



# East Hampshire District Council Landscape Capacity Study September 2018

terrafirma  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

## **EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **LANDSCAPE CAPACITY STUDY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**28 September 2018**

East Hampshire District Council appointed The terra firma Consultancy Limited in June 2018 to produce a Landscape Capacity Study to inform the evidence base for the emerging East Hampshire Local Plan. The Study assesses, at a strategic scale, the relative capacity of the landscape to accommodate housing development in the areas of the District, outside the South Downs National Park (SDNP), and outside of the established settlement boundaries, without causing significant and detrimental damage to the District's fine landscapes or those of the SDNP or the adjacent Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This Study will supersede the existing Landscape Capacity Study 2013. The East Hampshire Landscape Character Assessment (2006) provided an understanding and assessment of the landscape character of East Hampshire and is used as the starting point for this Study.

The aim of this Landscape Capacity Study (the Study) is to provide a robust landscape evidence base that will be weighed with all the other evidence used in plan making and planning decisions. The Study aims to provide a transparent, consistent, objective and robust assessment of the landscape capacity of the study area's landscape, sub-divided into 41 Local Areas for reporting purposes, to provide officers with evidence to understand where the landscape and visual impacts would be greatest and identify which general areas, if any, may have capacity to accommodate change. The landscape capacity of each Local Area has been assessed relative to the other Local Areas included in the study rather than against the most and least sensitive areas nationally. The attributes identified in the record sheets, and summarised within the individual reports, also provide guidance on which landscape and visual attributes require special protection should some level of development be acceptable.

It is important to note that this Study does NOT recommend that all the least sensitive areas would be suitable as potential developable areas within the undeveloped open land within the Local Plan period. The object of the Study is to identify those parts which are the least sensitive in landscape and visual terms to development from which East Hampshire District Council can select those Local Areas it wishes to investigate further for possible inclusion to meet demand within the Local Plan period.

The findings of the Study show that at a strategic level the East Hampshire District is very constrained in landscape terms with a large proportion of the Local Areas within the District of a low or medium/low landscape capacity (i.e. areas that have limited capacity to accommodate change). This is down to a number of factors, however the main constraints are: the presence of the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA) in the north-east of the District, internationally designated for its nature conservation importance; the proximity of

many of the local areas to the nationally designated landscapes of the SDNP and Surrey Hills AONB; and the strong rural character of large areas of the district, sparsely settled in places, which demonstrate many positive and distinctive landscape and visual characteristics.

The landscape capacity is indicative, and the actual capacity of each Local Area can be determined by a more detailed assessment of the area. It is likely that there will be some instances where a more detailed assessment of the local areas will identify smaller parcels of land that are less constrained in landscape terms and could accommodate some change without significant landscape and visual effects, provided this change is sensitively integrated into the landscape.

## EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### LANDSCAPE CAPACITY STUDY September 2018

#### CONTENTS

<b>A. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
General .....	3
<b>B. Summary of planning guidance and policy .....</b>	<b>4</b>
National Planning Policy .....	4
EHDC Planning Policy .....	5
South Downs National Park .....	5
Principles of development within the SDNP .....	7
Surrey Hills AONB .....	8
Principles of development within the Surrey Hills AONB .....	8
<b>C. Landscape character assessment .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>D. Methodology .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Basis of methodology .....	9
Assessment process .....	9
Stage 1: Determination of Visual Sensitivity .....	10
Matrix 1: Visual sensitivity .....	10
Matrix 2: Landscape sensitivity .....	12
Stage 3: Determination of Landscape Character Sensitivity .....	14
Matrix 3: Landscape character sensitivity .....	14
Stage 4: Determination of Wider Sensitivity – The Contribution of the Local Area to the Wider Landscape and Settlement Edge Pattern	15

Matrix 4: Overall landscape sensitivity .....	16
Stage 6: Determination of Landscape Value .....	17
Stage 7: Determination of Landscape Capacity .....	19
Matrix 5 Landscape Capacity .....	19
Stage 8: Determination of landscape capacity within the Local Area and of Green Infrastructure .....	21
Study Constraints .....	21
<b>E. Local Area reports .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>F. Appendices .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Appendix A Study area diagrams .....	24
Figure 1 Study area and Local Areas .....	25
Figure 2 Landscape Designations .....	26
Figure 3 Planning policy .....	27
Figure 4 South Downs National Park constraints .....	28
Figure 5 EHDC Landscape character areas .....	29
Figure 6 EHDC landscape character types .....	30
Figure 7 Topography .....	31
Figure 8 Nature conservation .....	32
Figure 9 Historic Designations .....	33
Figure 10 Public access .....	34
Figure 11 Flood zones .....	35
Figure 12 Landscape capacity summary map – North .....	36
Figure 13 Landscape capacity summary map – South .....	37
Appendix B Record sheets (see separate document) .....	38
Appendix C Bibliography .....	39
Appendix D Glossary .....	40



## A. Introduction

### General

1. East Hampshire District Council appointed The terra firma Consultancy Limited in June 2018 to produce a Landscape Capacity Study to inform the evidence base for the emerging East Hampshire Local Plan. The Study assesses, at a strategic scale, the relative capacity of the landscape to accommodate housing development in the areas of the District, outside the South Downs National Park (SDNP), and outside of the established settlement boundaries, without causing significant and detrimental damage to the District's fine landscapes or those of the SDNP or the adjacent Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This Study will supersede the existing Landscape Capacity Study 2013. The East Hampshire Landscape Character Assessment (2006) provided an understanding and assessment of the landscape character of East Hampshire and is used as the starting point for this Study.
2. The distinct and varied landscape provides a very attractive rural setting that defines the whole area, providing opportunities for agriculture, forestry, recreation and tourism and supporting rural communities and economies. Much of the District is designated as the SDNP. This designation gives national recognition to the special importance of the area and offers the highest level of protection. Part of the north-eastern East Hampshire District Council boundary, north-east of Bordon, is adjacent to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
3. Much of the remaining countryside beyond the boundaries of the SDNP is unspoilt and any new development should not harm this. A Landscape Character Assessment (2006), covering the East Hampshire District, identifies the distinctive features and character of the East Hampshire countryside and aims to ensure their retention and, where possible, enhancement. This is supported by parish Landscape Character Assessments for Rowlands Castle and Selborne.
4. The aim of this Landscape Capacity Study (the Study) is to provide a robust landscape evidence base that will be weighed with all the other evidence used in plan making and planning decisions. The Study aims to provide a transparent, consistent, objective and robust assessment of the landscape capacity of the Local Areas listed above, to provide officers with evidence to understand where the landscape and visual impacts would be greatest and identify which areas, if any, may have capacity to accommodate change. The landscape capacity of each Local Area will be assessed relative to the other Local Areas included in the study rather than against the most and least sensitive areas nationally. The attributes identified in the record sheets, and summarised within the individual reports, also provide guidance on which landscape and visual attributes require special protection should some level of development be acceptable.
5. The Study assesses the value and capacity of Local Areas. The boundaries of these Local Areas are based on landscape character areas identified in the East Hampshire District Landscape Character Assessment 2006 using historic landscape character types as guides to sub-divide character areas for a more refined assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape.
6. Section B describes the planning policy framework of relevance to this Study, at national, regional and local levels.

7. Section C describes the landscape character assessment framework for this Study.
8. Section D describes the methodology and factors taken into account to determine the landscape capacity of each Local Area. This includes the mass and scale of any potential development. At all times the recommendations for areas of least sensitivity in landscape terms should be read in conjunction with the associated landscape capacity assessment reports.
9. Section E comprises reports for each of the Local Areas included within the Study.
10. The following Local Areas are covered in this Study:
  - Local Area 2b.1-4
  - Local Area 3a.1
  - Local Area 3d.1-5
  - Local Area 3e.1-2
  - Local Area 3f.1-3
  - Local Area 4b.1-2
  - Local Area 6c.1-5
  - Local Area 7b.1
  - Local Area 8c.1-5
  - Local Area 9b.1-5
  - Local Area 10a.1-3
11. Appendix A comprises a series of Study Area Diagrams.
12. Appendix B includes the fieldwork record sheets for each Local Area, from which the key sensitivities are drawn in the Reports.
13. A full list of source documents listed in the Bibliography in Appendix C. The main documents that have informed the Study are:
  - *East Hampshire District Landscape Character Assessment (2006)*;
  - *Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment (2012)*
14. Appendix D lists and defines technical terminology used in this Study, in a Glossary.

## **B. Summary of planning guidance and policy**

### **National Planning Policy**

15. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the government's planning policies for England:  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/740441/National\\_Planning\\_Policy\\_Framework\\_web\\_accessible\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/740441/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_web_accessible_version.pdf)
16. Chapter 15, paragraphs 170 to 177 of the NPPF refer to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and Chapter 16, paragraphs 184 and 202, the historic environment. With regard to landscape, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
  - *protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
  - *recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*
  - *Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues*

### **EHDC Planning Policy**

17. East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) is commencing work on a new local plan to replace the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (adopted June 2014), the Housing and Employment Allocations (adopted April 2016) and the saved policies from the Second Review Local Plan 2006. The new local plan will review all strategic issues affecting East Hampshire, outside of the SDNP. It will establish an up-to-date development strategy and policies and will make new land allocations where appropriate. The new local plan will cover the period 2017-2036.
18. Land allocated by EHDC in their adopted Local Plan has been taken into account in this Study, with assumptions made that the land will be developed as per the relevant policy.
19. The Study takes account of Conservation Area Appraisals and documents which have been produced by the Local Planning Authority.

### **South Downs National Park**

20. Much of East Hampshire is within the SDNP and is adjacent to sections of this Study area. National Parks were designated originally under the National Parks and Countryside Act of 1949 and subsequently the Environment Act 1995 which revised the original legislation and set out two statutory purposes for National Parks in England and Wales:
  - *Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage;*
  - *Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of National Parks by the Public*



When pursuing these purposes in National Parks, there is also a duty to:

- *Seek to foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities within the National Parks*

21. In cases where there is conflict between the two purposes the Sandford principle will apply – that is, the first purpose takes priority.

22. The special qualities of the SDNP are defined as follows:

- *Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breathtaking views*
- *A rich variety of wildlife and habitats including rare and internationally important species*
- *Tranquil and unspoilt places*
- *An environment shaped by centuries of farming and embracing new enterprise*
- *Great opportunities for recreational activities and learning experiences*
- *Well-conserved historical features and a rich cultural heritage*
- *Distinctive towns and villages, and communities with real pride in their area*

23. The SDNPA has prepared a single local plan for the entire National Park and has carried out a separate evidence base. They have produced a Background Paper on Landscape to support their Local Plan (September 2017).

24. This paper outlines the basis upon which four key Local Plan policies have been formulated. These policies are:

- *Policy SD4: Landscape Character*
- *Policy SD6: Safeguarding Views*
- *Policy SD7: Relative Tranquillity*
- *Policy SD9: Dark Night Skies*

25. The Background Paper explains the context behind why the policies are necessary to ensure that the Purposes and Duty of the National Park are met, briefly summarises national policy, and summarises the key evidence base studies which have fed into the policies. It also looks briefly at the way the landscape has been protected through other policies in the Local Plan.

26. The SDNP Local Plan has been written to give priority to the protection and enhancement of the landscape, both through specific landscape policies and through the great weight accorded to landscape evidence in the drafting of the other Local Plan policies. This is described as a “landscape led approach”. The Background Paper on Landscape sets out in detail how such an approach has been translated into Local Plan policies.

27. As well as the Background Paper, reference has been made to a number of studies published by the SDNPA:

- *South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (SDILCA): 2011*
- *Settlement Baseline Maps*
- *Settlement Context Analysis drawings*

28. Parts of the Study area are within the setting of the SDNP. For the purposes of spatial planning, any development or change capable of affecting the significance of the SDNP or people's experience of it can be considered as falling within its setting. The scale, height, siting, use, materials or design of a proposed development will determine whether it affects the natural beauty and special qualities of the SDNP. A very large or high development may have an impact even if some considerable distance from the SDNP boundary. Therefore, there is no defined boundary where the setting of the SDNP ends. However, distance away from the SDNP will obviously be a material factor in that the further away a development is from the boundary the more the impact is likely to be reduced.

#### **Principles of development within the SDNP**

29. Emerging Core policy SD1: Sustainable Development in the South Downs National Park, states that the SDNPA will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development provided that they are consistent with the statutory purposes of the National Park. The SDNPA will work in partnership with other local authorities to ensure that development outside of the National Park does not have a detrimental impact on its setting or otherwise prejudice the achievement of the National Park purposes.
30. Please note that at the time of publication the SDNPA Local Plan has not been adopted and policies could change.

### **Surrey Hills AONB**

31. The Surrey Hills AONB stretches from the south-western and southern edges of Greater London to the East Hampshire / Surrey boundary between Farnham and Haslemere. AONBs are protected by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) to conserve and enhance natural beauty.
32. The Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan (2014-2019) sets out the vision and policy framework for the Surrey Hills. Local Authorities have a statutory duty to adopt the plan and public bodies must have a duty of regard to the purposes of AONB designation and the Management Plan policies.
33. The vision for the Surrey Hills recognises that the landscape will change but it needs to ensure that it changes in a way that conserves and enhances its special qualities. In doing so, it also needs to maintain the social and economic viability of the Surrey Hills in a sustainable manner.
34. The following vision statement sets the context for the Management Plan and guides the policies:

*The Surrey Hills AONB is recognised as a national asset in which its natural and cultural resources are managed in an attractive landscape mosaic of farmland, woodland, heaths, downs and commons. It provides opportunities for appropriate business enterprise and for all to enjoy and appreciate its natural beauty.*

### **Principles of development within the Surrey Hills AONB**

35. Within the context of the overriding vision and purpose of protecting the scenic beauty of the landscape, a number of land use planning policies (LU1-LU5) set out a framework to ensure that new development enhances local character and the environmental quality of its nationally important setting.

### **C. Landscape character assessment**

36. The assessment of landscape character involves the identification of distinct, recognisable and consistent patterns of elements in the landscape that make one area different from another and using this information to help manage change within the landscape. In broad terms the characterisation of the district's landscape is covered by the East Hampshire District Landscape Character Assessment (2006 - EHDCLCA). This study post-dates the Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland (2002) and is therefore still considered relevant. The EHDC landscape character areas have been the starting point in sub-dividing the Study area into reporting units called Local Areas. Further information has also been gained from the Hampshire County Council's 'Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment' (updated 2011). Two parishes in the district have produced their own Landscape Character Assessments – Selborne Local LCA (2014) (partly within the SDNP) and Rowlands Castle Local LCA (2012), both of which are a source of reference for this Study. Landscape character assessments for adjacent authorities have also been considered, most importantly the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (SDILCA): 2011.

## D. Methodology

### Basis of methodology

37. The methodology and assessment criteria used for this assessment are detailed below. Sources of data are identified in Appendix C of this Report. The key texts on which methodology is based are the Scottish Natural Heritage and The Countryside Agency's *Landscape Character Assessment* (2002) and subsequent *Topic Paper 6 Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity* (2006), Natural England's *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment* (2014), as well as the Landscape Institute / IEMA *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (2013) (GLVIA).
38. Landscape capacity is defined as 'the extent to which a particular area or type of landscape is able to accommodate change without significant effects on character or overall change in the landscape type'. It should be noted that landscape capacity is a combination of the sensitivity of the landscape character and the value attached to the landscape.
39. As in current best practice, sensitivity should be assessed against a specific change, and for this study, a development scenario based on a density of 15-30 residential dwellings per hectare including the provision of open space serving the development, with dwellings of two or three storeys, has been assumed for the Local Areas. The key factor is the height and mass and scale of the built form in this Study, and therefore commercial development of a similar height and overall volume on the Local Areas may also be appropriate.
40. Best practice guidance also recognises that a landscape with a high sensitivity does not automatically mean that landscape has a low capacity for change, but that 'capacity is all a question of the interaction between the sensitivity of the landscape, the type and amount of change and the way that the landscape is valued' (*Topic Paper 6, 2006, p12*). The Local Areas have been assessed with the development scenario above in mind. Recommendations and comments have been added to ensure raised awareness of potential unacceptable adverse effects on landscape character.
41. Proposals for any development would need to include appropriate, detailed and specialist input into siting, layout and design, and a full landscape and visual impact assessment should accompany a specific planning application relating to the Local Area. Other studies including ecology, archaeology, arboriculture, traffic, soils may also be required to accompany specific proposals.
42. Details of the landscape and visual attributes of the Local Areas and an assessment of landscape and visual sensitivity (based on desk top studies and field surveys) are to be found on the Record Sheet in Appendix B. A summary of the landscape sensitivity, value and capacity for each of the Local Areas follows in each Report.

### Assessment process

43. The assessment methodology is a staged process. Landscape attributes, and visual attributes, are considered separately in accordance with the guidance in GLVIA. These attributes are used to identify the **intrinsic landscape and visual sensitivity**

(Stages 1 and 2) of the Local Area on a scale of 5 levels from low to high as set out under the Matrix 1 and 2 below. These are set out in the Record Sheets. The landscape and visual sensitivity of the Local Area are then merged to identify the **landscape character sensitivity** (Stage 3) as set out under Matrix 3 below.

44. The Study then goes on to classify the **sensitivity of the Local Area in its wider context** (Stage 4) into five categories. In Stage 5 the landscape character sensitivity is combined with the wider sensitivity as set out in Matrix 4 to identify the **overall landscape sensitivity** (Stage 5).
45. The **landscape value** (Stage 6) of the Local Area is assessed separately on a scale of 5 levels as set out under Table 3 below. Finally the overall landscape character sensitivity is merged with the landscape value on a scale of 5 levels to give an assessment of **landscape capacity** (Stage 7) on a scale of 5 levels as set out under Matrix 5 below.
46. This 'bottom up' process is tested against the five criteria for landscape capacity (Stage 7) based on professional judgement and an overall full understanding of the Local Areas.

#### Assessment abbreviations and colour code:

<b>L</b>	– Low Capacity	<b>M/L</b>	– Medium / Low Capacity	<b>M</b>	– Medium Capacity
<b>M/H</b>	– Medium / High Capacity	<b>H</b>	– High Capacity		

#### Stage 1: Determination of Visual Sensitivity

47. This assessment is set out in the Record Sheet and Report for each Local Area.
48. The assessment considers the types of **views (e.g panoramic, distant, context)**, the nature of the **viewers** and the **potential to mitigate** visual impact on the identified viewpoints. The more viewpoints, the more exposed the area, the greater the sensitivity of the viewers (based on GLVIA) and the greater difficulties in screen planting to mitigate the impact without harm to the landscape and visual attributes of the area, the higher the sensitivity. At this stage each level has been given a score from low = 1 to high = 5 and the scores are added up. Total scores for the Local Area are grouped as shown.

#### Matrix 1: Visual sensitivity

<b>General visibility</b>	L (1)	L/M (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)
<b>Population</b>	L (1)	L/M (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)



<b>Mitigation</b>	L (1)	M/L (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)
<b>OVERALL VISUAL SENSITIVITY</b>	<b>3-4 = low; 5- 7 = Med/low; 8-10 = Med; 11-13 = Med/high; 14-15 = High</b>				

Table 1: Notes on Visual Sensitivity Assessment

Factor	Higher sensitivity	Lower sensitivity
<b>General Visibility</b>	Sequenced and exposed views toward area	Fleeting and limited views
	Most of Local Area visible	Little of Local Area visible
	Area is a key focus in available wider views	Area is an incidental part of wider views
	Area includes prominent and key landmarks	No landmarks present
	Important vistas or panoramas in/out of area	Unimportant or no vistas
	Prominent skyline	Not part of skyline
<b>Population</b>	Large extent or range of key sensitive receptors	Lack of sensitive receptors
	Large number of people see area	Few can see area
	Key view from a sensitive receptor	Views of Local Area are unimportant
	Area is part of valued view	Area does not form a part of a valued view
	Area in key views to/across/out of town	Not part of setting of settlement view
<b>Mitigation</b>	Mitigation not very feasible	Mitigation possible
	Mitigation would interrupt key views	Would not obscure key views
	Mitigation would damage local character	Mitigation would not harm local character

## Stage 2: Determination of Landscape Sensitivity

49. This assessment is set out in the Record Sheet and Report for the Local Area.
50. The assessment considers the **natural** physical factors which make up the landscape character of the Local Area, the **cultural** and built form aspects and the **perceptual** features. The greater the incidence of landscape interest and diversity, historically important features and cultural associations, and the greater the levels of access and perceptions of tranquillity and strong landscape pattern; the greater the sensitivity. At this stage each level has been given a score from low = 1 to high = 5 and the scores are added up. Total scores for the Local Area are grouped as shown.

### Matrix 2: Landscape sensitivity

<b>Natural factors</b>	L (1)	L/M (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)
<b>Cultural factors</b>	L (1)	L/M (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)
<b>Perceptual features</b>	L (1)	M/L (2)	M (3)	M/H (4)	H (5)
<b>OVERALL LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY</b>	<b>3-4 = low; 5- 7 = Med/low; 8-10 = Med; 11-13 = Med/high; 14-15 = High</b>				

**Table 2: Notes on Landscape Sensitivity Assessment**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Higher sensitivity</b>	<b>Lower sensitivity</b>
<b>Natural</b>	Native woodland	Plantation
	Significant tree/groups	Insignificant/young trees
	Strong hedgerow structure with hedgerow trees	Weak structure and no trees
	Species rich grassland	Arable field
	Significant water feature(s)	No water feature(s)
	Varied landform and distinctive feature of the area	Uniform landform and lack of topographical features
	Pronounced Geology	Lack of geological features
	Soils significantly contribute to landscape features	Soils are not an important feature
	Complex and vulnerable landcover	Simple robust landcover
	Presence of other significant vegetation cover	Absence of other significant vegetation
	Presence of valued wildlife habitats	Absence of valued wildlife habitats
	Significant wetland habitats and meadows	Poor water logged areas
	Presence of common land	No common land
Presence of good heathland	Lost heathland	
<b>Cultural</b>	Distinctive good quality boundary features	Generic or poor boundary features
	Evidence of surviving part of an historic landscape	No evidence
	Complex historic landscape pattern with good time depth	Simple modern landscape
	Evidence of historic park	No evidence
	Important to setting or in a Conservation Area	No relationship
	Includes a Scheduled Ancient Monument or Important to setting	No relationship
	Locally distinctive built form and pattern	Generic built form
	Important to setting of a Listed building	No relationship
	Distinctive strong settlement pattern	Generic or eroded pattern
	Locally significant private gardens	Poorly maintained gardens erode the character
Evidence of visible social cultural associations	Lack of social cultural associations	
<b>Perceptual</b>	Quiet area	Noisy area
	Absence of intrusive elements	Intrusive elements present
	Dark skies	High levels of light pollution
	Open exposed landscape	Enclosed visually contained landscape
	Unified landscape with strong landscape pattern	Fragmented/'bitty' or featureless landscape
	Well used area or appreciated by the public	Inaccessible by public
	Important rights of way	None present
	Well used and valued open air recreational facilities	None present
Open access land	None present	

**Stage 3: Determination of Landscape Character Sensitivity**

51. The landscape sensitivity and visual sensitivity are combined, as shown in Matrix 3, to give the **landscape character sensitivity**. The results of the assessment are set out in the Report.

**Matrix 3: Landscape character sensitivity**

<b>VISUAL SENSITIVITY</b>	High	M	M/H	M/H	H	H
	Med/High	M/L	M	M/H	M/H	H
	Medium	M/L	M/L	M	M/H	M/H
	Med/Low	L	M/L	M/L	M	M/H
	Low	L	L	M/L	M/L	M
		Low	Med/Low	Medium	Med/High	High
		<b>LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY</b>				

#### **Stage 4: Determination of Wider Sensitivity – The Contribution of the Local Area to the Wider Landscape and Settlement Edge Pattern**

52. Stages 1 to 3 have led to a comprehensive assessment of the intrinsic landscape sensitivity of the Local Areas. However the sensitivity of each Local Area to development is also affected by its importance, and contribution, to the adjacent wider rural landscape and the influence of, and pattern of uses within, the settlement edge. The relative wider sensitivity of the Local Area is assessed as follows:
53. **Low wider sensitivity** – The Local Area is heavily influenced by the built form of the adjacent urban settlement and not an important part of the adjacent wider landscape
54. **Medium/Low wider sensitivity** – The Local Area is heavily influenced by urban fringe uses and has views of the some parts of the adjacent urban settlement but shares some of the characteristics of the adjacent wider landscape
55. **Medium wider sensitivity** – The Local Area is partly influenced by urban fringe uses but shares many of the characteristics of the wider landscape, with good physical and visual links to the wider landscape
56. **Medium/High wider sensitivity** – The Local Area has strong physical and visual links to the wider landscape and these outweigh any minor impacts from the adjacent urban settlement
57. **High wider sensitivity** – The Local Area is an important part of the wider landscape with which it has strong visual and landscape links. The nearby settlement has little impact on the Local Area
58. The results of the assessment are set out in the reports for each Local Area.



**Stage 5: Determination of Overall Landscape Sensitivity**

59. The **overall landscape sensitivity** is determined by combining the landscape character sensitivity with the wider sensitivity as shown in Matrix 4. The results of the assessment are set out in the Report Sheet for each Local Area.

**Matrix 4: Overall landscape sensitivity**

<b>LANDSCAPE CAHARACTER SENSITIVITY</b>	High	H	H	M/H	M/H	M
	Med/High	H	M/H	M/H	M	M/L
	Medium	M/H	M/H	M	M/L	M/L
	Med/Low	M/H	M	M	M/L	M/L
	Low	M	M	M/L	M/L	L
		High	Med/High	Medium	Med/Low	Low
		<b>WIDER SENSITIVITY</b>				

**Stage 6: Determination of Landscape Value****Table 3 – Landscape value criteria**

<b>Value</b>	<b>Typical criteria</b>	<b>Typical scale</b>	<b>Typical examples</b>
<b>High</b>	Very High importance (or quality) and rarity. No or limited potential for substitution	International	World Heritage Site SAC SPA
<b>Medium/high</b>	High importance (or quality) and rarity. Limited potential for substitution	National	National Park/ AONB SSSI SPA 400m Buffer SANG HE Register of Parks and Gardens Scheduled Monuments Grade I and II* listed buildings and their settings National recreational route or area e.g. South Downs Way
<b>Medium</b>	Medium importance (or quality) and rarity. Limited potential for substitution	Regional	Setting of AONB / National Park Local landscape designation Open Access or common land Landscape value identified in the Local/Neighbourhood Plan SINC/Conservation Areas and their setting Grade II listed buildings and their setting Local Wildlife sites Regional recreational route/area
<b>Medium/low</b>	Local importance (or quality) and rarity. Limited potential for substitution	Local	Local buildings and parks/gardens of historic interest and their settings Local recreational facilities of landscape value
<b>Low</b>	Low importance (or quality) or rarity		Area of little value and identified for improvement

**Designations:** Although value is implicit in the assessment of sensitivities, the location of the Local Area within a designated area, or the presence of a designated area within the Local Area, is an important additional measure of the value society gives to the landscape of the Local Area. These include landscape, historic and ecological designations and recreational routes at a national/international level, regional or district level, or at the local level.

**Local Associations:** These are included as far as possible using available published data. In addition to the more formal designations above, Local Areas may sometimes have special scenic value, associations or meanings to the local community and therefore make a contribution to the value of the local landscape. This has been assessed through a review of readily available evidence of community value. Further research may be required as part of any detailed landscape and visual impact assessment.

**Professional judgement:** Professional judgement has been used to modify the value scoring where a particular designation has little effect on the sensitivity of a Local Area, e.g if there is only a single Grade I Listed Building which has little relationship with or influence over the wider Local Area, the value might be reduced from medium / high to medium.

### Stage 7: Determination of Landscape Capacity

60. Landscape capacity is the ability, or otherwise, of the Local Area to accommodate a certain amount of development. The landscape capacity is determined by combining the overall landscape sensitivity with the landscape value as shown in Matrix 5. The results of the assessment are set out in the Report Sheet.

#### Matrix 5 Landscape Capacity

OVERALL LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY	High	M	M/L	L	L	L
	Med/High	M/H	M	M/L	L	L
	Medium	H	M/H	M	M/L	L
	Med/Low	H	H	M/H	M	M/L
	Low	H	H	H	M/H	M
		Low	Med/Low	Medium	Med/High	High
		LANDSCAPE VALUE				

61. The results from the matrix are subsequently tested against the following classifications for each level of landscape capacity, building on classifications used by the authors of this Report for other capacity studies.

**Low capacity (red)** – The Local Area could not accommodate areas of new development without a significant and adverse impact on the landscape character. Occasional, very small scale development may be possible, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

**Medium / Low capacity (orange)** – A low amount of development can be accommodated only in limited situations, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

**Medium capacity (yellow)** - The Local Area could be able to accommodate areas of new development in some parts, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

**Medium/ High capacity (pale green)** – The Local Area is able to accommodate larger amounts of development, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. Certain landscape and visual features in the area may require protection.

**High capacity (dark green)** – Much of the Local Area is able to accommodate significant areas of development, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.



**Stage 8: Determination of landscape capacity within the Local Area and of Green Infrastructure**

62. Each Local Area Report contains an overall plan showing the landscape capacity classification. The landscape capacity is indicative, and the actual capacity of each Local Area will be determined by more detailed assessment of the area.
63. In some cases an area of least sensitivity is described which identifies a part of the Local Area that could be considered further as a potential growth area subject to further detailed assessment and the provision of Green Infrastructure which is multi-functional and appropriate to the rural character of the area. The policy constraint affecting areas within the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA) 400m buffer have also been taken into account.
64. It is important to note that this Study does NOT recommend that all the least sensitive areas would be suitable as potential developable areas within the undeveloped open land within the Local Plan period. The object of the Study is to identify those parts which are the least sensitive in landscape and visual terms to development from which East Hampshire District Council can select those Local Areas it wishes to investigate further for possible inclusion to meet demand within the Local Plan period.

**Study Constraints**

1. The Local Areas have been assessed from publicly accessible viewpoints including the local road network, public rights of way, public open space and other publicly owned land. Views from private houses and from private land are noted where obvious, but were not visited. This has not resulted in any significant constraint on the assessment.
2. Photographs included in this study are representative of key views of the Local Area.
3. Views from the surrounding countryside or urban areas have been assessed by noting intervisibility from within or adjacent to the Local Area, but the Study does not include an assessment of the potential zone of visual influence of any development on each Local Area.
4. The majority of study fieldwork was undertaken from May to June 2018.
5. The Agricultural Grade Classification (ALC) of each Local Area has been noted in the Record Sheets. However the quality of the agricultural land is not considered a key factor in determining the contribution each Local Area makes to defining the separate identity of the settlements or preventing coalescence. The ALC however is a material consideration in its own right and should be considered separately from this Study.