

Inquiry into:

**LAND AT SATCHELL LANE
HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON**

Appeal by Mr S Bull & Mr R Janaway

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/W1715/W/18/3194846

Eastleigh Borough Council Reference: O/17/80319

MAIN PROOF OF EVIDENCE

of

Peter Armstrong

On behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council

August 2018

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**
- 3. Methodology**
- 4. Baseline**
- 5. Impacts of the Proposed Development**
- 6. Mitigation**
- 7. Review of the Appellant's Landscape Assessment**
- 8. Summary and Conclusions**

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Methodology

Appendix 2 – Figures

1. INTRODUCTION

Witness Qualifications, Experience and Role

- 1.1 My name is Peter Armstrong. I am a Chartered Landscape Architect and Member of the Landscape Institute and have a Masters in Urban Design. I am a Senior Associate of Hyland Edgar Driver Landscape Architects, which was formed in 1992 and is now one of the leading independent UK based landscape consultancies. I have over 20 years of experience working upon a variety of residential projects in the UK and overseas. I have previously worked on landscape and visual impact assessments for infrastructure, commercial and residential projects.
- 1.2 I was the expert witness on landscape and visual issues on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council for the Land East of Grange Road 2015 planning appeal (Planning Inspectorate Ref APP/W1715/W/15/3005761) into a 230 dwelling scheme in the Strategic Gap between Bursledon and Netley. I also provided expert evidence on behalf of the Council at the 2016 planning appeal (Planning Inspectorate Ref APP/W1715/W/15/3063753) into a 335 dwelling scheme off Bubb Lane near Hedge End.
- 1.4 My company was formally instructed by Eastleigh Borough Council to provide independent landscape consultancy advice for this Appeal on 3 August 2018.

Proposed Development

- 1.5 The proposed development is for up to 70 dwellings with associated access, public open space, landscaping and amenity areas (all matters reserved except for access).
- 1.6 The Appeal Site (Figure 1) falls entirely within the jurisdiction of Eastleigh Borough Council. It is a single, roughly triangular, grass field, approximately 3.5 hectares (ha) in size, and is located to the north-eastern part of Hamble, occupying elevated ground with views out of the Site across the River Hamble to the east.
- 1.7 The Site is bounded to the west by Hamble Airfield to the north and north east, by Satchell Lane and the south and south east, and by the gardens to the rear of residential properties along Satchell Lane
- 1.8 The Site is currently used for grazing horses and is an open field, with mixed hedges and trees along the boundaries with the road and adjacent fields providing definition. There is a public right of way along the western boundary of the Site.

Relevant Reason for Refusal

- 1.9 The Council refused planning permission on 26 September 2017, giving 5 Reasons for Refusal. Of these, the relevant policies in terms of landscape issues are set out in Reasons for Refusal 1:

'(1) The proposal represents an inappropriate and unjustified form of development which would have an unacceptably urbanising and visually intrusive impact upon the

designated countryside, to the detriment of the character, visual amenity and the quality of the landscape of the locality. The application is therefore contrary to Saved Policies 1.CO, 18.CO, 20.CO and 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Purpose and Scope of Evidence

- 1.10 This Proof will support Reason for Refusal 1 in terms of the impact on the countryside and local landscape character, based on national and local planning guidance.
- 1.11 In this evidence I will review the impact of the proposed development on the landscape character of the area, testing the impact of the proposed development against the requirements set out in the relevant planning policy and guidance.
- 1.12 A landscape character assessment of the Site against the proposed development has been carried out to assess the nature and extent of change that would result in the current landscape if the development was implemented.
- 1.13 Following the desktop review of the landscape character baseline information, the Site area was visited on the 7th August and 5th September 2018, with photographs taken on both visits (Appendix 2).
- 1.14 Given that all Site visits and photographs have been undertaken with the vegetation in full leaf, it is to be noted that winter views will be more open and widespread. Ideally, an LVIA would be carried out in both summer and winter months to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the Site.

2. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

2.1 This section sets out the planning policy and guidance relevant to Reasons for Refusal 1.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018

2.2 The Paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF) which set out the relevant landscape issues in the context of the Site include the following:

- **Paragraph 9** – States that plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.
- **Paragraph 20** – States that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development; and make sufficient provision for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment.
- **Paragraph 28** - States that non-strategic policies can be used to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development, which can include conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment.
- **Paragraph 170** – Refers to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, stating that: “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...”

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011)

2.3 The Saved Policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review which set out the relevant landscape issues in the context of the Site include the following.

2.4 **Policy 1.CO Protection of the Countryside** - States that Planning Permission will not be granted for development outside the urban edge unless it is for certain specified purposes or meets the criteria in the other policies of the Plan.

2.5 This policy recognises that the countryside is a finite resource that should be protected from urbanisation. Once lost to development, for all intents and purposes the resource has been lost forever and that loss cannot be mitigated.

2.6 The Site falls within the countryside policy area (Figure 1) and the proposed development does not meet the criteria for the specific types of development that are permissible within Policy 1.CO.

2.7 **Policy 18.CO Landscape Character** - States that development which fails to respect, or has an adverse impact on, the intrinsic character of the landscape will be refused.

2.8 **Policy 20.CO Landscape Improvements** - States that in the areas identified for landscape improvements, as shown on the Proposals Map, proposals which would prejudice such improvements or which in themselves would be detrimental to the quality of the landscape in

these areas, will not be permitted. Developers' willingness to contribute towards landscape improvements will be a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications.

2.9 **Policy 59.BE Promoting Good Design** - Sets out a list of criteria for developments which must be met, including as follows:

'i) They take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and are appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, natural features and trees worthy of retention.'

'iv) They provide a high standard of landscape design and appropriate planting where required ... Development adjacent to or within the urban edge must not have an adverse impact on the setting of the settlement in the surrounding countryside.'

Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029)

2.10 Mrs Harrison will comment on the relevance and weight to be attached to the submitted Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan. It is to be noted, however, that the overarching principle of protecting the countryside is maintained. These include as follows.

2.11 **Draft Policy S1 – Sustainable Development** - Sets out a series of core principles, including to:

'viii) Maintain local environmental quality, and avoiding damage to, and where possible enhancing, the existing valued urban and rural environments in the borough and their landscape, biodiversity and heritage assets.'

2.12 **Draft Policy S9 – Countryside and Countryside Gaps** - Is a combination of Policies 1.CO, 2.CO and 3.CO of the EBLPR sets out that:

'Countryside is defined as all areas outside the urban edge as defined in the policies map, including river valleys and the undeveloped coast. In the countryside, there is a presumption against new development, subject to other policies of this local plan.'

2.13 **Draft Policy DM1 – General Criteria for New Development** - Sets out the criteria for appropriate development, including that development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance, the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast.

Emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)

2.14 Mrs Harrison will comment on the relevance and weight to be attached to the Emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036. It is to be noted, however, that the overarching principle of policies protecting the countryside is maintained. These include as follows.

2.15 **Draft Policy S1 – Delivering Sustainable Development** – Sets out a series of core principles, including to:

'ix. Maintain local environmental quality, including avoiding damage to, and where possible enhancing, the existing valued urban and rural environments in the Borough and heritage assets'.

2.16 **Draft Policy S7 – New development in the countryside** - Sets out that:

'There is a presumption against new development in the countryside, subject to other policies of this Local Plan. Countryside is defined as all the areas outside the urban edges as defined on the policies map, including river valleys, ancient woodland and the undeveloped coast'.

2.17 **Draft Policy DM1 – General criteria for new development** - Sets out the criteria for appropriate development, including that all new developments should:

- 'i) not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance,*
- a) residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast'.*

3. METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 The methodology for this assessment has followed current best practice as defined by the Landscape Institute and The Institute of Environmental Assessment 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' third edition (GLVIA), and is based on the following three main stages:

Stage 1 - Establishment of the Study Area;

Stage 2 - Description of the Landscape Character Baseline Conditions; and

Stage 3 - Landscape Assessment of the likely significant effects of the proposed development.

The updated third edition GLVIA methodology concentrates on the principles and process of LVIA and has opted not to provide a detailed or formulaic 'recipe' for the assessment of likely significant effects. When considered appropriate to this assessment, definitions and detailed methodologies from the earlier second edition of the GLVIA have been used.

For a detailed description of the assessment methodology refer to Appendix 1.

The Study Area

- 3.2 The study area for assessing the impact of the proposed development on the landscape, encompasses the urban edges of Hamble, Hamble Station, the Hamble River, and the wider landscape setting, with particular emphasis on the perception of the landscape from roads and footpaths.

Description of the Landscape Baseline Conditions

- 3.6 For the purposes of this assessment the terms landscape, townscape and seascape are interchangeable e.g. landscape character assessment can be applied to the assessment of landscape character within rural or urban areas.
- 3.7 The landscape in the study area has been described using a combination of desk-based study and Site survey. This has examined physical landscape elements such as vegetation and topography in addition to landscape character, sensitivity, value and quality.
- 3.8 The assessment methodology has followed the standard GLVIA approach of assessing changes in the development case against the baseline condition.

Landscape Assessment

- 3.9 Predicted effects have been identified for each receptor, and the magnitude of the identified landscape change evaluated by professional judgement. The significance of these effects has been determined by the inter-relationship of magnitude of effect and receptor sensitivity, a standard and accepted principle that is described in more detail in Appendix 1.

4. BASELINE

- 4.1 This section describes and records the Appeal Site as of August 2018. This forms the baseline against which any potential changes that may result from the new development have been assessed. The landscape baseline is comprised of the landscape character and its aesthetic characteristics and physical landscape elements, such as topography and vegetation. Set out below are the relevant landscape character assessments that have been carried out at National, County and Local Level:

National Landscape Character

- 4.2 At a National Level, the character area profile is NCA 126, South Coast Plain, with the relevant key characteristics of the Site area being:

- *The plain slopes gently towards the coast*
- *There are stretches of farmed land between developed areas*

County Landscape Character

- 4.3 In the Hampshire County Council's 'Integrated Character Assessment', the Site sits within the Character Area 3D Hamble Valley, with the relevant key characteristics of the Site area being (Coastal Plain Open):

- *Well defined strong valley landform with dense semi-natural woodland which clothes the valley sides and top.*
- *A lively, colourful and distinctive yachting character provided by the huge number of yachts and boat moorings, yards and marinas and intensively used water for recreation*
- *Large detached residences set within mature woodland along the valley tops and water's edge with substantial gardens and secluded character.*
- *High quality waterside conservation areas – and popular visitor areas*

Local Landscape Character

- 4.4 In Eastleigh Borough Council's Landscape Character Assessment, the Site sits within Area 13, Hound Plain, with the relevant key characteristics being:

- *Gently-domed landform*
- *Open character interrupted only by intermittent hedges and fences*
- *Mixed farming land use*
- *Woodland defining boundaries*
- *Roads and roadside vegetation prominent*
- *'Horsiculture' and derelict airfield give an urban fringe character*

- *Prominent urban edges and ribbon development*

4.5 Key issues relating to this character area are further set out:

- *The degraded landscape character due to the fairly intensive use of land for horsiculture; small scale agriculture and horticulture and disused land*
- *The detrimental impact of small industrial development on the open landscape*
- *Inconsistent management practices of farmland, small holdings, paddocks and boundary treatments*
- *Development pressure to diversify land uses from agriculture*
- *The contribution of the open character to the visual separation between the settlements of Bursledon, Southampton, Netley and Hamble*

The Site

4.6 The Site is predominantly in line with the Local Landscape Character, being gently domed pasture land use, falling towards the river to the east. The residential edge area of Hamble to the north is a clear settlement edge with the remaining edges of the Site being a mix of hedgerow and tree planting, of varying depth and completeness that allows glimpsed views from the road and footpath.

Landscape Quality and Value

4.7 Landscape value describes the relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society. It can apply to areas of landscape as a whole, or to the individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape. Landscapes, or their component parts, may be valued at the community, local, national or international levels. A review of existing landscape designations is usually the starting point in understanding landscape value, but the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be carefully considered. Individual elements of the landscape - such as trees, buildings, hedgerows, or historic features - may also have value. All need to be considered where relevant.

4.8 Landscape quality means the physical state of the landscape, a sub-set of 'value', and is particularly important when assessing landscapes with no particular designations (ordinary, everyday landscapes, p85 GLVIA3). It includes the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape from visual, functional and ecological perspectives and the condition of individual elements of the landscape.

4.9 The landscape is of local value as a landscape resource that provides visual amenity value. There are no landscape-specific statutory or non-statutory designations that cover the area of the Site.

4.10 When reviewed against the character assessments carried out on this area, for which the EBC assessment is particularly relevant, the Site has a recognisable landscape structure, and the

characteristic patterns and the combinations of landform and land cover as set out in the varying character assessments are evident. Detracting features include rear garden edges at the most southern tip of the Site. The fact that the hedgerow's edge is not 'solid' allows for glimpsed views of the Site from Satchell Lane and the PROW running along the northern edge of the Site.

4.11 This study has found that the Site is of:

Medium landscape value and Ordinary landscape quality

(See Appendix 1 for further detail on definitions).

Landscape Sensitivity

4.12 In evaluating landscape effects, 'sensitivity' should be used to assess the relative ability of a landscape to respond to and, where appropriate, accommodate change of a particular type. Landscape sensitivity therefore reflects landscape character, the nature of change, and the way both are experienced and perceived. It is influenced by a combination of factors, including existing land use, the pattern and scale of the landscape, visual sensitivity (resulting from visual enclosure/openness of views and the distribution of visual receptors), and the value placed on the landscape/townscape.

4.13 Judgements about sensitivity must be made on the basis of information assembled in the baseline survey about landscape character, its constituent elements, features, aesthetic and perceptual aspects, and the key characteristics of the landscape. Understanding of the nature of the change or development proposed must then inform judgements about which attributes of the landscape, and what aspects of overall character, are sensitive to that change and to what degree. Judgements must be made about degrees of sensitivity for landscape character types or landscape character areas and/or for individual components of the landscape.

4.14 The Site is part of the countryside landscape with some intrinsic quality and an open, simple pattern and semi-rural character that makes a positive contribution to the definition and appearance of Hamble, particularly along the Satchell Road section adjacent to the Site and the PROW running along the northern edge of the Site.

4.15 The Site is undesignated and locally valued and therefore the study has found that the Site is of:

Medium sensitivity (landscape of moderately valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of change)

(See Appendix 1 for further detail on definitions).

Topography

4.16 Topography is important in itself, as a natural feature to be appreciated and preserved, and is important for its indirect influences on views and on how the land is used.

4.17 The Site lies along a gentle ridge running roughly east west with the high point at approximately 18m AOD. The Site slopes gently down to circa 11m AOD on the eastern boundary, the north western edge at circa 17m AOD and to the south western corner of the Site circa 15m AOD.

4.18 Beyond the Site, the land continues to fall to the east towards the River Hamble. To the south, the land falls gently to Southampton Water, while the land to the west remains relatively level. To the north the land falls gently to the marshes.

4.19 The study has found that the topography is of:

Medium sensitivity (landscape of moderately valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of change)

Vegetation

4.20 Vegetation is important as a natural feature, often with ecological and cultural associations. It is also important as an element that controls views and, along with the urban built form, this is demonstrated within the study area.

4.21 The Site is an open field of improved grass, surrounded with mature trees along the western boundary, and hedgerows with trees are of varying width and density along the northern boundary. The conifer hedge to the south and mature woodland to the east provide the edges of the field but are outside the Site boundary generally.

4.22 The study has found that the vegetation is of:

Medium sensitivity (landscape of moderately valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of change)

The Wider Landscape (Aesthetic, Perceptual and Experiential Context)

4.23 As noted in GLVIA (3rd Edition) 'Character is not just about the physical elements and features that make up the landscape, but also embraces the aesthetic, perceptual and experiential aspects of the landscape that make different places distinctive.'

4.24 The Site is primarily perceived from Satchell Lane and the PROW along its eastern edge.

4.25 Approaching the Site from the north, turning off the major road into the Hamble Peninsula (Hamble Lane, the B3397) there is a sense of entering an area of countryside with only the Hamble School as a major built element.

4.26 The road continues south, over the railway line with a group of buildings on the corner as the road turns, substantially screened from the road. The countryside feel to the road continues up to the Site edge, where the entrance to Mercury Yacht Harbour, with glimpsed views of the boats in harbour and the low scale holiday homes. There are views of the Site's open field through the intermittent hedge and trees, with the fences at the rear of properties along Satchell Lane forming a clear edge and providing a sense of the depth of open space around the settlement. Moving further south, houses of varying sizes and style address the road edge with varying levels of planting in the front gardens creating a suburban edge. Moving towards the conservation area in Hamble, the houses become more prominent on both sides of the road until the village centre is reached with a more open urban space with parking and shops leading down to the river. There are glimpsed views of the boats and masts from the road, being most

significant at the centre of Hamble village (Port Hamble Marina) and at the edge of the Site at the entrance to Mercury Yacht harbour and through the adjacent holiday homes, adding a perception of the River Hamble to the character of the area (the Site is less than 300m from the edge of the river at its closest point).

4.27 There is a clear gradation of development in both directions, from the countryside edge along the Site, with residential development increasing in density down to the centre of the village. The Site plays an important part in this gradation, allowing glimpsed views of the open field, raised above the road level that creates an edge to the residential edge along Satchell Lane. These views are primarily from vehicles given the lack of footpaths and the tightness of the road between vegetation.

4.28 Along the PROW, moving west, the footpath has glimpsed views to the open fields to the north with views through into the open field through the hedges and trees bordering the Site. This continues along the majority of the Site with the rear of properties being screened by more consistent vegetation moving along the footpath beyond the site edge past the Site edge. There are glimpsed views from the footpath of masts to the east, along the River Hamble, which strengthens the perception of the River Hamble.

4.29 The study has found that the wider landscape is of:

Medium sensitivity (landscape of moderately valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of change)

5. IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Environmental Change without the Development

- 5.1 In the event of the Site not being developed, the landscape would remain as in the baseline, left as open countryside. There would be changes to the Site as trees and hedges developed, died and were replaced by others, but the Site's landscape character would remain essentially unchanged.

The Development and its Potential to Generate Landscape Effects

- 5.2 The completed development of the Site would potentially generate a range of landscape impacts including:

- Land take and character impacts on the currently open green landscape;
- Reduction of the perception of separation between Hamble and Hound;
- Direct landscape impacts on existing landscape elements such as vegetation and topography; and
- Direct and Indirect impacts on the perception of the Site for inhabitants and visitors.

- 5.3 There would also be a series of impacts during the course of the construction, which would generate a sub-set of impacts on a temporary basis:

- Securing the Site and setting up of the Site facilities;
- Services diversions and re-provision;
- Site clearance including vegetation removal;
- Earthworks including topsoil strip; and
- Construction of housing including the roads and lighting

Landscape Effects

- 5.4 The landscape assessment has followed the defined methodology of assessing sensitivity against the magnitude of change to identify a significance category for each identified effect. This process has been used as the basis for the description of the likely significant landscape effects of the project.

Landscape Character (Site and Wider Landscape)

- 5.9 There would be a major change in the landscape character from countryside to an urban development, with the open views currently afforded along the road and PROW becoming views of an urban development with associated planting. There would be changes to the majority of the currently open green character of the Site which would extend the urban character of Hamble towards open countryside in the direction of Hound. This would readily be perceived by local residents, and users of the roads and footpaths, changing significantly the perception of the Site from all sides. The current urban edge provided by residential properties fronts onto

Satchell Lane as a shallow ribbon development typology. The proposed development would be set back from the road and be a much deeper urban form.

5.10 As well as built form, the activity of people living in the new housing would bring about a noticeable change in the character of the Site and its immediate context, and extend the urban edge of the adjacent townscape areas. The housing development would be a busier scene than the baseline and there would also be lighting effects and noise. These effects, resulting from the presence of the development, would be permanent.

- ***Magnitude of change is major which would result in a moderate adverse to major adverse effect during the construction phase, at year 0 and at year 15.***
- ***Direct, permanent impact at a local scale***

Vegetation

5.11 The majority of the open grassland will be lost to urban development (apart from the area set aside for public open space) and the majority of existing hedgerows and trees would be retained.

- ***The magnitude of change is major which would result in a moderate adverse to major adverse effect during the construction phase, at year 0 and at year 15.***
- ***Direct, permanent impact at a local scale***

Topography

5.12 Given the outline nature of the application, the assumption is that whilst there would be small scale local topographical changes to obtain acceptable cross falls on roads and pathways etc., generally the existing topography would be retained with no fundamental change.

- ***The assumed magnitude of change is minor which would result in a minor adverse effect during the construction phase, at year 0 and at year 15.***
- ***Direct, permanent impact at a local scale***

Summary of Landscape Effects

5.13 The change from countryside to housing would bring about permanent changes to the landscape and to people's perception of it. These changes would include moderate to major adverse effects resulting from the loss of the predominantly open field and the current perception of the Site from the wider landscape. The replacement landscape would be of housing, lighting and roads in the majority of the Site. Whilst the proposed planting would aid in the screening of the development over time, the loss of both the landscape character and perception of open space will have adverse effects on the Site and its immediate context.

5.14 The current gradation of urban to countryside edge would be lost with the urbanisation of the open countryside, moving towards further open countryside.

5.15 As noted in the Appeal decision for Land to the east of Grange Road (APP/W1715/W/15/3005761), in the Hamble peninsula to the west of this Site. Mr Dignan notes that (point 17):

‘The extension of built development into ordinary farmland is intrinsically harmful, in terms of the character of the area, due to, at the very least, the diminution of the countryside.’

5.16 This point is applicable to the current Site. There would be a clear change to the character and appearance of the Site, as rather than open countryside it would become a housing estate, extending the urban edge of Hamble.

6. MITIGATION

- 6.1 Given the current character of the Site as relatively undeveloped countryside, the proposed development would completely, and permanently, change the character of the majority of the Site to urban.
- 6.2 The Illustrative Masterplan design has incorporated landscape measures, particularly additional planting as a landscape buffer zone around the Site. However, the proposed planting would reinforce the edge and limit views into the open space retained along Satchell Lane and the PROW running along the northern edge of the Site, thus having a direct and irreversible impact on the Site, as the Site currently offers glimpsed views into the open field from Satchell Lane and the PROW running along the northern edge of the Site, strengthening the impression of being in countryside before arriving at the edge of Hamble.
- 6.3 The proposed development therefore does not take account of, and is contrary to, the requirements set out in policies 1.CO, 18.CO and 59.BE regarding protecting the Countryside and Landscape Character.
- 6.4 In terms of policy 20.C regarding landscape improvements, this will need to be agreed with EBC as part of any future detail application.

7. REVIEW OF THE APPELLANT'S LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 Having carried out a review of the CSA Environmental 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (April 2017), I would make the following comments.
- 7.2 General agreement with the findings for the visibility of the Site (page 11-13) from a landscape perspective, but there appears to be no assessment of the magnitude of change or significance to the landscape and no visual impact assessment in terms of sensitivity, magnitude or significance.
- 7.3 General agreement in the assessment of the landscape being of medium value and quality (page 13). However, I would disagree with the assessment that the Site is of Medium to Low sensitivity (page 13) given the definition of Low in Table LE1 notes:
- 'A landscape with a good ability to accommodate change. Change would not lead to a significant loss of features or elements and there would be no significant loss of character or quality. Development of the type proposed would not be discordant with the landscape in which it is set.'*
- 7.4 The Impact on Landscape Features section (page 16) identifies the only features 'of note' as the planting along the boundaries of the Site, which ignores the role that the open field (typical of the character type in this area) plays in the landscape context and the resultant impact that the development will have on it.
- 7.5 There is no assessment of the landscape or visual impacts during the construction phase of the development.
- 7.6 The Relationship to Existing Settlement section (page 15) notes that the new development will relate well to the existing built development in Hamble. The key existing residential form along the western edge of Satchell Lane is linear, terraced and detached properties, set back from but addressing the road. The development along the eastern side of Satchell lane past the boat yard consists of the single storey holiday homes. Therefore, the proposed development will not relate to the existing built form in its immediate context.

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 In my Proof, I have outlined the background to the character of the area that the Appeal Site sits within, and at every level, the open nature of the landscape is emphasised. The boundary of the Hamble is clearly defined by the houses that face onto Satchell Road and any extension beyond this point towards Hound will erode the character of this open landscape.
- 8.2 For the reasons set out above, my evidence supports the Council's Reasons for Refusal 1 on landscape character grounds.

August 2018

Appendix 1: Methodology

Landscape baseline

- 1.1 For the purposes of this assessment the terms landscape, townscape and seascape are interchangeable e.g. landscape character assessment can be applied to the assessment of landscape character within rural, urban or coastal areas.
- 1.2 The landscape in the study area has been described using a combination of desk-based study and Site survey. This has examined physical landscape elements such as vegetation and topography in addition to landscape character and its perceptual qualities.

Landscape character

- 1.3 Landscape character describes the different types of landscape within any given area taking account of topography, vegetation, built form, settlement patterns, land use, local materials, hydrology and other landscape and cultural/historical features. Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) is the process by which landscape character is appraised and subdivided into homogenous units.
- 1.4 The baseline for the development Site and wider study area has been studied at national, county, and district scale, as part of national and county landscape character initiatives. The relevant studies are:
 - National Character Areas
 - County LCAs; and
 - Borough LCAs.

Landscape Value

- 1.5 This is the relative value attached to different landscapes by society. The value placed on a particular landscape may vary for different individuals within that society and value can be applied to whole landscapes, elements within it and particular aesthetic and perceptual dimensions that it provides.
- 1.6 Landscapes are valued at local, national or international levels, noting that undesignated landscapes (local or national level) do not necessarily have no value and may contain valued elements.
- 1.7 The baseline has recorded landscape value through a review of the existing landscape designations. Areas of undesignated landscape have been assessed through a combination of desk and Site based study to examine a range of factors including landscape quality and condition, scenic quality, rarity, representativeness, conservation interests, recreation value, perceptual aspects and associations. The criteria used for the assessment of landscape quality is described below.

Landscape Quality

- 1.8 Landscape Quality is part of the assessment and follows a GLVIA described methodology. The GLVIA defines landscape quality as the comparative value placed on a landscape or feature relative to its location, rarity or particular attributes. It considers the visual and physical attributes of the landscape, including ecological interest and cultural/heritage associations, identifying seven categories from Exceptional (National Park/AONB) to Damaged Landscapes (Derelict Land). The criteria used in the assessment are set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Landscape Quality Criteria.

Category	Criteria
High exceptional	Very strong landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns, balanced combination of landform and land cover. Appropriate management for land use and land cover. Extensive features worthy of conservation. Unique sense of place. No detracting features.
High	Strong landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns and balanced combination of landform and land cover. Appropriate management for land use and land cover but with potential scope to improve. Extensive features worthy of conservation. Strong sense of place. Occasional detracting features.
Good	Recognisable landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns and combinations of landform and land cover are still evident. Some scope to improve management for land use and land cover. Frequent features worthy of conservation. Sense of place. Some detracting features.
Ordinary	Distinguishable landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns of landform and land cover often masked by land use. Scope to improve management for land use and land cover. Some features worthy of conservation. Some detracting features.
Poor	Weak landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns of landform and land cover are often masked by land use. Lack of management and intervention has resulted in degradation. Lack of features worthy of conservation. Frequent detracting features.
Very Poor	Degraded landscape (urban) structure, characteristic patterns of landform and land cover are masked by land use. Lack of management and intervention has resulted in degradation. Lack of features worthy of conservation. Extensive detracting features.
Damaged landscapes	Damaged landscape (urban) structure. Disturbed or derelict land requires treatment. Detracting features dominate.

Landscape Sensitivity

- 1.9 Landscape sensitivity is a measure of the value of a particular landscape and its susceptibility to accept change resulting from a particular development type. Landscape sensitivity identifies the vulnerability of each landscape unit to change through the introduction of the new features, such as housing, or the loss of existing valued features such as mature hedgerows.

The GLVIA defines the sensitivity of a landscape as varying with a combination of:

- Landscape sensitivity resulting from existing land use, the pattern and scale of the landscape/townscape;
- Visual sensitivity resulting from visual enclosure/openness of views, and distribution of visual receptors;
- The value placed on the landscape/townscape; and
- The scope for mitigation, which would be in character with the existing landscape/townscape.

- 1.9 The assessment has applied these descriptors to the Study Area landscape using a criteria range of High, Medium and Low.

Table 3: Landscape Sensitivity Criteria

Sensitivity rating	Criteria
High	Important/highly valued (components of the) landscape or landscapes of particularly distinctive character susceptible to relatively small changes. <i>Examples include the highly valued, important AONB landscapes that are of high intrinsic quality</i>
Medium	Landscape of moderately valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of changes. <i>Examples include locally valued, undesignated rural landscapes with some intrinsic quality</i>
Low	Relatively degraded or low value landscape, the nature of which is potentially tolerant of substantial change. <i>Examples include brownfield land that has been subject to a history of constant change with relatively few established features.</i>

Assessment of landscape effects

- 1.10 This section describes the landscape assessment methodology and how it has been applied to the proposed development.
- 1.11 The assessment methodology follows the standard GLVIA approach of assessing changes in the development case against the baseline condition.

1.12 Predicted effects have been identified and the magnitude of the identified landscape changes evaluated by professional judgement. The significance of these effects has been determined by the inter-relationship of nature of effect (magnitude) and the nature of receptor (sensitivity): a standard and accepted principle that is described in more detail below.

Landscape assessment

1.13 Landscape assessment identifies the likely scale and nature of change to individual landscape elements and characteristics, and any consequential effects on character resulting from the proposed development. Components of the landscape which have been examined in this assessment are:

- landscape character;
- landscape designations; and
- physical characteristics such as topography and vegetation.

1.14 Once a potential impact on these components has been identified an experienced based judgement of the nature of the predicted landscape effect has been made and recorded as:

- Beneficial or adverse.
- Direct or indirect.
- Temporary/permanent.
- Short, medium or long term.
- Local/regional/national in scale.
- Single or cumulative.

1.15 The next step in the process uses experience based judgement to identify the magnitude of the potential change that would result from the identified landscape impact. The magnitude of the impact is the degree of change experienced by a receptor. The magnitude of landscape effects has been described using the criteria set out in Table 4 (below).

Table 4: Magnitude of Impact on Landscape Criteria

Magnitude Rating	Criteria
Major	Major alteration (loss/enhancement) to key elements/features/ characteristics of the baseline i.e. pre-development landscape and/or introduction of elements considered to be totally uncharacteristic/characteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape.
Moderate	Partial alteration (loss/enhancement) to one or more key elements/features/ characteristics of the baseline i.e. pre-development landscape and/or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not necessarily be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape.
Minor	Minor alteration (loss/enhancement) to one or more key elements/features/ characteristics of the baseline i.e. pre-development landscape and/or introduction of elements that may not be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape.
Negligible	Very minor alteration (loss/enhancement) to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline i.e. pre-development landscape and/or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic with the surrounding landscape.
No Change	No noticeable alteration (loss or gain) of key elements/features/ characteristics of the baseline.

1.16 The significance of the predicted landscape effects has then been identified using a matrix form of evaluation. The thresholds of landscape effects significance criteria have been based on the matrix provided in Table 5, which is adapted from the guidance set out in the GLVIA. Effects have been assigned one of the four categories of Insignificant / Minor / Moderate or Major considering the magnitude of the change and the ability of the receptor to accommodate the proposed change (sensitivity).

Table 5: Significance Thresholds for Landscape and Visual Effects

Magnitude of potential change to receptors	Nature of the receptor (sensitivity to proposed change)		
	Low	Medium	High
Major	Minor/ Moderate	Moderate/ Major	Major
Moderate	Minor	Moderate	Moderate/ Major
Minor	Neutral/Minor	Minor	Minor/ Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral/Minor	Neutral/Minor
No Change	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

1.17 The parameters for the significance category assigned for each identified landscape effect are defined within the written assessment.

Appendix 2: Figures