

9.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: Addendum

Section A: Landscape Response on Landscape and Visual Impact of the Application, Comments Received from Hampshire County Council, February 2022

- A 1.1 **“Whilst the proposed development is not located within a protected landscape it is a very well used area of land for informal recreation. The Landscape and Visual Impact assessment (LVIA) has valued this site as having medium to low sensitivity to the proposed development. This is agreed as the proposal does not impact permanently affect the landscape elements on the site. However the report does not fully address the effects on the perception of the site. Whilst it is accepted that this is private land the land owner has allowed access to take place over many years and therefore the land is of high value to the local population and their perception is of an area of open space adjacent to, or nearby to their homes.”**
- A 1.2 As acknowledged, the site is private land; it is fenced off and signage is in place. Access onto the site has not been actively allowed by the landowner and still constitutes trespass. This therefore reduces its value to the local population. As an area of open space viewed from nearby viewpoints including homes, the landscape appearance is unmanaged, subject to natural colonisation by bramble scrub and rank grassland, which reduces its open appearance. In addition, a large part of the frontage to the housing is already well vegetated and the wider site is increasingly obscured by the development of scrub and rank grassland.
- A 1.3 **“The timescale for the works is 14 years, until the restoration is fully completed, this is considered to be long term. As this site is of high value to local residents and the proximity of the works is adjacent to housing, it would be preferable to see each section of the site fully restored sequentially as the site progresses. Rather than leaving all the restoration including removal of screen bunds and planting until the end of the works with the planting taking place in years 13/14. We also need to be assured that the works can be carried out within this timescale, as we often see mineral operators requiring an extension of time, this would not be acceptable in this highly populated area.”**

- A 1.4 The value of the site to local residents is reduced by its status as private land with no permitted public access, as outlined in paragraph A 1.2 above. The site will be progressively restored as stated and as now illustrated on plan 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB, submitted as part of the overall Regulation 25 response. This shows the working phases restored sequentially, together with seeding and planting operations to ensure that once the peripheral soil acoustic and visual screen mounds are removed, a maturing landscape will be revealed over the greater part of the application area, and particularly the areas adjacent to the boundary properties. For acoustic screening reasons to benefit the adjacent properties, it is not possible to remove all soil mounds as restoration progresses. The anticipated timescale for the project is as set out in the application, and any future potential extension of time for the development would be assessed on its own merits at that point in time.
- A 1.5 Section 2.7 of the HCC landscape response mentions that **“Screen mounds can be very oppressive and enclosing if they are located too close to residential areas or public rights of way. Unfortunately the screen mound along the eastern footpath will be quite enclosing and domineering. The path is long and straight and the high mound will be on one side and garden fences on the other side. The proposal provides a 3m wide path, which is a reasonable width and will help to lessen this problem, but if in areas it could widen out further it would be preferable. This is an area that would benefit from sequential restoration occurring after each phase is completed, removing the mound and opening up views across the open landscape again.”**
- A 1.6 The screen mounding along the eastern footpath is set out in detail on the Landscape Layout Plan (Operational Phase) - 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-LAND Rev A, together with the overall widths of the landscape buffer areas around the site. There is a minimum width of 36m on that eastern buffer zone, within which sits the proposed permissive path. The detail section through the eastern boundary as set out on plan 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-LAND-SECT - Landscape Detail Sections (Operational Phase) does not show a mound at the edge of the eastern footpath. The issue of sequential restoration has been addressed in paragraph A 1.4 above.
- A1.7 The resolution to other issues on the restoration proposals have been set out the revised Landscaping, Restoration and Aftercare Document “Rev A” dated September 2022, and submitted as part of this Regulation 25 response.



Section B: Update to Chapter 9 (LVIA) November 2021, in respect of updates to the submitted application plans and supporting information

- B 1.1 **9.5.3** *"In order to minimise the impacts of the development, including those relating to landscape and visual issues, a number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the scheme "- these mitigation measures are updated on the revised plan 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-LAND Rev A.*
- B 1.2 **9.5.8** *"At the same time, the phased replacement of stored and stripped soils will ensure that both the agricultural land and the conservation features are reinstated to maximise potential quality for the establishment of agriculture and other habitats respectively". This sequence of restoration is now illustrated on plan series 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB prepared as part of the Regulation 25 response.*
- B 1.3 All application plans have been revised to take into account the definitive line of Footpath 1 through the eastern sector of the site, with minor realignments of the proposed permissive paths.
- B 1.4 Viewpoint 2 selected for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is set on an informal undesignated footpath link, rather than the definitive line of Footpath 1; as set out in paragraph **9.6.14(c)** views from this footpath area already categorised as being of major adverse significance, and the views from the definitive line on its northern end will be of similar significance and subject to the same mitigation measures proposed for the footpath elsewhere.
- B 1.5 **9.6.20** and **9.9.9** A total of 16,515 no. native trees and shrubs will be planted across the application area as part of the mineral working and restoration proposals:

Overall Planting Numbers	Total	Hedges	(Linear metres:)	Wood and scrub	Area Hectares:
New Advance Planting – Mitigation Measures–Across Site	7,040 no.	5,400 no.	1080 lin. metres	1,640 no	1.022 ha
New Restoration – Across Site	9,475 no.	1,650 no.	330 lin. metres	7,825 no.	3.859 ha.
Site Total	16,515 no.	7,050 no.	1,410 lin. m hedge	9,465 no.	4.881 ha wood and scrub (supplemented by natural recolonization & existing plantations)

- B 1.6 The planting species, spacings, stock sizes and general aftercare are outlined on the schedule on the submitted restoration plan, and the aftercare and management for the site is detailed in the Outline Aftercare Scheme also submitted as part of the application.
- B 1.7 In addition, 6 Pendunculate Oak (*Quercus robur*) regular standard (8-10) will be planted within the north-eastern part of the site, as replacements for the 3 mature trees (identified as T5, T6 and T7) which will be removed as part of the application proposals for the site access. The remainder of the restoration planting for the site will compensate for the loss of the small part of the tree grouping G8 (Oak, Ash, Silver Birch and Sycamore) and the scrub blocks G4 (Crab Apple, Willow, Field Maple, and Oak) in the south-eastern corner of the operational area.
- B 1.8 **9.6.22** *"In the long term, the application site and its surroundings will benefit from an increase in native tree and shrub cover, and supplementary and replacement woodland and hedgerow planting that will reinforce existing boundaries and provide enhanced linkages across the restored landform. In the medium-term, there should be an increase the nature conservation value of the site", with the Biodiversity Net Gain now calculated at 10.56%.*
- B 1.9 **9.7.5** The bunds will be 3.0m maximum height for topsoils, and 5.0m maximum height for subsoils and overburden; the latter will be dressed with topsoil separated from the subsoil layer by a geotextile. Slopes will be 1:1.0 inner face; outer faces to be a minimum for 1:2 for short term storage, to 1:3 for long term storage adjacent to residential properties.
- B 1.10 **9.7.20** Plan 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-RES Rev A– Final Restoration (as revised) outlines the restoration proposals; the table below summarises the UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats revised areas to be created as part of the restoration proposals:

Broad Habitat Type	HABITAT TYPE	HABITAT POST RESTORATION
Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland (including retained woodland areas)	3.648ha
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	6.367ha
Grassland	Other lowland acid grassland - south and central site	39.019ha
Grassland	Other lowland acid grassland - Enhancement to unworked margins	6.267ha

Broad Habitat Type	HABITAT TYPE	HABITAT POST RESTORATION
Grassland	Other lowland acid grassland - north of site	2.870ha
Lakes	Temporary lakes, ponds, and pools	0.547ha
Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	1.176ha
Urban	Gravel / Grass Footpath	0.146ha
Hedgerow	New Native Species Rich Hedgerow	1,019 linear metres.
Hedgerow	Enhancement of Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees	180 linear metres
Hedgerow	Enhancement of Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees	550 linear metres

B 1.11 The habitat areas further described in paragraphs **9.7.21-9.7.26** inclusive will be revised in accordance with the table as set out at paragraph B 1.10 above.

B 1.12 Restoration Plan 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-REST Rev A has incorporated the following changes:

- The woodland and scrub within the unworked margins of the site are included and reflect the developing vegetation establishing and identified within the BNG habitat baseline;
- Planting has been removed from the unworked margins – the focus will be on existing habitat retention and enhancement within this buffer zone;
- The fence line separating the two main fields has been moved northwards, and the grassland for both southern and central field areas is for paddocks established by natural colonisation or seeding with an appropriate mix;
- The main pond and associated wetland through the northern part of the site has been reduced in area
- The former military building footprint at the west boundary of the site has been retained at the request of the heritage consultant.