

LAND AT SACHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE

**Proof of Evidence of Jeremy Smith BSc (Hons),
Dip LA, CMLI on Landscape and Visual Matters**

Prepared for: Foreman Homes Limited

PINS Ref: APP/P1715/W/22/3292580

SLR Ref: 403.064427.00001
Version V3
October 2022



CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Qualifications and Experience	1
1.2 Scope of Evidence	2
1.3 Definitions	3
1.4 Methodology	3
1.5 Structure of this Evidence	4
1.6 The Study Area	4
2.0 REVIEW OF LANDSCAPE PLANNING CONTEXT	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 National Policy	5
2.3 Designations	5
2.4 The Development Plan	6
2.4.1 Adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036	6
2.5 Planning History	7
2.5.1 Appeal Decision for up to 70 Dwellings at Satchell Lane (APP/W1715/W/18/3194846), 20 th December 2018	7
2.6 Responses to the Application on Landscape and Visual Matters	10
2.6.1 Response from the Council’s Landscape Officer, Tim Griffin, 11 th February 2021	10
2.6.2 Response of the Council’s Tree Officer, Chris Stringer, 28 th January 2021	10
2.6.3 Response of the Council’s Urban Design Officer, Gary Osmond, 14 th May 2021	11
2.6.4 Planning Application Report (27 th April 2022)	12
2.7 Summary and Conclusions of Planning Context	12
3.0 THE POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	14
3.1 Introduction	14
3.2 Key Elements in the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan	15
3.3 How the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan Responds to the Concerns Expressed by Officers	16
3.4 Conclusions on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan	18
4.0 THE POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS OF THE APPEAL PROPOSALS	19
4.1 Introduction	19
4.2 Methodology	19
4.3 Potential Landscape Effects of the Proposed Development	20
4.3.1 The Existing Landscape Character of the Site and its Context	20
4.3.2 The Potential Landscape Effects of the Proposed Development	26
4.4 Potential Visual Effects of the Proposed Development	32

4.4.1	Overall Visibility of the Proposed Development.....	32
4.4.2	Potential Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints.....	32
4.4.3	Sensitivity of Visual Receptors.....	33
4.4.4	Potential Magnitude of Visual Effects.....	34
4.4.5	Assessment of Overall Visual Effects.....	34
4.5	Summary of the Potential Landscape and Visual Effects of the Proposed Development	37
5.0	RESPONSE TO REASON FOR REFUSAL 1 AND DESIGN ISSUES RAISED BY THE LANDSCAPE AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICERS	39
5.1	Introduction	39
5.2	Reason for Refusal 1	39
5.3	Landscape Design Concerns Raised by Reason for Refusal 4 and Landscape and Urban Design Officers	45
6.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	47
6.1	Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2	Planning Context.....	47
6.3	Landscape Design Review of the Appeal Proposals	47
6.4	Potential Landscape and Visual Effects of the Appeal Proposals	48
6.5	Response to Reason for Refusal 1.....	49

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Qualifications and Experience

1. I am Jeremy Smith, Director with SLR Consulting Limited (SLR). I am the founder member of SLR's landscape architecture practice, which now has over 110 landscape and masterplanning staff across the UK, Australia, New Zealand and USA.
2. I am a chartered landscape architect with 31 years of professional experience. I have a first class degree in geography from the University of Nottingham and a post-graduate diploma in landscape architecture from Sheffield University.
3. Whilst working in landscape practice I have specialised in landscape planning and landscape and visual assessment, and in the past fifteen years I have focused on the design and assessment of residential developments throughout the UK. I have acted as an expert witness on landscape, visual and Green Belt matters at numerous appeals, giving evidence both for and against development proposals. I have written guidance for Local Authorities such as Oxford and Harrow on protected views. I was one of four landscape architects that recently co-authored new guidance on landscape value and paragraph 174 valued landscapes on behalf of the Landscape Institute ("*Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations*", Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21). Further details of some of my recent relevant project experience are included at Appendix 1 to this proof of evidence.
4. In August 2022 I was asked by Foreman Homes Limited (Foreman) to review the application documents, the previous appeal decision and other relevant materials to determine whether I could support the appeal proposals at the forthcoming appeal. Based upon my desk top review I agreed that I would be willing to provide landscape and visual evidence for the appellant in relation to Reason for Refusal 1 and landscape aspects of Reason 4 (see decision notice **CD2.2**).
5. The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal in this proof of evidence is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of the Landscape Institute. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions, irrespective of by whom I am instructed.

1.2 Scope of Evidence

6. Foreman applied for full approval for the erection of 61 two storey homes, with associated public open space, landscaping and amenity areas with access from Satchell Lane (application reference F/20/89488).

7. On 13th August 2021 the Decision Notice (**CD2.2**) issued by Eastleigh Borough Council set out seven reasons for refusal, and this evidence focuses primarily on the landscape and visual concerns expressed in Reason for Refusal 1:

“The proposals represent 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), Draft Policies S7 & DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework”.

8. In relation to the policies quoted in this Reason for Refusal, section 7.6 of the Council’s Statement of Case clarifies that the relevant policies are now S5 and DM1 of the adopted Local Plan.

9. I have also provided an illustrative landscape masterplan, **drawing SL1**, in response to draft condition 11 and in order to seek to address the landscape design concerns expressed in Reason for refusal 4: these include the concern that the design *“fails to take the opportunity to provide safe and appealing footpath routes”* and also *“fails to provide well integrated and attractive recreational spaces and landscaping”*. Other design concerns expressed in Reason for refusal 4 are addressed by Mr Hillson. The illustrative landscape masterplan also seeks to address concerns raised in the responses by the Council’s Landscape and Urban Design Officers, and in the Council’s Statement of Case.

10. Evidence on planning policy and housing need is provided by Steven Brown of Woolf Bond, and evidence on the design and layout of the development is provided by Luke Hillson of Barton Willmore (now Stantec). Evidence on sustainability and traffic is provided by John Wilde, evidence on drainage is provided by Dan Lytton, and evidence on ecology is provided by Mark Rose.

11. I have also prepared a landscape and visual appraisal (LVA) at section 4 of my proof. This appraisal is based upon a desk top assessment of the relevant planning context, existing character assessments and maps, a computer model of the site and its context prepared to assess potential landscape and visual effects, and a site visit undertaken in clear conditions in September 2022. My appraisal is supported by drawings and assessment tables which are included in my Appendices.
12. My evidence specifically addresses the following issues:
 - Review of the planning context relevant to this proof.
 - Consideration of the form of the Final Landscaping Scheme for the Appeal proposals.
 - Appraisal of the existing character of the appeal site and its context, and the potential landscape effects of the proposed development;
 - Appraisal of the potential visibility and visual effects of the proposed development;
 - Response to Reason for Refusal 1, and the Landscape Officer's and Urban Design Officer's Landscape Comments.

1.3 Definitions

13. The European Landscape Convention (ELC) defines landscape as *"an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors"* (see Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (2013, GLVIA3, **CD10.3**, paragraph 2.2). As GLVIA3 states, the ELC definition of landscape is inclusive, in that covers *"natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas"*, as well as *"inland water and marine areas"*.

1.4 Methodology

14. The terminology in this proof of evidence follows the guidance of GLVIA3. The detailed methodology for the landscape and visual appraisal within this proof is included at Appendix A in my Appendices. The methodology for preparing the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is set out at Appendix B of my Appendices.
15. It is important to note that it is accepted practice in landscape and visual appraisal to conclude that the introduction of built form to a green field site will result in negative landscape and visual effects. However, notwithstanding this, it is possible that good design of the proposed building and

landscaping could still create successful places with attractive scenic qualities. It is therefore important to consider placemaking and design alongside the conclusions of the landscape and visual appraisal.

1.5 Structure of this Evidence

16. This document is my proof of evidence. The methodologies and supporting drawings are included within my appendices, and I have also produced a separate summary of my evidence.

1.6 The Study Area

17. The study area for the LVA is defined on **drawing SL2**. This has been defined partly by the ZTV for the development (see **drawing SL4**), but also by a broader area which allows for the site to be considered in its landscape context.

2.0 Review of Landscape Planning Context

2.1 Introduction

18. In this section of my proof I have briefly reviewed the relevant planning policy and history in order to understand the planning context for Reason 1 for Refusal. A full consideration of planning policy and history is included within the evidence of Steven Brown to whom I defer on matters of planning judgment; this section focuses only on those aspects relevant to the effects of the development upon character and views.

2.2 National Policy

19. I have selected only those paragraphs that are of most relevance to this proof.
20. NPPF paragraph 10 states that “*at the heart of the Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development***” (bold text as per NPPF).
21. The NPPF states at paragraph 174 that “*planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: (a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ... in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan” and (b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside...*”
22. Paragraph 175 states that plans should “*distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites*”.

2.3 Designations

23. Landscape-related designations are set out on **drawing SL2** in my Appendices. In essence the appeal site is not within or adjacent to any national or local landscape designations, nor is it within or adjacent to any landscape-related designations. There are also no formal rights of way across the site, although Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 runs parallel with the western boundary of the appeal site.

2.4 The Development Plan

2.4.1 Adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (CD4.1)

24. The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 was adopted on 25th April 2022, and now replaces the “saved” policies in the Adopted Local Plan 2001-2011. In this plan the site is not allocated for development and is therefore within an area defined as countryside on the proposals map.
25. Draft Policy S7 is mentioned in Reason for Refusal 1, but this has become Strategic Policy S5 in the adopted Local Plan. S5 sets out accepted form of development in the countryside in part 1 (appeal proposals do not meet any of these criteria), part 2 then states *“in permitting new development in the countryside the Borough Council will seek to:*
- a. 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;*
 - b. secure long-term beneficial management practices that will enhance the landscape and biodiversity of the countryside and coast;*
- parts c, d and e of this policy address sterilisation of mineral resources, best and most versatile agricultural land and the protection of soils, and these topics are outside of the scope of my evidence.
26. Draft Policy DM1 is also included in Reason for Refusal 1, and this remains Policy DM1 in the adopted Local Plan. DM1 is a general policy for all new development, and includes requirements for all new development to (*inter alia*) *“a. not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible enhance i. residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast”*.
27. Part c of DM1 states that applicants should *“take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale,*

materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views. Where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area”.

28. Part d of DM1 states that developments should “*not involve the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area, for appearance or biodiversity unless they can be replaced with features of equivalent or enhanced value*”.
29. Part e of DM1 states that developments should “*include a landscape scheme covering the design and layout of external space*”, and the other part of relevance to this evidence is part f, which requires that public rights of way should be protected and enhanced, and that green infrastructure should be “*fully connected*”.

2.5 Planning History

2.5.1 Appeal Decision for up to 70 Dwellings at Satchell Lane (APP/W1715/W/18/3194846), 20th December 2018 (CD8.1)

30. An outline application for up to 70 homes – on exactly the same site as the current appeal site - was refused by Eastleigh Borough Council on 26th September 2017, with five reasons for refusal. The case was appealed, and by the time of the inquiry the five reasons for refusal had reduced to two, the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and whether the appeal site’s location was sustainable. On 20th December 2018 the Inspector allowed the appeal. The landscape masterplan for the permitted proposals is included at **Plate I**, below.
31. It is notable that the permitted masterplan in **Plate I** has many similarities to that which is the subject of this appeal. Built form occupies largely the same area of the site, although the higher number of dwellings in the permitted scheme means that density was higher (a gross density of 19.88 in the permitted scheme compared with 17.3 in this appeal). Both schemes include two storey homes. It is notable that the central green space is much smaller than for the current proposal, but the approved scheme has a broader landscape buffer along the eastern edge of the site, adjacent to existing back gardens. A potential link with the footpath to the west of the appeal site is shown on the approved scheme.

32. At paragraph 21 of his decision the Inspector notes that the site is included within the Hound Plain character area. The Inspector notes at paragraph 22 that although these larger scale assessments “*accurately portray the wider area around the appeal site ... in more detail the site is strongly influenced by the proximity of the existing settlement*”.
33. The Inspector notes that the parties agreed “*that the landscape character of the wider area would not be materially affected by the appeal proposals*”. Both parties and the Inspector also agreed that the appeal site did **not** constitute a valued landscape in the sense of what was then paragraph 170 of the Framework (now 174(a)).



Plate I: The masterplan for the permitted outline residential development at Satchell Lane, prepared by CSA Environmental Ltd (CD3.1).

34. The Inspector also references the Council’s own sensitivity study at paragraph 24 of his decision, which he notes concluded that the locality of the site had **low sensitivity** to residential development. The Inspector remarked that this conclusion was “*of considerable significance*”.
35. In terms of the potential visual effects of the proposed development, the Inspector notes at paragraph 25 that “*the site is well contained from the wider area by virtue of the existing trees and development along the eastern boundary*”. The Inspector notes that whilst some partial views from the eastern bank of the River Hamble “*this is a considerable distance away and it is hard to even identify the site from that direction*”. The Inspector also notes at paragraph 29 that although the outlook from a number of houses close to the site would be “*significantly changed*” by the appeal proposals “*that is not a matter, in either landscape terms or in relation to outlook, which is of overriding significance*”.
36. In terms of potential landscape effects, the Inspector notes at paragraph 26 that development of the site would have an urbanising effect which “*would cause some limited harm to the existing landscape character*”, although he goes on to note that “*this would also be the case in relation to any greenfield development proposal*”. The Inspector also accepts (at paragraph 28) that in character terms the proposal to provide housing “*in depth*” on the site (as opposed to in a linear or ribbon form) was in keeping with housing found on the opposite side of Satchell Lane and that this form of development “*would therefore not be out of keeping with the general form of development in this part of the settlement*”.
37. The Inspector also notes at paragraph 30 that the landscape of the site does not have additional value conferred due to its position on a route to and from the settlement; he notes that this is not identified in any policy or guidance and that the view of the site as one approaches the settlement are limited. The Inspector also noted that although some parts of the wider area had been identified by the Council as having an important function of separating settlements, the appeal site did not perform this function.
38. In overview the Inspector concludes on character and appearance matters at paragraph 32 that:

“*Overall, this is a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development. The effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views. That said,*

the proposal would be in the countryside and would cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...

2.6 Responses to the Application on Landscape and Visual Matters

2.6.1 Response from the Council's Landscape Officer, Tim Griffin, 11th February 2021 (CD 1.51)

39. The Landscape officer expresses concerns regarding the proposed site layout, stating that it *"restricts opportunities for the creation of significant new Green Infrastructure (GI) which is regarded as essential to creating a high quality landscape setting for this site"*. Particular concerns include the *"disruption"* of the continuous landscape buffer around the edges of the site that formed part of the previous appeal proposals, and the limited opportunities for street tree planting. It is also noted that the road layout sometimes passes too close to existing hedgerows, and that the majority of front gardens are too small.
40. It is notable that the Landscape Officer makes no comments about the character of the site, potential visual receptors around the site, or the potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed development. All of his comments focus upon the design of the development itself.
41. It is also notable that the officer very fairly states that his comments are based upon a desk top review, and that *"I have not had the opportunity to visit the site"*. He also notes that his comments are based upon *"an illustrative landscape layout which lacks precise detail"*.
42. I discuss the landscape design of the proposals further in section 3 of my proof, and I have included an illustrative landscape masterplan (drawing SL1) in my Appendices. I provide a response to the Landscape Officer's Concerns at section 6 of this proof.

2.6.2 Response of the Council's Tree Officer, Chris Stringer, 28th January 2021 (CD 1.53)

43. The Tree officer notes that *"the site contains significant trees and hedges, which border the site"*. He notes that although some trees would need to be removed for the access arrangements these *"are generally damaged, stunted or have no future potential"*. He therefore concludes that the *"long term impact, with suitable replacement planting, is relatively low"*.

44. No objection to the proposals was made from an arboricultural perspective, subject to conditions.

2.6.3 Response of the Council's Urban Design Officer, Gary Osmond, 14th May 2021 (CD 1.54)

45. Urban Design matters are addressed by Luke Hillson of Barton Willmore, and I have therefore only included references to matters which relate to landscape design, landscape character and views.
46. The Urban Design Officer states that the *"general site layout lacks any consideration of the site context, or the character of the surrounding area"*, that there is *"insufficient room left over to provide worthwhile green infrastructure"*, and that streetscapes are *"poorly composed"*. The village green at the centre of the appeal proposals is described as a *"token gesture"*, *"little more than a modest area of grass with some trees planted it"*.
47. The Urban Design Officer also expresses concerns regarding the potential effects of the development upon the character of Satchell Lane, which he states will *"form the northern gateway into Hamble"*. In particular he notes that the clearing of some vegetation to create the new access *"will mean that the whole site will be visible when travelling out of hamble around the sharp bend in the lane"*, with *"insufficient room"* provided to *"enforce and enhance the boundary planting"*. In the same vein, concerns are expressed that the *"soft landscape buffers to the site boundaries need to be strengthened to soften the appearance of the scheme"*, and also that the landscaping along the western edge of the site should be sufficient to minimise the effects of development on the wider countryside in this direction.
48. I note that the Urban Design Officer's response states that his comments *"are based on a desktop study without the benefit of a recent site visit. However, the site is known to the author"*.
49. As with the Landscape Officer's comments I have discussed the landscape design of the proposals at section 3.0 of my proof, and I provide a response to the Urban Design Officer's Concerns at section 6 of this proof.

2.6.4 Planning Application Report (27th April 2022, CD2.1)

50. The section of this report titled *“Impact on the Countryside”* states that the appeal proposals would be to cause *“the significant and irreversible urbanisation of both the site itself as well as that of the surrounding area, to the detriment of the intrinsic character of the landscape and that of the countryside locality”*.
51. The report goes on to state that Satchell Lane is *“semi-rural”*, being narrow, *“bound by trees and green verges”* and *“devoid of footways and street lighting”*, and the appeal site *“contributes notably to the transition from the built up area of the settlement of Hamble to the more rural character of this section of countryside, with this being considered to occur when moving beyond the existing housing on the eastern side of the lane (The Halyards)”*. The report states that a similar transition to more rural character occurs when walking northwards on Footpath number 1. The report states that for users of both the lane and the footpath *“whilst the tree line along the northern boundary of the application site would filter views to a degree, the urban nature of the development would still be significantly and eminently apparent”*. The Officer goes on to state that this urban influence would also be apparent from the Airfield land and footpath 1 to the west. He concludes that the proposals would therefore *“significantly extend and undermine the built-up edge of Hamble, and would represent a visually intrusive encroachment into this area of countryside, to the detriment of its prevailing character”*.
52. The report also echoes the design concerns expressed by the Landscape and Urban Design Officers, which I have summarised at sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.3, above.

2.7 Summary and Conclusions of Planning Context

53. The appeal site is not within or adjacent to any national or local landscape designations, nor is it within or adjacent to any landscape-related designations. There are also no formal rights of way across the site, although Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 runs parallel with the western boundary of the appeal site.
54. In the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 the site is not allocated for development and is within an area defined as countryside on the proposals map.

55. However, an appeal for up to 70 homes on exactly the same site as the appeal site was allowed in 2018. The Inspector noted that the parties agreed *“that the landscape character of the wider area would not be materially affected by the appeal proposals”*. Both parties and the Inspector also agreed that the appeal site did not constitute a valued landscape. In terms of potential landscape effects, the Inspector noted that development of the site would have an urbanising effect which *“would cause some limited harm to the existing landscape character”*, but that *“this would also be the case in relation to any greenfield development proposal”*. The Inspector concluded that this was *“a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”*, that *“the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views”* and *“the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...”*

3.0 The Potential Form of the Final Landscaping Scheme for the Proposed Development

3.1 Introduction

56. As I have noted in sections 1.0 and 2.0 of this proof, Reason 4 for Refusal and responses from the Urban Design and Landscape Officers for the Council express concerns regarding landscape aspects of the proposed masterplan. Whilst the majority of design issues raised in Reason 4 and the Officer's responses will be addressed by Mr Hillson, in this section of my proof I consider how some of the landscape issues raised by Officers might be addressed.

57. Draft condition 11 states that:

"Prior to commencement of development, a final landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be in broad accordance with the Illustrative Landscape Plan, FHL-001, and cover all hard surfacing and soft landscaping, including trees with the proposed species, and boundary treatments, and shall provide details of timings for all landscaping and any future maintenance".

58. The Reason behind this draft condition states that the objective is *"to ensure a high quality landscape scheme in the interest of visual amenity and biodiversity, in accordance with Policies S9 and DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036"*.

59. It is therefore agreed between the parties that if permission were to be granted for the appeal proposals further landscape design work would need to be submitted, and that the submitted designs would need to be in *"broad accordance with the illustrative landscape plan"* (my emphasis).

60. It is in this context that I have produced an illustrative landscape masterplan (**drawing SL1** in my Appendices). On this plan the position and scale of spaces remains precisely the same as in the submitted landscape plan, but the details of tree and shrub planting have been refined. The illustrative masterplan is therefore in broad accordance with the illustrative landscape plan, as the draft condition requires.

61. In section 3.2, below, I summarise the key elements of this illustrative landscape masterplan, and at **Table 1**, below, I have summarised the concerns of Officers (as noted in section 2.0 of this proof), and have then set out how the illustrative landscape masterplan seeks to address each of these points.
62. In preparing the illustrative landscape masterplan I am also aware that Eastleigh Borough Council has recently adopted a new Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Trees and Development (April 2022). Key point 3 of this document requires that applicants demonstrate that tree retention has been considered at the planning and design stage, and Key Point 8 requires that applicants develop a “*high quality landscape scheme*” as part of the development proposal. Key point 9 states that “*landscape plans must illustrate how trees and soft landscape will enhance all public open space, streetscapes and public realm...*”. More general design guidance is also provided within Eastleigh Borough’s Quality Places SPD (November 2011).
63. When considering the potential landscape and visual effects of the appeal proposals in my LVA at section 4.0 of this proof I have considered the proposals without established landscaping in year 1, but have also considered how the illustrative landscape masterplan might influence landscape and visual effects in the medium to long term (at year 15).

3.2 Key Elements in the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan

64. The illustrative landscape masterplan in **drawing SL1** has not amended any elements of the built form as shown in the submitted masterplan; the houses, roads and paths are exactly the same as in the submitted scheme. The only element that has been amended is landscaping, in the same way that landscaping details pursuant to a condition would refine the design and provide a further level of detail.
65. The new landscape features that have been introduced include the following:
- **Street trees** have been relocated: all trees are now in beds at least 2 metres wide, and at least 4m from the nearest buildings. Some street trees have been removed but new ones have also been added.

- **New hedgerows** have been added in front gardens and along streets. Some hedges would be closely clipped beech hedges, others would be ornamental hedges. These elements would provide further diversity of the streetscapes.
- **New native scrub/woodland edge planting** has been proposed along the northern, north-eastern, southern and western edges of the site. This planting would gap-up and reinforce existing hedgerows around the site, as well as providing additional habitat.
- **New species-rich grasslands** have also been placed around the edges of the site, creating further habitat diversity. Dam grasslands would be established within drainage basins.
- **New Village Green Design.** A further level of detail has been provided for the village green design. This area now accommodates a Local Area for Play (LAP) with tree planting, and an area of amenity grassland with seating areas, ornamental shrub borders and enclosure by pleached hornbeam trees. Rain gardens have also been suggested around the edges of this space, and given the ornamental character of this space it is recommended that this be planted with a mixture of native and non-native species (for example Seat Thrift, *Armeria maritima*, *Iris pseudacorus*, *Achillea*, *Aster*, *Echinops*, *Euphorbia*, *Kniphofia*, *Stachys*, *Carex*, *Geum*, *Heuchera*, *Rudbeckia*).
- **New small orchard in species rich grassland located at the southern end of the site.** The relocation of the LAP provides an opportunity to create another new habitat at the southern end of the site, which would also include seating areas.

66. Of the total site area (3.52ha), 2.55ha would comprise houses, gardens and paths, with 0.97ha comprising Public Open Space (POS) and landscaping. 27.5% of the appeal site therefore comprises landscaping and open space.

3.3 How the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan Responds to the Concerns Expressed by Officers

67. **Table 1**, below, summarises how elements of the Illustrative landscape Masterplan respond to landscape design concerns raised by officers.

Table 1: Concerns Raised by Officers regarding the landscape Design, and the Response within the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan

Concerns Expressed by Officers	Design Response in the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (SL1)
<p>Reason for refusal 4: Fails to take the opportunity to provide safe and appealing footpath routes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Illustrative Landscape masterplan indicates three points where potential links between paths on the appeal site and Footpath number 1, to the west of the appeal site, could be made, with all of these points being existing breaches in the hedgerow. Within the appeal site there is the potential for a number of short circular walks, which could pass by the Village Green, the orchard at the southern end of the site, and areas of species rich grassland and woodland edge/scrub around the edges of the site, or tree and hedgerow lined streets.
<p>Reason for Refusal 4: Fails to provide well integrated and attractive recreational spaces and landscaping</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Green now incorporates the LAP, which would then benefit from informal surveillance by fronting houses to the west, north and east. Similarly the Village Green now includes a small amenity grassland area (sufficient for a kick-about) with seating, and this is again surveyed by fronting houses on all sides. The orchard area at the south of the site provides a different character of space, with meadow grassland, fruit trees and seating areas. The arrival area at the site access benefits from retained trees and shrubs as well as additional native shrub planting and species-rich grasslands, creating a soft, green gateway to the site. Streetscapes include not only street trees but also ornamental shrub planting and hedgerows, providing visual diversity.
<p>Restricts Opportunities for Creation of Significant Green Infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Illustrative landscape masterplan creates a continuous belt of species-rich grassland, scrub/woodland edge and tree planting around the southern, western, northern and north-eastern edges of the site, with the eastern edge being provided by existing vegetation within large private gardens (gardens on the eastern edge are typically over 40 metres long). 27.5% of the area of the appeal site would be occupied by POS and landscaping, most of which is within contiguous spaces around the edges of the site. Street trees and hedgerows provide further green infrastructure connections within the appeal site.
<p>Limited Opportunities for Street Tree Planting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the proposed streets would include not only street trees but also hedgerows. Additional tree planting has also been proposed at the western and southern edges of the site. Importantly, existing trees around the site would be largely unaffected by the proposed development, and these also contribute significantly to the character of the site.

<p>Village green “a token gesture”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Village Green now incorporates a LAP, kick about area, ornamental planting, seating areas and rain gardens. It would be a diverse and attractive area used by different age groups and at all times of year.
<p><i>Insufficient Room to Enclose and Enhance Boundary Planting (also site boundaries needs to be strengthened, especially along the western edge of the site)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The illustrative landscape masterplan provides sufficient space for gapping up and thickening existing boundary planting with new native tree and shrub planting. • Along the western edge of the site new areas of native tree planting are also proposed, in addition to areas of native tree and shrub planting. These planting areas would vary in width between a minimum of 2.38m and a maximum of 11 metres wide.

3.4 Conclusions on the Landscape Design of the Appeal Proposals

68. At sections 1 and 2 of my proof I have noted that Reason for Refusal 4 and Responses from the Urban Design and Landscape Officers express concerns regarding the landscape design of the appeal proposals.
69. I have considered how the landscape design of the site might be refined in response to a draft condition 11. I have produced an illustrative landscape masterplan to indicate the potential elements of a landscaping scheme.
70. I have considered how the illustrative landscape masterplan might help to address some of the concerns expressed by Officers. In particular the illustrative plan includes additional native tree and shrub planting around the edges of the site, hedgerows and trees within streetscapes, a multi-functional Village Green, potential footpath connections with the footpath to the west, a central LAP and a new orchard and seating area at the south of the site.

4.0 The Potential Landscape and Visual Effects of the Appeal Proposals

4.1 Introduction

71. In this section of my Proof of Evidence I have set out an appraisal of the potential landscape and visual effects of the Appeal proposals, in order to address the concerns expressed in Reason for Refusal 1.
72. In considering the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development it is important to acknowledge that all green field residential developments will result in at least some degree of localised landscape and visual harm, a fact that was acknowledged by the Inspector on the previous appeal (see paragraph 26 of the previous Satchell Lane appeal decision and also section 2 of this proof of evidence), and which is also common ground between the parties (see LSoCG paragraph 2.15).

4.2 Methodology

73. This appraisal follows the most up to date and relevant guidance for assessing landscape and visual effects, as set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (GLVIA3). The full methodology is set out at **Appendix A** of my Appendices, and detailed assessment matrices are set out at **Appendices C and D**. This methodology was designed with the input and review of Carys Swanwick, who works with SLR and who was the author of GLVIA3. I have applied the methodology to numerous assessments since 2012, and it has been accepted at numerous inquiries.
74. The report was based upon a site visit in clear conditions, a thorough desk top appraisal of maps and policies, and computer modelling of the proposed development.
75. A computer-based analysis of potential visibility has been carried out, (See Zone of Theoretical Visibility, ZTV, **drawing SL4**), which accurately predicts not only the geographical extent of visibility in the wider landscape, but also the vertical angle that the development would subtend in views, for points at 5 metre intervals extending up to 5 kilometres from the site boundary. It

is worth noting that the ZTV does not include any proposed vegetation. It therefore provides a worst-case assessment of potential visibility.

76. In summary, this appraisal follows best practice and provides a robust and thorough assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed development.

4.3 Potential Landscape Effects of the Proposed Development

4.3.1 The Existing Landscape Character of the Site and its Context

77. As GLVIA3 notes, (paragraph 5.12), the first step when describing the existing character of the site and its context is to refer to existing published character assessments. However, as GLVIA3 notes at 5.13, *“existing character assessments must be reviewed critically as their quality may vary, some may be dated and some may not be suited to the task in hand”*. Furthermore, as paragraph 5.14 notes, *“broad scale assessments at a national or regional level can be helpful in setting the landscape context, but are unlikely to be helpful on their own as the basis for LVIA – they may be too generalised to be appropriate for the particular purpose”*. It is for this reason that GLVIA3 recommends (paragraph 5.15) that it is *“likely that it will be necessary to carry out specific and more detailed surveys of the site itself and perhaps its immediate surroundings”*, which will allow the assessor to *“analyse to what extent the site and its immediate surroundings conform to or are different from the wider Landscape Character Assessments that exist, and to pick up other characteristics that may be important in considering the effects of the proposal”*.
78. Existing landscape character classifications are also illustrated on **drawing SL3** in my Appendices. In summary the appeal site is classified as being within National Character Area 126, South Coast Plain, at a regional level. Key characteristics of this broad character area that are of relevance to the appeal site and its context are as follows:
- *The plain slopes gently southwards towards the coast*
 - *Coastal inlets and ‘harbours’ contain a diverse landscape of narrow tidal creeks, mudflats, shingle beaches, dunes, grazing marshes and paddocks. These include the ... the Hamble Estuary*

- *There are stretches of farmed land between developed areas, often with large arable fields defined by low hedges or ditches.*
- *The coastline provides feeding grounds for internationally protected populations of overwintering waders and wildfowl and is also extensively used for recreation.*
- *The area has significant urban development, with settlements along the coastline dominated by the Portsmouth conurbation, suburban villages and seaside towns including Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and Worthing linked by major road and rail systems.*

79. At a County level the Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment (HICA, 2010) classifies the site as being on the western edge of the Hamble Valley character area (LCA 3d), with the Netley, Bursledon and Hamble Coastal Plain character area extending up to the western edge of the appeal site. Identified characteristics of the Hamble Valley character area which are of relevance to the appeal site and its context are as follows:

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

80. The HICA also classifies the appeal site as being within the Coastal Plain Open character type, which is the same classification as the disused airfield to the west of the appeal site. Relevant characteristics of this character type include *"extensive and flat or gently sloping plain", "tree shelter belts and low hedgerows", "some of the most densely developed areas in Hampshire have occurred in this landscape"*.

81. At a Borough scale the site is classified as part of character area 13, Hound Plain, in the Eastleigh Landscape Character Assessment (2011). This character area includes the disused airfield to the west of the appeal site, but does not include the residential area to the north-east, east and

south-east of the appeal site (these residential areas are not classified within the assessment). Key characteristics of this character area of relevance to the appeal site include the following:

- *Gently domed landform.*
- *Open character interrupted only by intermittent hedges and fences.*
- *Mixed farming and land-use.*
- *Roads and roadside vegetation prominent.*
- *“Horsiculture” and derelict airfield give an urban fringe character.*
- *Prominent urban edges and ribbon development*

82. A Landscape Sensitivity Background paper was also prepared by Eastleigh Borough to assist with the consideration of Strategic Growth Options in October 2018. Within this study Assessment Parcel G is Hamble Airfield, and this parcel extends up to the western boundary of the appeal site (the extent of parcel G is also defined on the landscape character plan, drawing SL4). It is common ground between the parties that this assessment remains a material consideration for this appeal (see LSoCG paragraph 2.4).

83. Parcel G is described as being of moderate/low sensitivity to change, although the more open area at the centre of the disused airfield, and the area close to the footpath, are *“slightly more sensitive to change”*. In the methodology moderate-low sensitivity to change is defined as *“the majority of the landscape qualities are less likely to be adversely affected by change. Although change can be accommodated, care would still be needed in locating and designing change in the landscape”*. In summary, the Eastleigh Borough Sensitivity Study concludes that the area immediately to the west of the appeal site is of moderate/low sensitivity and consequently has capacity for some well-designed development.

84. An earlier assessment of urban character for the Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound area was prepared for Eastleigh Borough Council by Roger Evans in January 2008. This assessment does no purport to deal with landscape character, but it does provide an analysis of townscape in the locality. Character area BHH32 includes the housing to the east of the appeal site, and this is

described as being Victorian to present day cottages/villas/bungalows, with a moderate strength of character.

85. A site-focused landscape character assessment indicates that the site possesses many of the attributes identified in the description of the Hound Plain character area. The site comprises gently sloping field, currently used as horse-grazing, with prominent housing to the north and east. Existing vegetation along Satchell Lane is also prominent at the northern end of the appeal site. **Plates I to III**, below, illustrate some of these characteristics. Whilst some glimpsed long views towards boats on the River Hamble are possible from parts of the site, these are not widely available and so do not overcome the overriding sense of enclosure on the site.



Plate I: View northwards from the appeal site towards the Mercury Holiday Park, with views filtered by existing mature trees and a low hedgerow along Satchell Lane.

79. As **Plate I**, above, illustrates, filtered views of the holiday park are visible from the site to the north, and as **Plates II, III and IV**, below, illustrate existing houses and gardens are also prominent on the eastern boundary of the site, particularly since several of the houses do not have vegetation along the boundary shared with the site.



Plate II, above, and Plate III, below. Existing houses and gardens are also clearly visible on the eastern edge of the appeal site, with boundaries often marked only by post and wire or post and rail fencing.





Plate IV: More houses and gardens which can be clearly seen from the appeal site. As with plates II and III, it is notable that the boundary with the site is often marked only by a post and rail or post and wire fence, which means that private properties are particularly visible.

86. When considering the character of a site it is also important to consider the night-time landscape. Very rural areas tend to have very little influence from existing light sources, and are therefore more susceptible to residential development, which is likely to introduce street lighting as well as light sources on the houses themselves. **Plate V**, below, is an extract from the CPRE's Dark Skies mapping, which provides an objective analysis of the influence of existing light sources, for each area of land in England at a resolution of 400 metre grid squares. In this mapping the dark sky areas are indicated by greys and blues (see the colour scale at the right of plate V), with suburban areas typically being in yellow and orange, and dense, urban areas being in purple, red and pink. Ad Plate V clearly shows, the appeal site is within an area coloured yellow, that is with an existing light level of 2 to 4 Nano Watts/cm²/sr, a level typically associated with suburban/residential areas.



Plate V: Extract from the CPRE Dark Skies Map, illustrating that the appeal site is within an area which is already characterised by light spill from residential areas and roads

87. This is perhaps not surprising, as there is street lighting along the footpath on Satchell Lane, to the east of the appeal site, and also street lighting in the residential areas to the east of Satchell Lane, such as St Agatha's Road and Mercury Gardens.
88. In overview, the landform of the appeal site is orientated towards the settlement edge, and the character of the site is visually influenced by prominent houses and gardens on the settlement edge, as well as by lighting and some traffic noise from. In addition, the site is used for horse-grazing which, as the Eastleigh Landscape Character Assessment notes, is a typical urban fringe use. The site can therefore be classified as Settlement Edge Hound Plain. Land to the west of the appeal site is less influenced by the settlement edge, and is more open, and this has therefore been classified as Open Hound Plain.

4.3.2 The Potential Landscape Effects of the Proposed Development

Landscape Receptors

89. As paragraph 5.34 of GLVIA3 notes, the first step in predicting the landscape effects of a development is to "*identify the components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme, often referred to as the **landscape receptors***". These receptors include individual elements or features, specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects, and overall character.
90. The landscape receptors for the appeal proposals are as follows

- **Individual Elements/features:**
 - Sloping, horse-grazed pasture (on the appeal site);
 - Breached hedgerows and trees (on and around the appeal site).
- **Aesthetic attributes:**
 - Small scale, enclosed with sense of proximity to settlement (appeal site, Satchell Lane, residential areas to the north-east and east of the appeal site).
 - Medium scale, open with more remoteness (disused airfield to the west of the appeal site)
- **Character:**
 - Settlement Edge Hound Plain (including appeal site, Satchell Lane and part of the residential areas to the north and east of Satchell Lane),
 - Open Hound Plain (Disused Airfield, west of the appeal site).

Landscape Value and Valued Landscape

91. As GLVIA3 notes, (5.19), *“a review of existing landscape designations is usually the starting point in understanding landscape value”*. In this context it is important to note that the appeal site is not within or adjacent to a landscape designation, nor is it within or adjacent to landscape-related designations such as heritage or ecological designations.
92. Of course, the fact that a landscape is not designated does not mean that it has no value at all. The value of landscape receptors is assessed in table C1 of **Appendix C**, and this applies the factors set out in table 1 of Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 (**CD10.6**). This assessment concludes that the value of landscape receptors in and around the appeal site is generally of community/low level, since the natural and cultural heritage value of the site is general between low and community value, the site has no associations with (for example) important events, people, art or literature, it has no direct recreational access, and there is little sense of remoteness and tranquillity. The scenic quality and condition of the site is of community level, since the existing settlement edge is a prominent and detractive influence on

the site. The appeal site has no particular functional importance, since, for example, it is not close to a national designation and does not serve as part of the immediate setting for such a designation.

93. As Appendix A to the SLR LVA notes, even undesignated landscapes can be judged to be of Local Authority or even National value: these levels of value are effectively the “*valued landscapes*” referred to in paragraph 174(a) of the NPPF. But, based upon the factors considered in table D1, **the appeal site and its immediate context does not possess characteristics which would elevate it to being a valued landscape**. This judgement was also reached by the Inspector and both parties at the previous appeal, and is also common ground between the parties (see LSoCG paragraph 2.3).

Susceptibility of the Landscape

94. The susceptibility of different landscape receptors to the proposed development is set out in table C2 of my **Appendix C**.
95. In essence, the susceptibility of the sloping horse-grazed pasture field within the appeal site to residential development is high/medium, since this field is currently open and free from development, but is also influenced by views of existing houses to the north and east. The susceptibility of the breached hedgerows and trees receptor is medium, since although this vegetation is inherently susceptible to built development, the majority of the existing native trees and shrubs would be retained in the proposed masterplan.
96. The susceptibility of the Settlement Edge Hound Plain character receptor (which includes the appeal site but also Satchell Lane and the residential areas to the north-east and east) would be medium. Although the field within the appeal site has inherently high/medium susceptibility to residential development, the character of the local area is already partly defined by residential areas, light and roads, and consequently would be possible to accommodate a small scale residential development without transforming local character.
97. The susceptibility of the Open Hound Plain receptor (the disused airfield to the west of the appeal site) is inherently higher since it is less influenced by the settlement edge, but this

susceptibility is reduced due to the fact that the appeal proposals would have no direct effects on this character area.

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

98. In accordance with GLVIA3 (see for example pages 88 to 90) the sensitivity of the landscape receptors can be determined by combining their value with their susceptibility to the proposed development. Table C2 in **Appendix C** sets out the assessment of sensitivity for each of the receptors.
99. The sensitivity of the sloping, horse-grazed pasture is medium, and the sensitivity of the hedgerows and trees around the field is medium/low. In relation to the aesthetic receptors, the small scale and enclosed nature of the appeal site is of low/medium sensitivity, and the medium scale and open nature of the disused airfield to the west of the appeal site is medium.
100. The Settlement Edge Hound Plain character area, which includes the site, Satchell Lane and part of the residential areas to the north-east and east, is of medium/low sensitivity to the proposed development, whereas the Open Hound Plain, to the west of the appeal site, is of medium sensitivity.

Magnitude of Potential Landscape Effects

101. In accordance with the recommendations of GLVIA 3 at paragraph 4.3.7 the potential magnitude of landscape effects for each of the receptors is determined by considering the size/scale of effects, geographical extent of effect and duration of effects. Table C3 of **Appendix C** summarises the potential magnitude of landscape effects for each of the receptors.
102. The proposed development would result in a large scale of change for the sloping, horse-grazed pasture receptor, but this change would be focused on a small geographical area. Given that this effect would be permanent/ long term the overall magnitude of effect for this receptor would be substantial/medium. In contrast, the breached hedgerows and trees receptor would experience only a slight magnitude of change, since the majority of trees and shrubs around the site would be retained, with potential for new native trees and shrubs to be introduced as shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan.

103. For the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the site, there would be a medium magnitude of effect for the small scale, enclosed landscape receptor (which includes the appeal site, Satchell Lane and part of the residential areas to the east). However for the medium scale and open receptor, which is located to the west of the appeal site, there would be only a slight magnitude of change; as the ZTV in drawing SL4 illustrates, the visual influence of the proposed development on this area would be limited, and this would lessen further once the proposed planting shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan has established.
104. For the Settlement Edge Hound Plain character receptor there would be a medium scale of change over a small area: residential development is already a prominent characteristic of this character sub-area, and new homes would be introduced to a field that is already visually influenced by the existing settlement edge. For the Open Hound Plain sub-area, which lies to the west of the appeal site, the magnitude of change would be slight, since, as the ZTV in drawing SL4 illustrates, visibility of the proposed development across this area would be limited to glimpses from a few locations, with this visibility reducing further once the propose planting shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan starts to mature.

Assessment of Overall Landscape Effects

105. Table C4 in **Appendix C** provides a detailed breakdown of how effects have been determined for each of the landscape receptors, by combining sensitivity of receptor with the magnitude of effect.
106. There would be a **major/moderate and negative** effect on the sloping, horse-grazed field, since it is accepted best practice in LVA to assess the introduction of new buildings to a green field site as a negative effect. As I have explained in the methodology at Appendix A, major and major/moderate effects are considered to be important planning considerations (and concentrations of moderate effects can also be considered to be important considerations in some cases).
107. However the effects on the hedgerows and trees around the edge of the site would be moderate/minor, and although these would be negative in nature in the short term (due to the need to remove some vegetation for the site access for example) there is potential for the

effects to become positive in the medium to long term if the native tree and shrub planting proposed in the illustrative landscape masterplan were to be implemented.

108. The effects on the small scale and enclosed nature of the site would be moderate and negative, since the proposed development would intensify the existing sense of enclosure provided by the surrounding vegetation and buildings, combined with the sloping landform. The effects of the development upon the medium scale and open aesthetic receptor, to the west of the appeal site, would be moderate/minor and negative, since although this open area is more inherently susceptible to the introduction of built form it would only experience indirect, visual effects from the new housing, and as the ZTV in drawing SL4 illustrates these effects would be glimpsed over parts of this area, and would reduce over time if the proposed planting in the illustrative masterplan were to be implemented.
109. Turning to the character receptors, the effects on the Settlement Edge Hound Plain sub-area would be moderate and negative: on the one hand this character area is relatively small, and the development would cause noticeable change to a relatively large proportion of it; but on the other hand the proposed development would be introducing two storey homes, gardens and roads to an area which is already characterised by those same elements, or views of those elements, in addition to movement, lighting and noise associated with the existing settlement edge. The effects on the Open Hound Plain sub-area would be moderate/minor and negative, since there would be no direct effects of the proposed development on this area, only glimpsed views of the proposed new houses seen from a small number of locations across the disused airfield.
110. In summary the effects on development on local landscape character would therefore be highly localised, and major/moderate negative effects would be mainly focused upon a single field (the appeal site) which is already influenced by views of built form, lighting and movement. The character of Satchell Lane, which forms part of the Settlement Edge Hound Plain sub-area, would undergo some noticeable change but the proposals would not alter the fundamental character of this route; at present the southern end of the Lane, in the locality of the appeal site, is narrow and enclosed, with filtered views towards houses on both sides, and these characteristics would remain. The disused airfield, to the west of the appeal site, would remain open and medium

scale, with no direct effects from the appeal proposals and with views of the development limited to glimpses from a few locations.

4.4 Potential Visual Effects of the Proposed Development

4.4.1 Overall Visibility of the Proposed Development

111. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) at drawing SL4 in my Appendices provides an objective measure of the visibility of the appeal proposals. The ZTV not only measures the potential extent of visibility, but also the vertical angle of visibility that would be subtended at eye level in the surrounding landscape. As **Appendix B** notes, for comparison, a two-storey house, at an average height of 8m, would subtend a vertical angle of 4.58° at 100m, 2.29° at 200m, 0.92° at 500m and 0.46° at 1km. This particular ZTV includes areas where even 0.1° vertical subtended angle could be visible.
112. However, as I have noted, the ZTV in drawing SL4 is also a worst-case assessment, as it assumes only conservative heights for the surrounding vegetation, excludes the vast majority of vegetation within private gardens, and includes no proposed vegetation.
113. But even on this conservative, worst-case basis the visibility of the proposed development is shown by SL4 to be highly localised. The combination of topography, existing buildings and vegetation provides strong enclosure of the site, both in winter and summer, which would focus visibility of the proposed new homes upon the appeal site itself and areas immediately adjacent to the site boundary. There are only glimpsed and acute angles of visibility to the west of the appeal site, on the disused airfield, and visibility on the eastern bank of the River Hamble is limited to isolated patches of visibility subtending less than 1 degree of visibility.

4.4.2 Potential Visual Receptors and Representative Viewpoints

114. Based upon the worst-case ZTV the following people around the site would have potential to obtain views of the proposed development:
- Drivers, walkers and cyclists on Satchell Lane;
 - Residents to the east and north-east of the appeal site;

- Walkers on Footpath number 1, to the west of the appeal site.
- Walkers on the permissive rights of way on the Disused Airfield.
- Walkers and residents on the eastern bank of the River Hamble.

115. It is notable that the majority of these potential receptors (excepting the walkers and residents on the eastern bank of the River Hamble) is within 50 metres of the appeal site boundary.

116. In total 8 viewpoints were selected to represent the views of potential receptors. The analysis of potential visual effects for each of these representative viewpoints was carried out by site based assessment but aided by computer modelling, and the result of this analysis are set out in tables D1, D2 and D3 of Appendix D. Further assessment of the potential visual effects of the development on different groups of people is then provided in the following sections, and this analysis draws on the assessments for the representative viewpoints, as well as additional computer modelling and site-based assessment.

4.4.3 Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

117. Table D1 in **Appendix D** sets out the sensitivity of the viewpoints, which is assessed by combining the value of the potential viewpoints and the susceptibility of the receptors. The criteria used for this analysis are taken from GLVIA 3 paragraphs 6.31 to 6.41.

118. The appraisal assesses the walkers on public footpaths as being of medium value and high susceptibility, and therefore medium to high sensitivity overall. This reflects the fact that these users are often focused on views of the countryside, and rights of way are designated in order to afford the enjoyment of the countryside. Walkers and cyclists on roads are assessed as being of low value and high susceptibility and therefore medium sensitivity overall.

119. Residents are assessed as being of medium or high/medium sensitivity, since residents often appreciate views from the houses and gardens.

120. Vehicle users are assessed as being of medium susceptibility, and for viewpoints on Satchell Lane this results in a sensitivity of medium/low.

4.4.4 Potential Magnitude of Visual Effects

121. The potential magnitude of visual effects for people at each of the representative viewpoints is set out in Table D2 of **Appendix D**. In accordance with GLVIA3 6.38 to 6.40 magnitude is assessed by considering the size/scale of effect, geographical extent of effect and the duration of effect.
122. In the first few years, before the proposed vegetation as shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan (drawing SL1) has established, there would be the potential for substantial/medium effects at viewpoints 1 (site access, Satchell Lane), as well as 3 and 4 (both on footpath 1, immediately to the west of the appeal site). The proximity of these viewpoints to the appeal site, and the paucity of existing vegetation on the site boundary, mean that the proposed housing would be clearly visible, albeit that this would often be seen in the context of existing housing on the settlement edge. For all other viewpoints the magnitude of effect would be medium or less, with the magnitude of effects for viewers at viewpoint 8, on the eastern bank of the Hamble, being slight/negligible.
123. By year 10 to 15, once proposed trees have reached a height of around 7.5 to 8 metres and native shrubs are at least 4 to 5 metres tall, these potential visual effects would reduce further. There would be a medium magnitude of effect for viewers at viewpoints 1 and 3, since the proposed native planting shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan would largely screen views of new homes. Viewers at viewpoint 4, on footpath 1 and to the south-west of the appeal site, would experience a medium/slight magnitude of change as the proposed homes would be largely screened by intervening shrubs and orchard trees.

4.4.5 Assessment of Overall Visual Effects

124. The assessment of visual effects for each of the representative viewpoints is set out in table D3 in **Appendix D**. **Drawing SL22** summarises the visual effects at each of the representative viewpoints on year 1 and at year 15: it is notable that viewers at only one of the viewpoints (viewpoint 3) would experience long term major/moderate effects, and that viewpoint is less than 5 metres from the appeal site boundary. Viewers at all other viewpoints would experience effects that are moderate or less, with effects often reducing once the proposed landscaping has established. Further evaluation of the visual effects on different receptor groups is set out below.

125. There would be intermittent **major/moderate** negative effects on **walkers on Footpath 1**, west of the site, as illustrated by viewpoints 3 and 4, (as Appendix A explains, and as for landscape effects, major and major/moderate effects are regarded as being important planning considerations, as are concentrations of moderate effects in some cases). In the short term these walkers would be able to obtain clear views of the proposed new houses. However, as the existing photographs for viewpoints 3 and 4 illustrate, these views already include views of existing houses and gardens, albeit that these occupy a smaller proportion of the view than the proposed new homes: consequently, the proposed development would not introduce entirely new or anomalous elements into the view, but would instead change the composition of these elements within the view. By years 10 to 15 proposed tree and shrub planting on the western site boundary would have achieved a height which comfortably exceeds the eye level of walkers on the footpath (around 1.5m on average), and consequently views of the proposed development would be limited to glimpses through potential gaps providing access between the site and footpath number 1, with most effects becoming moderate negative or less, and some intermittent views into the site remaining at major/moderate and negative.
126. For **walkers and cyclists on Satchell Lane** (see for example viewpoints 2, 1 and 7) there would be glimpsed views of the development in the early years following construction, with major/moderate effects at the site entrance, where views would be clearest, but moderate or moderate/minor effects for other viewpoints, where the proposed houses would be at least partially screened by existing vegetation or buildings. Importantly, viewers moving south-east on Satchell Lane, towards the centre of Hamble-le-Rice, already have views of the existing holiday accommodation on the left of the road, and the existing housing on Satchell Lane to the right of the view, and consequently the proposed development would not be introducing new or anomalous elements into these views, but would instead be increasing the visibility of residential development within an area which is already influenced by the settlement edge. Equally importantly, and as the ZTV in **drawing SL4** illustrates, the development would not introduce visibility of new houses into the section of Satchell Lane to the north of the appeal site, a section of the lane which is more rural and remote in character.
127. It is also notable that these localised visual effects for viewers on Satchell Lane immediately to the east of the appeal site would once the proposed planting, as indicated on the illustrative

landscape masterplan at Drawing SL1, has started to mature. Effects at viewpoints 1 and 2, immediately adjacent to the appeal site, would reduce to moderate and moderate/minor and negative respectively once the proposed woodland edge/scrub planting has reached a height of at least two metres and is sufficiently dense.

128. For **walkers on the permissive rights of way to the west of the appeal site** (see for example viewpoints 5 and 6) views of the proposed housing would be partly screened by existing vegetation in the first few years following construction, but this visibility would be greatly reduced once the proposed native shrub and tree planting has achieved a height of three to five metres. As the ZTV in **drawing SL4** illustrates, even without this proposed planting the visibility of the proposed development over the disused airfield would be highly localised and intermittent.
129. For **walkers and residents on the eastern bank of the River Hamble** (illustrated by viewpoint 8), views of the western bank are characterised by glimpsed views of existing houses set within mature trees. Whilst it would be possible to glimpse the proposed development from this perspective, the proposed built forms would occupy a very small proportion of the total view, and these built forms would be entirely in keeping with the scale and character of existing houses which are already an integral part of the view.
130. As **plates I, II, III and IV**, above, illustrate, there is the potential for **residents** to the north-east and east of the appeal site to obtain views of the appeal proposals from living room windows and gardens. Whilst it has not been possible to include viewpoints to represent the views of these properties, it is important to acknowledge that they would experience at least **major/moderate** and negative effects as a result of the proposals, due to the relative proximity of the dwellings (holiday homes to the north-east of the site are on the opposite side of Satchell Lane from the appeal site, around 15 metres at the closest point, and the estimated 14 houses to the east of the appeal site are on average more than 40 metres from the appeal site, but with gardens abutting the appeal site). For residents to the north-east of the site some screening and filtering of views is provided by existing vegetation, and this screening effect would be further enhanced by the proposed new planting shown in the illustrative landscape masterplan. For residents to the east of the site views of the proposed housing would be screened by existing garden vegetation in some cases, but it is likely that some residents would experience high

magnitudes of visual change in the medium to long term, albeit that these effects would be reduced by a combination of the large distance between the proposed and existing houses, (often over 50 metres), and existing vegetation within gardens.

131. In summary, the visual effects of the proposed development would be highly localised upon the site and its immediate context, as illustrated by the ZTV in drawing SL4 and also by the representative viewpoint analysis. Where views of the new homes would be perceived in views it would often be in the context of existing housing, and would not, therefore, be introducing new elements. Visual effects would also reduce in many cases once the proposed planting shown on the illustrative landscape masterplan.

4.5 Summary of the Potential Landscape and Visual Effects of the Proposed Development

132. I have prepared a landscape and visual appraisal of the proposed development, in order to thoroughly evaluate the potential effects of the development upon character and views. My methodology follows the guidance within GLVIA3 and TGN 02/21, and is based upon a desk top assessment of policies, guidance and assessments, a computer assessment of visibility and views, and a site based assessment of the site and its context.
133. In the Eastleigh landscape character assessment the site is classified as part of landscape character area 13, Hound Plain. A site-focused landscape character assessment indicates that the site does possess many of the attributes identified in the description of the Hound Plain character area. The site comprises gently sloping field, currently used as horse-grazing, with prominent housing to the north and east. Existing vegetation along Satchell Lane is also prominent at the northern end of the appeal site.
134. My landscape appraisal has concluded that the effects of the proposed development on local landscape character would be highly localised, and major/moderate negative effects would be mainly focused upon a single field which is already influenced by views of built form, lighting and movement. The character of Satchell Lane, which forms part of the Settlement Edge Hound Plain sub-area, would undergo some noticeable change but the proposals would not alter the fundamental character of this route; at present the southern end of the Lane, in the locality of

the appeal site, is narrow and enclosed, with filtered views towards houses on both sides, and these characteristics would remain. The disused airfield, to the west of the appeal site, would remain open and medium scale, with no direct effects from the appeal proposals and with views of the development limited to glimpses from a few locations.

135. In my visual appraisal I have concluded that the visual effects of the proposed development would be highly localised upon the site and its immediate context, as illustrated by the ZTV in **drawing SL4** and also by the representative viewpoint analysis (see for example **drawing SL22**). Where views of the new homes would be perceived in views it would often be in the context of existing housing, and would not, therefore, be introducing new elements. Visual effects would also reduce in many cases once the proposed planting shown on the illustrative landscape masterplan.
136. These conclusions bear a striking resemblance to the conclusions of the Inspector for the previous appeal. He concluded *“that the landscape character of the wider area would not be materially affected by the appeal proposals”*, and that the proposals *“would cause some limited harm to the existing landscape character”*. As with my own LVA, the Inspector concluded that this was *“a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”*, that *“the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views”*, and *“the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...”*. Significantly, the Inspector concluded that these localised landscape and visual effects were acceptable.
137. As I have noted in the introduction to this appraisal, when considering the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development it is important to acknowledge that all green field residential developments will result in at least some degree of localised landscape and visual harm, a fact that was acknowledged by the Inspector on the previous appeal and which is also common ground between the parties (see LSoCG paragraph 2.15).

5.0 Response to Reason for Refusal 1 and Design Issues Raised by the Landscape and Urban Design Officers

5.1 Introduction

138. In this section of my proof I address Reason for Refusal 1, with reference to earlier sections of my proof. I also address some of the landscape design issues raised by Reason for Refusal 4 and the Landscape and Urban Design Officers, as set out in section 2.0 of my proof, based upon my analysis of the proposed landscape masterplan at section 3.0 of my proof.

5.2 Reason for Refusal 1

“Inappropriate and Unjustified Form of Development”

139. The term inappropriate suggests that this form of development – 61 new homes – would be anomalous when considering the character of the site and its context.

140. However, the Eastleigh Borough landscape character assessment classifies the appeal site as part of the Hound Plain, and the key characteristics for this character area include *“horsiculture”*, *“prominent urban edges and ribbon development”* and the *“urban fringe character”* of the disused airfield.

141. The Borough’s sensitivity study, prepared in 2018, includes analysis of the sensitivity of the land immediately to the west of the appeal site. This study concluded that the area had a *“moderate/low sensitivity to change”* and therefore had some capacity to accommodate development.

142. In the previous appeal the Inspector concluded that the site is *“strongly influenced by the proximity of the existing settlement”*. As a result, he concluded that *“overall, this is a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”*.

143. In my own landscape and visual appraisal at section 4 of this proof I have noted that the character of the site continues to be visually influenced by prominent houses and gardens to the north-east and east, and an analysis of the CPRE’s Dark Skies map indicates that the site and its

context is already influenced by adjacent street lamps and residential lighting. It is for this reason that I have classified the site as Settlement Edge Hound Plain.

144. In this context it cannot be said that housing would be “*inappropriate*” on the appeal site. The existing character of the site is influenced by the settlement edge, and it is therefore logical to place new homes in an area where housing is already a key characteristic.
145. In relation to the “*unjustified*” nature of the proposals, Steven Brown has concluded that the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, and I defer to him on this matter. There is therefore an urgent need for new homes in the Borough, and it is likely that new green field sites will be required. In this context the provision of new homes on a site which is already influenced by the settlement edge, and which received permission for 70 homes on appeal just four years ago, seems entirely justified.

“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”

146. Initially it is important to consider the phrase “*designated countryside*”. In landscape terms this statement implies that this is a highly valued rural landscape, that has therefore been designated or recognised formally. In this case it is common ground between the parties that this is not a designated landscape, and it is also common ground that the site does not constitute a valued landscape. The phrase “*designated countryside*” is therefore a planning term, meaning land outside the settlement which has not been allocated for development.
147. With regard to the “*unacceptably urbanising and visually intrusive impact*” it is initially important to consider the existing character of the appeal site and its context. As I have noted above, there is agreement between the Council’s own landscape character assessment for the Hound Plain character area, the previous Inspector’s own analysis of the character and sensitivity of the site and its context and my own analysis that the site and its context is already influenced by existing residential areas to the north-east and east, as well as movement and traffic on Satchell Lane and lighting from the settlement edge. These existing influences mean that this is not an intact, remote and rural landscape where urban influences would be particularly anomalous and intrusive, it is instead a settlement edge landscape where some

residential development can be accommodated without fundamentally changing the character of the locality.

148. I have concluded in my landscape and visual appraisal that the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development would be negative, but highly localised, and focused on an area where residential development is already a key characteristic element in the landscape. The previous Inspector, judging an appeal scheme that was very similar to this proposal in extent and scale, but with 9 more homes, concluded that *“the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views”* and that *“the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...”* Importantly, the previous Inspector concluded that this level of harm was acceptable.
149. There is therefore agreement that some landscape and visual harm would result from the appeal proposals: but of course all residential development on green field sites will result in at least localised landscape and visual harm, a fact that the former Inspector also agreed with. If the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, and if green field sites are required to provide at least some of this supply, then the Council must expect that some landscape and visual harm will occur.
150. The reality is that the level of landscape and visual harm that would result from this proposal would be at the lower end of the scale in my experience: landscape effects would be almost entirely focused on the appeal site itself, which is already influenced by the settlement edge; in visual terms, the viewers that would be affected are almost all immediately adjacent to the site, and many of these views would be progressively screened once proposed planting has started to establish.
151. It is also important to note that although a development results in negative landscape and visual effects does not mean that it is necessarily inappropriate or anomalous (or *unacceptable*). It is perfectly possible to create an attractive place to live - which is appropriate in the local context in terms of scale, form and character, and which also delivers landscape and visual benefits such as new recreational space and habitats – and yet still cause negative landscape and visual effects by introducing buildings to open fields.

152. In my landscape design review at section 3.0 of this proof I have concluded that the appeal proposals could provide not only 61 new homes but also attractive spaces including a multi-functional village green, new orchard, new habitats and additional tree and shrub planting around the edges of the site.

Policy S5

153. Policy S5 states that permission will be granted for certain forms of new development in the countryside, but these forms of development do not include residential development. As I have noted above, Steven Brown concludes that the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, and consequently it is likely that some housing will be required on green field “countryside” locations. All such development would therefore contravene the first part of S5, the appeal proposals included.
154. Part 2a of S5 states that if development is permitted in the countryside it should “*seek to ... avoid adverse effects 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*”. In my landscape and visual appraisal I have concluded that the character of the site is influenced by the settlement edge, and therefore not an intact rural landscape. I have also concluded that the landscape and visual harm to this settlement edge landscape would be localised and focused largely on the site itself. By reducing the geographical extent of landscape and visual effects, and focusing them on an area which is already partly characterised by settlement edge influences, the appeal proposals are indeed *seeking to avoid adverse effects on rural character*. It is also notable that the proposals would have no effects on the character of woodlands, riparian or coastal character, and nor would they affect an area adjoining a national park or its setting. Again, I acknowledge that some harm to character would occur as a result of the proposals, but this would be the case for any residential development on a green field site.
155. Part 2b of Policy S5 states that when permitting new development in the countryside the Council will “*secure long-term beneficial management practices that will enhance the landscape and biodiversity of the countryside and coast*”. Whilst I have acknowledged that the proposed development – as with all green field residential developments – would cause some localised

harm to the landscape, I have also noted at section 3.0 of my proof, and with reference to the illustrative landscape masterplan in **drawing SL1**, that the proposed development could provide not only new homes but also a series of attractive new spaces and also diverse new habitats including dry and damp species rich grassland, scrub/woodland edge, an orchard, as well as new trees within and around the new houses. The proposed development therefore includes landscape and ecological enhancements, whilst recognising that some degree of landscape harm is inevitable for all green field residential developments.

Policy DM1

156. Policy DM1 section 1a states that all new development should “*not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible enhance i. residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast*”. Within my landscape and visual appraisal I have concluded that the appeal proposals would result in localised negative visual effects for residents to the north-east and east of the appeal site: however I have also concluded that these effects would reduce over time for the residents to the north-east, due to the establishment of proposed new planting as shown on the illustrative landscape masterplan. For residents to the east of the site the distance between the proposed houses and the existing homes would often be fifty metres or more, and this considerable distance, combined with the presence of some existing planting within gardens, would reduce the potential visual effects.
157. In terms of the potential effects of the proposals upon the “*countryside*”, I have noted above that the appeal proposals would result in localised landscape and visual harm, but that these effects would be focused upon an area which is already influenced by the settlement edge. It is for this reason, and also the potential landscape and benefits of the proposed illustrative landscape masterplan, that I have concluded that the degree of harm to landscape character would be acceptable.
158. Part 1c of DM1 states that applicants should “*take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings,*

spaces and views". As I have noted above, the appeal proposals would focus residential development upon an area which is already influenced by the settlement edge, in terms of the visibility of built form, lighting and noise; they would also minimise the effects of development on the wider landscape, due to the largely enclosed nature of the site. They are also of a similar scale and density to existing housing to the east of the site. The proposed development is therefore appropriate in its landscape context, and is compatible with the character of existing development on the settlement edge.

159. Part 1d of Policy DM1 states that developments should *"not involve the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area, for appearance or biodiversity unless they can be replaced with features of equivalent or enhanced value"*. The appeal site contains few landscape features of value, with the exception of the existing mature trees and hedgerows around the site, which are clearly visible from Satchell Lane. It is notable in this context that the Tree Officer concluded in his 2021 consultation response that although some trees would need to be removed for the access arrangements these *"are generally damaged, stunted or have no future potential"*. He therefore concluded that the *"long term impact, with suitable replacement planting, is relatively low"*. He did not object to the proposals and there is no arboricultural reason for refusal.
160. Part 1e of DM1 states that developments should *"include a landscape scheme covering the design and layout of external space"*. After concerns were expressed by the Landscape and Urban Design officers, I have considered how the landscape masterplan could be refined to address these matters (see section 3 of this proof and also the illustrative landscape masterplan in **drawing SL1**). Whilst more detailed hard and soft landscaping drawings would be required by condition, the illustrative landscape masterplan does address many of the concerns expressed by officers, as I have noted in table 1 at section 3 of my proof. I have also concluded above that the illustrative masterplan would provide an attractive series of open spaces, potential connections with the footpath to the west of the appeal site, and a variety of new habitats.

5.3 Landscape Design Concerns Raised by Reason for Refusal 4 and Landscape and Urban Design Officers

161. At section 2 of my proof I summarised some of the concerns that had been raised regarding the landscape design of the proposals in Reason for Refusal 4, and also expressed by the Landscape and Urban Design Officers in their consultation responses. In section 3 of my proof I introduced an illustrative landscape masterplan (**drawing SL1**), which in accordance with draft condition 11 is in broad accordance with the submitted illustrative landscape plan, but provides further details of tree and shrub planting. At table 1 of section 3 I have explained how this design might address some of the concerns of officers. I have summarised some of the key matters below.
162. In relation to Reason for Refusal 4's concerns regarding the failure to *"take the opportunity to provide safe and appealing footpath routes"*, I noted how the illustrative landscape masterplan indicates three points where the paths within the site could be connected to the existing footpath to the west of the appeal site. I also noted that the paths within the site would provide a number of short circular walks, which could pass by a variety of new habitats around the edges of the site, the new Village Green, the new orchard, as well as tree and hedge-lined streetscapes. The illustrative landscape masterplan thus provides a number of appealing footpath routes, as well connections with the existing external footpath.
163. Reason for refusal 4 also states that the design *"fails to provide well integrated and attractive recreational spaces and landscaping"*. As I have noted at table 1 in section 3 of my proof, the illustrative landscape masterplan has now ensured that spaces within and around the development provide attractive places to sit, walk and play, and all of these spaces are close to the proposed homes with informal surveillance from fronting houses. Importantly the character of these spaces varies according to their location, with informal, ecologically led planting around the edges of the site contrasting with the more formal planting of streetscapes and the Village Green.
164. One of the concerns expressed by Officers was that the proposed masterplan *"restricts opportunities for the creation of significant green infrastructure"*. As I have noted in Table 1 of section 3 of my proof, the illustrative landscape masterplan proposes contiguous belts of new habitats along the southern, western and northern edges, as well as further connections across

the site provided by street trees and hedgerows. In total 27.5% of the area of the site would comprise POS and landscaping, which provides a significant opportunity for the creation of green infrastructure.

165. Concerns have also been expressed about the “*limited opportunities for street tree planting*”, and yet the illustrative landscape masterplan indicates that there is space to establish trees on every street. In this masterplan, trees have only been placed where there is a bed at least 2 metres wide, and where the centre of tree planting is at least 4 metres from the nearest building. In addition, beech and ornamental hedgerows could be established along streets, as well as ornamental shrub and perennial planting beds. This variety of planting, combined with the retention of the majority of existing trees and shrubs around the edges of the appeal site, would provide interest and visual diversity in streetscapes.
166. The design of the Village Green was described as “*a token gesture*” by Officers, but this too has been addressed in the illustrative landscape masterplan. This open space now incorporates a LAP, seating areas, a small kick about area and additional tree planting, including pleached hornbeams. This is therefore a multi-functional open space that would appeal to all ages of resident, and would also form an attractive focal point to the new development.
167. Finally, several concerns were expressed by Officers regarding the lack of room to “*enclose and enhance boundary planting*”, particularly along the western edge of the appeal site. The illustrative landscape masterplan shows, additional native tree and shrub planting has been included on the site boundaries to the south, west and north of the site. In my LVA, at section 4 of my proof, I show that this additional planting would have visual benefits in the medium to long term, reducing the potential visual effects on users of Satchell Lane and also walkers on footpath number 1.
168. In summary the illustrative landscape masterplan in drawing SL1 addresses the landscape design concerns raised in reason for refusal 4 and in the consultation responses of the landscape and Urban Design Officers.

6.0 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Planning Context

169. The appeal site is not within or adjacent to any national or local landscape designations, nor is it within or adjacent to any landscape-related designations. It is common ground that the site is not a valued landscape in the sense of NPPF paragraph 174(a). There are also no formal rights of way across the site, although Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 runs parallel with the western boundary of the appeal site.
170. In the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 the site is not allocated for development and is within an area defined as countryside on the proposals map.
171. However, an appeal for up to 70 homes on exactly the same site as the appeal site was allowed in 2018. The Inspector noted that the parties agreed *“that the landscape character of the wider area would not be materially affected by the appeal proposals”*. Both parties and the Inspector also agreed that the appeal site did not constitute a valued landscape. In terms of potential landscape effects, the Inspector noted that development of the site would have an urbanising effect which *“would cause some limited harm to the existing landscape character”*, but that *“this would also be the case in relation to any greenfield development proposal”*. The Inspector concluded that this was *“a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”*, that *“the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views”* and *“the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...”*

6.2 Landscape Design Review of the Appeal Proposals

172. In my proof I have noted that Reason for Refusal 4 and Responses from the urban Design and Landscape Officers express concerns regarding the landscape design of the appeal proposals.
173. I have considered how the landscape design of the site might be refined in response to draft condition 11. I have produced an illustrative landscape masterplan to indicate the potential elements of a landscaping scheme.

174. I have considered how the illustrative landscape masterplan might help to address some of the concerns expressed by Officers. In particular the illustrative plan includes additional native tree and shrub planting around the edges of the site, hedgerows and trees within streetscapes, a multi-functional Village Green, potential footpath connections with the footpath to the west, a central LAP and a new orchard and seating area at the south of the site.
175. I have concluded that the illustrative landscape plan therefore addresses the landscape design concerns raised in Reason 4 and the comments of Landscape and Urban Design Officers.

6.3 Potential Landscape and Visual Effects of the Appeal Proposals

176. I have prepared a landscape and visual appraisal of the proposed development, in order to thoroughly evaluate the potential effects of the development upon character and views. My methodology follows the guidance within GLVIA3 and TGN 02/21, and is based upon a desk top assessment of policies, guidance and assessments, a computer assessment of visibility and views, and a site based assessment of the site and its context.
177. In the Eastleigh landscape character assessment the site is classified as part of landscape character area 13, Hound Plain. A site-focused landscape character assessment indicates that the site does possess many of the attributes identified in the description of the Hound Plain character area. The site comprises gently sloping field, currently used as horse-grazing, with prominent housing to the north and east. Existing vegetation along Satchell Lane is also prominent at the northern end of the appeal site.
178. My landscape appraisal has concluded that the effects of the proposed development on local landscape character would be highly localised, and major/moderate negative effects would be mainly focused upon a single field which is already influenced by views of built form, lighting and movement. The character of Satchell Lane, which forms part of the Settlement Edge Hound Plain sub-area, would undergo some noticeable change but the proposals would not alter the fundamental character of this route; at present the southern end of the Lane, in the locality of the appeal site, is narrow and enclosed, with filtered views towards houses on both sides, and these characteristics would remain. The disused airfield, to the west of the appeal site, would

remain open and medium scale, with no direct effects from the appeal proposals and with views of the development limited to glimpses from a few locations.

179. In my visual appraisal I have concluded that the visual effects of the proposed development would be highly localised upon the site and its immediate context, as illustrated by the ZTV in drawing SL4 and also by the representative viewpoint analysis. Where views of the new homes would be perceived in views it would often be in the context of existing housing, and would not, therefore, be introducing new elements. Visual effects would also reduce in many cases once the proposed planting shown on the illustrative landscape masterplan.
180. These conclusions bear a striking resemblance to the conclusions of the Inspector for the previous appeal. He concluded *“that the landscape character of the wider area would not be materially affected by the appeal proposals”*, and that the proposals *“would cause some limited harm to the existing landscape character”*. As with my own LVA, the Inspector concluded that this was *“a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”*, that *“the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views”*, and *“the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...”* Significantly, the Inspector concluded that these localised landscape and visual effects were acceptable.
181. When considering the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development it is important to acknowledge that all green field residential developments will result in at least some degree of localised landscape and visual harm, a fact that was acknowledged by the Inspector on the previous appeal and which is also common ground between the parties (see LSoCG paragraph 2.15).

6.4 Response to Reason for Refusal 1.

182. The term *inappropriate* suggests that this form of development – 61 new homes – would be anomalous when considering the character of the site and its context.
183. However, the Eastleigh Borough landscape character assessment classifies the appeal site as part of the Hound Plain, and the key characteristics for this character area include

“horsiculture”, “prominent urban edges and ribbon development” and the “urban fringe character” of the disused airfield.

184. The Borough’s sensitivity study, prepared in 2018, includes analysis of the sensitivity of the land immediately to the west of the appeal site. This study concluded that the area had a “moderate/low sensitivity to change” and therefore had some capacity to accommodate development.
185. In the previous appeal the Inspector concluded that the site is “strongly influenced by the proximity of the existing settlement”. As a result, he concluded that “overall, this is a medium quality landscape area with a low sensitivity to residential development”.
186. In my own landscape and visual appraisal at section 4 of this proof I have noted that the character of the site continues to be visually influenced by prominent houses and gardens to the north-east and east, and an analysis of the CPRE’s Dark Skies map indicates that the site and its context is already influenced by adjacent street lamps and residential lighting. It is for this reason that I have classified the site as Settlement Edge Hound Plain.
187. In this context it cannot be said that housing would be “*inappropriate*” on the appeal site. The existing character of the site is influenced by the settlement edge, and it is therefore logical to place new homes in an area where housing is already a key characteristic.
188. In relation to the “*unjustified*” nature of the proposals, Steven Brown has concluded that the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, and I defer to him on this matter. There is therefore an urgent need for new homes in the Borough, and it is likely that new green field sites will be required. In this context the provision of new homes on a site which is already influenced by the settlement edge, and which received permission for 70 homes on appeal just four years ago, seems entirely justified.
189. Turning to the allegation that the proposed development “*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*”, it is important initially to consider the phrase “*designated countryside*”. In landscape terms this statement

implies that this is a highly valued rural landscape, that has therefore been designated or recognised formally. In this case it is common ground between the parties that this is not a designated landscape, and it is also common ground that the site does constitute a valued landscape. The phrase “*designated countryside*” in the Reason for Refusal is therefore a planning term, meaning land outside the settlement which has not been allocated for development.

190. With regard to the “*unacceptably urbanising and visually intrusive impact*” it is initially important to consider the existing character of the appeal site and its context. As I have noted above, there is agreement between the Council’s own landscape character assessment for the Hound Plain character area, the previous Inspector’s own analysis of the character and sensitivity of the site and its context and my own analysis that the site and its context is already influenced by existing residential areas to the north-east and east, as well as movement and traffic on Satchell Lane and lighting from the settlement edge. These existing influences mean that this is not an intact, remote and rural landscape where urban influences would be particularly anomalous and intrusive, it is instead a settlement edge landscape where some residential development can be accommodated without fundamentally changing the character of the locality.
191. I have concluded in my landscape and visual appraisal that the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development would be negative, but highly localised, and focused on an area where residential development is already a key characteristic element in the landscape. The previous Inspector, judging an appeal scheme that was very similar to this proposal in extent and scale, but with 9 more homes, concluded that “*the effect of the proposal would be appreciated only from close views*” and that “*the proposal would ... cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area...*” Importantly, he concluded that this level of effect was acceptable.
192. There is therefore agreement that some landscape and visual harm would result from the appeal proposals: but of course all residential development on green field sites will result in at least localised landscape and visual harm, a fact that the former Inspector also agreed with. If the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, and if green field sites are required to

provide at least some of this supply, then the Council must expect that some landscape and visual harm will occur.

193. The reality is that the level of landscape and visual harm that would result from this proposal would be at the lower end of the scale in my experience: landscape effects would be almost entirely focused on the appeal site itself, which is already influenced by the settlement edge; in visual terms, the viewers that would be affected are almost all immediately adjacent to the site, and many of these views would be progressively screened once proposed planting has started to establish.
194. It is also important to note that although a development results in negative landscape and visual effects does not mean that it is necessarily inappropriate or anomalous (or unacceptable). It is perfectly possible to create an attractive place to live - which is appropriate in the local context in terms of scale, form and character, and which also delivers landscape and visual benefits such as new recreational space and habitats – and yet still cause negative landscape and visual effects by introducing buildings to open fields.
195. In my landscape design review at section 3.0 of this proof I have concluded that the appeal proposals could provide not only 61 new homes but also attractive spaces including a multi-functional village green, new orchard, new habitats and additional tree and shrub planting around the edges of the site.

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RELEVANT EXPERIENCE OF JEREMY SMITH CMLI

I have been/am involved in the following projects which have relevance to this appeal. In addition to those listed I am frequently asked to review the development capacity of potential residential sites throughout England.

Public Inquiries

- Land at South Road, Wivelsfield Green (Appeal 2022). Proposal for 45 homes recommended for approval by Officers, but subsequently refused by Members. One reason for refusal, focused upon potential effects on character and appearance of the local landscape. Agreed between the parties that landscape and effects would be localised. Decision awaited.
- Land between Appledore Road and Woodchurch Road, Tenterden, Kent (Appeal 2022): initially reviewed the previously refused application and advised the client on a revised proposal for 141 homes. With the aid of computer-generated ZTVs illustrated that the proposals would not adversely affect the High Weald AONB or the Tenterden Conservation Area, and with the aid of photomontages illustrated that views towards grade I St Mildred's church could be retained. Appeal allowed.
- Land at Moor Road, Yatton (appeal 2022): initially reviewed previously refused application and made design changes to the scheme, including a small reduction in numbers from 64 to 60 and the preparation of a new landscape masterplan. Appeal allowed.
- Land at Maldon Road, Burnham-on-Crouch, Essex (appeal 2022). Expert witness on 250 home retirement village, with flats and other facilities, in rural location at settlement edge. Landscape and visual evidence included a computer-generated ZTV and verifiable photomontages. Appeal allowed.
- Land East of Station Road, Oakley (appeal 2021): initially helped to shape the masterplan with the aid of computer-generated model for this 120 home, green field development on the edge of a conservation area and also close to the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Then appeared as expert witness on landscape and visual matters. Appeal allowed.

- Land West of Winterfield Lane, East Malling (appeal 2021): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 250 home green field site close to the Kent Downs AONB and in proposed Green Belt. Appeal allowed.
- Posbrook Lane, Titchfield (appeal 2021): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 57 homes in a para 174 valued landscape. Appeal allowed.
- Pool in Wharfedale, Bradford (Appeal 2019): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 220 home settlement edge development. Appeal allowed.
- Land at Waverley Lane, Farnham (appeal 2016): expert witness on landscape and visual matters at appeal for 157 homes on a green field site adjacent to the Surrey Hills AONB. Appeal allowed by the Inspector but subsequently SoS refused.
- Land at Hatfield Peverel, Essex (appeal 2016). Expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 120 homes in strategic gap. Call-in inquiry. Appeal allowed.
- New Hartley, Northumberland (appeal 2017): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 294 homes on the settlement edge and next to a conservation area. Appeal allowed.
- Abbotsford, Romsey (2017): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 46 homes on green field site at settlement edge. Appeal allowed.
- Pool in Wharfedale (2018): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 120 home development on green field site on the settlement edge. Appeal allowed.
- Stone, Staffordshire (2016): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 200 home green field residential development on the settlement edge. Appeal allowed.
- Stobhill, Morpeth (2014): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for 396 home development on green field site on the settlement edge. Appeal allowed.
- Milton Road, Adderbury (2012): expert witness on landscape and visual matters for proposed development of 65 homes on green field site. Appeal allowed.
- College Road, Harrow (2010): expert witness for London Borough of Harrow against residential development adjacent to conservation area. Appeal dismissed.

Other Relevant Residential Projects

- Burley in Wharfedale, Bradford: landscape masterplan for 800 homes in this rural edge location, incorporating extensive POS with habitat creation, SuDS, “play on the way”, Parkrun route. Submitted 2022.
- Warfield, Bracknell Forest: landscape masterplan for 700 homes on green field site, incorporating country park and broad greenways. Approved unanimously and now under construction.
- Kilnwood Vale, Crawley: landscape masterplan and landscape and visual appraisal for 2500 home urban extension within strategic gap and adjacent to High Weald AONB. Attendance at EiP and joint working with Horsham and Crawley. Now being built-out.
- Kennylands Road, Sonning Common: landscape masterplan and landscape and visual appraisal for 60 home residential development adjacent to the North Wessex Downs AONB. Permission granted, being built out.
- Stonehams Farm, Tilehurst: landscape masterplan and landscape and visual appraisal for 120 homes on green field site adjacent to North Wessex Downs AONB. Permission granted.
- Land East of Hemel Hempstead: Ongoing landscape design and assessment work for 3000 home green field urban extension. Preferred allocation in evolving local plan. Submission 2022.
- Land at Beacon Hill, Stafford: Ongoing landscape masterplanning for 2000 home green field development on the northern edge of Stafford. Submission 2022.
- Land at Oakley Green, Windsor: ongoing landscape design and assessment work for proposed 450 home green field residential development. Collaborative working with Council on preferred site. Application 2022.
- Land at Althorne, Essex: ongoing landscape design and assessment work for 800 home residential-led mixed use development north of the River Crouch, where over 60% of the area of the scheme comprises POS and greenways.

Guidance and SPDs

- Co Author of “*Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations*”, (Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21, 2021).
- Author of the Harrow Views SPD, the SPD on protected views for London Borough of Harrow (2011).
- Contributor to “*Assessment of the Oxford View Cones*”, produced by Oxford Preservation Trust and Historic England (2015).
- Co-author of Tall building strategy for London Borough of Haringey (2015).

EUROPEAN OFFICES

United Kingdom

AYLESBURY

T: +44 (0)1844 337380

BELFAST

T: +44 (0)28 9073 2493

BRADFORD-ON-AVON

T: +44 (0)1225 309400

BRISTOL

T: +44 (0)117 906 4280

CAMBRIDGE

T: + 44 (0)1223 813805

CARDIFF

T: +44 (0)29 2049 1010

CHELMSFORD

T: +44 (0)1245 392170

EDINBURGH

T: +44 (0)131 335 6830

EXETER

T: + 44 (0)1392 490152

GLASGOW

T: +44 (0)141 353 5037

GUILDFORD

T: +44 (0)1483 889800

LONDON

T: +44 (0)203 691 5810

MAIDSTONE

T: +44 (0)1622 609242

MANCHESTER

T: +44 (0)161 872 7564

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

T: +44 (0)191 261 1966

NOTTINGHAM

T: +44 (0)115 964 7280

SHEFFIELD

T: +44 (0)114 2455153

SHREWSBURY

T: +44 (0)1743 23 9250

STAFFORD

T: +44 (0)1785 241755

STIRLING

T: +44 (0)1786 239900

WORCESTER

T: +44 (0)1905 751310

France

GRENOBLE

T: +33 (0)4 76 70 93 41

Ireland

DUBLIN

T: + 353 (0)1 296 4667