheries of this area, temporary nature of this effect and its limited geographical area) and the construction effect is assessed as **minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.

Operational Effects

LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland

- 7.16 Once the development is operational, the application Site will be transformed from agricultural land to development. Whilst the nature of this change is adverse due to a localised urbanising effect of the development and the loss of an agricultural field of locally high scenic quality, the proposed development is designed to mitigate this adverse effect by setting its parameters within acceptable limits and by proposing a landscape-led layout with a number of improvements within the development and along its edges to help absorb the development into its context and create a pleasant, soft edge with recreational opportunities.
- 7.17 In particular, the proposed development would not materially affect the surrounding woodland and wetlands, which form an important part of the local landscape. The proposed buffer zones would enable these important landscape features to be retained and protected. The eastern boundary, recognised in the baseline as an important area for due to its visibility from Snakemoor Lane and from the wetlands, would be largely kept as a green open space with swales, play areas and recreational paths, to set the built form back from this boundary and provide a green edge to the scheme.
- 7.18 The boundary along Snakemoor Lane would feature low density housing with back gardens facing onto the road. This would set the built form back from the road and enhance the development boundary with planting.
- 7.19 Similarly to the construction phase, the operational development's visibility from this LCA would be very low due to the woodland wrapping around the Site. The only material

exception would be views of the proposed built form from the relatively small area of farmland to the south of Little Snakemoor Farm and east of the B3354, on the opposite side of Snakemoor Lane, and – only partially – from the wetlands to the east of the Site.

- 7.20 Overall, once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **very low**, and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **minor adverse (permanent, long-term)**.

LCA23 Durley Claylands

- 7.21 Once the development is operational, the application Site will be transformed from agricultural land to development, however, it would cause no physical impact on the Durley Claylands LCA, which lies entirely within the Winchester District. It would, however, cause some perceptual impact on this character area due to very limited changes in views and a very small loss of countryside to development.
- 7.22 The visibility of the operational development from this landscape character area would be limited only to a small area of private farmland around Little Snakemoor Farm, west of Stapleford Lane.
- 7.23 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **negligible**, and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)**.

8 Assessment of Visual Effects

- 8.1 This section of the report assesses landscape effects after implementation of all mitigation measures.

Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

Susceptibility to change

- 8.2 Due to differing responses to changes in views and visual amenity depending on the context and purpose for being in a particular place, the susceptibility of each receptor group to change is assessed separately.
- 8.3 The assessment of susceptibility of visual receptors to the proposed development takes account of the nature of the proposed development (residential housing).
- 8.4 Users of PRoV have generally a strong relationship with their surroundings and their attention is well focussed on the views and visual amenity, particularly in case of recreational walkers who enjoy views at a walking pace. Their overall susceptibility to change in views is assessed as **high**.
- 8.5 Whilst some road users, such as motorists and cyclists, have generally **low** susceptibility to change in views as their views have transient nature and their activity (driving at speed) which does not allow for full appreciation of the surrounding landscape, other road users (pedestrians) have slightly more elevated (**medium**) susceptibility due to walking pace and more possibilities of enjoying their surroundings.
- 8.6 Local residents adjacent to the Site have **medium** susceptibility due to their orientation of views and limited intervisibility with this Site itself.
- 8.7 Whilst people at their place of work are usually assessed as having low susceptibility, the susceptibility of Forest Lodge employees is assessed as **medium** due to the place and nature of their work, strongly associated with the surrounding woodland.
- 8.8 Visitors to the Holy Cross Church and cemetery are assessed as having **medium** susceptibility due to some interest in the surrounding landscape thanks to the Site's elevated position with many long distance views.

Sensitivity of visual receptors

- 8.9 Table 3 summarises the relevant visual receptors within the detailed study area that were considered to have the potential to be materially affected by the proposed development.

Table 2 Visual receptors and sensitivity

Receptor	Viewpoints	Sensitivity
Users of PRow	5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13	High
Motorists and cyclists on local roads	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 14	Low
Pedestrians on local roads	3, 4, 6, 9, 14	Medium
Local residents	N/A	Medium
People at their place of work	14	Low
Visitors to the Holy Cross Church and cemetery	15	Medium

Predicted Visibility and Changes to Views

- 8.10 As described in the baseline sections, most of the landscape around the Site would not receive any material views of the proposed development, neither during the construction, nor during the operation of the scheme.
- 8.11 Only the following publicly accessible areas would receive views of the Site and experience material changes to visual amenity due to the construction or operation of the proposed development:
- Snakemoor Lane from residential properties at the south-western corner of the Site up to the bridge over the watercourse to the east of the Site.
 - PRow no 069/15/1, to the north-east of the Site, is likely to provide only limited views of the proposed development (likely glimpses of roofscape) thanks to a generous landscape buffer along the eastern Site boundary, which – in combination with the low elevation of the footpath – set the proposed built form back from the boundary. Due to levels, the central and western parts of the Site will not be visible from this footpath and the wetlands themselves.
 - A glimpse of the new proposed footpath access at Botley Road – only in the vicinity to the footpath.

Viewpoints

- 8.12 The proposed development would be screened from most viewpoints provided in the baseline section for illustrative purposes, as a representation of the Site's visibility from public vantage points in the surrounding landscape. Following our 'winter' site visit (worst case scenario in terms of visibility), we concluded that whilst the proposed development may be glimpsed from several viewpoints through the existing tree cover, these views would be non-material and, in reality, non-perceptible by an average viewer. For example, a glimpse of the proposed footpath to Botley Road access may be possible in 'winter' conditions from a footpath to the west of the site, however, this would have negligible impact on visual amenity and the existing woodland around the Site would effectively screen all material views into the proposed development.

- 8.13 Therefore, in line with the principle of proportionality, only those changes to views that are material for the appraisal of visual effects are described below.
- 8.14 Viewpoint which would not experience any material change include:
- Viewpoint 3 – Denham's Corner roundabout;
 - Viewpoint 4 – Shamblehurst Lane / Winchester Road;
 - Viewpoint 5 – PRoW no. 026_707B_1, south of the Site;
 - Viewpoint 8 – PRoW no. 026_706_1, south-west of the Site;
 - Viewpoint 9 – Blind Lane / Botley Road;
 - Viewpoint 10 – Woodland / PRoW no. 085_719_1, north-west of the Site;
 - Viewpoint 13 – PRoW no. 069_15_1; east of the Site;
 - Viewpoint 14 – Saint Barns Business Park;
 - Viewpoint 15 – Holy Cross Church.
- 8.15 The only viewpoint that would experience noticeable change are viewpoints 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12. Those changes in views are described below.

Viewpoints 1 and 2 – Snakemoor Lane

- 8.16 Viewpoints 1 and 2 are located in the immediate vicinity of the Site, along Snakemoor Lane, and will experience the highest level of visual change, due to their proximity to the proposed development. The highest visual change would occur at Viewpoint 1, near the existing Site access, where both construction activities and operational development would be visible from.
- 8.17 The completed scheme would create a development edge along the northern edge of Snakemoor Lane, which would replace the existing agricultural land. The proposed residential dwellings would be set back from the boundary by approximately 20 to 30 meters, which would minimise their visual impact along Snakemoor Lane and provide an opportunity to soften this edge by tree and shrub planting.
- 8.18 Receptors at Viewpoint 2 would experience a much lower level of change, both during construction and operation, as the development is proposed approximately 100 meters away, and the adjacent part of the Site would be occupied by a public green open space with amenity planting. Whilst the development edge would be visible from this part of Snakemoor Lane, the scale of the visual change would be low.

Viewpoints 6 and 7 – south-west of the Site

- 8.19 Receptors at Viewpoints 6 and 7, located on Bubb Lane and a PRoW south-west of the Site, respectively, would experience a very low level of visual change, during construction and operation. Not only the woodland along the western Site boundary would heavily filter view of the proposed development (or its construction) and only glimpses of rooftops

would be possible in 'winter' conditions, but the visual change would be experienced in the context of existing residential dwellings adjacent to the Site and roads / vehicular traffic along Bubb Lane and / or Botley Road. The visual perception of the development would be negligible from these viewpoints.

Viewpoints 11 and 12 – east of the Site

- 8.20 These Viewpoints represent views experienced by walkers on PRoW running through the wetlands to the east of the Site. They are located on lower elevation than the Site itself and provide views upwards – only the east facing slopes of the easternmost part of the Site are visible. The proposed built form is set back from the edge of the Site by 50m to 100m, depending on the location, which would keep most of the slopes undeveloped. However, the eastern edge of the proposed development would be glimpsed through existing vegetation on top of the ridge. Only the first rows of housing would be visible – they would effectively screen the central and western parts of the scheme, which would minimise the 'urbanising' effect on these views and, together with the proposed amenity planting, would create a soft development edge of low density.
- 8.21 The proposed attenuation basin and swales along the road would be supplemented by planting and would create an interesting landscape feature along the edge of the development.
- 8.22 In 'summer' months, with full foliage, the visibility of the development would be significantly reduced compared to 'winter' views.

Visual Effects on Receptor Groups

- 8.23 Following the appraisal of visual baseline, the following receptor groups have been brought forward to the appraisal of visual effects:
- Users of PRoW;
 - Motorists and cyclists on local roads;
 - Pedestrians on local roads;
 - Local residents.
- 8.24 There are no other receptors that could be materially affected by the proposed development. As discussed in the baseline section, visitors to the Holy Cross Church and cemetery or visitors to the Saints Barn Business Park (people at their place of work) will not experience any views of the site or the proposed development due to screening by existing woodland and topography.
- 8.25 The appraisal of visual effects on visual receptor groups is presented below.

Users of PRow

- 8.26 The magnitude of construction impact on users of PRow is assessed as **low** due to a very limited geographical area (only footpaths to the east of the site lying on lower elevation compared to the site itself) and the small scale and duration of the temporary impact. The overall construction effect is assessed as **moderate/minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.
- 8.27 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **very low**, and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **minor adverse (permanent, long-term)**. This is due to a very limited geographical area, few receptors affected, and the small scale of the changes in views.

Motorists and cyclists on local roads

- 8.28 The magnitude of construction impact on motorists and cyclists on local roads is assessed as **low** due to a very limited geographical area (only a short section of Snakemoor Lane would be affected) and the small scale and duration of the temporary impact. The overall construction effect is assessed as **minor/negligible adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.
- 8.29 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **very low** and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)**. This is due to a very limited geographical area (only a short section of Snakemoor Lane would be affected), very few affected visual receptors, and the small scale of the changes in views.

Pedestrians on local roads

- 8.30 The magnitude of construction impact on pedestrians on local roads is assessed as **negligible** due to a very limited geographical area and the small scale and duration of the temporary impact. The overall construction effect is assessed as **negligible adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.
- 8.31 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **negligible**, and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)**. This is due to a very limited geographical area, very few receptors affected, and the small scale of the changes in views.

Local residents

- 8.32 The magnitude of construction impact on local residents is assessed as **low** due to a very limited geographical area (only residents of a couple of properties adjacent to the Site

would be affected) and the small scale and duration of the temporary impact. The overall construction effect is assessed as **minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.

- 8.33 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the magnitude of change is assessed as **very low**, and the overall significance of effect is assessed as **minor/negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)**. This is due to a very limited geographical area, very few receptors affected, and the small scale of the changes in views.

9 Summary and Conclusions

- 9.1 This Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal considers the effects of the proposed development on physical landscape features and elements, landscape character and effects on views and visual amenity.
- 9.2 The visibility of the Site in the surround landscape is limited by landform and woodland areas, which wrap around the Site and provide effective screening from the north, east and west. The Site is well visible only from the adjacent Snakemoor Lane and a small area of private farmland to the south of Little Snakemoor Farm. There are very few public vantage points, from which views of the Site can be experienced, including in 'winter' conditions, when trees are not in leaf.
- 9.3 This limited geographical area of Site's visibility, natural screening factors and the proposed design of the development which takes account of Site constraints and opportunities, and key local sensitivities (landscape, ecological and other), will result in a very limited level of landscape and visual effects due to the proposed development.
- 9.4 The summary of key landscape and visual effects is provided below.

Landscape Effects

- 9.5 During construction, the magnitude of construction effect on the character of the LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland is assessed as **moderate adverse (temporary, very short-term)** and the construction effect on the character of the LCA23 Durley Claylands is assessed as **minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)**.
- 9.6 Once the proposed development is operational and the proposed landscaping has established and begun to mature, the overall significance of effect on the character of the LCA 9: Horton Heath Undulating Farmland is assessed as **minor adverse (permanent, long-term)** and the significance of effect on the character of the LCA23 Durley Claylands is assessed as **negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)**.

Visual Effects

- 9.7 In visual amenity terms, whilst the proposed development will replace undeveloped countryside with a residential scheme, it will also sit well within the surrounding landscape and its visibility will be limited by landform and vegetation.
- 9.8 The highest level of visual effect will be experienced by walkers on the PRow network, due to their high sensitivity to changes in views, which result in elevated level of effect even at relatively low magnitude of impact.

- 9.9 Overall, users of Public Rights of Way will experience a **moderate/minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)** effect during the construction phase, which will lower to **minor adverse (permanent, long-term)**, once the development is operational and the proposed vegetation has established and begun to mature.
- 9.10 Motorists and cyclists on local roads, who have low sensitivity to the proposed development, will experience **minor/negligible adverse (temporary, very short-term)** effects during construction, and **negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)** once the development is operational.
- 9.11 Pedestrians on local roads will experience **negligible adverse** effects both during the construction and operation of the proposed development.
- 9.12 Finally, local residents will experience **minor adverse (temporary, very short-term)** effects during the construction phase and **minor/negligible adverse (permanent, long-term)** effects, once the development is operational and the proposed vegetation has established and begun to mature.

10 References

- Eastleigh Borough Council, Eastleigh Adopted Local Plan 2001-2011
- Eastleigh Borough Council, Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (EBLP) 2016-2036
- Eastleigh Borough Council, Trees and Development SPD
- Eastleigh Borough Council, Character Area Appraisal for Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath
- Eastleigh Borough Council, Quality Places SPD
- Eastleigh Borough Council, December, 2011, Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough
- Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment, 2012, Forest of Bare West
- Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment, 2010, Lowland Mosaic Small Scale
- Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Appraisal (2013)
Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal 3rd Edition
- National Planning Policy Framework, 2024
- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
- Natural England, 2014, National Character Area Profile 128
- Natural England, 2014, An Approach to Landscape Character Appraisal
- Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment

Appendix 1

Glossary of LVIA Terms

Appendix 1 Glossary of LVIA Terms

Source: GLVIA3, pp. 155-159

Access land	Land where the public have access either by legal right or by informal agreement.
Baseline studies	Work done to determine and describe the environmental conditions against which any future changes can be measured or predicted and assessed.
Characterisation	The process of identifying areas of similar landscape character, classifying and mapping them and describing their character.
Characteristics	Elements, or combinations of elements, which make a contribution to distinctive landscape character.
Compensation	Measures devised to offset or compensate for residual adverse effects which cannot be prevented/avoided or further reduced
Competent authority	The authority which determines the application for consent, permission, licence or other authorisation to proceed with a proposal. It is the authority that must consider the environmental information before granting any kind of authorisation.
Consultation bodies	Any body specified in the relevant EIA Regulations which the competent authority must consult in respect of an EIA, and which also has a duty to provide a scoping opinion and information.
Designated landscape	Areas of landscape identified as being of importance at international, national or local levels, either defined by statute or identified in development plans or other documents.
Development	Any proposal that results in a change to the landscape and/or visual environment.
Direct effect	An effect that is directly attributable to the proposed development.
'Do nothing' situation	Continued change or evolution in the landscape in the absence of the proposed development.
Ecosystem services	The benefits provided by ecosystems that contribute to making human life both possible and worth living. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (www.unep.org/maweb/en/index.aspx) grouped ecosystem services into four broad categories: 1. supporting services, such as nutrient cycling, oxygen production and soil formation - these underpin the provision of the other 'service' categories; 2. provisioning services, such as food, fibre, fuel and water; 3. regulating services, such as climate regulation, water purification and flood protection; 4. cultural services, such as education, recreation, and aesthetic value.
Elements	Individual parts which make up the landscape, such as, for example, trees, hedges and buildings
Enhancement	Proposals that seek to improve the landscape resource and the visual amenity of the proposed development site and its wider setting, over and above its baseline condition.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	The process of gathering environmental information; describing a development; identifying and describing the likely significant environmental effects of the project; defining ways of preventing/avoiding, reducing, or offsetting or compensating for any adverse effects; consulting the general public and specific bodies with responsibilities for the environment; and presenting the results to the competent authority to inform the decision on whether the project should proceed.
Environmental Statement	A statement that includes the information that is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development and which the applicant can, having regard in particular to current knowledge and methods of assessment, reasonably be required to compile, but that includes at least the information referred to in the EIA Regulations.
Feature	Particularly prominent or eye-catching elements in the landscape, such as tree clumps, church towers or wooded skylines OR a particular aspect of the project proposal.
Geographical Information System (GIS)	A system that captures, stores, analyses, manages and presents data linked to location. It links spatial information to a digital database.
Green Infrastructure (GI)	Networks of green spaces and watercourses and water bodies that connect rural areas, villages, towns and cities.
Heritage	The historic environment and especially valued assets and qualities such as historic buildings and cultural traditions.
Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) and Historic Land-use Assessment (HLA)	Historic characterisation is the identification and interpretation of the historic dimension of the present-day landscape or townscape within a given area. HLC is the term used in England and Wales, HLA is the term used in Scotland.
Indirect effects	Effects that result indirectly from the proposed project as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects.
Iterative design process	The process by which project design is amended and improved by successive stages of refinement which respond to growing understanding of environmental issues.
Key characteristics	Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place
Land cover	The surface cover of the land, usually expressed in terms of vegetation cover or lack of it. Related to but not the same as land use.
Land use	What land is used for, based on broad categories of functional land cover, such as urban and industrial use and the different types of agriculture and forestry.
Landform	The shape and form of the land surface which has resulted from combinations of geology, geomorphology, slope, elevation and physical processes.

Landscape	An area, as perceived by people, the character of which is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)	A tool used to identify and assess the likely significance of the effects of change resulting from development both on the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity.
Landscape character	A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.
Landscape Character Areas (LCAs)	These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular landscape type.
Landscape Character Assessment (LCA)	The process of identifying and describing variation in the character of the landscape, and using this information to assist in managing change in the landscape. It seeks to identify and explain the unique combination of elements and features that make landscapes distinctive. The process results in the production of a Landscape Character Assessment.
Landscape Character Types (LCTs)	These are distinct types of landscape that are relatively homogeneous in character. They are generic in nature in that they may occur in different areas in different parts of the country, but wherever they occur they share broadly similar combinations of geology, topography, drainage patterns, vegetation and historical land use and settlement pattern, and perceptual and aesthetic attributes.
Landscape classification	A process of sorting the landscape into different types using selected criteria but without attaching relative values to different sorts of landscape.
Landscape effects	Effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right.
Landscape quality (condition)	A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements.
Landscape receptors	Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Landscape strategy	The overall vision and objectives for what the landscape should be like in the future, and what is thought to be desirable for a particular landscape type or area as a whole, usually expressed in formally adopted plans and programmes or related documents.
Landscape value	The relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society. A landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons.
Magnitude (of effect)	A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration.
Parameters	A limit or boundary which defines the scope of a particular process or activity.
Perception	Combines the sensory (that we receive through our senses) with the cognitive (our knowledge and understanding gained from many sources and experiences).
Photomontage	A visualisation which superimposes an image of a proposed development upon a photograph or series of photographs.

Receptors	See Landscape receptors and Visual receptors.
Scoping	The process of identifying the issues to be addressed by an EIA. It is a method of ensuring that an EIA focuses on the important issues and avoids those that are considered to be less significant.
Seascape	Landscapes with views of the coast or seas, and coasts and adjacent marine environments with cultural, historical and archaeological links with each other.
Sensitivity	A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.
Significance	A measure of the importance or gravity of the environmental effect, defined by significance criteria specific to the environmental topic.
Stakeholders	The whole constituency of individuals and groups who have an interest in a subject or place.
Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	The process of considering the environmental effects of certain public plans, programmes or strategies at a strategic level.
Susceptibility	The ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences.
Time depth	Historical layering - the idea of landscape as a 'palimpsest', a much written-over manuscript.
Townscape	The character and composition of the built environment including the buildings and the relationships between them, the different types of urban open space, including green spaces, and the relationship between buildings and open spaces.
Tranquillity	A state of calm and quietude associated with peace, considered to be a significant asset of landscape.
Visual amenity	The overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of the people living, working, recreating, visiting or travelling through an area.
Visual effects	Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.
Visual receptors	Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Visualisation	A computer simulation, photomontage or other technique illustrating the predicted appearance of a development
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)	A map, usually digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible.

Appendix 2

LVIA Methodology

Appendix 2 LVIA Methodology

Introduction

- 1.1 This Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) aims to determine the likely effects of the proposed development on the existing landscape and visual receptors within the study area.
- 1.2 The LVIA assesses the effects on:
- Landscape as a resource (including its character and physical landscape elements/features); and
 - Views and visual amenity experienced by visual receptors (people).

Guidance and Approach

Guidance

- 1.3 This assessment methodology for assessing landscape and visual effects is based on the following best practice guidance:
- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013;
 - Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland, Countryside Agency, 2002;
 - An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment, Natural England, 2014;
 - Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Landscape Institute, 2019;
 - GLVIA3 Statement of Clarification 1/13, Landscape Institute, 2013.
- 1.4 Other reference documents used to understand the baseline position in landscape terms comprise published landscape character assessments appropriate to the Site's location and the nature of the proposed development.

Approach

- 1.5 The following approach is used to assess landscape and visual effects:
- Determine the scope of the assessment;
 - Collate landscape and visual baseline information;
 - Describe and review the proposed development and the likely impacts associated with it and identify mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset (for example by planting outside the site) the likely adverse impacts;
 - Assess the sensitivity of the receptors likely to be affected by the proposed development by judging value and susceptibility;

- Assess the magnitude of change for these receptors by combining judgements on scale/size of impact, its duration and reversibility;
- Assess the overall degree of significance of effects by combining judgements on receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impact.

Determining the Scope and Baseline

Study Area

- 1.6 The study area should be proportional to the scale and nature of the proposed development.
- 1.7 For landscape effects it includes the site itself and the full extent of the wider landscape around it, which the development may influence in a significant manner (directly or indirectly). For visual effects, the study area is typically associated with the extent of the potential visibility of the proposed development.
- 1.8 The study area is determined in 2 stages:
 - Preliminary study area is identified at the scoping stage. It can be based on the extent of Landscape Character Areas likely to be significantly affected by the proposed development, a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis or an analysis of the site context through desk study and field work.
 - A preliminary study area is then refined during field work and takes account of the assessor's experience, including the actual site visibility, the scale and nature of the proposed development), and the likelihood of significant landscape and visual effects in the wider landscape.

Baseline information

- 1.9 Baseline information is collated using desk study and field survey.
- 1.10 Desk study uses all available studies and materials (i.e. Ordnance Survey maps, existing landscape character assessments, planning policy documents or local guidance) that enable the identification of key baseline information, including potential landscape and visual receptors likely to be affected by the proposed development.
- 1.11 Detailed field survey of the site and its context is carried out in order to review/refine the information collated during the desk study, identify the key landscape and visual receptors that may be affected by the proposed development and attribute value to the landscape receptors.
- 1.12 Site photographs are taken using a full frame digital single lens reflex (DSLR) camera with 50mm lens and viewpoint photographs conform to the Landscape Institute's TGN 6/19 guidance for Type 1 visualisations (Annotated Viewpoint Photograph).

Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 1.13 Sensitivity of landscape receptors is assessed by combining judgements of their susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed and the value attached to the landscape. Although landscape has some intrinsic sensitivity, different landscape receptors have different elements and features that can accommodate a variety of development types. Therefore, in LVIA, sensitivity is specific to the particular project or development that is being proposed and to the location in question.

Landscape value

- 1.14 The description of value of the potentially affected landscape receptors (areas of landscape, or individual elements, features or perceptual aspects) is undertaken as part of the baseline study.
- 1.15 A review of designations is a starting point in understanding the landscape value but other factors will be also taken account of, especially if existing studies on value of the landscape in question are not available or are limited. These factors include (see Box 5.1, page 84 of the GLVIA3):
- Landscape quality (condition);
 - Scenic quality;
 - Rarity;
 - Representativeness;
 - Conservation interests;
 - Recreation value;
 - Perceptual aspects;
 - Associations.
- 1.16 Table A-1 provides indicative criteria for determining the value of landscape receptors.

Table A-1 Determining landscape value

Value	Criteria
High	Predominantly nationally/Internationally designated/valued landscape. All or most criteria indicating higher landscape value are met including good condition and scenic quality; rare elements of features, strong/distinctive/important landscape characteristics; high nature conservation and/or heritage interest, high recreation value and perceptual qualities/tranquillity, historic associations. No detracting features. In some cases, landscapes designated on the local and community levels or undesignated landscapes which are of exceptional quality and meet all of most of the above criteria can also be determined as having high value.

Value	Criteria
Medium	Landscapes designated on the county or local (e.g. Areas of High Landscape Value, Regional Scenic Areas) which meet some of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1.15. For example, high nature conservation and/or heritage interest, high recreation value and perceptual qualities/tranquillity, historic associations, but lack of rare elements of features or important landscape characteristics. Some detracting features. In some cases, a part of internationally or nationally designated landscapes can be also attributed locally medium value if the only some of the criteria are met, for example if a part of such landscape is in very poor condition and is not representative of the wider character. Undesignated landscapes can also be attributed medium value if most of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1.15 are met.
Low	Predominantly undesignated landscape. Few criteria outlined in paragraph 1.15 are met. For example, landscape is in poor condition and of average or poor scenic quality; no rare elements of features, weak landscape characteristics; limited nature conservation and/or heritage interest, average or low recreation value and few perceptual qualities/ low tranquillity, no historic associations. Many detracting features. In some cases, locally designated landscape can also be attributed low value if its condition is very poor and it is not representative of the wider character, or it does not meet most of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1.15.

- 1.17 The final judgement on landscape value is guided by the criteria outlined in the Table A-1 and should be supported by a clear and transparent justification.

Susceptibility to change

- 1.18 Susceptibility of landscape receptors is assessed as high, medium or low and is based on the combination of a range of factors (based on GLVIA3, para 5.40 to 5.43):
- Landscape capacity;
 - Nature of the development (or presence of similar developments and the degree of contribution to existing landscape character);
 - Nature of landscape components (whether that can be easily substituted or not).
- 1.19 The guiding criteria for assessing landscape susceptibility to change/development proposed are provided in the Table A-2.

Table A-2 Susceptibility of landscape receptors to change/development

Susceptibility	Criteria
High	Low capacity of the receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation.

Susceptibility	Criteria
	The proposed development type is not present within the landscape and its addition would be out of character. Components of the landscape cannot be easily substituted.
Medium	Average capacity of the receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. The proposed development type has some presence within the surrounding landscape. Components of the landscape can be easily substituted.
Low	High capacity of the receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. The proposed development type is present within the landscape and its addition would be completely in line with the existing character. Components of the landscape can be easily substituted or their substitution is highly desirable (components with negative contribution to character).

Sensitivity of landscape receptors

- 1.20 Once the landscape value and receptors' susceptibility to the type of change or development proposed have been determined, the overall sensitivity of the landscape receptors can be evaluated. Table A-3 contains a guide to combining value and susceptibility in order to determine the overall sensitivity.

Table A-3 Matrix for assessing sensitivity of landscape receptors

Value	Susceptibility		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Very high	High	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Low	Very low

- 1.21 Table A-4 summarises landscape sensitivity levels used in the assessment of landscape effects.

Table A-4 Landscape sensitivity definitions

Item	Description
Very high	Landscape receptor of high value and high susceptibility to change / proposed development.

Item	Description
	Typical examples include nationally/internationally designated landscapes or locally designated landscapes of exceptional quality with low capacity for the type of development proposed.
High	Landscape receptor of high value and medium susceptibility to change / proposed development or medium value and high susceptibility to change / proposed development. Typical examples include valuable landscapes (such as nationally/internationally designated landscapes or locally designated landscapes of exceptional quality) with some capacity for the type of development proposed or landscapes of average value with low capacity for the type of development proposed.
Medium	Landscape receptor of medium value and medium capacity for the type of development proposed. Landscape receptor of high / low value but low / high capacity for the type of development proposed, respectively. Examples include a variety of landscapes, such as locally designated landscapes of medium value with some capacity for the type of development proposed; nationally and internationally designated landscapes with high capacity for the type of development proposed or landscapes of low value with limited susceptibility to change.
Low	Landscape receptor of medium value and low susceptibility to change / proposed development of low value and medium susceptibility to change / proposed development. Typical examples include locally designated landscapes or undesignated landscapes with some value and high capacity for the type of development proposed or undesignated landscapes of low value with medium capacity for the type of development proposed.
Very low	Landscape receptor of low value and low susceptibility to change / proposed development. Typical examples include undesignated landscapes of low quality with high capacity for the type of development proposed.

Magnitude of landscape effects

1.22 Once the sensitivity of landscape receptor is established, the magnitude of change to landscape receptor is determined according to the following key criteria:

- Size or scale of impact;
- Geographical extent of the area over which the landscape effects will occur;
- Duration and the reversibility of the impact.

1.23 In assessing the size or scale of impact the judgements are made based on the:

- The extent of existing landscape elements that will be lost, the proportion of the total extent that this represents and the contribution of that element to the character of the landscape;

- The degree to which aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered;
 - Whether the effect changes the key characteristics of this landscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.
- 1.24 Size and scale of impact are described as total/major, large, medium, small, negligible (very low).
- 1.25 The geographical extent of impact refers to the geographical area over which the landscape effects will be felt. It can be perceived at site level, immediate setting of the site, local/community level, landscape type or area level, large scale (several landscape types or areas), regional scale.
- 1.26 The duration and reversibility of effects are separate but interlinked terms which are considered in assessing the magnitude of landscape effects. For the purpose of this LVIA, the duration of effects is described as:
- Very long term (more than 20 years);
 - Long term (10 to 20 years);
 - Medium term (5 to 10 years);
 - Short term (2 to 5 years);
 - Very short term (up to 2 years).
- 1.27 Each landscape effect is also assessed based on its reversibility. For example, housing developments are considered as irreversible, but wind farm or solar farm developments have usually a limited life and the changes to the landscape are reversible following their decommissioning.
- 1.28 The assessment of magnitude of landscape effects takes account of all three groups of criteria (and their sub criteria) and is based on a professional judgement, guided by the examples of the application of the criteria provided in Table A-5. Due to the complexity of the criteria used in the assessment of magnitude it is impossible to provide precise definitions of each degree of magnitude. Instead, typical examples are provided of how the criteria are applied at each level of magnitude.

Table A-5 Magnitude of landscape effects

Magnitude	Application of criteria – typical examples
Very High	Total/major or very large loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that have crucial contribution to key characteristics on a very large/regional scale.
High	Large loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that contribute to key characteristics on a landscape area/type level or large scale (several landscape areas/types). OR Total/major loss or addition of landscape elements on a local/community level or a medium loss of landscape features on a large scale.

Magnitude	Application of criteria – typical examples
Medium	Medium loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that affect a limited number of key characteristics over a local/community or landscape area/type level. OR Total/major loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that affect a limited number of key characteristics in the immediate site setting. OR Small loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that affect a limited number of key characteristics on a very large/regional scale.
Low	Small loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that have limited contribution to key characteristics on an immediate site setting or site level. OR Very small loss or addition of landscape elements on a local/community level or landscape type/area level.
Negligible	Negligible (very low) loss or addition of landscape elements and/or alteration to perceptual aspects that have limited contribution to key characteristics within the site, its immediate setting or a landscape character area/type.

Assessment of Visual Effects

- 1.29 Visual receptors are individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal. The assessment of visual effects looks at the sensitivity of visual receptors to change in the landscape or townscape caused by the proposed development type.
- 1.30 Sensitivity of visual receptors is a function of the value attached to views and the susceptibility of visual receptors (people) to change in views.

Susceptibility of visual receptors

- 1.31 People generally have differing responses to changes in views and visual amenity depending on the context (location, time of day, season, degree of exposure to views) and purpose for being in a particular place. The susceptibility of visual receptors therefore depends on:
- The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and
 - The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focussed on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.

- 1.32 The susceptibility of visual receptors is described as high, medium or low. Table A-6 provides criteria and examples of visual susceptibility levels.

Table A-6 Susceptibility of visual receptors to change/development

Susceptibility	Criteria and examples
High	The occupation/activity of visual receptors has strong relationship with the experience of the surroundings. The attention of viewers is well focussed on the views and visual amenity. Examples: Views from open and elevated positions, views from rights of way, where landscape is the primary focus of the receptor, views from designated viewpoints where viewer's full attention is on views and visual amenity
Medium	The occupation/activity of visual receptors has some relationship with the experience of the surroundings. The attention of viewers is partially focussed on the views and visual amenity. Examples: Views from rights of way (or roads, other footpaths, public areas), where receptors' are only partially focussed on the landscape, receptors' activity does not allow for full appreciation of the landscape or is primarily directed elsewhere (travelling at speed, poor condition of a footpath, etc).
Low	The occupation/activity of visual receptors has very little or no relationship with the experience of the surroundings. The attention of viewers is barely focussed or not focussed at all on the views and visual amenity. Examples: Transient views, views from enclosed locations where wider landscape is a secondary focus, receptors' activity/occupation does not allow for appreciation of the landscape, people at their place of work etc.

Value of views

- 1.33 As part of the overall assessment of visual sensitivity, the LVIA makes judgements about the value of views. It takes account of:
- Recognition of value attached to particular views, for example in relation to heritage assets, or through planning designations.
 - Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors, for example through appearances in guidebooks or on tourist maps, presence of interpretation boards, or references in literature.
- 1.34 Value of views is described as high, medium or low. For example, views of high value are likely to be from designated landscapes (such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Countryside Parks) where the condition or scenic quality of the view is higher and where distinctive elements or features form a prominent part of a

view. Views of lower value are likely to be from an undesignated area of landscapes in poor condition where the scenic quality of the view is low, detracting features are present in the view and only limited value can be attached to it by visitors.

Sensitivity of visual receptors

- 1.35 The assessment of visual sensitivity takes account of susceptibility of visual receptors and the value attached to their views.
- 1.36 Once the value attached to views and visual receptors' susceptibility have been determined, the overall sensitivity of the visual receptors can be evaluated. Table A-7 contains a guide to combining value and susceptibility in order to determine the overall visual sensitivity.

Table A-7 Matrix for assessing sensitivity of visual receptors

Value	Susceptibility		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Very high	High	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Low	Very low

- 1.37 Table A-8 summarises visual sensitivity criteria used in the assessment of effects on visual receptors.

Table A-8 Sensitivity of visual receptors

Sensitivity	Descriptions and Examples
Very High	Views of high value appreciated by visual receptors with high susceptibility. Examples: - Visitors to promoted viewpoints (often with interpretation boards) within highly valued, designated landscapes; - Visitors to recreational hilltops and peaks or walkers on important public footpaths within highly valued, designated landscapes.
High	Views of high value appreciated by medium susceptibility receptors. OR Views of medium value appreciated by high susceptibility receptors. Examples: - Occupiers of residential properties; - People engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is likely to be focussed on the landscape, such as golf, fishing; - Themed rights of way with a local association; - Panoramic viewpoints marked on OS maps;

Sensitivity	Descriptions and Examples
	- People travelling through landscape on roads, rail or other transport passing through promoted or designated scenic areas.
Medium	Visual receptors with medium susceptibility experiencing views of medium value. OR Highly susceptible receptors experiencing views of low or no value. OR Receptors with low susceptibility experiencing views of high value. Examples: - Residential locations with lower susceptibility; - General users of local PRoV and other recreational, undesignated routes with views of some local value; - Visitors to local viewpoints and resting places; - People travelling through undesignated, general landscape on roads, rail or other transport.
Low	Views of medium value experienced by low susceptibility receptors. OR Views of low value appreciated by medium susceptibility receptors. Examples: - Major road routes where receptors have low susceptibility due to travelling at speed, busy major roads; - Receptor at a place of work where visual surroundings have limited relevance; - People engaged in outdoor sport and recreation not especially influenced by an appreciation of the wider landscape e.g. pitch sports or play areas;
Very Low	Views of low value experienced by visual receptors with low susceptibility. Examples: - Users of more transitory routes such as cycle routes on roads with no scenic value; - Users of the local road network and major highways in unattractive, undesignated landscapes with many detractors; - People at their place of work but visual surroundings very limited relevance; - Users of indoor or sporting recreational facilities.

Magnitude of visual effects

1.38 Once the sensitivity of visual receptors is established, the magnitude of change is determined according to the following key criteria:

- Size or scale of impact;
- Geographical extent;
- Duration and the reversibility of the impact.

1.39 In assessing the size or scale of impact the judgements are made based on the:

- The scale of the change in view as a result of loss/addition of features and changes in their composition, including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development;
 - The degree of contrast or integration of any new features with the remaining characteristics of the view in terms of form, scale and mass, line, height, colour and texture;
 - The nature of the view of the proposed development in terms of the relative amount of time it will be experienced and whether views will be full, partial or glimpses.
- 1.40 Size and scale of impact are described as total/major, large, medium, small, negligible (very low).
- 1.41 The geographical extent of impact depends on the location of viewpoints and may reflect:
- The angle of view in relation to the main activity of the receptor;
 - The distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development;
 - The extent of the area over which the changes would be visible.
- 1.42 The geographical extent is described as extensive, large, medium, limited, barely perceptible.
- 1.43 The duration and reversibility of effects are separate but interlinked terms which are considered in assessing the magnitude of visual effects. For the purpose of this LVIA, the duration of effects is described as (same as for landscape effects):
- Very long term (more than 20 years);
 - Long term (10 to 20 years);
 - Medium term (5 to 10 years);
 - Short term (2 to 5 years);
 - Very short term (up to 2 years).
- 1.44 As with landscape effects, each visual effect is also assessed based on its reversibility.
- 1.45 The assessment of magnitude of visual effects takes account of all three groups of criteria (and their sub criteria) and is based on a professional judgement, guided by the examples of the application of the criteria provided in Table A-9. Due to the complexity of the criteria used in the assessment of magnitude it is impossible to provide precise definitions of each degree of magnitude. Instead, typical examples are provided of how the criteria are applied at each level of magnitude.

Table A-9 Magnitude of Visual Effects

Magnitude	Application of criteria – typical examples
Very high	Total/major or large change in the view as a result of loss or addition of landscape features within the view, change in composition, high contrast with the existing features. Typically applied to a full view, where changes are well visible. Extensive geographical extent in relation to the angle, distance and proportion of the view that is affected.

Magnitude	Application of criteria – typical examples
	Long to very long term duration with irreversible changes to the view.
High	Large change in the view as a result of loss or addition of landscape features within the view, change in composition, high contrast with the existing features with large extent in relation to the angle, distance and proportion of the view that is affected. Duration is typically long to very-long term and the effect is irreversible.
Medium	A partial (medium) change in the view as a result of loss or addition of landscape features within the view, change in composition, limited contrast with the existing features. Medium extent in relation to the angle, distance and proportion of the view that is affected. Duration may vary. Effect can be reversible or not.
Low	A small change in the view as a result of loss or addition of landscape features within the view, change in composition, very limited contrast with the existing features. Limited extent in relation to the angle, distance and proportion of the view that is affected. Duration may vary. Effect can be reversible or not.
Negligible	Negligible change in the view as a result of loss or addition of landscape features within the view, change in composition, barely perceptible contrast with the existing features. Barely perceptible extent in relation to the angle, distance and proportion of the view that is affected. Duration may vary. Effect can be reversible or not.

Significance of Effects

- 1.46 The significance of effects is determined by assessing the sensitivity of the landscape and visual receptors to change / proposed development, against the magnitude of change predicted upon them. In line with the current guidance, the assessment is made using professional judgement, as landscape and visual effects often cannot be quantified and over-reliance on matrices is discouraged.
- 1.47 However, the use of a significance matrix (see Table A-10) provides a useful guide for the initial appraisal of the significance level based of the assessed sensitivity and magnitude and the results are then refined using professional judgement with a clear and transparent justification.
- 1.48 Effects can be positive, adverse or neutral (when no change arises).
- 1.49 Effects are assessed during the construction and operational phase of the development with the assumption that all proposed landscape mitigation has established and begun to mature.
- 1.50 Table A-10 provides a significance matrix used as a guide in the final assessment of the significance of landscape and visual effects, which is carried out using professional judgement.

Table A-10 Significance Matrix

Overall Sensitivity	Overall Magnitude				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Very High	Major	Major	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor
High	Major	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor
Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Minor/ Negligible
Low	Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Minor/ Negligible	Negligible
Very Low	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Minor/ Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

- 1.51 Table A-11 provides definitions of landscape and visual effects. In Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments forming a part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), all effects above moderate level are assessed as 'significant'

Table A-11 Definitions of landscape and visual effects

Item	Description
Major	Fundamental changes resulting in a complete or near complete variance with the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Moderate	A material but non-fundamental change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Minor	A slight but non-material change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.
Negligible	A detectable but non-material change to the landscape resource or visual amenity or a non-detectable change to the landscape resource or visual amenity.

Non-EIA appraisals

- 1.52 Standalone LVIA reports which do not form part of an Environmental Impact Assessment follow the same principles and methodology as LVIA reports prepared for EIA purposes.
- 1.53 However, in a standalone LVIA effects are not assessed as 'significant' or 'not significant', which is in line with Landscape Institute's GLVIA3 Statement of Clarification 1/13. In such standalone LVIA, which are typically called 'appraisals', only a degree/level of effect is provided according to the table A-11, above.

Supporting Figures

Viewpoint Sheets





info@deacondesign.co.uk