

YOUR PLACE YOUR PLAN.

Winchester District Local Plan

Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022

Appendix 3 – Initial technical appraisals

Background Paper to inform the
Local Plan 2039

November 2022



Introduction

This document contains the initial assessments to consider the landscape, heritage and transport implications of developing the sites proposed for development in the emerging draft Winchester Local Plan 2039. These appraisals have informed the selection of the sites for development, and the resulting planning policy as set out in the draft Local Plan document. Not all sites have appraisals which cover these three issues. Where that is the case, it is described in the text of the main report.

It is anticipated that as the Plan progresses, these initial assessments may be supplemented by additional information provided by site promoters and others to further inform the final development strategy, and refine the proposals for development.

Appraisal Index

Site Name	SHELAA Reference	Local Plan Policy	Page
Winchester site appraisals			
Sir John Moore Barracks	LH05	W2	2
St Peter's Car Park	WIN22	W3	11
Courtenay Road	HW09	W4	18
Central Winchester Regeneration	N/A	W7	29
Station Approach*			
Brassey Road Multi Storey Car Park	WIN27	W8	32
Land at Boscobel Road	WIN28		
River Park	WIN23	W10	52
Winchester University and Hospital area	WIN16	W11	59
South Hampshire Urban Area sites appraisals			
Land off Whiteley Lane	CU14	SH2	66
Land at Ridge Farm Lane	CU18	SH2	75
Buckwood Cottage, Ridge Lane, Curbridge	CU24	SH2	84
Land off Whiteley Lane D	CU34	SH2	93
Land off Whiteley Lane	CU45	SH2	102
Market Towns site appraisals			
Land north of Rareridge Lane	BW17	BW4	106
Larger Settlements site appraisals			
LA Cart And Horses PH	KW02	KW2	114
Cornerways and Merrydale	KW12	KW1	125
Land at Ravenswood, Knowle	WI18	WK4	135
Colden Common Farm	CC02	CC2	140
Land at Main Road	CC04	CC3	150
Land Adjoining 85 Church Lane	CC15	CC4	159
Intermediate Settlement Site appraisals			
Main Road Otterbourne	OT03	OT01	169
Land at West Hill Road North	SW07	SW01	178

*Station Approach includes two parcels which have been appraised as WIN27 and WIN28, SA1 and SA2, Station Approach 1 and Station Approach 2.

LH05 Sir John Moore Barracks

Summary:

The site is already occupied and currently home to the Army Training Regiment but is very well concealed from the surrounding road network and is not crossed by public footpaths. In landscape terms the site has some value for its semi-rural character but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses. Consequently, its landscape sensitivity is 'low'.

In visual terms, some properties on Chestnut Avenue, Littleton have views in to the site. Some properties on Hilltop also have views, however most residential properties adjacent to the site are separated by belts of vegetation. The site is furthermore very well concealed from the local road network. From both Harestock Road, the Andover Road and Kennel Road the site is hidden behind substantial belts of vegetation. Visual sensitivity is deemed therefore to be 'very low'. Overall sensitivity is therefore **5/15 = 'Low'**.

There are consequently no reasons why this site could not be taken forward if required.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	West Winchester Downs (HCC)
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Chalk and Clay (WCC), Downland Mosaic Small Scale (HCC).
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	55-75m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	The site sits in a shallow valley within a fold in the Downs.
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?	
Drainage: well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs	
Geology: distinctive or varied?	Chalk downland

Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Heavily wooded site.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	No. No. Yes - Flowerdown SINC
VALUE	
National Park	No.
Former ASLQ	No.
Scenic quality/ views	No.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	No, the site is already developed.
Tranquillity	No.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	No.
Special cultural associations?	Scheduled Ancient Monument at adjacent Flower Down Barrows.
Historic parks or gardens?	No.
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	Scheduled Ancient Monument at adjacent Flower Down Barrows.
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	Access restricted.
Recreational value	No.
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties?</i>	Some properties on Chestnut Avenue, Littleton would have views in to the site. Some properties on Hilltop would also have views however most residential properties adjacent to the site are separated by belts of vegetation.
Prominence/visibility?	The site is very well concealed from the local road network. From both Harestock Road the Andover Road and Kennel Road the site is hidden

	behind substantial belts of vegetation.
Enclosure/Openness?	The site is visually enclosed.
Distinct skylines?	No.
Scope to mitigate?	Not necessary.
Key visual or functional corridor?	No.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	No.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No.
Views outwards	No.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and</p>

	tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Landscape character sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Visual sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Value	5	4	3	2	1
Overall sensitivity					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Landscape character sensitivity				2	
Visual sensitivity					1
Value				2	
Overall sensitivity				5 = Low	

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester: LH05



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- SAM Barrows at Western boundary List UID: 1012690
- Grouping of Grade II listed houses & War Memorial to the NW

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The barrow to the West (Flower Down barrow) contains examples of both disc and bowl barrows. Historic England describe it as follows: "The disc barrow, once described as 'the finest disc barrow in Hampshire', is an exceptionally well preserved example of the most fragile type of round barrow". The SAM is visually disconnected from the site due by a dense belt of woodland, and as such at present the site makes negligible contribution to the asset.
- The site is too remote from the cluster of listed buildings to have any impact on their significance.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Multi-storey development directly adjacent to the Eastern edge of the Flower Downs Barrow site is likely to adversely impact its setting.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Development of this site has the potential to cause harm to the Flower Downs Barrow and it is recommended that consideration is given to restricting development - both in terms of distance and height - against the SMC boundary and that the woodland belt between the SAM and LH05 is retained/enhanced. It is also recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Littleton & Harestock

Site Name: LH05

5th July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Littleton & Harestock

Site Name: LH05

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (2)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **High**

Site LH05 is located north west of Winchester City Centre. There is an existing motor vehicle access point for this site onto the B3047 (Andover Road North) and it is likely that this existing access or this plus one additional access (also onto the B3047) will be sufficient to serve the whole site if it is redeveloped. Due to the size of the site and location of the potential access point(s) a signalised junction may be required (subject to detailed transport assessments) and if this is required the costs associated with this would be high. Motor vehicle access from this site onto Kennell Road and Harestock Road would not be supported due to the size of the site. There is potential for the redevelopment of this site to provide a new Park and Ride facility serving the City centre. It should also be noted that there are ongoing discussions surrounding the future plans to close off Andover Road to motor vehicles (bus priority corridor would be created) and this provides potential for segregated cycle facilities to be provided to link the site with the existing urban area and Winchester City Centre.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30/40mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 7% commute on foot and 7% by public transport. Public transport use is higher than averages for Winchester and Hampshire. 44% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester and Hampshire. Although only 2% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	7%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	7%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	44%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	2%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	7%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	34%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	4	18	22	Amber

The PIC data associated with LH05 shows 22 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. The majority of these collisions are associated with Andover Road North (B3420) which is located to the east of the site, with two clusters of collisions along this road. There are 7 recorded collisions at its junction with Harestock Road (6 slight and 1 serious) and another 5 (3 slight and 2 serious) further south on B3420 at its junction with Manley Road. There is one collision (serious) located within close proximity of the existing site access of LH05.

WIN22 St Peters Car Park, Gordon Road

Summary:

Whilst not landscape sensitive, this is a prominent site on the edge of the Winchester Conservation Area and as such will need to be redeveloped sensitively, retaining significant existing trees on site and incorporating space, where possible, for new tree planting.

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoil' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual</i>	5	4	3	2	1

<i>sensitivity</i>					
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>					1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>	5				
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>			= 10 medium		

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *development could be comfortably accommodated without changing landscape character*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *a well-designed development could enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester: WIN22



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Within Winchester District Conservation Area.
- Grade II Listed pair of houses to the E, List UID: 1259798
- Grade II* listed Church of the Holy Trinity to the SE List UID: 1350718 within direct line of sight
- Grade II listed War Memorial in the ground of the Church List UID: 1393192

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site is currently largely undeveloped and makes little contribution to the significance of the adjacent heritage assets.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Appropriate development at WIN22 has the potential to enhance this part of the conservation area, in that it may enable replacement of the unsightly carpark, trolley park and recycling centre with development which could contribute to the streetscape both along North Walls and Gordon Road.
- Consideration should be given to views into the site from Upper Brook Street which has a direct visual connection to the Cathedral.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Subject to the development being of appropriate scale and massing it is considered that this site is appropriate, however it is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: WIN22

5th July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: WIN22

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

Site WIN22 is currently a car park and therefore the proposed motor vehicle access to this site would be retained via the existing access off Gordon Road. There are already pedestrian linkages (in addition to the motor vehicle access point) on to North walls where there is a signalised crossing and a bus stop. The emerging Winchester LCWIP which includes this area, provides opportunities to enhance the walking and cycling opportunities in this location. The WCC LCWIP includes plans to improve the walking and cycling network in Winchester city. The site is close to routes C1, C4, C7, C8 and to W4, W6, W8, W9, W10 and W11 in the emerging LCWIP.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 20% commute on foot. This is significantly higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Furthermore, 10% commute using public transport, which is higher than the Winchester and Hampshire averages, but lower than the national levels. The bicycle commute, at 3%, is higher than all three averages, compared to the motor vehicle data which is lower than all three averages.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	10%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	27%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	3%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	20%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	34%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	13	47	60	Amber

The PIC data associated with WIN22 shows there were 60 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period (47 slight, 13 serious and 29 involving pedestrians). The number of collisions is high but this would be expected in a city centre location. Within the immediate vicinity of the site along North Walls there are 7 recorded collisions (6 slight, 1 serious and 1 involving a pedestrian).

Name & Ref: HW09 – Land off Courtenay Road, Winchester

Summary:

Designated as Public Open Space and within the Settlement Gap separating north Winchester from Headbourne Worthy, the site has particular 'Value' sensitivity for this reason. Long distance views are possible to the west and sensitive receptors include residents of Courtenay Road, some of whom border the site and glimpsed views are possible from nearby roads. A PRoW borders the site in the north west corner and walkers can be expected to be somewhat sensitive to changes to the view.

Currently an agricultural field, characteristic of the large downland fields of the area. Some mature trees and hedges around the perimeter, would be likely to have biodiversity value in particular in the trees and hedgerows, the field itself having low value as it stands but potential as per the LCA.

The site was assessed to score: 12 = high sensitivity: protection from development is the preferred option.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	<p>WCC: Wonston Downs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The character area almost entirely comprises arable landscape with very little tree/woodland cover. • Conserve the large and generally regular field pattern and wide panoramic views. • Potential for recreation of calcareous grassland on agricultural land.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Open Arable
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Approx. 62m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	Lower downland, slightly undulating topography. Land rises to the south towards Winchester and descends to the north.

Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Large arable fields
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	Well drained chalk downland
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	Distinctive chalk downland
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Arable field
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	No designations over the site. Intensively farmed field with probably low biodiversity currently but potential for recreating chalk grassland (as per LCA). Hedgerows around the perimeter likely to have biodiversity value.
VALUE	
National Park	No
Former ASLQ	No
Scenic quality/ views	Has scenic qualities
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Some detracting influences but retains sense of countryside and expansive landscape.
Tranquillity	Sense of tranquillity. Railway to the west may reduce tranquil quality somewhat but no main roads and limited views of obvious human activity.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Some sense of rurality modified to a small degree by railway and glimpse of houses on Courtenay Road.
Special cultural associations?	Within the Kingsworthy Settlement Gap. Within the N&W of Courtenay Road Public Open Space.
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public</i>	Accessible from residential Courtenay Road (minor road) and narrow link shown to Worthy Road

<i>rights of way or cycle routes</i>	
Recreational value	Designated as Public Open Space
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views from houses on north section of Courtenay Road. Views from PRow Headbourne Worthy 1.
Prominence/visibility?	Long distance views to the west / south-west towards Barton Farm development; Weeke and Harestock and as far as Teg Down.
Enclosure/Openness?	Open site
Distinct skylines?	No
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	No
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Views from rear of houses on Courtenay Road. Possible glimpsed views from neighbouring roads.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No
Views outwards	Views towards surrounding houses and extensive views from the site to the west / south-west.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>	5				
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester: HW09



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Grade II Listed house, Stapenhill, List UID: 1393400 to the SE
- Grade I listed Church at Headborne Worthy, List UID: 1350461

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site makes a negligible contribution to the significance of the Stapenhill Hill House, as it is visually separated by other modern development.
- Further listed buildings to the north of Wellhouse Lane are separated visually by topography.
- The site is sufficiently distant and screened from Headbourne Worthy Church to have any significant impact.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- The allocation will have a negligible effect of the significance of Stapenhill house.
- The allocation will have a negligible effect of the significance of Headbourne Worthy Church.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm

SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Headbourne Worthy

Site Name: HW09

1st July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Headbourne Worthy

Site Name: HW09

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (2)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

There are two main options for motor vehicle access to this site. The first and preferable option would be to access this site off Courtenay Road, however there is also the option to create a new motor vehicle access onto the B3047 (Worthy Road). Creating the main access onto the B3047 would be a more expensive option than accessing the site via Courtenay Road. Both options would be subject to adequate visibility splays being achieved. Only one motor vehicle access would be required for a site of this size.

Access (in particular for motor vehicles) is constrained along the western boundary of the site due to railway line that runs the entire length of the site. There is however an existing pedestrian linkage in the form of an underpass which could facilitate east-west linkages between this site and the Barton Farm residential development to the west of the site. There are options to improve this access for both pedestrians and cyclists.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 9% commute on foot and 6% by public transport. These levels are higher than average for Hampshire. 37% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	7%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	6%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	37%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	9%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	40%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision


Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	4	3	7	Amber

The PIC data for HW09 shows 7 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site. There are no recorded collisions on Courtenay Road (which one of the potential motor vehicle access points for this site is located on). Two of the collisions are associated with the B3047 (Worthy Road) which has been identified as another potential motor vehicle site access point. The majority of the recorded collisions are not within close proximity to the site and no patterns can be identified from this collision data.

Winchester: CWR

Site Plan:



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated with the site however it falls wholly within the Winchester District Conservation Area.
- This site is located in the heart of Winchester and as such a significant number heritage assets, including most notably Winchester Cathedral, have the potential to be impacted through its development.

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site is currently dominated by the modern buildings along Silver Hill, Tanner Street and the Brooks Centre. These buildings do not currently contribute to the heritage significance of the site.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Any significant development on this site will impact a large number of heritage assets and has the potential to wholly change the character of the conservation area in this part of the city. This impact is will be largely visual, but is also likely to result in significant changes to movement patterns around the city, distant views into the City (for example from St Giles Hill), and may impact on the listed buildings in close proximity during the development process itself.

4.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Site CWR has been under consideration for development for a number of years and WCC has an adopted Supplementary Planning Document which offers guidance on Heritage opportunities and risks within the site.
- [Central Winchester Regeneration SPD - Winchester City Council](#)



SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Central Winchester Regeneration

Site Name: CWR


5th July 2022

Issue 01

Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Central Winchester Regeneration
 Site Name: CWR

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) Yes (2)

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low High

CWR is located in Winchester City Centre and has a number of existing access points for both motor vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and public transport. If any of these access points needed changing / upgrading to accommodate the development, the estimate of cost for this would be high due to the historic nature of the area and the impact on bus routes and higher volume traffic corridors of the one-way system. This site has potential to support sustainable travel options and should ensure that access, especially for buses is maintained. The emerging Winchester LCWIP which includes this area, provides opportunities to enhance the walking and cycling opportunities in this location. The emerging WCC LCWIP includes plans to improve the walking and cycling network. This site is close to routes W1, W5, W6, W10, W11, W12, W13, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8. The maps showing these routes can be found in the methodology.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 20% commute on foot and 10% by public transport. These levels are higher than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 27% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 3% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	10%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	27%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	3%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	20%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	34%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	14	51	65	Amber

The PIC data associated with CWR shows there were 65 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period (51 slight, 14 serious and 32 involving pedestrians). The number of collisions is high but this would be expected in a city centre location. Within close proximity of the site there are 9 collisions (6 slight, 3 serious and 5 involving pedestrians).

WIN 27 Eastern Car Park, Winchester

Summary:

Eastern Car Park is a multi-storey car park within central Winchester, adjacent to the historic core and Conservation Area (CA). It lies adjacent to roads and railway lines such that it is a visually prominent site, but due to its position on rising land, is also a prominent site in longer views, particularly from the eastern part of the CA at St Giles Hill and Joyce’s Garden, two popular viewpoints over the town.

The site has development potential, but this must be balanced with the scale and character of the surroundings and wider setting. As long as the height of any new development did not break the tree line further to the west as seen from the key viewpoint from the east, then harm to the CA and setting of Winchester would be negligible. A useful guideline is provided by the neighbouring ‘Cathedral Point’ student accommodation blocks which were deliberately limited in height due to these same visual and character constraints.

The site scores 8 out of 15 and is seen as moderately sensitive: development could be accommodated without changing landscape character, with certain provisos, chiefly limiting height.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	
<i>WCC/HCC Landscape Type</i>	
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, <i>low lying, high? state OD</i>	55.0 m AOD
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, ‘rolling’, hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	Valley side.
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	

Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Significant belt of trees on the eastern flank of the site.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.</i>	
VALUE	
National Park	
Local Gap?	
Scenic quality/ views	Yes – from within CA
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	
Tranquillity	
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	
Special cultural associations?	On the edge of the Winchester CA.
Historic parks or gardens?	
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	
Recreational value	
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public</i>	The key views tend to be from the east, from the other side of the river valley

<i>rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	
Prominence/visibility?	Prominence of the site depends on whether the trees bordering the site's eastern boundary are in leaf or not
Enclosure/Openness?	
Distinct skylines?	
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	
Significant outward views from within settlements?	
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	
Views outwards	

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.

Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...

Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences
----------	--

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>					1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>			= 8 medium		

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

WIN 28 Brassey Road, Winchester

Summary:

Visually prominent site beside the B3420 Andover Road, as it approaches the bridge over the railway line. Other key viewpoints are from the private residential properties on Brassey Road. There are trees on site which are considered important in the street scene and are covered by a TPO. There are no other landscape constraints and the site which is outside of the Conservation area is considered to have low landscape sensitivity: a well-designed development could utilise this vacant space and enhance character and appearance.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	Urban area
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Urban area
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	Flat site with steep heavily vegetated slopes to the west where the site adjoins Brassey Road.
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	There are trees on site which are considered important in the street scene and are covered by a TPO

Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	
VALUE	
National Park	
Local Gap?	
Scenic quality/ views	
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	
Tranquillity	
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	
Recreational value	
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Visually prominent site beside the B3420 Andover Road as it approaches the bridge over the railway line. Other key viewpoints are from the private residential properties on Brassey Road.
Prominence/visibility?	
Enclosure/Openness?	
Distinct skylines?	
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	
Significant outward views from within	

settlements?	
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	
Views outwards	

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1

Value	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows


	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>					1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
Value					1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>				= 6 low	

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester: SA1 (South West)

Site Plan:



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site, however part of site lies within Winchester District Conservation Area (along the East end of Stockbridge Road)
- County Records Office: List UID: 1480912 – Adjacent, to the East
- Church of St Paul: List UID: 1271988 – Adjacent, to the West
- Housing on Upper High Street - List UID: 1174156 – Adjacent, to the South
- Part of the site is elevated, potential for impact on long distance views across the city.

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The southern part of the proposed site currently sits on an elevated level relative to the secluded reading room and sculpture garden of the County Records Office which contains a secluded triangular garden, enclosed by a high brick wall and includes the sculpture 'Mother and child' by Glyn Williams and simple stone memorial benches. Together with the SW facing glazed elevation to the building this forms a place of quiet sanctuary, and at present this area of the proposed site contributes to this character through its dense planting along the SW boundary and through its current lack of buildings.
- Occupying the southernmost part of the proposed site, Newburgh House currently has a negative effect on the character of this area, which abuts the Conservation Area boundary and is largely defined by two storey Victorian terraced housing.
- Within the proposed site there are two modern steel framed multistorey carpark serving the station. The carpark north of Stockbridge Road currently has a negative impact on the adjacent conservation area to the South due to height, topography and proximity. The carpark to the South of Stockbridge Road has limited impact on the conservation area to the South due to topography and existing boundary treatments.


3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Subject to the proposals, the redevelopment of the Newburgh House site has the potential to mitigate the negative impact it currently has on the historic character of the Newburgh Street and Station Road area.
- Maintaining the secluded nature of the SW elevation and garden of the County Records Office is a critical consideration in the development of site SA1. Proposals should consider retaining the planted boundary and reducing the height and proximity of buildings adjacent to the SW boundary of the Records Office site.
- The allocation of this site has the potential to mitigate the negative impact of the multistorey carparks serving the station.
- Consideration should be given to controlling the height of development to directly to the West of the railway station building due to the close proximity of the East front of St Pauls Church.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Development of the Newburgh House site is considered appropriate and has the potential to be beneficial to the historic character of the area.
- Development of the land to the South and West of the County Records Office is considered appropriate, subject to its proximity to that building.
- Development to the West of the station is considered appropriate, subject to consideration of the East front of St Pauls Church.
- Development of the carparking to the north of the station is considered appropriate although consideration should be given to storey heights as the sites sit topographically much high than the adjacent conservation area.

Winchester: SA2 (North East)



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Directly adjacent to Winchester District Conservation Area to the South
- Grade II listed house to the North East, List UID: 1172858
- Grade II listed Hyde Lodge to the North, List UID: 1419302
- Winchester Cathedral to the South

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site in its current form has minimal impact on the adjacent conservation area to the South due to its current boundary treatment, including a row of mature trees within the site providing visual separation. At the SE corner there is a more negative impact due to the very wide bell mouth, ramped carpark access and recycling centre.
- Modern development has blocked the views between the site and Hyde Lodge.
- Negligible impact on List UID 1172858 due to distance and sight lines.
- Minor impact on setting of Winchester Cathedral when viewed from the north, but minimal due to distance and sight lines.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- The Conservation Area to the South is currently defined by the brick and flint gable end of Hyde Close terracing and the handsome two storey late Victorian terrace to the East. In order to mitigate any potential harm to this character and also due to the fact the site rises away from Worthy Lane to the North, consideration should be given to restricting development heights along this boundary.
- Subject to the proposed development, there is a potential for visual impact on the conservation area as the site is visible from Hyde Close and Hyde Church Lane.
- Development on the site has the potential to harm the setting of the cathedral when viewed from the Andover Road (north) approach into the city.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Development of this site has the potential to cause harm to both the cathedral and the setting of the conservation area to the South. As such it is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: Station Approach 1

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Winchester
 Site Name: Station Approach 1

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (3)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **High**

Station Approach is comprised of two sites located in Winchester City Centre. There are a number of existing access points to the site. There are some barriers to increasing the access to this site, including rail line severance (north – south) through the centre of the larger of the two sites. There is also a pinch point for cyclists on Stockbridge Road under bridge for east west movements. There is a subway under the railway which provides some east – west connectivity. Without understanding of the masterplan options, it's difficult to establish new motor vehicle access points to the site. The site does however have excellent potential for sustainable transport options including access to rail travel. The emerging Winchester LCWIP which includes this area, provides opportunities to enhance the walking and cycling opportunities in this location. The emerging WCC LCWIP includes plans to improve the walking and cycling network within Winchester. The site is close to routes W1, W2, W3, W4, W11, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8 in the emerging LCWIP.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20/30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 22% commute on foot and 15% by public transport. These levels are higher than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 27% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	15%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	27%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	22%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	30%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
1	15	49	65	Red

The PIC data for Station Approach 1 features 65 collisions, with one being fatal. The majority are slight, but from the 500m radius, three clusters are visible. Naturally, because this site features a heavily built environment, a city centre and a train station, the casualty and collision rates are going to be much higher than other sites. To the far south of the site, a cluster of eight is present, one being serious. This is at the Jewry Street/B3331/Southgate Street meet point. Despite showing a geographical cluster, the set of collisions do not display a trend or pattern, as they are evenly distributed over the five year period. The second cluster is, again, not in the immediate vicinity of the site, on the City Walls Road, after its connection with Jewry Street. These collisions are also dispersed over the five year data collection, concluding that this cluster does not present a pattern or trend. The final cluster is present directly outside the site, on the Andover Road-Worthy Lane junction. There are four slight collisions, again dispersed over time, negating the presence of a trend or pattern. Ten collisions happen within the designated site. Because of the nature of the site, being a train station, it is likely to have increased casualties; three are serious, but five involve pedestrians. They are spatially even, with no significant clusters to suggest any patterns or trends and chronologically evenly distributed over the five-year period. One of these (44200410495) cites the road layout for potential collision.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: Station Approach 2

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Winchester
 Site Name: Station Approach 2

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (3)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **High**

Station Approach is comprised of two sites located in Winchester City Centre. There are a number of existing access points to the site. There are some barriers to increasing the access to this site, including rail line severance (north – south) through the centre of the larger of the two sites. There is also a pinch point for cyclists on Stockbridge Road under bridge for east west movements. There is a subway under the railway which provides some east – west connectivity. Without understanding of the masterplan options, it's difficult to establish new motor vehicle access points to the site. The site does however have excellent potential for sustainable transport options including access to rail travel. The emerging Winchester LCWIP which includes this area, provides opportunities to enhance the walking and cycling opportunities in this location. The emerging WCC LCWIP includes plans to improve the walking and cycling network within Winchester. The site is close to routes W1, W2, W3, W4, W11, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8 in the emerging LCWIP.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20/30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 19% commute on foot and 14% by public transport. These levels are higher than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 32% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 2% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	7%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	14%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	32%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	2%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	19%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	26%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	8	32	40	Amber

This PIC data shows 45 total collisions within 500m of Station Approach 2. There is one visible cluster at the southern point of the site, with five collisions, yet these are distributed over the five year period fairly evenly and do not show any discernible trends. The cluster point is likely due to the junction of Worthy Lane and Andover Road, two fairly busy roads rather than road layout itself. There are a series of pedestrian-involved collisions on the North Walls and Jewry Street, but due to being dispersed over time. No other discernible trends surface in the PIC data. There are several collisions around the edge of the site, but when analysing the data, these are higher in number due to the location being a train station and do not suggest any significant road layout issues.

WIN23 River Park Leisure Centre, Gordon Road

Summary:

Whilst this site is outside the Winchester town boundary and technically in the countryside, there would be little harm to the wider landscape if the site were redeveloped. Development could be comfortably accommodated without changing landscape character.

There are however landscape sensitivities or constraints on or around the site which would need to be taken into account in any new scheme. These include the nearby nature reserve, the mature tree stock, on and around the site, the watercourses and additionally the flood zone. Any development would need to respect and work with these constraints and factor in a high quality soft and hard landscape scheme, whilst also maintaining pedestrian and cycle routes across the site.

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance</p>

	and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.
--	--

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>

Landscape character sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Visual sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Value	5	4	3	2	1
Overall sensitivity					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Landscape character sensitivity					1
Visual sensitivity		4			
Value				2	
Overall sensitivity				= 7 low	

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *development could be comfortably accommodated without changing landscape character*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *a well-designed development could enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester: WIN23



- | |
|--|
| <p>1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None designated within the site. • Close to Winchester District Conservation Area to the West and South |
| <p>2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is occupied by the redundant Riverpark Leisure Centre. Its condition and scale have a negative impact on the immediate surroundings however it has negligible impact on the adjacent heritage assets. |
| <p>3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate development at WIN23 has the potential to enhance the part of the conservation area directly to the West, in that it may enable replacement of the derelict building with development which could contribute to the streetscape both along Gordon Road, King Alfred terrace, and within Hyde Abbey Gardens. |
| <p>4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to the development being of appropriate scale and massing it is considered that this site is appropriate, however it is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals. |


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: WIN23

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Winchester
 Site Name: WIN23

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Low**

Site WIN23 is the site of the River Park Leisure Centre which has now closed. The site has an existing motor vehicle access point on Gordon Road. The proposed redevelopment of this site is for provision of education (F1). There are opportunities to travel to this site using sustainable transport modes are good, due to its city centre location. Motor vehicle access to this site would be to retain the existing access point on Gordon Road. There are already additional pedestrian access points to this site in addition to the motor vehicle access point. The emerging Winchester LCWIP which includes this area, provides opportunities to enhance the walking and cycling opportunities in this location. The emerging WCC LCWIP includes plans to improve the walking and cycling network in Winchester city. This site is close to routes C1, C4, C7, C8, W4, W6, W8, W9, W10 and W11 in the emerging LCWIP.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 19% commute on foot. This is higher than the Winchester, Hampshire and national averages. 14% commute by public transport, again, being higher than the Winchester, Hampshire and national averages. 32% commute by motor vehicle, lower than the average for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 2% cycle to work, which matches the levels of Hampshire and England, whilst being higher than the average commute in Winchester.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	7%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	14%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	32%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	2%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	19%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	26%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	9	37	46	Amber

The PIC data associated with WIN23 shows there were 46 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period (37 slight, 9 serious and 19 involving pedestrians). The number of collisions is high but this would be expected in a city centre location. There is one slight collision recorded at the junction of North Walls and Hyde Abbey Road which is the route motor vehicles would take to access this site, as it is located off residential roads in the centre of Winchester.

WIN16 Milnthorpe Lane, Winchester

Summary:

The site is located at the end of Milnthorpe Lane in a narrow valley between two spurs of higher ground. To the south the land rises steeply up towards Sleeper’s Hill – a low density residential area set within a Locally Listed Historic garden. To the north, the land rises up towards the Romsey Road and a more heavily developed part of the town consisting of the hospital and the university. The whole valley is significant for its degree of mature tree cover which, from key viewpoints on the opposite side of the River Itchen valley to the east, lends this part of the town its verdant character.

The sites scores **9 out of 15 and is considered to be moderately landscape sensitive**. Development could be accommodated on this site without changing landscape character, providing tree loss was minimised and building heights were kept low.

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other ‘detracting’ influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance</p>

	and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.
--	--

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>

Landscape character sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Visual sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
Value	5	4	3	2	1
Overall sensitivity					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Landscape character sensitivity			3		
Visual sensitivity		4			
Value				2	
Overall sensitivity	= 9				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Winchester South: WIN16



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None designated within the site.• None identified beyond the site.
2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No contribution identified.
3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A
4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: WIN16

5th July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Winchester

Site Name: WIN16

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

Site WIN16 is proposed to be developed for student accommodation. The site is located immediately to the south of the Royal Hampshire County Hospital and access to the site is currently via Milnthorpe Lane which is a private road. Therefore, if this site was developed, agreement would need to be reached with the landowner in order to formalise access for motor vehicles.

The structural condition of Milnthorpe Lane will be a factor as to whether it can accommodate increased traffic movements or whether it needs upgrading to support the increased motor vehicle movements associated with the proposed development.

Development of this site offers potential to increase access to the hospital and university for pedestrians. There is no existing cycle provision to link in to this location, but the development of this site may include opportunities to provide some infrastructure to support this.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 20mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 7% commute using public transport. This is higher than the Winchester and Hampshire average, but lower than the England average. Motor vehicle commutes are lower than all three averages at 25%, however commuting on foot is higher than all three averages at 17%. Bicycle commutes are at 1%, matching Winchester, but lower than Hampshire and England.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	7%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	25%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	17%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	44%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Generally, this area has very good potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	4	20	24	Amber

The PIC data associated with WIN16 shows there were 24 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period (20 slight, 4 serious and 5 involving pedestrians). The majority of collisions are associated with the B3040 (Romsey Road) at junctions and roundabouts. There is one collision (slight) located on Sparkford Road, south of the junction with Milnthorpe Lane.

CU14 land off Whiteley Lane

Summary:

This site is adjacent to the southern edge of the North Whiteley Major Development Area but is presently remote from roads and footpaths. A significant part is covered with trees subject to a TPO of covered by Ancient Woodland and the eastern end by scrub and new growth. The site is not prominent in public views but likely has wildlife value. Adjacent are two commercial operations which detract from the rurality and nearby are recent housing developments making an increasingly urban location.

See adjacent SHELLA sites CU03,02, 34

The site was assessed to score 7 – Low sensitivity.

Desk/Field checklist:

Landscape Character Sensitivity	
WCC Landscape Character Area	Whiteley Woodlands (WCC)
WCC Landscape Type	Mixed Farmland and Woodland
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	15m
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	Flat.
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Small assarted.
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	Not in a flood zone.
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed,</i>	The has mature trees which are covered by a TPO to the north part and a fringe of ancient woodland on the south west side.

<i>wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg</i> : Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves <i>etc.</i>	No designation on site. Ancient woodland to the west and TPO area to the north.
VALUE	
National Park	No.
Former ASLQ	No.
Scenic quality/ views	Gives some relief to increasingly urbanised area
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Adjacent to industrial sites.
Tranquillity	Detractors significant but remains a green area
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	No.
Special cultural associations?	Not known.
Historic parks or gardens?	None.
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	None.
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	PROW to the south east edge of site (Curdridge 9).
Recreational value	Private land
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views possible from PROW to the south west (Curdridge 9).
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent.
Enclosure/Openness?	
Distinct skylines?	No.
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional	No.

corridor?	
Significant outward views from within settlements?	No.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No.
Who and where are the 'key' visual receptors?	The key visual receptors are few but there may be views from the new housing on the MDA site to the NE

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. An absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance</p>

	and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.
--	--

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character, well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Value</i>				2	
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:**
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity.**

Whiteley: CU14



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- Caigers Green Grade II List UID 1339251

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- This wooded site is 440m from Caigers Green, a Grade II Listed house forming part of the ribbon development along this section of Botley Road (A3051) and is separated from it by a belt of trees between the properties along Botley Road and Sweethills, one of the new Whiteley residential neighborhoods.
- No significant contribution identified.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- No potential impact identified

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Curbridge

Site Name: CU14

1st July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Curbridge
 Site Name: CU14

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

The intention is for these sites (CU14, CU34 and CU35) to be accessed via the North Whiteley development that is currently under construction. The current North Whiteley development has provided a fourth arm on the roundabout on Bluebell Way, to accommodate future development. The fourth arm of the roundabout goes right up to the red line boundary of CU34 and CU45. Engagement with the landowner of the current and prospective development sites would be advantageous at an early stage to ensure a ransom situation regarding access does not occur.

The above option is likely to be the only viable motor vehicle access option for this site as HCC would not support a second access onto the A3051 as the existing access (Whiteley Way and the Car Yard) is substandard and would create a potential link road through the site.

This site is located within close proximity to route 342 in the emerging Fareham LCWIP therefore there is potential to create links between this proposed development site and the existing walking and cycling infrastructure that has been identified in the LCWIP. There is also the opportunity to increase the links south from these sites into existing residential area.

The scale of this proposed development is fairly low (approximately 100 dwellings). However, further transport assessments would need to be undertaken to see if the existing infrastructure is able to accommodate this increase in motor vehicle traffic to the proposed development sites. Costs associated with access to the site are predicted to be low - medium depending on if the existing infrastructure has been designed to accommodate these additional sites.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	32%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	2	3	Amber

The PIC data associated with CU14 shows that there have been three recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site. These collisions are spread over the five year period. Two of the recorded collisions were on the A3051 (Botley Road) – which is located to the west of the site. No direct access is proposed from this site on the A3051. The serious collision recorded is located to the north east of the site on Bluebell Way at the junction with Glassfield Road. No patterns or trends can be established from this collision data.

CU18 Land at Ridge Farm Lane

Summary:

Some of the site lies within flood zone 3 and a SINC therefore cannot be developed but could be used as part of any mitigation works. Landscape character in this area is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. The site is assessed to have **high medium sensitivity** scoring **10 out of 15: development could be accommodated without changing landscape character** so long as the existing tree and hedge boundaries are maintained and enhanced to ensure any development is well screened and that there is careful managed of site design and layout.

Desk/Field checklist:

	Comments/observations
Landscape Character Sensitivity	
WCC Landscape Character Area	Whiteley Woodlands (WCC) Hamble Valley (HCC)
WCC Landscape Type	Mixed farmland and Woodland Landscape (WCC) Lowland Mosaic medium scale (HCC)
Characteristic Landscape components	
Elevation	Low lying, below 10.0m AOD
Topography	Flat, slight rise from watercourse at western boundary
Field pattern	n/a
Drainage	Impeded drainage
Geology and soils	Loamy
Land Use	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Open with heavily treed area to west and south. Some trees on site. All other boundaries have tree/hedge belt TPO areas on western part of site, northern and eastern boundaries
Biodiversity	SINC: Suttons Copse to the west, ancient woodland and SINC to the south Whiteley Stream (tidal) along western boundary Western part of site lies within FZ 2 & 3
VALUE	
National Park	No
Former ASLQ	No
Scenic quality/ views	No
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or	Remote unspoilt character. Woodside house adjacent otherwise access down Ridge lane – unmetalled, off highway

absence of detracting influences, rurality, remoteness or wildness?	
Tranquillity	
Special cultural associations?	Unknown.
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	Public Open space and PRow adjacent to the site to the west
Recreational value	No
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Key viewpoints are not readily available. There may be glimpses into the site during the winter months from Ridge Lane and from adjacent Woodside House
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent.
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed.
Distinct skylines?	no
Scope to mitigate?	yes
Key visual or functional corridor?	no
Significant outward views from within settlements?	no
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	no

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following three criteria: Landscape Character Sensitivity, Visual sensitivity and value

Landscape Character Sensitivity

i.e., the ability of a landscape to accommodate housing development without changing it's character.

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very susceptible to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. An absence of intrusive or detracting influences (i.e. a lack of development) and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is susceptible to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.</p>
High	<p>Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new</p>

	elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

i.e., the importance that society attaches to the landscape.

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character, well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and combined to give an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>			= 10 high medium		

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character*
- 7/6/5 = **low:**
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity.**

Whiteley: CU18



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Roman Site SAM, List UID: 1001838 to the North.

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The Scheduled Monument site is an open field at the confluence of the River Hamble and Curbridge Creek with known archaeology of the Roman period.
- This site is 700m to the SW on slightly higher ground beyond Harmsworth Livery Stables, the A3051 and Sutton's Copse. It is surrounded by woodland to the west and south and tree belts to the north and east. There is a house, Woodside, in the SE corner.
- The site does not make a tangible contribution to the Scheduled Monument site.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- The site is screened from the Scheduled Monument by the belt of trees along Curbridge Creek and additionally by Sutton's Copse. Provided these barriers remain, its development would not have a perceptible impact.
- The Whiteley residential development around Bluebell Way is closer (525m) and less screened.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Curbridge

Site Name: CU18

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Curbridge
 Site Name: CU18

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Low**

Site access for CU18 is suggested from the adjoining Taylor Wimpey site located to the north of CU18. Ridge Lane would not be recommended to provide access for a site of this size due to it being narrow and winding and not designed to support a large increase in traffic movements.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 40mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	32%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

To summarise, this area has little scope to reduce the reliance on car travel as oppose to the use of sustainable modes of transport.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	2	3	Amber

The PIC data associated with CU18 shows 3 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. Two of these collisions occurred on the A3051 (1 to the north and 1 to the south of the site) and both of these were classified as slight. The third collision was recorded at the junction on Glassfield Road and Bluebell way and was serious. No trends can be established from this data.

CU24 Buckswood Cottage Ridge Lane, Curbridge

Summary:

This site is within the major development area of North Whiteley and new housing development is being built in the fields adjacent the site to the north and east with areas of public open space to the south (Ridge Farm Meadows). Buckswood House and Cottage however remain intact and accessed along Ridge Lane. Nevertheless landscape sensitivity has been assessed to be moderately sensitive scoring 8 out of 15; *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character.*

Desk/Field checklist:

	Comments/observations
Landscape Character Sensitivity	
WCC Landscape Character Area	Whiteley Woodlands (WCC) Hamble Valley (HCC)
WCC Landscape Type	Mixed farmland and Woodland Landscape (WCC) Lowland Mosaic medium scale (HCC)
Characteristic Landscape components	
Elevation	Low lying, below 7.0m AOD
Topography	Flat, slight rise from watercourse at western boundary
Field pattern	n/a
Drainage	Impeded drainage
Geology and soils	Loamy
Land Use	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Open site but with heavily treed boundaries. Lies to the east of a large wood, Coldland Copse, which is Ancient Woodland and protected as a SINC as well as a TPO area.
Biodiversity	SINC: Suttons Copse to the north west, ancient woodland and SINC to the east Coldland Copse Whiteley Stream (tidal) along western boundary Western part of site lies within FZ 2 & 3
VALUE	
National Park	No
Former ASLQ	No
Scenic quality/ views	No
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences, rurality,	Remote unspoilt character. Access down Ridge lane – unmetalled, off highway however the N Whiteley major development area wraps around the site which decreases its landscape sensitivity.

remoteness or wildness?	
Tranquillity	
Special cultural associations?	Unknown.
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	Public Open space and PRoW adjacent to the site to the west and south.
Recreational value	No
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Key viewpoints are not readily available. There may be glimpses into the site during the winter months from Ridge Lane.
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent.
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed.
Distinct skylines?	no
Scope to mitigate?	yes
Key visual or functional corridor?	no
Significant outward views from within settlements?	no
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	no

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following three criteria: Landscape Character Sensitivity, Visual sensitivity and value

Landscape Character Sensitivity

i.e., the ability of a landscape to accommodate housing development without changing it's character.

Sensitivity	Criteria
-------------	----------

Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very susceptible to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. An absence of intrusive or detracting influences (i.e. a lack of development) and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is susceptible to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.</p>
High	<p>Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but</p>

	would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

i.e., the importance that society attaches to the landscape.

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	Former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ); 'unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character, well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and combined to give an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>			= 8 medium		

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high:** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character*
- 7/6/5 = **low:**
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity.**

Whiteley: CU24



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Roman Site SAM, List UID: 1001838 to the North.

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The Scheduled Monument site is an open field at the confluence of the River Hamble and Curbridge Creek with known archaeology of the Roman period.
- This site is 825m to the SW on slightly higher ground beyond Harmsworth Livery Stables, the A3051 and Sutton's Copse. It is surrounded by woodland to the west and south and tree belts to the north and east. It is currently occupied by a Buckswood House and its garden.
- The site does not make a tangible contribution to the Scheduled Monument site.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- The site is screened from the Scheduled Monument by the belt of trees along Curbridge Creek and additionally by Sutton's Copse. Provided these barriers remain, its development would not have a perceptible impact.
- The Whiteley residential development around Bluebell Way is closer (525m) and less screened.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Curbridge

Site Name: CU24

1st July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Curbridge
 Site Name: CU24

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

CU24 is a relatively small site which is currently accessed off Ridge Lane.

Motor vehicle access on to Ridge Lane could be possible for a small development of approximately 10 dwellings. The junction of Ridge Lane and the A3051 may need improving to achieve safe motor vehicle access to this site. The existing pedestrian facilities in this area are poor, however there are potential opportunities to link this site to the residential areas to the south and proposed development to the north.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 40mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	32%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

To summarise, this area has little scope to reduce the reliance on car travel as oppose to the use of sustainable modes of transport.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	0	1	Amber

There is one collision recorded in the PIC data, at the Glassfield Road junction onto the neighbouring B road. It is a serious collision, but on the outer edges of the 500m boundary. This concludes that there are no trends or patterns in PIC data for this site

Name & Ref: CU34 - Land off Whiteley Lane D (SEE CU03, CU02, CU14 WHICH COVER THE SAME PARCEL OF LAND)

Summary:

Covered under CU02, 03, 14 in the most part with additional land to the south and a small amount to the North West. These sites have been scored at 3, 6 and 7 respectively. The additional land added under CU34 does not differ significantly from CU14 adjacent but has the added feature of being further from commercial development and a slightly enhanced sense of greenery and distance from detracting influences.

For these reasons a score of 7 was allocated.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	WCC: Whiteley Woodlands
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Mixed Farmland and Woodland
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?	
Drainage: well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs	
Geology: distinctive or varied?	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.	

Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	
VALUE	
National Park	
Former ASLQ	
Scenic quality/ views	
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	
Tranquillity	
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	
Recreational value	
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	
Prominence/visibility?	
Enclosure/Openness?	
Distinct skylines?	
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	
Significant outward	

views from within settlements?	
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	
Views outwards	

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Value</i>				2	
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	7				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Whiteley: CU34



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- Caigers Green Grade II List UID 1339251

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- This partially wooded site is 400m from Caigers Green, a Grade II Listed house forming part of the ribbon development along this section of Botley Road (A3051) and is separated from it by a belt of trees between the properties along Botley Road and Sweethills, one of the new Whiteley residential neighborhoods. The northeastern strip of the site is currently in use as a salvage and timber yard.
- No significant contribution identified.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- No potential impact identified

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Curbridge

Site Name: CU34

1st July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Curbridge
 Site Name: CU34

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

The intention is for these sites (CU14, CU34 and CU35) to be accessed via the North Whiteley development that is currently under construction. The current North Whiteley development has provided a fourth arm on the roundabout on Bluebell Way, to accommodate future development. The fourth arm of the roundabout goes right up to the red line boundary of CU34 and CU45. Engagement with the landowner of the current and prospective development sites would be advantageous at an early stage to ensure a ransom situation regarding access does not occur.

The above option is likely to be the only viable motor vehicle access option for this site as HCC would not support a second access onto the A3051 as the existing access (Whiteley Way and the Car Yard) is substandard and would create a potential link road through the site.

This site is located within close proximity to route 342 in the emerging Fareham LCWIP therefore there is potential to create links between this proposed development site and the existing walking and cycling infrastructure that has been identified in the LCWIP. There is also the opportunity to increase the links south from these sites into existing residential area.

The scale of this proposed development is fairly low (approximately 100 dwellings). However, further transport assessments would need to be undertaken to see if the existing infrastructure is able to accommodate this increase in motor vehicle traffic to the proposed development sites. Costs associated with access to the site are predicted to be low - medium depending on if the existing infrastructure has been designed to accommodate these additional sites.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	32%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety




A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	3	4	Amber

The PIC data associated with CU34 shows that there were only four collisions recorded within a 500m radius of the site and these were staggered over the five year period. All of the recorded collisions were not within close proximity of the site and no patterns or trends have established from this data. Three of the recorded collisions were on the A3051 (Botley Road) – which is located to the north and west of the site. No direct access is proposed from this site on the A3051. The serious collision recorded is located to the north east of the site on Bluebell Way at the junction with Glassfield Road.

Whiteley: CU45



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- Caigers Green Grade II List UID 1339251

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site is 550m from Caigers Green, a house forming part of the ribbon development along this section of Botley Road (A3051) and is separated from it by a belt of trees between the properties along the Botley Road and Sweethills, one of the new Whiteley residential neighborhoods. Its north west boundary backs onto woodland and a fishing lake.
- No significant contribution identified.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- No potential impact identified

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.

SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Curbridge

Site Name: CU45

1st July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Curbridge
 Site Name: CU45

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

The intention is for these sites (CU14, CU34 and CU35) to be accessed via the North Whiteley development that is currently under construction. The current North Whiteley development has provided a fourth arm on the roundabout on Bluebell Way, to accommodate future development. The fourth arm of the roundabout goes right up to the red line boundary of CU34 and CU45. Engagement with the landowner of the current and prospective development sites would be advantageous at an early stage to ensure a ransom situation regarding access does not occur.

The above option is likely to be the only viable motor vehicle access option for this site as HCC would not support a second access onto the A3051 as the existing access (Whiteley Way and the Car Yard) is substandard and would create a potential link road through the site.

This site is located within close proximity to route 342 in the emerging Fareham LCWIP therefore there is potential to create links between this proposed development site and the existing walking and cycling infrastructure that has been identified in the LCWIP. There is also the opportunity to increase the links south from these sites into existing residential area.

The scale of this proposed development is fairly low (approximately 100 dwellings). However, further transport assessments would need to be undertaken to see if the existing infrastructure is able to accommodate this increase in motor vehicle traffic to the proposed development sites. Costs associated with access to the site are predicted to be low - medium depending on if the existing infrastructure has been designed to accommodate these additional sites.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	32%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall, this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	3	4	Amber

The PIC data associated with CU35 shows that there were only four collisions recorded within a 500m radius of the site and these were staggered over the five year period. All of the recorded collisions were not within close proximity of the site and no patterns or trends have established from this data. Three of the recorded collisions were on the A3051 (Botley Road) – which is located to the north and west of the site. No direct access is proposed from this site on the A3051. The serious collision recorded is located to the north east of the site on Bluebell Way at the junction with Glassfield Road.

BW17, Land north of Rareridge Lane, Bishops Waltham

Summary:

The site scores 8 out of 15 *i.e. development could be accommodated here without changing landscape character, with certain provisos.*

The key viewpoint is from the footpath to the north of the site, which is within the National Park. There are other views of the site from the adjacent residential properties to the south west of the site. However, whilst viewers on the footpath are considered to be sensitive receptors, development on this site would be seen in the context of other development on Rareridge Lane so while the change may be prominent, the development (if it were sensitively designed) would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting.

Landscape sensitivity is considered to be 'Low': the site has some value for its rural character and tranquillity but these qualities are influenced or eroded by the presence of the existing urban edge of the town. 'Value' is also considered to be Low: while the site is crossed by footpaths, this is an 'urban fringe' site.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change without some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change

	and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors eg residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows


	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>				2	
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	= 8				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Bishops Waltham: BW17

Site Plan:



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Grade II listed Barn to the SE, List UID: 1350576
- Grade II listed Middle Hoe Cottage to the SE, List UID: 1095709
- Grade II listed West Hoe Farmhouse to the SE, List UID: 1095667
- Grade II Listed Barn to the SE, List UID: 1095668
- Grade II listed cottage to the E, List UID: 1350577

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site is close to a group of Listed buildings including barns, farmhouse and cottages which together form a significant remnant of the former agrarian community. The distance between them and the nearest point on the site's boundary varies between 50 and 150m and are in direct line of sight, although the modern landscaped cemetery and its approach road, which are crossed by over-head power lines, lies between the site and the listed buildings.
- The site presents a boundary of coniferous trees along its east boundary within which it is dense, semi-mature woodland. It is on gently rising ground at the northeastern edge of the village. Its north side is on the boundary of The South Downs National Park
- The southwest boundary follows the boundaries of several back garden developments in the row of Victorian villas along Rareridge Lane which originally all had long back gardens. The access to the proposed site would be achieved by removing one of the houses on Rareridge Lane.
- The site's contribution to the setting of the group of Listed Buildings is to offer a dense woodland backdrop to their west consisting of a mixture of coniferous and deciduous trees.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- The development of this site has the potential to impact on the setting of the listed buildings, particularly on the rural character of the cottage List UID 1350577 which currently faces West onto the landscaped cemetery and undeveloped land further to the NE.
- The development of the site may result in increased traffic movements with associated impacts on the Listed Buildings to the east and the historic centre to the west.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- In Heritage terms, the site may be appropriate however it is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals. Consideration should be given to restricting development towards the South and retaining a landscape buffer along the site's eastern boundary.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Bishops Waltham

Site Name: BW17

1st July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Bishops Waltham

Site Name: BW17

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets)

Yes (2)

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low

Medium

Site BW17 is comprised of two potential development sites. The majority of the site with potential motor vehicle access access on to Hoe Road is proposed for approximately 126 dwellings and a much smaller part of the site (towards the western side) with potential motor vehicle access on to Byron Close is proposed for approximately 10 dwellings.

As Byron Close is an existing cul-de-sac with potentially very low traffic flows it would be advisable to ensure the traffic flow between the two sites is limited to pedestrian and cycle flow only and a modal filter is installed to ensure traffic gaining access to the majority of the site (126 dwellings) is accessed solely off Hoe Road.

To access the larger part of the site a standard T junction on to Hoe Road would be required and potentially a reduction in the speed limit on Hoe Road to 30 mph. This proposed access would be subject to appropriate visibility splays being achieved.

A pedestrian crossing would be needed on Hoe Road as there is no footpath on the north side of the road.

The access to the site for for cyclists would be the same access as the motor vehicle access.

Connectivity between the two parts of the sites for pedestrians and cyclists could be achieved. There is an opportunity to connect BW17 into the existing rights of way network.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 6% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester and England. 50% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester and England.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	3%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	50%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	0%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	6%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	31%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	3	4	Amber

The PIC data relating to BW17 shows that there have been 4 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site, over a 5 year period. There are no patterns that can be drawn from this data as the collisions are widely dispersed and not linked to a particular location. There is only one serious collision recorded (in 2018) within 500m of the site.

Name & Ref: KW02 – Land Adjacent Cart and Horses PH

Summary:

TPO area and part of the green ribbon along the A33 and within the settlement gap. Within the SSSI impact risk zone. Valued in the Village Design Statement for its contribution to the rural nature of the outskirts of Kings Worthy. Although not designated the LCA indicates the area is valuable for farmland birds.

Sensitive in terms of value indicated by a number of historic garden designations on and around the site, views from local footpaths and the Village Design Statement's section on the importance of preserving the woodland and farmland between the Cart and Horses PH and Lovedon Lane. Also within the settlement gap.

Visually important as part of the green corridor along the A33. Users of footpaths that cross the site are likely to be sensitive to development.

The site was assessed to score 12 – High Sensitivity.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	WCC: North Itchen Downs: Rolling, relatively low lying chalk downland. Good populations of decreasing farmland birds. Relatively large fields. Strong field boundaries. Remote rural character, although the A33 and railway detract.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Open Arable.
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Approx. 65m AOD.
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	South west facing valley, gentle slope in the direction of the River Itchen.
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?	Small field and woodland, scattered trees. Remnants of Kings Worthy House parkland, a locally listed garden. Within the settlement gap between Kingsworthy and Abbots Worthy.
Drainage: well drained or numerous streams,	

<i>ponds and springs</i>	
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	TPO area covers all of the site. Approx. 60% woodland covered with scattered trees.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.</i>	Within the River Itchen SSSI Impact Risk Zone. TPO area covers all of the site.
VALUE	
National Park	No – but boundary is on other side of A33
Former ASLQ	Abutting Itchen Valley ASLQ (around Abbots Worthy)
Scenic quality/ views	Views from paths Kingsworthy 6b; Kingsworthy 505 which run around the edge of the site. Scenic quality of surviving parkland open space and trees.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	A33 detracts from the rural feel to some degree. Housing to the south west creates an urban presence. Site is part of the band of open land extending along the A33 northwards. Village Design Statement notes that the trees on site is 'important vegetation'.
Tranquillity	Some detractors from tranquillity i.e. A33 and housing to the south west side of the site.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Semi-rural. Not remote but sense of diminishing urban environment and edge of countryside. Village Design Statement notes that 'The open, rural character of the following areas is important to the setting of the villages and should be conserved: -The woodland and farmland between the Cart and Horses Public House and Lovedon Lane.'
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	Site is larger part of locally listed garden of Kings Worthy House, building demolished but garden although not maintained remains a large green space. Locally listed garden of Morton House on the west boundary but now built upon. Locally listed garden to Northleigh on the south west border (mostly built on) and Kingsworthy Conservation Area adjoining to the south west.
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	Coach and Horses public house (grade II) adjoining the south corner.
Accessibility – <i>local</i>	Potentially accessible from the A33.

<i>highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	
Recreational value	Currently private land.
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views from the A33 between trees. Views from the public rights of way along the perimeter of the site: Kings Worthy 6b and 505 – likely sensitivity to development of walkers will be heightened when crossing this site.
Prominence/visibility?	Not highly visible from longer distances but highly visible from A33. Football pitch (public open space) to the north and new open space to the east (Eversley Gardens).
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed by woodland, trees and hedgerows.
Distinct skylines?	
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	Functions as verdant edge to the A33 with trees of stature along the perimeter which have a strong visual presence.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Direct views of the site from houses on Hinton Fields and The Woodlands on the west boundary of the site.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	Part of the green corridor along the A33.
Views outwards	

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and

	<p>rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows


	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>		4			
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	12				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity: protection from development is the only option**

- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity** : *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium**: *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low**: *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity**: *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Kingsworthy: KW02



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Directly adjacent to Grade II listed PH, List UID: 1156354
- Site is opposite Grade II listed Kingsworthy Grove and Stable Block to the East, List UID: 1095841
- Site directly adjacent to Winchester District Conservation Area

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- More than half of the site is wooded, along its western and southern boundaries. The woodland effectively forms the northern boundary of the conservation area and forms visual the backdrop to the listed PH to the south. As such in its current form it contributes to the rural setting of the Kingsworthy Conservation area.
- The site is topographically several meters lower than Kingsworthy Grove to the East, which has its principal elevation facing SW towards the site which therefore currently partially contributes to the open setting of the house, albeit it partially shielded by vegetation and separated by the A33.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Potential impact on special character of Conservation area, subject to highways development to enable site access, and loss of woodland currently defining the Conservation Area boundary to the SW. Highways proposal plan ITB15009 - GA – 005 indicates two new roundabouts, one of which sits at the existing junction of Basingstoke Road and the B3047. Anticipated impacts from these proposed highway works on Kingsworthy Grove include possible need for vegetation clearance required to facilitate vision splays, resulting in greater visual impact of housing development site on Kingsworthy Grove, and possible noise impact due to increased traffic movements, affecting the rural character of the house.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- The site may be appropriate subject to the retention of the woodland buffer to the South and consideration of the views and setting of Kingsworthy House. These issues may be resolvable through the concentration of development on the site towards the West/North-West. It is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Kings Worthy

Site Name: KW02

1st July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Kings Worthy
 Site Name: KW02

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **High**

The current road configuration of the highway is not adequate to allow safe motor vehicle access to this site. This location has existing safety concerns and the highway would need significant reconfiguration to allow for this site to be accessed safely. With significant improvements, safe access to this site could be achieved.

The site promoter has undertaken work regarding potential access options for this site. These plans include the installation of a double roundabout to gain access to the site.

This site has a proposed access point on an A road which will need to be considered. Please refer to the Methodology chapter 3.1

It should be noted that this junction may be impacted by the M3 Junction 9 National Highways (NH) improvement scheme, so whilst not within the direct remit of the work, HCC are working in conjunction with NH have looked at a number of potential improvement options for this junction. There are no plans to increase the capacity of this junction at this time. Any development on this site will have an impact on the modelling work and proposed options for this junction therefore early engagement between all parties involved is advised.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 8% by public transport. Public transport levels are higher in Winchester and Hampshire, in contrast walking rates which are lower than Winchester, Hampshire and nationally. 51% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	8%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	51%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	28%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	3	14	17	Amber

The collision data for KW02 shows that there are 17 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. 9 of the collisions are on or closely associated with the A33 (Basingstoke Road) and a further 4 are on London Road to the south of the site. The cluster of collisions immediately to the south of the site (4 slight collisions) at the A33 Basingstoke Road and London Road junction have resulted from right and left hand turns associated with this junction. There is another slight collision recorded immediately to the north of the site.

Name & Ref: KW12 – Cornerways and Merrydale, Church Lane, Kings Worthy.

Summary:

Within the settlement. A medium density housing environment and currently occupied by a building. Simple landscaping scheme of grass and trees around the building and ranking low in sensitivity to change.

Tranquillity is lessened by surrounding development and roads and not a site expected to be sensitive for cultural reasons.

Visually not prominent but seen from surrounding houses and users of Church Lane and so some sensitivity to changes in the view but not of the highest order.

The site was assessed to score 6 – Low Sensitivity. *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	Within Kings Worthy settlement boundary
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Within Kings Worthy settlement boundary
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Approx. 50m AOD
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	Flat
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Urban environment. Medium to low density of buildings in the vicinity.
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees,	Scattered trees around the site. Those on the site appear to be semi-

hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	mature with some large mature trees around the periphery. Hedgerows and trees on broad margins to roads nearby.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	No designations over site and an urban environment which may limit biodiversity at the larger scale.
VALUE	
National Park	No
Former ASLQ	No
Scenic quality/ views	Views directly in to the site from Church Lane. Longer views limited. Not a highly visible site.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	
Tranquillity	Detractors from tranquillity in evidence.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	None
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	None
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	From Church Lane
Recreational value	Not recreational.
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views from Church Lane directly in to the site and from surrounding houses. Some degree of sensitivity to changes in the view from house owners probable.
Prominence/visibility?	Screened by buildings, wall and vegetation around the perimeter of the site.

Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed
Distinct skylines?	No
Scope to mitigate?	Yes
Key visual or functional corridor?	No
Significant outward views from within settlements?	
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No
Views outwards	Limited to surrounding buildings.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a</p>

	local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.
--	--

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows


	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>					1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Value</i>				2	
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	6				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity: protection from development is the only option**

- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity** : *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium**: *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low**: *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity**: *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Kingsworthy: KW12



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Winchester District Conservation Area to the South down Church Lane
- Grade II listed cottage to the South down Church Lane List UID: 1350504
- Grade II listed cottage to the South down Church Lane List UID: 1095844
- Iron Age SAM to the north across Springvale Rd, List UID: 1013269

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site currently makes a minor contribution to the approach to the conservation area and the two listed buildings, as at present the buildings on it are set well back behind an elevated grass bank, which enables the rural character of the approach to the Conservation Area to be maintained.
- The site is surrounded by modern development to the north and has no impact on distant views of the SAM's.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Development close to the highway (NE) boundary has the potential to cause harm to the setting of the two thatched cottages, in particular List UID: 1095844 and the approach to the conservation area.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- It is considered that the site may be appropriate, subject to consideration of impacts on views down Church Lane to the South. It is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Kings Worthy

Site Name: KW12

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Kings Worthy
 Site Name: KW12

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Low**

The options for this site include utilising the existing access (low-cost option) or potentially relocating the access further south on Church Lane to improve visibility splays (medium cost). There is also the potential to improve the pedestrian and cycle access from the site down the existing track located to southwest of site which links to Willis Way.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 60mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 8% by public transport. Public transport levels are higher in Winchester and Hampshire, in contrast walking rates which are lower than Winchester, Hampshire and nationally. 51% commute by motor vehicle which is lower than the averages for Winchester and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	8%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	51%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	28%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	2	14	16	Amber

The PIC data associated with KW12 shows 16 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. The majority of these collisions are associated with major roads the A34, the A33 and London Road and are classified as slight. There are no recorded collisions in the residential area immediately surrounding this site.

WI18 Land north of Ravenswood House Hospital, Wickham

Summary:

The site occupies a minor ridge of high land with land sloping NW towards the River. The site is not prominent in the local landscape and is largely concealed from public view although there are glimpsed views of parts of the site from both Mayles Lane and private views from Greater Horseshoe Way on the NE edge of Knowle village. There is also a longer view from the other side of the river valley from Titchfield Lane, 1.1 km distant to the NW, where the upper parts of the site can be clearly seen. Ravenswood Hospital looks out north over the southern half of the site.

The unspoilt character and rurality of the site is diminished to an extent due to the presence of the adjacent Ravenswood Hospital, the presence of Knowle Village and several pylons crossing the site. There is sensitive ancient woodland on the NE boundary of the site.

The site is considered to be **moderately sensitive scoring 8 out of 15**. Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos:

- Development should avoid the highest parts of the site in order to avoid visual impact from the other side of the Meon Valley to the NW.
- There should be a substantial landscape buffer between the development site and the ancient woodland. There would also need to be landscape buffers between the site and the edge of the village.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	Lower Meon Valley (WCC)
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Mixed Farmland and Woodland (Open).
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	the high point on site is 45m AOD and slopes down towards the river and Mayles Lane at 25m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	The site occupies a minor ridge of high land with land sloping NW towards the River.
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open,	Medium sized assorted fields.

<i>distinctive pattern?</i>	
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	Close to the River Meon. There is a pond on site.
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	The site consists of large open fields fringed by ancient woodland on its NE boundary.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.</i>	There is sensitive ancient woodland on the NE boundary of the site.
VALUE	
National Park	The site is not within or near the South Downs National Park.
Local Gap?	The site is not within or near the Meon Gap
Scenic quality/ views	
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	The unspoilt character and rurality of the site is diminished due to the presence of the adjacent Ravenswood Hospital, the presence of Knowle Village and several pylons crossing the site.
Tranquillity	Moderate.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	No.
Special cultural associations?	No.
Historic parks or gardens?	The site is not within an historic park.
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	There are no listed buildings on the site.
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	There is a public footpath to the east of the site which continues through Dash Wood.
Recreational value	

VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	The site is largely concealed from public view although there are glimpsed views of parts of the site from both Mayles Lane and private views from Greater Horseshoe Way on the NE edge of Knowle village.
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent locally but longer views do exist.
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed.
Distinct skylines?	No.
Scope to mitigate?	Yes.
Key visual or functional corridor?	No.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	No.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No.
Views outwards	Yes, there are views from the site overlooking the Meon Valley to the NW of the site.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape

	<p>components or character; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden.
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.

Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>			= 8 medium		

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Name & Ref: Colden Common, 97 Main Rd – CC02

Summary:

Trees / hedgerows surrounding the site serve the function of screening the site to a large extent from the surroundings – this has been diminished to some extent by the development of the housing area to the east. The field forms part of green space that extends from Main Road east and separates the new development of Sandyfields Lane from Boyes Lane and adjoins the SINC of Temple Usk Meadow.

The site is not highly visible from public routes, but development would have some visual impact on residents now occupying houses in Sandyfields Lane.

The site adjoins the Manor House listed building (SHELLA CC06) which has cultural value and the open land to the north of Main Road is valued by the community.

The site scored 8 (low medium sensitivity) overall.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	WCC: South Winchester Downs – tranquil, undulating chalk down. Remote, rural landscape predominantly arable. Significant areas of woodland – copses, spinneys, large woods.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Chalk and Clay (Farmland)
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Low lying approx. 45m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	Flat.
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?	Undistinguished, medium sized field north of farm buildings.
Drainage: well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs	Well drained (LCA).
Geology: distinctive or	Chalk downland / pasture

<i>varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Open field with matures trees surrounding and hedgerow.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg:</i> Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves <i>etc.</i>	No designations. Valuable tree cover and historic boundaries. Next to the Temple Usk Meadow SINC (west of site).
VALUE	
National Park	140m to the east at nearest point.
Former ASLQ	
Scenic quality/ views	
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Some detractors: built-up area of Colden Common on opposite side of Main Road and new housing area immediately to the east boundary. Colden Common Farm buildings in the south part of the property. New housing development to the east. However, the Village Design Statement noted that 'It was clear from the feedback of the consultation process that the local community value highly these aspects of the local landscape which affirm the rural character of the area outside of the settlement boundary' indicating that residents value the open green areas outside of the settlement boundary.
Tranquillity	
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Edge of town – low rurality but part of open fields to the east of Colden Common.
Special cultural associations?	The Manor, Grade II listed buildings adjoining to the north of the farm.
Historic parks or gardens?	None
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	None on site
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	Access from B3354
Recreational value	

VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views from new development to the east probable. Visual connection with the listed Manor to the west probable. Largely contained by surrounding trees.
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent. Frontage on to Main Road which raises the possibility of visibility to road users. Village Design Statement recognises that residents value highly the green appearance of road sides and the screening provided including Main Rd.
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed by hedgerows and trees.
Distinct skylines?	No
Scope to mitigate?	Limited
Key visual or functional corridor?	No
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Views from new development to the east probable in to the site.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	
Views outwards	Surrounding views currently of fields and trees with new development site to the east.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>				2	
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	8				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Colden Common: CC02



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Grade II Listed Manor House (with listed barn and granary) directly adjacent to the North, List UID: 1095818 (17th Century)

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site is currently occupied by Colden Common Farm. It contains a small number of agricultural buildings and the open field fronting onto Main Road is used for grazing. The field at the rear, directly south of the Manor House, is a touring camp site. At present, due to the proportion of open space on the site and the rural function of the buildings, it has an overall positive impact on the setting of the Manor House.
- It is noted that the site boundary directly abuts the listed barn within the curtilage of the Manor House.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- It is considered that development at CC02 has the potential to cause harm to the setting of the group of listed buildings. The site bounds the curtilage of the manor on three sides and full development would have the effect of severing the Manor House from the open countryside to the North-East, severely impacting on it's special character.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Development linking the Sandyfields Lane housing development with the Manor House and severing it from the open countryside to the North has the potential to impact on the open, rural character of the three listed buildings.
- It is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Colden Common

Site Name: CC02

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Colden Common
 Site Name: CC02

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

The existing motor vehicle site access onto the B3354 (Main Road) is located within close proximity to the adjacent Sandyfields residential development. This could have implications for the visibility splay for the proposed motor vehicle site access to the proposed development. It could be advantageous to consider relocating the site access further north on the B3354 than the existing access currently is. This would also mean that the site access is not directly opposite the Avondale mobile home park.

Another option would be to create a motor vehicle access point via the new Sandyfields development adjacent to the site. This would be preferable to creating a new access point onto the B3354 (Main Road). It would also be advantageous to create pedestrian and cycle access from this site into the existing Sandyfields development.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 2% commute on foot and 4% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	4%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	2%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	34%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	0	9	9	Amber

The PIC data associated with CC02 shows there were 9 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. All the collisions were classified as slight and were fairly evenly dispersed across the 5 year period. Five of the collisions form a cluster located north-west of the site, at the junction between Main Road and Spring Lane. However, this does not denote a trend, due to the time between each collision. All recorded collisions were associated with Main Road, primarily at junctions with other roads.

Name & Ref: Colden Common, 97 Main Rd – CC04

Summary:

A small to medium sized field, opening on to the wider countryside beyond the edge of the town.

Attractive open views in to the site, with surrounding trees forming a distinct edge to the urban area. Identified in the Village Design Statement as part of the valued green space that surrounds the town.

Main Road detracts from the tranquillity. A transition zone between the urban and known sensitive areas i.e. National Park and former Area of Special Landscape Quality (ASLQ), Ancient Woodland and TPO areas.

Assessed to have a score of 11, the lower third of Highly Sensitive.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	WCC: South Winchester Downs – tranquil, undulating chalk down. Remote, rural landscape predominantly arable. Significant areas of woodland – copses, spinneys, large woods.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Chalk and Clay (Farmland)
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Low lying approx. 45m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	Flat.
Field pattern: small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?	Small field on edge of town. Surrounded by small fields and woodland.
Drainage: well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs	Well drained (LCA).
Geology: distinctive or	Chalk downland / pasture

<i>varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Pasture surrounded by mature trees and hedge row on three sides; Main Rd forms fourth side.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	Two trees with TPOs on south edge of site, TPO area on the north of the site (The Dell). No designations on the site. Probably improved pasture but signs of wildflowers; probable value for invertebrates. Surrounding hedgerows and trees have visual as well as biodiversity value.
VALUE	
National Park	150m to north.
Former ASLQ	Itchen Valley 250m to the west. Noted that 'the settlement edge (of Colden Common) forms a distinct boundary to the generally unspoilt river valley landscape.'
Scenic quality/ views	Views in to the site from Main Rd (B3354).
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Unspoilt view of pasture and trees looking east across the field from Main Rd, few detracting influences looking east towards open countryside. Village Design Statement 2012 notes valued landscape of the 'fields and woodlands which rise to the east around...'. 'There was significant agreement from consultation for the need to protect this to ensure the preservation of a green, natural patchwork of fields and woodland around the village.'
Tranquillity	Tranquillity reduced by presence of traffic on Main Rd.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Edge of town semi-rural situation defined by it being part of the open countryside stretching to the east from Main Rd.
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	Access from Main Road.
Recreational value	Currently not used for recreational purposes (agricultural).

VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Significant views in to the site from Main Rd (B3354).
Prominence/visibility?	Very visible from Main Rd.
Enclosure/Openness?	Open to Main Rd but enclosed on other sides.
Distinct skylines?	Tree line on east of field.
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	Visually significant at entrance to the town from the north.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Views of the site from houses opposite – residents likely to be sensitive to change.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	Visually significant at entrance to the town from the north (B3354 Main Road).
Views outwards	Views of fields and trees to the east and north; low density housing seen to the west.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;

High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>		4			
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	11				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Colden Common: CC04



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Grade II listed Malt House directly opposite to the West, List UID: 1095855
- Grade II listed cottage directly opposite to the West, List UID: 1156574
- Grade II listed cottage directly opposite to the West, List UID: 1350489
- Grade II listed house to the North, List UID: 1302812

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site contributes greatly to the setting of the three listed houses opposite on the West side of the B3354. The houses are detached and occupy generous plots of land, commensurate with their size and rural location, and their special character is in part defined by the open field opposite, Site CC04.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- This site allocation has the potential to have a negative visual impact on the setting of the three listed buildings on the opposite site of Main Road, in particular the approach towards the Malt House from the West. Any development should consider both the proximity of the buildings to the site boundary and their distribution to ensure the character of this part of Colden Common is not harmed.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- It is considered that development on this site may be appropriate if consideration is given to maintaining the open rural character of the setting for the three listed buildings. It is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Colden Common

Site Name: CC04

1st July 2022

Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Colden Common

Site Name: CC04

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

Motor vehicle access to the site could be achieved by providing a simple priority junction from the site onto the B3354 (Main Road). The speed limit of the road at this point is 30mph although this does increase to 50mph further north of the site. Adequate visibility splays would need to be achieved in order to establish a safe motor vehicle access to the site. There are a number of private access points on the opposite side of the road which may influence the best location for the motor vehicle access point to this site. Depending on where the vehicular access is positioned and internal layout of the site, additional pedestrian accesses could be provided to the north and south, however there are no existing cycle facilities in the vicinity for this proposed development to link into. There is a controlled crossing approximately 100m south of this site, however it is not deemed suitable to serve the recreation ground opposite due to the distance. There is no available road width to accommodate a pedestrian refuge currently however there is potential to realign the eastern side adjacent to the site frontage to provide a pedestrian refuge to assist crossing the B3354 (Main Road) and providing access to the existing footway.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 4% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 59% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	5%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	4%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	59%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	1%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	27%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	0	7	7	Amber

The PIC data for CC04 shows there have been seven recorded collisions (all slight) within a 500m radius of the site. These collisions are evenly spread over a five-year period. Five of the collisions form a cluster to the south of the site, at the junction between Main Road and Spring Lane. An increase in collision data is to be expected at junctions.

Name & Ref: CC15– Land Adjoining 85 Church Lane, Colden Common

Summary:

Edge of Colden Common, outside of the settlement boundary and the edge of open fields to woodland to the south. The site is partially overlooked by houses on Church Lane and road users – receptors likely to be sensitive to changes in the view. No designations on the site. Colden Common 21 Public right of way 290m to the south with visual connection to the site possible.

LCA recognises urban fringe development as a threat and advises the preservation of the nucleated form of Colden Common. No designations on the site or in the immediate vicinity.

The site is typical of its type, being open pasture with surrounding hedgerows but has significance in forming the edge of open countryside to the south of the town whose development to the south has been limited to date by the settlement boundary designation.

The site was given a score of 10 - high medium: *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	WCC: Durley Claylands: Relatively low lying, gently undulating landscape with a geology ranging from a narrow strip of Reading Beds and wider strip of London Clay in the north around Colden Common. Numerous ponds, streams and ditches. Arable, pasture, copses. Loss of hedgerows; suburbanisation, urban fringe encroachment; visual intrusion of pylons; untidy peripheral areas. Strategies include: Restore woodlands and hedgerows; conserve views; conserve nucleated form of Colden Common and Bishops Waltham; Integrate new development sensitively with appropriate planting.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	WCC: Mixed Farmland and Woodland
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	Approx 34m AOD
Topography/ Landform: steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?	Flat

Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Adjoining large fields in varied pattern of field sizes interspersed with woodland and hedgerows.
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	No obvious signs of water on the site.
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Pasture, hedges surrounding the field except on the south side.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.	No designations. Pasture. Mature trees within hedgerows and hedgerows will have wildlife value.
VALUE	
National Park	No
Former ASLQ	
Scenic quality/ views	Has some scenic qualities by virtue of its green open space forming the edge of open countryside.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Outside of Colden Common (outside the settlement boundary) in open ground. Houses to the east and north on Church Lane detract somewhat from rurality, but valuable for its transitional function .
Tranquillity	Some sense of tranquillity, modified by presence of houses, traffic and distant pylons but gives sense of rural environment.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Some sense of rurality
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle</i>	Church Lane on north boundary. Colden Common 21 Public right of way to the south 290m.

<i>routes</i>	
Recreational value	Private land. Visual amenity
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	Views from Church Lane. House to east and houses to north side of Church Ln will have views of the site.
Prominence/visibility?	Low lying in flat terrain therefore unlikely to be highly visible from longer distances.
Enclosure/Openness?	Open field bordered by hedgerows.
Distinct skylines?	Long distance views to the south to higher ground
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	Views from adjacent Church Lane – not a main corridor but well used.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Views across the site likely from some houses on Church Lane
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	Views from adjacent Church Lane – not a main corridor but well used.
Views outwards	Long views to the south across open fields to woodland on ridge.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
-------------	----------

Very High	National or international designated landscape eg National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	10				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Colden Common: CC15



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Grade II listed cottage directly adjacent to the NW, List UID: 1095822
- Grade II listed Hill Farm House to the West List UID: 1350492

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site currently contributes in part to the setting of both the cottage to the North West and Hill Farm House to the West, as it is wholly undeveloped and adds to the rural character of the area.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- Hill Farm House is topographically elevated from site CC15 and commands a view to the South and East towards Fishers Pond. The proposed site is within 300m of the house and development has the potential to impact its wider setting.
- Development of the site has the potential to harm the setting of the listed cottage to the North and open views towards it from rights of way to the South. The corner of the site is 25mm from the property (Keepers Cottage).

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- Due to the potential harm to List UID: 1095822, it is recommended that further phased investigations are carried out based on specific design proposals.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Colden Common

Site Name: CC15

1st July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Colden Common

Site Name: CC15

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets)

Yes (1)

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low

Medium

The access to this site will depend on whether the proposed development follows the existing building pattern immediately to the east of the site or whether it is developed in a similar style to Finches Close at the eastern end of Church Lane. Both options would form new access point(s) on to Church Lane.

If the development follows the building line immediately to the east of the site, then each dwelling would have an individual vehicle crossover and follow the existing pattern of access (1 motor vehicle access per dwelling). The number of access points would then be dictated by the number of dwellings created. Another option for this site would be to create one motor vehicle access off Church Lane to serve multiple dwellings. It would be unlikely that additional pedestrian or cycle access over and above the motor vehicle access points would be created. There are a number of existing mature trees along Church Lane and these may have an impact on the visibility splays.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 2% commute on foot and 4% by public transport. These levels are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 52% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	6%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	4%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	52%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	2%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	34%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	1	1	2	Amber

The PIC data relating to CC15 shows there have been two recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site (one slight and one serious). Neither of these recorded collisions have occurred within close proximity of the potential site access. The contributory factors associated with these collisions would not indicate that the road layout in this location is a safety concern.

OT03 Land off Main Road, Otterbourne

Summary:

The site is considered to be moderately sensitive. Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character *with certain provisos*: most of the mature trees on the site and around its edges are protected by a TPO and would need to be retained in any development proposal. The footpath across the site could be repositioned to follow the line of the tree belt which bisects the site and this belt of trees could form the centre piece of any on site open space.

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	Cranbury Woodlands
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Mixed Farmland and Woodland (Enclosed)
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	25-30m AOD Low lying
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	Gently sloping
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Small fields
Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	The site is SW of a main river and sits just outside flood zones 2 and 3.
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	There are significant belts of trees through the middle of the site and on the perimeters of the site, all of which are covered by tree preservation orders
Biodiversity	
Low value or high	There are no designations on the site.

value?, <i>eg</i> : Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves <i>etc.</i>	
VALUE	
National Park	Not within the National Park
Former ASLQ	Not within a former ASLQ.
Scenic quality/ views	There are rural views from both adjacent residential properties and the footpath which crosses the site.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	The site exhibits few detracting influences
Tranquillity	Some tranquillity on the footpath.
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Some degree of rurality.
Special cultural associations?	Not known.
Historic parks or gardens?	No historic parks or gardens in the vicinity.
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	No listed buildings or scheduled monuments on or close to the site.
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	A popular footpath runs across the site.
Recreational value	High.
VISUAL	
Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	The site is not prominent from Main Road or Kiln Lane but the key public viewpoint is from the public right of way.
Prominence/visibility?	Not prominent in the wider landscape.
Enclosure/Openness?	Enclosed.
Distinct skylines?	
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	No.
Significant outward views from within settlements?	No. Nothing significant.

Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	No.
Views outwards	No. the site is enclosed.

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.
Medium	<p>Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.</p>
Low	<p>These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.</p>
Very Low	<p>Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.</p>

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).
Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					

For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows


	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>			3		
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	= 10 medium				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

Otterbourne: OT03

Site Plan:



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- Directly opposite Grade II Listed Parsonage List UID: 1350539
- Meadow Cottage to the South, List UID: 1095754
- Milestone to the South, List UID: 1095755
- Otterbourne House to the South, List UID: 1350540

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The Parsonage is set back from the Highway behind a low flint wall a wide grass verge and dense planting, which exists on both the West and East sides of Main Road. The gently sloping topography across the site (down towards the East and North) inhibits any clear views of the Parsonage from the site however glimpses of the six ornate octagonal chimneys as possible from the right of way that runs across the currently undeveloped site.
- The immediate surroundings of Otterbourne House and Meadow Cottage have been developed with housing, and the southern gardens of Otterbourne House also contain modern development, greatly reducing the contribution the open site makes it's setting.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- It is possible that this site allocation may have a negative impact on the Parsonage, through impacting on it's open setting to the East and long-distance views of its ornate chimneys, however it is considered this impact will be minimal due to dense planting.
- Subject to the scale of development, the impact on Otterbourne House and Meadow Cottage is considered to be negligible due to the surrounding existing modern housing.

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- In Heritage terms, the identified impacts are considered to be minimal and as such it is considered appropriate.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: Otterbourne

Site Name: OT03

5th July 2022


Issue 01



Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: Otterbourne
 Site Name: OT03

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

Site OT03 has been submitted as part of this assessment with the potential for approximately 50/60 dwellings to be developed on this site. Two potential motor vehicle access options have been identified for site OT03 to serve the proposed development. The first option includes modifying the existing roundabout on Main Road directly in front of the site, to include a fourth arm or upgrading it to a compact roundabout to provide motor vehicle access to the site. Further work (including monitoring traffic flows in this location) would be needed to establish the most appropriate roundabout access solution. The costs associated with upgrading the existing roundabout would be high. Another option would be to establish a new a motor vehicle access point (simple T junction) further north of the site, onto Main Road away from the existing roundabout (subject to visibility plays being achieved). The costs associated with this option would be medium. There is a footway on both sides of Main Road at this point and an existing pedestrian crossing point. There is limited existing cycling infrastructure in this location to link in to.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.


3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 7% by public transport. These Public Transport levels are higher than averages for Winchester and Hampshire. On the other hand, walking rates are lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 51% commute by motor vehicle which is higher than the averages for Winchester and England. Although only 1% commute by cycle.

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	8%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	7%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	51%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	1%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	31%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall, this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	3	13	16	Amber

The PIC data associated with OT03 shows 16 recorded collisions within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. The majority of these collisions are however associated with the M3 and are not representative of the residential area in which the site is located. There are 3 slight collisions recorded on Main Road, 2 of these are within fairly close proximity of the site. All 3 of these collisions have been classified as slight.

SW07 – Land at West Hill Road North

Summary:

South Wonston is arranged on a local ridge within an area of elevated (100 – 105m AOD) downland (*Wonston Downs Landscape Character Area*) where tree cover and woodland is sparse. The LCA recognises the visually open and expansive landscape with long, panoramic views. Development in this location would extend the village envelope in to open countryside (*Open Arable Landscape Type*) which due to its elevation is prominent and visible over a wider area in viewpoints to the north, including the Drove public right of way, Stainers Lane, Wonston Lane and Christmas Hill. The site contributes to the distinctive setting and identity of the village and is considered to be **11 = high sensitivity** : *protection from development is the preferred option*

Desk/Field checklist:

LANDSCAPE	
WCC/HCC Landscape Character Area	<p>WCC: Wonston Downs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A visually open and expansive landscape with long, panoramic views over the downs. Key views are towards Winchester and over the Dever Valley. • Conserve and enhance the isolated areas of ecological importance through appropriate management plans, in particular Worthy Down chalk grassland and Bazeley Copse ancient woodland and the surrounding land. • Degradation of remaining semi-natural grassland at Worthy Down due to under-grazing. • Conserve the sparse scattered pattern of rural farm settlement.
WCC/HCC Landscape Type	Open Arable (WCC)
Key Landscape components	
Elevation, low lying, high? state OD	100-105m AOD
Topography/ Landform: <i>steep or pronounced topography, flat, sloping, gently undulating, 'rolling', hilly, ridges, scarps or valleys, river valley, complex, varied or simple?</i>	North facing shallow slope
Field pattern: <i>small, medium, large, open, distinctive pattern?</i>	Small field amongst larger to the north and west

Drainage: <i>well drained or numerous streams, ponds and springs</i>	Chalk downs likely to be well drained
Geology: <i>distinctive or varied?</i>	
Land cover, trees, hedges and woodland: <i>Open, exposed, wooded, sparsely wooded, varied.</i>	Sparsely wooded, few trees on site.
Biodiversity	
Low value or high value?, <i>eg: Ancient Woodland; Special Protection Areas; Special Areas of Conservation; SINC's; wildlife reserves etc.</i>	Bordered by hedgerow with some value, otherwise improved pasture
VALUE	
National Park	No.
Former ASLQ	No.
Scenic quality/ views	Yes.
Spoilt/unspoilt character / presence or absence of detracting influences	Absence of detracting influences, no pylons for example.
Tranquillity	
Rurality Remoteness/Wildness?	Strongly rural
Special cultural associations?	
Historic parks or gardens?	No
Listed buildings or scheduled monuments?	There are a number of scheduled monuments in this area. Barrows to the SW near to the site
Accessibility – <i>local highway network, pedestrian connections, public rights of way or cycle routes</i>	The site adjoins the Drove public right of way. There are several rights of way in the area.
Recreational value	Yes.
VISUAL	

Where are the key viewpoints – <i>public rights of way, settlements and residential properties.</i>	The key views are from the residential properties on the north edge of the village; Stainers Lane, to the west and north of the site; Alresford Drove looking north and from Wonston Lane.
Prominence/visibility?	Open to the surroundings, long views to the north
Enclosure/Openness?	Open
Distinct skylines?	Forms part of skyline when seen from lower elevations to the north
Scope to mitigate?	
Key visual or functional corridor?	No
Significant outward views from within settlements?	Yes.
Views on approach to the settlements from the principal approach roads?	
Views outwards	

The site has been ranked for its overall sensitivity to housing development using the following criteria:

Landscape Character Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Important landscape components or landscape character types of a particularly distinctive and highly valued character and rarity, which might be extremely sensitive to disturbance or very vulnerable to even slight changes, such that the change from rural to urban characteristics could not be mitigated to acceptable levels. A notable absence of intrusive or detracting influences and evidence of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tranquillity; • unspoilt character; • rurality, remoteness or wildness • dark night skies; • natural beauty; • wildlife; and • cultural heritage.
High	<p>Valued landscape components or landscape character types of importance and rarity or the landscape is vulnerable to change and :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character, identity or setting of a nearby settlement; or • contributes to the setting of a nationally protected landscape; or • could only accommodate limited change with some impact on landscape components or character; or • is unlikely to be capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels.

Medium	Landscape components or landscape character which is susceptible to change and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. However, there could be scope to mitigate some sensitivity through careful siting and design.
Low	These landscapes may have some value for their rural character, beauty and tranquillity but these qualities are eroded or influenced by existing urban land uses or other 'detracting' influences.
Very Low	Landscape components or landscape character of relatively low importance and rarity, or degraded, possibly as a result of major urban development at a local scale. These landscapes are resilient to change or they are of relatively low intrinsic value.

Visual sensitivity

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	Development would result in a complete or substantial change in the view or the change would be prominent, involving complete or substantial obstruction of the existing view, or complete change in the character and composition of the view through the removal of key elements or the introduction of uncharacteristic elements. Highly sensitive receptors <i>eg</i> residential properties, public rights of way, cycle routes or open access land. Land above the average elevation for the area.
High	Development would result in a significant change in the view which may involve partial obstruction of the existing view or partial change in the character and composition of the view through the introduction of new elements or the removal of existing elements. Change may be prominent but would not substantially alter the scale and character of the surroundings and the wider setting. Sensitive receptors might include users of the local road network, public open spaces and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
Medium	The composition of views would alter and the quality of the view may be partially changed through the introduction of features which, though uncharacteristic, may not necessarily be discordant. Moderately sensitive receptors might include major transport corridors, commercial or industrial premises, formal sports facilities.
Low	A very slight change in the view which might be distinguishable from the surroundings.
Very Low	No part of the proposed development or work activity associated with it would be discernible.

Value

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	National or international designated landscape <i>eg</i> National Park;
High	'Unspoilt' rural character, special cultural associations, recognised views, evidence of scenic beauty or tranquillity, Historic Park or Garden, former 'Area of Special Landscape Quality' (ASLQ).

Medium	Strong rural character well used public rights of way or cycle routes in the immediate area, some cultural associations.
Low	Urban fringe...
Very Low	Degraded or 'spoilt' landscape with 'detracting' or 'intrusive' influences

For the site, each of these three aspects is ranked according to their sensitivity and given an overall sensitivity score using a 'matrix' as follows:

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Value</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>					


For this site the Overall Landscape Sensitivity to a housing development is assessed as follows

	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
<i>Landscape character sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Visual sensitivity</i>		4			
<i>Value</i>			3		
<i>Overall sensitivity</i>	= 11 high sensitivity				

Overall Sensitivity scores

- 15 /14 = **very high sensitivity:** *protection from development is the only option*
- 13/12/11 = **high sensitivity :** *protection from development is the preferred option*
- 10/9/8 = **high medium/medium/ low medium:** *development could be accommodated without changing landscape character with certain provisos.*
- 7/6/5 = **low:** *a well designed development could enhance character and appearance*
- 4/3 = **very low sensitivity:** *Development would enhance character and appearance.*

South Wonston: SW07



1.0 Heritage assets potentially affected by the site allocation

- None designated within the site.
- SAM Barrow to the SE, List UID: 1013345
- SAM Barrow to the SE, List UID: 1015983
- SAM Barrow to the North, List UID: 1021109

2.0 Contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

- The site makes no contribution to the three local SAM's. They are visually separated from the site by development and vegetation.

3.0 Impact the allocation might have on that significance (Positive and Negative)

- N/A

4.0 Summary heritage appraisal on whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate

- This site is acceptable/appropriate in principle from a heritage perspective as there is no identified harm.


SHELAA high-level transport review

Site Location: South Wonston

Site Name: SW07

5th July 2022

Issue 01




Hampshire Services
Economy, Transport & Environment
Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court
Winchester
Hants
SO23 8UD

Site Location: South Wonston

Site Name: SW07

1. Site Access & Costings



Can motor vehicle access be established (number of access points in brackets) **Yes (1)**

Estimate of cost to establish site access (RAG) High/Medium/Low **Medium**

Access to site SW07 could be gained from Westhill Road North subject to adequate visibility splays being achieved. There is poor existing provision for pedestrians and cyclists in this location, with little scope to significantly improve this. Development of this site offers the potential to provide a footway on the western side of Westhill Road North to link to existing footway on eastern side of the road. This could help to provide better linkages southwards into the village where the existing amenities are located.

Access to this site could still be possible even if a section of the site (in the south-eastern corner) was removed from the development site boundary.

2. Speed Limit

Speed limit of road where primary motor vehicle access is proposed: 30mph.

3. Modal Share

Of the existing residents in this area, 3% commute on foot and 3% by public transport. These levels are both lower than averages for Winchester, Hampshire and England. 59% commute by motor vehicle, higher than all three averages and bicycle commutes are at 2%, higher than the Winchester average and matching the Hampshire and English average

	LSOA site	Winchester	Hampshire	England
Work mainly at or from home	5%	6%	4%	3%
Public transport	4%	6%	5%	11%
Motor vehicle	59%	45%	51%	41%
Bicycle	2%	1%	2%	2%
On foot	3%	9%	6%	7%
Other method of travel to work	0%	1%	1%	0%
Not in employment	26%	32%	30%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall this area has some potential for enabling trips by sustainable modes of transport and reducing car dependency.

4. Safety



A red triangle indicates a fatal collision, a blue square a serious collision and a green circle a slight collision

Split View of PIC Data (500m)

Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	RAG rating
0	0	1	1	Amber

The PIC data associated with SW07 shows 1 recorded collision within a 500m radius of the site over a 5 year period. The collision was classified as slight and occurred on Downs Road, not within close proximity to the site.