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1.0 Non-Technical Summary

1.1 The aim of this report is to provide a full assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed development upon the receiving landscape, in line with current legislation and guidance. It comprises two main assessments, the first for landscape and the second for visual effects. The assessment has been conducted in line with published best practice guidelines and includes a desk study (data trawl of local plan policies, published landscape character assessment and production of a computer generated Zone of Theoretical visibility) and onsite observations.

1.2 This report provides a landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposed development for circa 750 residential units, 3 retail units with office space above them, a local food store, a primary school, a doctors surgery a number of open spaces, retention of existing trees and vegetation, access road and parking provision.

1.3 A number of landscape character assessments have been undertaken including Nationwide Character Assessment prepared by The Countryside Agency, Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment and on site observations.

1.4 The site and its surrounding landscape were assessed during September 2014 and March 2015. A total of thirteen viewpoints were selected to represent residents of Hook and its surroundings; along with users of adjacent roads and public rights of way which surround the site.

1.5 The visual impact assessment identified a total of five viewpoints with significant visual effects, representative of users of public rights of way (including footpaths) immediately adjacent to the site boundaries which have direct views onto the site, as well as an elevated view from the west.

1.6 Following mitigation measures, vegetation growth and weathering, significant visual impacts would remain from three of the thirteen viewpoints. For the remaining receptors the views of the development will remain largely unchanged or have only glimpsed views at such a distance that it would be difficult for the casual viewer to distinguish the development from the surrounding existing residential development of Hook.

1.7 The proposals would form a defined edge to the existing Hook settlement to the west. This will have the effect of demarcating the gap between the settlements of Hook and Newnham at Tylney Park.

1.8 When this development is assessed in context with the wider landscape, the visual impact would be reduced, visually blending in with the surrounding suburban landscape to the east.
2.0 Introduction

2.1 Landscape and visual impact assessments can be defined as a mechanism by which the landscape can be assessed against its capacity to accommodate change.

2.2 The aim of this report is to provide a full assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed development upon the receiving landscape, in line with current legislation and guidance. It comprises two main assessments, the first for landscape and the second for visual effects. ‘Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape, which may give rise to changes in its character and how this is experienced. This may in turn affect the perceived value ascribed to the landscape. Due to the inherently dynamic nature of the landscape, change arising from a development may not necessarily be significant.’

2.3 ‘Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people’s responses to the changes and to the overall effects with the respect of visual amenity’ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition published by The Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment 2013

2.4 This report provides a landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposed development for circa 750 residential units, 3 retail units with office space above them, a local food store, a primary school, a doctors surgery a number of open spaces, retention of existing trees and vegetation, access road and parking provision.

2.5 The site is located at High Ridge House, Owens Farm, Hook and this document includes an appraisal of the following:

Landscape Impacts, including:

- direct impacts upon specific landscape elements within and adjacent to the site;

- effects on the overall pattern of the landscape elements which give rise to the landscape character of the site and its surroundings; and

- impacts upon any special interests in and around the site.

Visual Impacts:

- direct impacts of the development upon views in the landscape; and

- overall impact on visual amenity.
3.0 Assessment Methodology and Uncertainty

3.1 As a matter of best practice the assessment will be undertaken in accordance with the methods outlined in the following best practice guidance:

3.2 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition), published by the Landscape Institute and the IEMA (2013) (GLVIA); and


3.4 In accordance with the GLVIA and other best practice guidance noted above, both the landscape and visual assessments will include baseline studies that describe, classify and evaluate the existing landscape and visual resources, focusing on their sensitivity and ability to accommodate change.

3.5 The assessment has been based on a desk-based review of relevant published guidance, including legislation and policy, baseline information production, and information followed by a number of detailed site appraisals.

3.6 The principal objectives of the LVIA are:

- to identify and classify the existing landscape likely to be affected by the construction and operation of the proposal and ancillary works;

- to identify the ‘visual receptors’ with views of the proposed development; and

- to assess the significance of effects on the prevailing landscape character and visual amenity, taking into account the measures proposed to mitigate any impacts identified.
4.0 Legislation and Policy Context

Landscape Planning Policies

4.1 Guidelines, legislation and planning policy documents provide the framework for the protection and conservation of landscape within the study area, the most relevant of which are outlined below.

4.2 Of these, statutes exist to ensure both direct and indirect protection of our most valued and important landscapes, their intrinsic visual qualities and the individual elements and components that constitute their appeal. Those with direct relevance to the assessment comprise the following:

- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- Hedgerow Regulations 1997;
- Environment Act 1995;
- Countryside Act 1968; and

4.3 A list of relevant planning policy is included in the appendices.

4.4 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.
5.0 Baseline Study

5.1 Both the landscape and visual assessment include baseline studies that describe, classify and evaluate the existing landscape and visual resources, focusing on their sensitivity and ability to accommodate change. The initial study area was set to a radius of approximately 2.5km from the centre of the site (N51°16.54, W00°58'46") on the basis that, at this distance, this form of development, when seen by the human eye, would be hardly discernible or not legible.

5.2 Following an initial desk based assessment of aerial photography, Ordnance Survey mapping a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

5.3 In order to assist in the assessment of the potential visual effects of any development, a computer-generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is normally modelled. The computer ZTV is used as a working tool to inform the assessment team of the extent of the zone within which the proposed development may have an influence or effect on landscape character and visual amenity and the areas within which the study area together with site survey work should be concentrated. It should be noted that this is a topographical information based exercise with no account being taken of the visual barrier effects of vegetation or buildings.

5.4 A computer generated ZTV was established and a study area together with a number of representative viewpoints determined. All these viewpoints are at various distances from the scheme and cover all main points of the compass.

5.5 The extent of study area and viewpoints were selected as being representative and having the potential to offer significant landscape and visual effects.
6.0 Method of Assessment

6.1 The landscape and visual impact assessments have been based on an evaluation of the sensitivity of the receiving landscape and visual receptors, and the magnitude of change associated with the introduction of the proposed scheme into the landscape and visual context of the study area.
7.0 Landscape Character Assessment Criteria

7.1 Description and classification of existing landscape character has involved a review of published regional and sub-regional landscape character assessment information.

7.2 Local landscape character and landscape sensitivity has been defined by taking account of landform, hydrology, vegetation, settlement, land use pattern, and cultural and historic features and associations, consequently the landscape character has been categorised as follows.

Quality

7.3 Quality or condition relates to the physical state of the landscape and its intactness from the visual, functional and ecological perspectives, together with the state of repair of its constituent features or elements (e.g. hedgerows, woodlands, field pattern etc.). Local landscape quality within the study area has been considered based on the criteria described in the following table.

Table 1. Landscape Quality (or Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Quality (or Condition)</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>All landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Buildings are in local vernacular and materials. No detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Most landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Most buildings are in local vernacular and materials. Few detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Some landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Some buildings are in local vernacular and materials and some detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Few landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Few buildings are in local vernacular and materials. Many detracting or incongruous elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>No landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Buildings are not in local vernacular and materials. Detracting or incongruous elements are much in evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value

7.4 The value attributed to an area of landscape reflects communal perception at a local, regional, national or, occasionally, international scale. It is informed by a number of factors including scenic beauty, wildness, tranquillity and particular cultural associations. Cultural associations may be widely held at a national scale or more local in nature. Landscapes considered to be of the highest value would generally be formally designated at the national level, whereas those considered of lowest value would generally be undesignated, degraded landscapes, perhaps identified as being in poor condition and requiring either restoration or re-creation. Although value is largely determined by reference to statutory and planning policy designations, an absence of such designation does not necessarily imply the absence of
value, as other factors such as scarcity or cultural associations can establish an area of otherwise unremarkable landscape as a valued local resource. The value of landscape character areas and designations has been determined using the criteria described in the following table.

Table 2. Landscape Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Value</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Areas comprising a clear composition of valued landscape components in robust form and health, free of disruptive visual detractors and with a strong sense of place. Areas containing a strong, balanced structure with distinct features worthy of conservation. Such areas would generally be internationally or nationally recognised designations, e.g. National Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Areas primarily containing valued landscape components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition and lacking prominent disruptive visual detractors. Areas containing a strong structure with noteworthy features or elements, exhibiting a sense of place. Such areas would generally be national statutorily designated areas, such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Such areas may also relate to the setting of internationally or nationally statutory designated areas, e.g. National Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Areas primarily of valued landscape components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition with low levels of disruptive visual detractors, exhibiting a recognisable landscape structure. Such areas would generally be non-statutory locally designated areas such as Areas of Great Landscape Value. Such areas may also relate to the setting of national statutorily designated areas, such as AONB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Areas containing some features of landscape value but lacking a coherent and aesthetically pleasing composition with frequent detracting visual elements, exhibiting a distinguishable structure often concealed by mixed land uses or development. Such areas would be commonplace at the local level and would generally be undesignated, offering scope for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Areas lacking valued landscape components or comprising degraded, disturbed or derelict features, lacking any aesthetically pleasing composition with a dominance of visually detracting elements, exhibiting mixed land uses which conceal the baseline structure. Such areas would generally be restricted to the local level and identified as requiring recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Character sensitivity

7.5 Each landscape character area or designation is assessed for the sensitivity of its character to the introduction of the proposed development, taking into account its key characteristics, landscape elements, composition and cultural associations. Certain aspects of landscape character are particularly important indicators of the degree to which a landscape is likely to be able to successfully accommodate development. These include the general scale and complexity of its landforms and elements; the degree of enclosure or openness; the degree and nature of manmade influences upon it; and whether it offers particular experiences such as remoteness or tranquillity. The criteria used to determine the sensitivity of landscape character are set out in the following table.
### Table 3. Character Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Sensitivity</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Very High**         | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape susceptible to change and of high quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Small-scale landform/land cover/ development, human scale indicators, fine grained, enclosed with narrow views, sheltered.  
**Manmade influence**: Absence of manmade elements, traditional or historic settlements, natural features and ‘natural’ forms of amenity parkland, perceived as natural ‘wild land’ lacking in man-made features, land use elements and detractors  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: Sense of peace, isolation or wildness, remote and empty, no evident movement. |
| **High**              | Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Very High criteria but exceed those for Medium |
| **Medium**            | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape of moderate susceptibility to change and of medium quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Medium-scale landform/land cover/ development, textured, semi-enclosed with middle distance views.  
**Manmade influence**: Some presence of man-made elements, which may be partially out of scale with the landscape and be of only partially consistent with vernacular styles.  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: some noise, evident, but not dominant human activity and development, noticeable movement. |
| **Low**               | Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Medium criteria but exceed those for Very Low. |
| **Very Low**          | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape insusceptible to change and of low quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Large-scale landform/land cover/ development, Featureless, coarse grained, open with broad views.  
**Manmade influence**: Frequent presence of utility, infrastructure or industrial elements, contemporary structures e.g. masts, pylons, cranes, silos, industrial sheds with vertical emphasis, functional man-made land-use patterns and engineered aspects.  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: Busy and noisy, human activity and development, prominent movement. |
Visual Sensitivity of Landscape Areas:

7.6 The visual sensitivity of an area of landscape relates to its general level of openness, the nature and number of visual receptors present within a landscape, and the probability of change in visual amenity due to the development being visible. It should be noted that landscape visual sensitivity refers to the visual sensitivity of the entire landscape that is being assessed, rather than an assessment of the visual effects of a specific, individual development.

7.7 The following table provides an overview of the typical indicators of visual sensitivity, which can be used to give a transparent, reasoned judgement regarding landscape visual sensitivity.

Table 4. Landscape Visual Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Sensitivity</th>
<th>Visual interruption</th>
<th>Nature of views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
<td>Flat or gently undulating topography, few if any vegetative or built features.</td>
<td>Densely populated, dispersed pattern of small settlements, outward looking settlement, landscape focused recreation routes and/or visitor facilities, distinctive settings, gateways or public viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Very High criteria but exceed those for Medium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>Undulating or gently rolling topography, some vegetative and built features.</td>
<td>Moderate density of population, settlements of moderate size with some views outwards, routes with some degree of focus on the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Medium criteria but exceed those for Very Low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low</strong></td>
<td>Rolling topography, frequent vegetative or built features.</td>
<td>Unpopulated or sparsely populated, concentrated pattern of large settlements, introspective settlement, inaccessible, indistinctive or industrial settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8 The overall landscape sensitivity is derived by combining the assessed values attributed to landscape condition, landscape value, character sensitivity and effects on landscape elements and landscape visual sensitivity, to define an overall value within the range of Very High, High, Medium and Low.

7.9 Since each criterion has a varying weight in its contribution to sensitivity the overall value is determined by professional judgement.

7.10 For the purposes of this assessment greater weight is attributed to Landscape Value and Landscape Character Sensitivity since these factors have greater defining criteria in the description of the landscape characterisation.
Magnitude of Change

7.11 Magnitude of change has been predicted by considering the anticipated loss or disruption to character forming landscape elements (e.g. tree planting, landform, buildings, and watercourses etc.), which would arise through introduction of the proposed scheme.

Table 5: Definition of Magnitude of Landscape Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Total loss of or major alteration to key valued elements, features, and characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements considered being prominent and totally uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Would be at a considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape. Would cause a high quality landscape to be permanently changed and its quality diminished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Would be out of scale with the landscape, and at odds with the local pattern and landform. Will leave an adverse impact on a landscape of recognised quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements, features, characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. May not quite fit into the landform and scale of the landscape. Affect an area of recognised landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Very minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements, features, and characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Maintain existing landscape quality, and maybe slightly at odds to the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Landscape Effects

7.12 The significance of the landscape character effects is determined by the assessment of landscape sensitivity set against the magnitude of change as indicated by the matrix in Table 5.

7.13 For the purposes of this assessment and with reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, ‘Significant’ landscape effects would be those effects assessed to be severe, major or major/moderate and are indicated by shading in the following table.

Table 6: Significance of Landscape Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Minor/moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 Visual Assessment Criteria

8.1 In conjunction with the landscape character impact assessment, a visual impact assessment has been undertaken in order to assess any potential visual impact arising as a result of the proposed development.

8.2 In order to evaluate what the visual impact of the development will be and, if appropriate, what can be done, to ameliorate the impact, it is necessary to describe the existing situation to provide a basis against which any change can be assessed. The assessment of visual impact from any one location takes into account the:

- Sensitivity of the views and viewers (visual receptor) affected;
- Nature, scale or magnitude and duration of the change
- Extent of the proposed development that will be visible;
- Degree of visual intrusion or obstruction that will occur;
- Distance of the view;
- Change in character or quality of the view compared to the existing.

Visual Receptors

8.3 Visual impact assessment considers the sensitivity to change of visual receptors within the study area, and the magnitude of change associated with the introduction of the proposed development into the existing visual context.

8.4 A range of fixed visual receptors was initially considered, with emphasis placed on identification and selection of locations with a clear relationship to the proposed scheme where potential visual implications were deemed to be greatest. The key visual receptors normally include statutory and non-statutory designated or protected areas, cultural heritage resources, residential properties and farmsteads, recreational/tourist resources, panoramic hilltop views, focused or directed views, and cumulative views. Viewpoints were selected to be representative of these visual receptor types.

8.5 These preliminary viewpoints locations were assessed in terms of visibility during field investigation resulting in some preliminary viewpoints either being repositioned to locations offering improved visual representation or discounted as not offering any views. In addition, field investigation identified a number of other closer viewpoints.
8.6 For the field assessment, a Canon EOS 500D camera with an 18-55mm lens was used, set at 35mm focal length. This is in line with best practice as shown in the Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment advice notes issued by the Landscape Institute (Advice note 01/11).

8.7 Field investigation from the preliminary viewpoints was used to assess the actual visibility of the proposed development within the study area, taking into account the visual barrier effect of vegetation and buildings.

Site Appraisal/ Photographic Studies

8.8 The initial photographic study was undertaken in September 2014 and again in March 2015 for winter views. Viewpoints at varying close distance from the site were selected to represent the typical views of the site. ACD figure 4 shows the location of these viewpoints. In determining the viewpoints, whether in the immediate locality or further away, the main public highways, sections of public footpaths, and some of the publicly available spaces within the study area were visited. It is acknowledged that from public places, more viewers are likely to be affected thereby adding to the significance of the impact upon receptors in those locations.

8.9 The locations from which the proposed development will be visible are known as visual receptors. In accordance with the “Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition”, for the purposes of the visual assessment the visual receptors have been graded according to their sensitivity to change.

8.10 From the results of the initial desk study and site appraisal it is clear that the proposed development will be visible from a limited number of locations, at varying but close distances, and from both public and private areas.

8.11 In order to evaluate what the visual impact of the development will be and, if appropriate, what can be done to ameliorate the impact, it is necessary to describe the existing situation to provide a basis against which any change can be assessed. Each assessment of visual impact has therefore been made taking into consideration the character and quality of the existing view. The assessment of the significance of effect is a result of the assessment of magnitude of the impact related to the assessment of sensitivity of the receptor.
### Visual Receptor Sensitivity

**8.12** The locations from which the proposed development will be visible are known as visual receptors. The assessment of visual sensitivity considers both the category of visual receptor and the nature of their existing view. It takes account of the location of the receptor or viewpoint; the expectations, occupation or activity of the people present; the quality of the existing visual context; and the importance or value likely to be attributed by them to the available view. It is therefore the case that not all receptors within a given category are deemed to display equal sensitivity.

**8.13** In accordance with the GLVIA, for the purposes of the visual assessment, the visual receptors have been graded according to their sensitivity to change against criteria set out in the table below.

*Table 7: Visual Receptor sensitivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Occupiers of residential properties. Users of outdoor recreational facilities, including public rights of way, whose attention or interest may be focused on the landscape. Communities where the development results in changes in the landscape setting or valued views enjoyed by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>People travelling through or past the affected landscape in cars, on trains or other transport routes where higher speeds are involved and views sporadic and short-lived. People engaged in outdoor recreation where enjoyment of the landscape is incidental rather than the main interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>People at their place of work, Industrial facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.14** The number of people likely to be present and the duration of time that a view is likely to be experienced may also influence the visual sensitivity of a particular location.

**8.15** It is sometimes the case that different categories of visual receptor might be present at a selected representative viewpoint (e.g. a selected location may include both residential properties and workplaces suggesting different levels of sensitivity). In such cases the primary receptor category is identified (usually the more sensitive).
Visual Magnitude of Change

8.16  The visibility of the proposals and the magnitude of their change upon a view and the resulting significance of visual effect are dependent on the range of factors already outlined, together with, the angle of the sun, the time of year and weather conditions. Of equal importance will be whether the site is seen completely, or in part; whether the site appears on the skyline; whether it is viewed with a backcloth of land or vegetation; or with a complex foreground; and whether the site forms part of an expansive landscape or is visible within a restricted view. The aspect of dwellings and whether the view is from a main window or a secondary window, which may be used less frequently, is also a consideration. From highways, the direction and speed of travel are also a consideration. In the assessment magnitude of change is ranked in accordance with the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Large</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in a dramatic change in the existing view and/or would cause a dramatic change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would appear large scale and/or form the dominant elements within the overall view and/or may be in full view the observer or receptor. Commanding, controlling the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and/or would cause a prominent change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would form prominent elements within the overall view and/or may be easily noticed by the observer or receptor. Standing out, striking, sharp, unmistakeable, easily seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and/or would cause a noticeable change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element within the overall view and/or may be readily noticed by the observer or receptor. Noticeable, distinct, catching the eye or attention, clearly visible, well defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in a perceptible change in the existing view, and/or without affecting the overall quality and/or character of the view. The development would form an apparent small element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer or receptor. Visible, evident, obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Small</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view, and/or without affecting the overall quality and/or would form an inconspicuous minor element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer or receptor. Lacking sharpness of definition, not obvious, indistinct, not clear, obscure, blurred, indefinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negligible</strong></td>
<td>Only a small part of the development would be discernible and/or it is at such a distance that no change to the existing view can be appreciated. Weak, not legible, near limit of acuity of human eye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Visual Effect

8.17 The significance of the visual effects is determined by the assessment of receptor sensitivity set against the magnitude of change as indicated by the matrix in Table 9.

8.18 For the purposes of this assessment and with reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, ‘Significant’ landscape effects would be those effects assessed to be severe, major or major/moderate and are indicated by shading in the following table.

Table 9: Significance of Visual Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate/minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate/minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative Viewpoint Assessment

8.19 Viewpoint selection has been chosen by a review of visual receptors within the vicinity of the site as well as the presence of landscape designations. The choice of representative viewpoints has been limited due to the location of the scheme and surrounding industrial form. The baseline description of each view is contained within the visual impact assessment.

8.20 The following viewpoints in Table 10 were selected and submitted as part of the scoping process as being representative of the potential visual issues associated with the proposed development.

Table 10: Submitted Viewpoint Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance (km) and direction of view</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Rationale for selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road</td>
<td>0.08km, N</td>
<td>51°16'41</td>
<td>00°58'53</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newnham Road</td>
<td>0.0km, NW</td>
<td>51°16'43</td>
<td>00°58'32</td>
<td>Viewpoint close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRoW at site boundary</td>
<td>0.0km, W</td>
<td>51°16'49</td>
<td>00°58'37</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW accessed from Blue Haven Walk</td>
<td>0.19km, W</td>
<td>51°16'51</td>
<td>00°58'28</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Hook Bowling Club</td>
<td>0.20km, W</td>
<td>51°16'55</td>
<td>00°58'26</td>
<td>Users of recreation in the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Goose green</td>
<td>0.35km, SW</td>
<td>51°17'17</td>
<td>00°58'16</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>0.0km, E</td>
<td>51°16'50</td>
<td>00°58'58</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>0.0km, NE</td>
<td>51°16'44</td>
<td>00°58'54</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of Assessment

8.21 The initial field study and photographic appraisal was undertaken during September 2014 and again in March 2015 at a time when views do not have the benefit of vegetation in full leaf. In summer months when deciduous species have their foliage, less views of the landscape will be available due to vegetation forming visual barriers. Photographs at the end of each viewpoint indicate the general outlook for receptors.

8.22 In determining the viewpoints, whether in the immediate locality or further away, the main public highways, sections of public footpaths, and some of the publicly available spaces within the study area were visited. It is acknowledged that from public places, more viewers are likely to be affected, thereby adding to the significance of the impact upon receptors in those locations.

8.23 For the purposes of this report, the assessment has been based on development proposals illustrated in the planning application. The proposals include a series of elevations and sections for the various heights of buildings and a series of detailed development plans.
9.0 Establishment of Baseline Environment

Landscape Character Baseline

‘Countryside Character Initiative’ – Natural England

9.1 Natural England has published a study on its website entitled ‘Countryside Character Initiative’. This initiative is concerned with the management of England’s countryside through an understanding of its character. It aims to guide policy developments, national decision making, and give a context to local planning, action and development. This initiative is based on ‘The Character of England: landscape, wildlife and natural features’ map, first published in 1997, which divides England into National Character Areas (NCA’s). These character areas were updated and republished in April 2014.

The NCA of relevance to the study area, the site and its vicinity is NCA 129 – Thames Basin Heaths.

9.2 The key characteristics of this area are:

- Plateaux of Tertiary sands and gravels in the London Basin, with intervening river valleys floored by London Clay. In the far west, Chalk forms the Hampshire Downs escarpment and the river beds of the Kennet and Pang.

- High woodland cover, offering an array of colour in the autumn. Conifers and large plantations on former heathland are dominant features in the east, while the west is scattered with small, semi-natural woodlands on ancient sites.

- Acid, leached soils mean that farming on the plateaux is limited to rough pasture, and that alternative land uses (such as forestry, golf courses and horse paddocks) have emerged. Heather, gorse, oak and birch all thrive here. Arable land and improved pasture are found in the valleys, on alluvium.

- Beyond the large areas of heathland and woodland, there is a patchwork of small to medium-sized fields with woods. The legacy of historic hunting forests includes veteran trees, ancient woods, ancient hedgerows and parklands. Historic meadows remain as fragments along watercourses.

- Prehistoric earthworks such as barrows and hill forts mark promontories on the plateaux. Archaeology is well preserved on historic heathland. Mosaics of open heathland and grassland with scrub, secondary woodland and plantation. Valley bogs, ponds and streams enhance diversity. Large, continuous mosaics are found in the east: they include Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and Chobham Common National Nature Reserve (NNR).
Historic commons offer tranquillity and unenclosed views, while other rights of access are enjoyed across farmland, canals and downland. Ministry of Defence ownership restricts (but does not entirely prevent) public enjoyment.

‘Churring’ nightjars, dragonflies and purple heather are all readily identified with heathland. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA protects internationally important populations of woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler.

Valley floors are wet with ditches, numerous watercourses, ponds, waterfilled gravel pits, reedbeds and carr. Historic features include mills, relict water meadows, and canals such as the River Wey Navigations.

20th-century conurbations, including Camberley, sprawl along the Blackwater Valley, with associated roads (including the M3) dissecting heathland and woodland into blocks. Elsewhere, there are winding lanes and historic dispersed villages and farmsteads of traditional, locally-made brick and tile.

Sub-Regional Character

Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment

9.3 The Hampshire County Integrated Landscape Character Assessment was commissioned by Hampshire County Council and published in May 2012. The purpose of the report was to assess the baseline study of the landscape character, at a sub-regional level that gives a further understanding of the landscape resource.

9.4 The key characteristics of the relevant sub-regional character area relevant to the study area are reproduced below:

2C: Loddon Valley and Western Forest of Eversley

Key Characteristics

- Low lying gently undulating landscape divided on a north-south axis by the shallow, broad valley of the River Loddon.

- A poorly draining landscape, dissected by a network of often wooded streams and minor tributaries. It contains a mosaic of habitats supporting a rich and varied biodiversity.

- Distant views of continuous plantation woodland on elevated sand and gravel plateaux in adjoining character areas to the east and west.

- Thick hedges often with banks and ditches and many ancient trees.
• A high density of public rights of way and permissive access network.
• A secluded intimate feel, and a sense the landscape has had a long history of small settlement and farms by the presence of timber framed and old brick small farm buildings.
• Early disafforestation of medieval deer parks in the 14th century, resulting in an assarted landscape in which woodland has become increasingly fragmented. Fields have been reorganised but generally retain their irregular pattern.
• A significant concentration of large historic parks and gardens, such as Stratfield Saye, Tylney Hall and The Vyne.
• A high density dispersed settlement pattern which has mid medieval origins and remains relatively little altered, including a concentration of medieval moated sites. Villages often have greens.
• GHQ defence line.
• High voltage power lines stride through the landscape.

Landscape Character Type: Lowland Mosaic Small Scale – Confined to central southern Hampshire, subtle differences to other lowland mosaic types.

9.5 Key Identifying Characteristics and Boundary Definitions

• Low lying silty clay, but not sandy soils, that are seasonally wet and waterlogged in parts but also with better drained areas.
• The soils support predominantly permanent pasture land use.
• Less marginal farmed areas than the lowland mosaic medium scale and lowland mosaic heath associated types.
• Often small enclosures, small areas of woodland and undulating topography which produces the sense of a small scale landscape.
• Associated mostly with small chalk fed streams apart from where they border the New Forest perambulation where they are more acidic.
• Generally, high to very high density of dispersed small farmsteads and hamlets and associated with nucleated spring line settlements in the south and north Hampshire lowlands.
• Small semi natural and ancient woodland copses and hedges of varying character.
• Frequently a high density of public rights of way and winding lanes.
- Varying periods and types of enclosure but generally small scale but has some of the earliest enclosures out of all the lowland mosaic types – perhaps indicating less marginal and richer soils.

- Particular association with hamlets and villages of medieval and Saxon origin often associated with wood and wood clearance.
LOCAL CHARACTER AREA

The site is currently laid out as fields in agricultural use, with mature hedgerow with trees field boundaries. To the north, adjacent to the boundary, College Copse forms a wooded area that foreshortens views into and out of the site. Within the site, two well managed hedgerows bisect from east to west acting as field boundaries.

The site is rural in feel, but noise from the local railway line can be felt through the landscape.

Assessed Landscape Sensitivity of Local Character Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Assessed Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Some landscape elements remain intact and in good repair, notably the site boundary vegetation, however, internal hedgerows are in poor over managed condition.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>A few detracting visual elements, being undesignated and as marginal farmland offers scope for improvement.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character sensitivity</td>
<td>Few key landscape elements are susceptible to change, the area is subject to the presence of man-made infrastructure and residential elements with vertical emphasis and engineered patterns. In terms of remoteness the area is subject to some human activity and development and in terms of tranquillity it is subject to some noise and movement. The landscape is partially enclosed but includes some views of the wider landscape.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape visual sensitivity</td>
<td>Gently undulating topography, moderate density of population, routes with some degree of focus on the landscape.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Weighted Landscape Sensitivity. MEDIUM
Landscape Character of the Site and Its Surroundings

9.6 This section describes in detail, the site and its surroundings. The section also discusses in brief the issue of visual amenity from certain areas within the landscape.

Land to the North of the site

To the north of the site, College Copse forms a wooded area in the landscape, with a pond within. The topography falls gently to the north, with other copses forming landscape features in the landscape. Detached houses and farm buildings are located within an agricultural landscape.

Land to the East of the site

The site is bound to the east with a mature hedgerow with trees set within agricultural fields. The settlement of Hook forms an urban feel to the area, with existing residential development forming the current built boundary to the wider countryside.

Land to the South of the site

The site is bound to the south by Newnham Road that runs adjacent to the railway line which bisects the landscape roughly east to west in a cutting, forming a strong manmade linear landscape feature. To the south of Newnham Road, mature trees form a visual barrier to views further to the south.

Land to the West of the site

To the west of the site, a dense mature hedgerow with trees bounds the site and forms a visual barrier which minimises potential intervisibility with the wider landscape. The topography falls gently to the west and small copses sit within a rural landscape that contains some small nucleated groups of residential dwellings.
Identification and Assessment of Potential Impacts

9.7 This section aims to identify the Landscape and Visual effects of the proposed development during construction and operation.

9.8 For the purposes of this report the assessment is based on the effects encompassed by the zone of theoretical visibility within the extent of the 2.5km radius study area.

9.9 For the purposes of this report and as ‘worst case’, the construction and operational stages are assessed at peak construction and fully operational periods.

9.10 The characteristics of the proposed development that have been considered as part of this assessment are described below.
Characteristics of the Proposed Development

9.11 The proposed height of the differing buildings and structures are expected to be up to a maximum of 9m in height.

9.12 It can be anticipated that taller features on site, such as rooftops and eaves have the chief potential to contribute to the most significant effects.

9.13 Landscape and visual impacts may result during both the temporary construction phase and the permanent operational period of the proposed development, including:

- Site establishment works including temporary spoil mounds;
- Construction activities, including the location of site compound areas, laydown areas and the use of cranes and task lighting;
- Permanent features introduced as part of the operational stage development proposals, including the principal visual features of the phased development which are proposed to be:
  - Raised ground levels to form building platforms;
  - Amended road infrastructure and associated car parking together with external lighting;
  - Development set within the consented and agreed framework of landscape structure planting;
  - Consented and agreed ecological conservation landscaping as part of the development.
10.0 Assessment of Effects

10.1 This section aims to identify the issues relating to the impacts of the proposed development during construction and operation.

10.2 The characteristics of the proposed development that have been considered as part of this assessment are described below. The potential visual impact of the proposed development is assessed from the photographic viewpoints (See ACD Figure 4: photo viewpoint locations).

Landscape Character Impacts during Construction

10.3 While the current use of the site is primarily given over to poor semi-improved grassland, the site contains few landscape features in the way of woodland or hedges that act as visual focal points other than those forming the boundary.

10.4 The phased and gradual removal of the existing land uses of open grassland, hedges and trees, to be replaced with the storage of spoil, laydown areas full of materials, construction compounds and buildings under construction will form part of a perceived loss of localised landscape elements.

10.5 While the above description explains the changes to the localised site landscape features, the assessment of landscape character impacts must be seen in the wider context of landscape elements that contribute and make up the character areas within the study area.

10.6 Landscape quality, value, character sensitivity and visual sensitivity as it relates to the individual LCA’s have been determined. Taking into account the perceived alteration to landscape character that the scheme will bring, it is assessed that the study area overall, will have a medium landscape character sensitivity to this form of development.

10.7 When seen as part of an essentially extended residential area, the character for this part of the study areas landscape character will continue to have medium sensitivity during the construction period.

10.8 In summary, both the proposed site itself and the local landscape in general, are assessed as having medium landscape sensitivity. For the proposed site itself, it is assessed to be subject to a negligible magnitude of change, due to the very minor loss or alteration to key elements or features, and the introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Consequently the significance of landscape effect for the construction period is assessed to be negligible. This assessment of landscape effect is not classified as ‘significant’.
Visual Impacts during Construction

10.9 The potential for visual impact will fluctuate throughout the period of construction, particularly during specific construction operations relating to rooftops. As construction progresses on these elements there will be a gradual change in the visual ‘environment’ as the working height increases.

10.10 The intermittent but temporary introduction of prominent tall features such as cranes used during the construction phases would have some short term, temporary visual effects on the visual amenity of both nearby and to a lesser degree longer distance sensitive receptors. In particular for short distance visual receptors, the taller cranes will be obvious, distinct and clearly visible (temporary) features within the landscape that may be readily noticed by the receptors.

10.11 Additional temporary visual effects will be caused as a result of construction vehicle movements to and from the construction site and for general construction operations.

10.12 During the construction phases, some temporary lighting will be required. It is not anticipated that there will be any activities requiring work on a 24-hour basis, however, the use of lighting to ensure safe working will probably be required particularly during the winter months. For the highest structures lighting at higher elevations will be required, consequently the greatest potential for visual impact from construction lighting for receptors will result primarily, (but not solely from), from the construction of these particular structures.

10.13 As part of the extended residential area for this part of Hook, the introduction of prominent construction features and facilities, construction lighting, together with general construction activities for large scale projects will not be unfamiliar or uncommon features in the local landscape.

10.14 With the introduction of all these construction activities, given that the scheme would occur over a relatively short period, it would result in a perceptible change in the existing view, and would form an apparent small element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer or receptor. This would result in a small magnitude of change.

10.15 The sensitivity of the large majority of visual receptors in closest proximity to the proposed construction activities can be classified as high (users of PRoW). Consequently, with a high receptor sensitivity set against a small magnitude of visual change, the temporary visual effect during the construction period would, as a worst case, result in a significance of effect that can be assessed as Moderate (i.e. ‘Not significant’).
Operation Stage Impacts

Landscape Effects

10.16 The introduction of residential development within a substantial landscape framework will not be uncharacteristic when set within the existing attributes of the local receiving landscape. It can be determined that the introduction of features that are not in the local vernacular would be similar to more recent buildings found adjacent to the site. The magnitude of change on landscape character is determined to be medium – (partial loss or alteration to one or more key elements, or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape).

10.17 Based on a medium landscape sensitivity of both the local and wider landscape rather than of the site itself, the significance of effect on the landscape character resulting from the proposed development is therefore assessed to be moderate.

Visual Effects

10.18 The introduction of residential development within the existing landscape framework would not be considered out of character when considered as part of the wider setting. This includes the road network, existing development and infrastructure.

Viewpoint Analysis

10.19 The viewpoints have been selected to be representative of the types of views experienced by a range of sensitive receptors such as those listed in the preceding Table 10 and should be read in conjunction with ACD figure 4.

10.20 A full list of viewpoints are listed in Table 11 (this continues on from Table 10).
### Viewpoint Analysis

10.21 The viewpoints have been selected to be representative of the types of views experienced by a range of sensitive receptors such as those listed in the preceding Table 10 and should be read in conjunction with ACD figure 4. The original fieldwork was undertaken during September 2014 and March 2015.

10.22 A full list of viewpoints, are listed in Table 11 as follows;

**Table 11: Viewpoint Locations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Direction of view</th>
<th>Distance to site (Km)</th>
<th>Receptor sensitivity at viewpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newnham Road</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Viewpoint close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRoW at site boundary</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW accessed from Blue Haven Walk</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Hook Bowling Club</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Users of recreation in the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Goose Green</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 1: View from junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road

Winter View
## Baseline Description
This is a view from the junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road looking north. This view is representative of the potential views of residents in the local area.

The landscape is suburban in feel, with detached and semi-detached residential dwellings that have small front gardens with hedgerow boundaries and trees. The railway is nearby and the effects of trains can be felt when they travel past.

## Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the rear of the existing residential dwellings and further to the east along Newnham Road. There exists the potential for residents to see the proposals from the rear of their properties.

## Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

## Type of Effect
The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view and may be indistinct to the observer.

## Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Residents - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Very small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Significance of Effect
Minor – Not significant

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp1</th>
<th>Panoramic View (Distance 0.08km looking north)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a view from the junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road looking north. This view is representative of the potential views of residents in the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The landscape is suburban in feel, with detached and semi-detached residential dwellings that have small front gardens with hedgerow boundaries and trees. The railway is nearby and the effects of trains can be felt when they travel past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Predicted change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the rear of the existing residential dwellings and further to the east along Newnham Road. There exists the potential for residents to see the proposals from the rear of their properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Magnitude of Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Type of Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view and may be indistinct to the observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Significance of Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor – Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 2: View from Newnham Road

Winter View
Baseline Description
This is a view from Newnham Road looking north west. This view is representative of the potential views of road user in the local area.
The landscape is suburban in feel, with the railway set behind the mature tree belt to the south. Existing residential development and buildings associated with farming can be seen in the local landscape.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the rear of the existing hedgerow seen in the foreground. There will be a number of views of potential access points to the site and the proposals set within the field.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and may be easily seen by an observer.

Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Road users</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effect
Major/moderate – Significant
Viewpoint 3: View from PRoW

Winter View
### Vp3

**Panoramic View** *(Distance 0.0km looking west)*

#### Baseline Description
This is a view from a PRoW, where it connects with the eastern site boundary looking west. This view is representative of the potential views of users of the PRoW in the local area.

The view into the site shows fields in agricultural use with well managed internal hedgerows and mature vegetation to the western boundary. Some residential dwellings can be seen to the south west, set against a wooded horizon.

#### Predicted change
From this viewpoint, the proposals will be directly in front of the observer and will foreshorten the existing view with residential dwellings.

#### Predicted change
From this viewpoint, the proposals will be directly in front of the observer and will foreshorten the existing view with residential dwellings.

#### Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

#### Type of Effect
The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and may be easily seen by an observer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Users of PRoW - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Significance of Effect
Major – Significant
Viewpoint 4: View from PRoW accessed from Blue Haven Walk

Winter View
Baseline Description
This is a view from the PRoW which is accessed from Blue Haven Walk looking north west. This view is representative of the potential views of users of the PRoW in the local area.

The landscape is rural in feel, with poplar trees forming strong vertical elements in view. Existing residential development and buildings associated with agriculture can be seen in the local landscape, set within a wooded backcloth.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set behind the existing hedgerow that forms the boundary of the field. Views of the site will be limited to the higher elements, such as eaves and roofs.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and may be noticeable to an observer.

Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Users of PRoW - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effect
Major/moderate – Significant
Viewpoint 5: View from adjacent to Hook Bowling Club

Baseline Description
This is a view from the recreation ground adjacent to Hook Bowling Club looking west. This view is representative of the potential views of users of recreation facilities in the local area.

The landscape is suburban in feel, with an equipped play area set within a recreation ground. Existing residential development accessed from Varndell Road can be seen set within a wooded backcloth in the local landscape.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the west, beyond the mature wooded vegetative barrier. The mature vegetation forms a strong visual barrier to potential views, but some glimpsed views will be available.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view and may be indistinct to an observer.

Assessment
Sensitivity: Users of recreation in the landscape - High
Magnitude: Very small

Significance of Effect
Minor – Not significant
Viewpoint 6: View from Public Right of Way accessed from Goose Green

Baseline Description
This is a view from a PRoW looking south west towards the site. This view is representative of the potential views of users of the PRoW in the local area. The landscape is rural in feel, with fields in agricultural use that have mature vegetation field boundaries. This mature vegetation of College Copse creates dense visual barriers to longer range views.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the rear of the existing College Copse seen in the foreground. This vegetative visual barrier will prevent views of the site.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in no discernible change in the existing view and will not be seen by an observer.

Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Users of PRoW - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effect
Negligible – Not significant
**Viewpoint 7: View from Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp7</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.0km looking east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from a PRoW accessed from Newnham Road looking east. This view is representative of the potential views of users of the PRoW in the local area. The landscape is rural in feel, with fields in agricultural use bound by mature vegetative field boundaries. Some partial views of existing residential development and buildings associated with farming can be seen in the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint, the proposals will be directly in front of the observer and will foreshorten the existing view with residential dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and may be easily seen by an observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Sensitivity</td>
<td>Users of PRoW - High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Major – Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 8: View from Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road

Baseline Description
This is a view from a PRoW accessed from Newnham Road looking north east. This view is representative of the potential views of users of the PRoW in the local area. The landscape is rural in feel, with fields in agricultural use bound by mature vegetative field boundaries. Some views of existing residential development and buildings associated with farming can be seen in the landscape. The horizon is textured, with some parts formed by vegetation and buildings, with some formed by the field.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint, the proposals will be directly in front of the observer and will foreshorten the existing view with residential dwellings.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and may be easily seen by an observer.

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Users of PRoW - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effect
Major – Significant
Viewpoint 9: View from Ridge Lane

Baseline Description
This is a view from Ridge Lane looking east. This view is representative of the potential views of road users in the local area. This a winter view and represents worst case scenario as deciduous species have lost their foliage, creating a less complete visual barrier.

The landscape is rural in feel, with fields in agricultural use bound by mature vegetative field boundaries. Mature trees form partial visual barriers to views of the wider landscape.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint, the proposals will be located behind the incomplete tree line that filters views of the wider landscape to the east. The proposals will be visible through this partial vegetative visual barrier.

Magnitude of change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and may be noticeable to an observer.

Assessment
Sensitivity: Road users - Medium
Magnitude: Medium

Significance of Effect
Moderate – Not significant
Viewpoint 10: View from Ridge Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp10</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.96km looking south)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from Ridge Lane looking south. This view is representative of the potential views of road users in the local area. This a winter view and represents worst case scenario as deciduous species have lost their foliage, creating a less complete visual barrier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint, the proposals will be located beyond a number of interceding tree lines and woodland. The proposals will not be visible due to the interceding vegetative visual barriers in the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in no change in the existing view and would not be seen by an observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Sensitivity</td>
<td>Road users - Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Negligible – Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 11: View from Ridge Lane**

[Image: View from Ridge Lane]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp11</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.47km looking south)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from Ridge Lane looking south close to the entrance to Tylney Hall. This view is representative of the potential views of road users in the local area. This a winter view and represents worst case scenario as deciduous species have lost their foliage, creating a less complete visual barrier. The landscape is rural in feel, with the road bounded by mature vegetative field boundaries. Mature trees form visual barriers to views of the wider landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint, the proposals will be located beyond a number of interceding tree lines and woodland. The proposals will not be visible due to the interceding vegetative visual barriers in the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in no change in the existing view and would not be seen by an observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Road users - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Negligible = Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 12: View from Ridge Lane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint 12</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.29km looking south east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Description</strong></td>
<td>This is a view from Ridge Lane looking south east near to the entrance to the Gordon Brown Centre. This view is representative of the potential views of road users in the local area. This a winter view and represents worst case scenario as deciduous species have lost their foliage, creating a less complete visual barrier. The landscape is rural in feel, with the road bounded by mature vegetative field boundaries. Mature trees form visual barriers to views of the wider landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicted change</strong></td>
<td>From this viewpoint, the proposals will be located beyond a number of interceding tree lines and woodland. The proposals will not be visible due to the interceding vegetative visual barriers in the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnitude of Change</strong></td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Effect</strong></td>
<td>The development would result in no change in the existing view and would not be seen by an observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Sensitivity Road users - Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude Negligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Effect</strong></td>
<td>Negligible – Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 13: View from Ridge Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp13</th>
<th>Panoramic View (Distance 0.42km looking east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from Ridge Lane where it meets the edge of Newnham, looking east. This view is representative of the potential views of residents in the local area. This a winter view and represents worst case scenario as deciduous species have lost their foliage, creating a less complete visual barrier. The landscape is rural in feel, with the road bounded by mature vegetative field boundaries and trees. Mature trees and residential boundaries, made up of fences, form visual barriers to views of the wider landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint, the proposals will be located beyond a number of interceding tree lines and existing residential development. The proposals will not be visible due to the interceding vegetative and built visual barriers in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in no change in the existing view and would not be seen by an observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity Residents - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Negligible – Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Visual Impacts and Significance

Table 12 Summary of Visual Significance of Effect for Operational Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Receptor Type</th>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newnham Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRoW at site boundary</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW accessed from Blue Haven Walk</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Hook Bowling Club</td>
<td>Users of outdoor recreation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Goose Green</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effects indicated in bold are considered Significant’ in Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011
11.0 Mitigation and Recommendations for Development

11.1 The scale of the development should be limited to 2.5 storey to retain the same skyline to views from the local landscape.

11.2 Development should also be kept back from the site boundaries to allow for boundary planting and visual barrier elements to minimise the potential impact of built form.

11.3 Materials that form the external envelope and roof of the buildings to match the surrounding existing palette, for example, the brick and dark brown roof tiles. These colours will also have a more subtle impact on the landscape.

11.4 A 2-3m high boundary hedge should be planted along the site boundaries to supplement the existing boundary hedging. This will reduce the impact of vehicular lighting and ground floor lighting within the local area.
12.0 Summary of Residual Impacts and Significance

Summary of Residual Landscape and Visual Effects

12.1 While the visual assessment has looked, where necessary, at both the construction stage and operational stage separately the residual impacts will only cover the operational stage since:

- The construction stage is temporary;
- Any planting mitigation will take some years to become effective.

12.2 The most successful mitigation will be the development of a substantial landscape framework to reinforce the existing retained hedges and trees. This additional visual barrier effect will reduce the visibility of the development to form either inconspicuous minor elements within the view or that no part of the development would be appreciated. The reassessment of visual impacts has been taken after this 15 year period following the start of the operational stage. In this time span any tree planting will have grown to over 8m high and any hedge planting, for example, will have now become a dense managed hedgerow.

Landscape Character

12.3 With the introduction of new residential development into this part of Hook and at the same time, the introduction of landscape management objectives including the introduction of further indigenous hedgerow species, the overall magnitude of landscape character impact is assessed as still being medium, since in accordance with Table 5 the development would give rise to a loss or alteration to one or more key landscape elements but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set against the attributes of this receiving landscape. Assessed against a landscape character that has been determined to have a medium sensitivity, and a magnitude of change assessed as medium the Significance of Effect will remain as moderate.
Visual Impact

12.4 Within a 15-year assessment period;

- New hedging and vegetation boundaries will be well established and will have been managed at heights that provide more effective visual barrier.
- Planting to reinforce the existing vegetation will provide denser effective winter visual barrier.
- The tree belts and occasional hedge trees will also now be 8+ metres high.
- Materials that form the external envelope and roof of the buildings will have ‘weathered’ and have more subdued tones.

12.5 These mitigation measures would help limit views of the development and therefore alter and reduce some of the magnitudes of visual change from the established viewpoints.
### Table 13 Summary and comparison of Residual Visual Significance of Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Receptor Type</th>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Stage</td>
<td>Residual Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junction of Newnham Road and Old School Road</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newnham Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRoW at site boundary</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW accessed from Blue Haven Walk</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Hook Bowling Club</td>
<td>Users of outdoor recreation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Goose Green</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Right of Way accessed from Newnham Road</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate/ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Viewpoints</td>
<td>Receptor Type</td>
<td>Receptor Sensitivity</td>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>Significance of Visual Effect</td>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>Significance of Visual Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effects indicated in bold are considered ‘Significant’ in Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011
13.0 Conclusion

Landscape Character

13.1 The site does not fall within any statutory designations. The site falls within the national character area 129 – Thames Basin Heaths (as defined by the former Countryside Commission).

13.2 With regard to the dominance within the landscape of transport corridors and urban edges the assessment of local character areas, on the whole are assessed as having medium sensitivity to this form of development.

Construction Stage

13.3 For the proposed site itself during the construction stage and with the retention of the main important landscape features such as the boundary hedgerow, it is assessed to be subject to a medium magnitude of change, due to the partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements or features, and the introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Consequently the significance of landscape effect for the construction of the proposal is assessed to be moderate. This assessment of landscape effect is not classified as ‘significant’.

Operational Stage

13.4 It has been assessed that a minor loss of key landscape elements and the introduction of elements that may be prominent but not uncharacteristic will occur and the subsequent landscape effects are considered not significant in planning terms.

Residual Significance of Landscape Effects

13.5 All viewpoints are from public accessible areas and have been specifically chosen to represent certain views or users of certain views. These include footpaths, residential areas, points of interest and roads. This is determined to have no significant residual effects.

Visual Effects

13.6 All viewpoints are from public accessible areas and have been specifically chosen to represent certain views or users of certain views. Viewpoints chosen include footpaths, settlements and roads that fall within the ZTV.
Construction Stage

13.7 The introduction of construction features and facilities, construction lighting, together with general construction activities for large scale projects will not be unfamiliar or uncommon features in the local landscape.

13.8 With the introduction of all these construction activities, given that the scheme would occur over a relatively short period, it would result in a medium magnitude of change.

13.9 The sensitivity of the large majority of visual receptors in closest proximity to the proposed construction activities can be classified as high (residents and users of PRoW). Consequently, with a high receptor sensitivity set against a medium magnitude of visual change, the temporary visual effect during the construction period would, as a worst case, result in a significance of effect that can be assessed as Major/Moderate (i.e. ‘Significant’).

Operational Stage

13.10 The visual impact assessment has identified a number of significant visual effects when the proposal and ancillary works are considered as a stand-alone development. In particular viewpoints 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 where existing visual barriers created by topographical and vegetation features are minimal. These viewpoints are also within close proximity to the site boundary.

13.11 This is primarily due to the scale of the proposals being considered noticeable even though it would not affect the quality or character of the view.

13.12 For the majority of the receptors the assessment has found that while parts of the development are visible such views are glimpsed and would not have significant visual effects in planning terms.
Residual Significance of Visual Effects

13.13 With heights of these structures being up to 9m, the mitigation planting will provide visual barriers to the entire site. Three viewpoints, 3, 7 and 8 will have residual significant visual effects. On this basis the residual impact assessment is expected, as a worst case, to have ‘Significant’ visual effects.

13.14 When seen within the context of the wider landscape, from most viewpoints, the proposals are less noticeable and would consequently have visual effects that are not considered ‘Significant’.

13.15 However, from nearby views, the site would remain noticeable with little visual barrier effect from either mitigation planting or its juxtaposition with other residential development. In these views the significance of visual effect would remain ‘Significant’ in planning terms.
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## APPENDIX A - Glossary of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis (landscape)</td>
<td>The process of breaking the landscape down into its component parts to understand how it is made up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (landscape)</td>
<td>An umbrella term for description, classification and analysis of landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>The concept of variety in all species of plants and animals through which nature finds its balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>A process of sorting the landscape into different types using selected criteria, but without attaching relative values to the different kinds of landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>The measures taken to offset or compensate for residual adverse effects that cannot be mitigated, or for which mitigation cannot entirely eliminate adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints map</td>
<td>Map showing the location of important resources and receptors that may form constraints to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>The rural environment and its associated communities (including the coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>The summation of effects that result from changes cause by a development in conjunctions with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Where a variety of qualities or characteristics occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do nothing situation”</td>
<td>Continued change/evolution of landscape or of the environment in the absence of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>A component part of the landscape (for example, roads, hedges, woods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Landscape improvement through restoration, reconstruction or creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Our physical surroundings including air, water and land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental appraisal  
A generic term for the evaluation of the environmental implications of proposals (used by the UK Government in respect of policies and plans).

Environmental fit  
The relationship of a development to identified environmental implications opportunities and constraints in setting.

Environmental Impact Assessment  
The evaluation of the effects on the environment of particular development proposals.

Field pattern  
The pattern of hedges and walls that define fields in farmed landscapes.

Geographical Information System  
Computerised database of geographical information that can easily be updated and manipulated.

Heritage  
Historical or cultural associations.

Indirect impacts  
Impacts on the environment, which are not a direct result of the development but are often produced away from it or as a result of a complex pathway. Sometimes referred to as secondary impacts.

Landcover  
Combinations of land use and vegetation that cover the land surface.

Landform  
Combinations of slope and elevation of the land conditioned by knowledge and identity with a place.

Landscape capacity  
The degree to which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate change without unacceptable adverse effects on its character. Capacity is likely to vary according to the type and nature of change being proposed.

Landscape character  
The distinct and recognisable pattern of elements that occurs consistently in a particular type of landscape, and how this is perceived by people. It reflects particular combinations of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use and human settlement. It creates the particular sense of place of different areas of the landscape.
Landscape character type
A landscape type will have broadly similar patterns of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use, settlement and field pattern discernible in maps and field survey records.

Landscape effects
Change in the elements, characteristics, character and qualities of the landscape as a result of development. These effects can be positive or negative.

Landscape evaluation
The process of attaching value (non-monetary) to a particular landscape, usually by the application of previously agreed criteria, including consultation and third party documents, for a particular purpose (for example, designation or in the context of the assessment)

Landscape factor
A circumstance or influence contributing to the impression of a landscape (for example, scale, enclosure, elevation)

Landscape feature
A prominent eye-catching element, for example, wooded hilltop or church spire.

Landscape quality (or condition)
is based on judgements about the physical state of the landscape, and about its intactness, from visual, functional, and ecological perspectives. It also reflects the state of repair of individual features and elements which makes up the character in any one place.

Landscape resource
The combination of elements that contribute to landscape context, character and value.

Landscape sensitivity
The extent to which a landscape can accept change of a particular type and scale without unacceptable adverse effects on its character.

Land use
The primary use of the land, including both rural and urban activities.

Landscape value
The relative value or importance attached to a landscape (often as a basis for designation or recognition), which expresses national or local consensus, because of its quality, special qualities including perceptual aspects such as scenic beauty, tranquillity or wildness, cultural associations or other conservation issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>A combination of the scale, extent and duration of an effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>The specific approach and techniques used for a given study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Measures, including any process, activity or design to avoid, reduce, remedy or compensate for adverse landscape and visual effects of a development project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (of landscape)</td>
<td>The psychology of seeing and possibly attaching value and/or meaning to landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary principle</td>
<td>Principle applied to err on the side of caution where significant environmental damage may occur, but where knowledge on the matter is incomplete, or when the prediction of environmental effects is uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>The liking by people for one particular landscape element, characteristic or feature over another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>See Landscape quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptor</td>
<td>Physical landscape resource, special interest or viewer group that will experience an effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory authority</td>
<td>The planning or other authority responsible for planning consents or project authorisation (synonymous with determining authority).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>A picture of a possible future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>The process of identifying the likely significant effects of a development of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of place (genius loci)</td>
<td>The essential character and spirit of an area; <em>genius loci</em> literally means 'spirit of the place'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive/sensitivity</td>
<td>See landscape sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieve mapping</td>
<td>Technique for mapping environmental constraints, working from a series of overlays, sieving out less important factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>The principle that the environment should be protected in such a condition and to such a degree that ensures new development meets the needs of the present without</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

**Technique**

Specific working process

**Threshold**

A specified level in grading effects, for example, of magnitude, sensitivity or significance.

**Visual amenity**

The value of a particular area or view in terms of what is seen.

**Visual effect**

Change in the appearance of the landscape as a result of development. This can be positive (ie beneficial or an improvement) or negative (ie adverse or a detraction)

**Visual envelope**

Extent of potential visibility to or from a specific area or feature.

**Visualisation**

Computer simulation, photomontage or other technique to illustrate the appearance of a development.

**Worst-case situation**

Principle applied where the environmental effects may vary, for example, seasonally to ensure the most severe potential effect is assessed.

**Zone of visual influence**

Area within which a proposed development may have an influence or effect on visual amenity.
APPENDIX B - Sources of Information

The following sources of information were obtained or consulted during the course of the assessment:

- Consultations with the client regarding the development proposals;
- Hampshire County Council and Hook District Council published landscape character descriptions;
- Aerial photography;
- Ordnance Survey Mapping at 1:10,000, 1:25,000 and 1:50,000 scale;
- Site visits and fieldwork to confirm data derived from available mapping and to identify and assess potential impacts.
APPENDIX C – Policy

Hart District Council Local Plan 1996-2006 – saved policies

GEN 1 PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WHICH ACCORD WITH OTHER PROPOSALS OF THIS PLAN WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY:

(i) Are in keeping with the local character by virtue of their scale, design, massing, height, prominence, materials, layout, landscaping, siting and density;

(ii) Avoid any material loss of amenity to existing and adjoining residential, commercial, recreational, agricultural or forestry uses, by virtue of noise, disturbance, noxious fumes, dust, pollution or traffic generation;

(iii) Cause no material loss of amenity to adjoining residential uses, through loss of privacy, overlooking or the creation of shared facilities;

(iv) Do not constitute ribbon or sporadic development, unrelated to existing patterns of settlement within the District;

(v) Include provision for the conservation or enhancement of the District's landscape, ecology and historic heritage and natural resources;

(vi) Where the public would reasonably expect to use the building, provide suitable access for people with impaired mobility, including those confined to wheelchairs;

(vii) Have adequate arrangements on site for access, servicing or the parking of vehicles;

(viii) Do not give rise to traffic flows on the surrounding road network, which would cause material detriment to the amenities of nearby properties and settlements or to highway safety;

(ix) Do not create the need for highway improvements which would be detrimental to the character and setting of roads within the conservation areas or rural lanes in the District;

(x) Do not lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas or settlements, or use unsuitable roads;

(xi) Include provision for any necessary improvements to infrastructure and utilities resulting from the development;
(xii) Take account of the proximity of overhead cables and power lines;

(xiii) Avoid the installation of lighting, which is visually damaging to the character of the area.

GEN 3 WITHIN THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS, AS INDICATED BELOW AND SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED IF IT DOES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE, AND IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH OTHER POLICIES OF THIS PLAN.

1. Wellington

2. Tylney

3. Bartley

4. Whitewater Valley

5. Blackwater Valley

6. Firgrove

7. Bramshill

8. Hazeley / West Green

9. Winchfield

10. Dogmersfield

11. Hart Valley

12. Minley

13. Tweseldown

14. Redlands

15. Hart Downs

GEN 4 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY SUSTAIN OR IMPROVE THE URBAN DESIGN QUALITIES OF TOWNS, VILLAGES AND OTHER SETTLEMENTS WHICH DERIVE FROM THEIR LAYOUT AND FORM, SCALE, CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE, SPECIAL FEATURES, OR THE ARRANGEMENT, SCALE AND DESIGN OF BUILDINGS AND SPACES.
GEN 12 PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT WHICH FAILS TO INCORPORATE APPROPRIATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIME PREVENTION WITHIN ITS DESIGN.

CON 1 DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF CLASSIFIED OR PROPOSED SPECIAL PROTECTION AREAS OR CANDIDATE OR DESIGNATED SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION (DESIGNATED UNDER EUROPEAN LEGISLATION IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE) WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THERE ARE NO ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS AND THERE ARE IMPERATIVE REASONS OF OVER-RIDING PUBLIC INTEREST, INCLUDING THOSE OF A SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC NATURE. IN THE CASE OF SPA AND SAC WHICH SUPPORT A “PRIORITY” HABITAT OR SPECIES, PLANNING PERMISSION MAY ONLY BE GRANTED IF THE DEVELOPMENT CAN BE JUSTIFIED ON THE GROUNDS OF HUMAN HEALTH, PUBLIC SAFETY OR BENEFICIAL CONSEQUENCES OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

CON 2 DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF A SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST OR NATIONAL NATURE RESERVE EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IF IT CAN BE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS THAT WILL PREVENT DAMAGING IMPACTS ON WILDLIFE HABITATS OR OTHER NATURAL FEATURES OF IMPORTANCE ON THE SITE OR IF OTHER MATERIAL FACTORS ARE SUFFICIENT TO OVERRIDE THE NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST

CON 3 DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST OF SITES OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IF OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS OUTWEIGH THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SITE TO LOCAL NATURE CONSERVATION.

CON 8 WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WHICH WOULD AFFECT TREES, WOODLANDS OR HEDGEROWS OF SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPE OR AMENITY VALUE PLANNING PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GRANTED IF THESE FEATURES ARE SHOWN TO BE CAPABLE OF BEING RETAINED IN THE LONGER TERM OR IF REMOVAL IS NECESSARY NEW PLANTING IS UNDERTAKEN TO MAINTAIN THE VALUE OF THESE FEATURES. PLANNING CONDITIONS MAY BE IMPOSED TO REQUIRE THE PLANTING OF NEW TREES OR HEDGEROWS TO REPLACE THOSE LOST.
CON 12 DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS OR THEIR SETTINGS, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.

CON 21 DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD LEAD TO THE COALESCENCE OR DAMAGE THE SEPARATE IDENTITY OF NEIGHBOURING SETTLEMENTS WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GAPS:

i) Fleet to Crookham Village;

ii) Fleet/Church Crookham to Ewshot;

iii) Crookham Village to Dogmersfield;

iv) Eversley to Yateley;

v) Hook to Newnham;

vi) Odiham to North Warnborough;

vii) Eversley Centre and Eversley Cross.

CON 22 DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE CHARACTER OR SETTING OF A SETTLEMENT, OR LEAD TO THE LOSS OF IMPORTANT AREAS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPEN LAND AROUND SETTLEMENTS, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHERE IT WOULD:

i) Obscure typical views of the settlement from public vantage points;

ii) Obstruct significant public views our of the settlement;

iii) Result in the loss of "green fingers" important to the structure and amenity of the settlement; or

iv) Otherwise have a serious adverse effect on the character or setting of the settlement.

CON 23 DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHICH WOULD SERIOUSLY DETRACT FROM THE AMENITY AND CONSEQUENT RECREATIONAL VALUE OF WELL-USED FOOTPATHS AND OTHER PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY IN THE COUNTRYSIDE CLOSE TO MAIN SETTLEMENTS BY REDUCING THEIR RURAL CHARACTER OR DETRACTING FROM SIGNIFICANT VIEWS.

RUR 2 DEVELOPMENT IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE, OUTSIDE THE DEFINED SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THE LOCAL
PLANNING AUTHORITY IS SATISFIED THAT IT IS SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED FOR BY OTHER POLICIES IN THE LOCAL PLAN, AND THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON THE CHARACTER AND SETTING OF THE COUNTRYSIDE BY VIRTUE OF ITS SITING, SIZE AND PROMINENCE IN THE LANDSCAPE.

RUR 3 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE WHICH ARE PROVIDED FOR BY OTHER POLICIES IN THIS PLAN, WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE:

(i) The countryside is protected and maintained through the retention, creation or enhancement of features of nature conservation or landscape importance;

(ii) Any existing buildings or structures can be retained if of architectural quality;

(iii) The site is satisfactorily landscaped to reduce its impact on the surrounding countryside;

(iv) The criteria of the specific Policy by which the development proposed may be permitted are also met.
APPENDIX D - Published Local Landscape Character Areas

NCA 129 – Thames Basin Heaths.

The key characteristics of this area are:

- Plateaux of Tertiary sands and gravels in the London Basin, with intervening river valleys floored by London Clay. In the far west, Chalk forms the Hampshire Downs escarpment and the river beds of the Kennet and Pang.

- High woodland cover, offering an array of colour in the autumn. Conifers and large plantations on former heathland are dominant features in the east, while the west is scattered with small, semi-natural woodlands on ancient sites.

- Acid, leached soils mean that farming on the plateaux is limited to rough pasture, and that alternative land uses (such as forestry, golf courses and horse paddocks) have emerged. Heather, gorse, oak and birch all thrive here. Arable land and improved pasture are found in the valleys, on alluvium.

- Beyond the large areas of heathland and woodland, there is a patchwork of small to medium-sized fields with woods. The legacy of historic hunting forests includes veteran trees, ancient woods, ancient hedgerows and parklands. Historic meadows remain as fragments along watercourses.

- Prehistoric earthworks such as barrows and hill forts mark promontories on the plateaux. Archaeology is well preserved on historic heathland. Mosaics of open heathland and grassland with scrub, secondary woodland and plantation. Valley bogs, ponds and streams enhance diversity. Large, continuous mosaics are found in the east: they include Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and Chobham Common National Nature Reserve (NNR).

- Historic commons offer tranquillity and unenclosed views, while other rights of access are enjoyed across farmland, canals and downland. Ministry of Defence ownership restricts (but does not entirely prevent) public enjoyment.

- ‘Churring’ nightjars, dragonflies and purple heather are all readily identified with heathland. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA protects internationally important populations of woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler.
Valley floors are wet with ditches, numerous watercourses, ponds, waterfilled gravel pits, reedbeds and carr. Historic features include mills, relict water meadows, and canals such as the River Wey Navigations.

20th-century conurbations, including Camberley, sprawl along the Blackwater Valley, with associated roads (including the M3) dissecting heathland and woodland into blocks. Elsewhere, there are winding lanes and historic dispersed villages and farmsteads of traditional, locally-made brick and tile.

Sub-Regional Character

Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment

The Hampshire County Integrated Landscape Character Assessment was commissioned by Hampshire County Council and published in May 2012. The purpose of the report was to assess the baseline study of the landscape character, at a sub-regional level that gives a further understanding of the landscape resource.

The key characteristics of the relevant sub-regional character area relevant to the study area are reproduced below:

2C: Loddon Valley and Western Forest of Eversley

Key Characteristics

- Low lying gently undulating landscape divided on a north-south axis by the shallow, broad valley of the River Loddon.
- A poorly draining landscape, dissected by a network of often wooded streams and minor tributaries. It contains a mosaic of habitats supporting a rich and varied biodiversity.
- Distant views of continuous plantation woodland on elevated sand and gravel plateaux in adjoining character areas to the east and west.
- Thick hedges often with banks and ditches and many ancient trees.
- A high density of public rights of way and permissive access network.
- A secluded intimate feel, and a sense the landscape has had a long history of small settlement and farms by the presence of timber framed and old brick small farm buildings.
- Early disafforestation of medieval deer parks in the 14th century, resulting in an assarted landscape in which woodland has become increasingly
fragmented. Fields have been reorganised but generally retain their irregular pattern.

- A significant concentration of large historic parks and gardens, such as Stratfield Saye, Tylney Hall and The Vyne.
- A high density dispersed settlement pattern which has mid medieval origins and remains relatively little altered, including a concentration of medieval moated sites. Villages often have greens.
- GHQ defence line.
- High voltage power lines stride through the landscape.

Landscape Character Type: Lowland Mosaic Small Scale – Confined to central southern Hampshire, subtle differences to other lowland mosaic types.

Key Identifying Characteristics and Boundary Definitions

- Low lying silty clay, but not sandy soils, that are seasonally wet and waterlogged in parts but also with better drained areas.
- The soils support predominantly permanent pasture land use.
- Less marginal farmed areas than the lowland mosaic medium scale and lowland mosaic heath associated types.
- Often small enclosures, small areas of woodland and undulating topography which produces the sense of a small scale landscape.
- Associated mostly with small chalk fed streams apart from where they border the New Forest perambulation where they are more acidic.
- Generally, high to very high density of dispersed small farmsteads and hamlets and associated with nucleated spring line settlements in the south and north Hampshire lowlands.
- Small semi natural and ancient woodland copses and hedges of varying character.
- Frequently a high density of public rights of way and winding lanes.
- Varying periods and types of enclosure but generally small scale but has some of the earliest enclosures out of all the lowland mosaic types – perhaps indicating less marginal and richer soils.
Particular association with hamlets and villages of medieval and Saxon origin often associated with wood and wood clearance.
NB: Viewshed analysis run with 1.6m viewer height and buildings at a 9m height with MapInfo and represents surface topography, without taking into account potential visual barriers in the form of trees, hedgerows, woodland, buildings and other man made elements.
NB: Viewshed analysis run with 1.6m viewer height and buildings at a 9m height with mapinfo and represents surface topography, without taking into account potential visual barriers in the form of trees, hedgerows, woodland, buildings and other man made elements.
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