

2. Landscape and Visual

Introduction

- 2.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development in relation to landscape character and visual amenity.
- 2.2 In line with **Chapter 1: Introduction**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both Primary and Tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 1: Introduction** for further details) and is informed by the EIA Scoping process and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 2.3 This Chapter, and its associated **Appendix 2.1** (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)), is intended to be read as part of the wider Environmental Statement (ES) with particular reference to **Chapter 1** as well as **Chapter 3: Built Heritage**.

Summary of Consultation

- 2.4 The Scoping Report, prepared by Atmos Consulting to support the 2025 ES, provided the following commentary on consultation:

“As part of the Screening Opinion provided in January 2022 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council stated concerns over the proximity to North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and can be considered to be in its setting.

Due to the location of roads, lanes, public footpaths and byways running within and near to the site, it is the Councils view that there would be adverse visual impacts arising from the Proposed Development.

As part of the EIA Screening Request in November 2021 and the pre-application advice requested in July 2022, the Applicant sought agreement on the number and location of viewpoints. Confirmation of viewpoints was not provided in the EIA Screening response or pre-application advice response on 11 November 2022.

However, the preapplication response noted that the number of viewpoints were considered low and would need to:

“include all key vantage points around the perimeters of the site, along rights of way which run in close proximity to the proposals, and along the track which runs through the site. Viewpoints will also be needed from key locations further out into the landscape around the site, also capturing public vantage points along rights of way and roads/lanes. Views from within local villages will also need to be included, as well as views from within the North Wessex Downs AONB.”

As such the number of viewpoints has been reviewed and a revised list presented in Section 4.4.”

- 2.5 The viewpoints remain the same and unchanged within the 2026 ES as the 2025 ES.
- 2.6 Further to the Scoping carried out as part of the 2025 ES, an email was issued to the Principal Landscape and Planning Officer at North Wessex Downs National Landscape on 2nd February 2026, requesting any comments on the Proposed Development and the scope of the LVIA assessment. A response was not received. For robustness, a viewpoint was included from the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, informed by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and from the churchyard of the Church of All Saints to demonstrate the potential impact on the visual amenity of receptors using the church and churchyard. These two viewpoints were in addition to those within the 2025 ES.
- 2.7 **Table 2.1** provides an overview of consultation undertaken to inform this assessment.

Table 2.1: Summary of Technical Consultation

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Influence on Assessment
North Wessex Downs National Landscape	02/02/26	Requested feedback on the Proposed Development in relation to the National Landscape.	No feedback received – for robustness an additional viewpoint was added from the closest public right of way (PRoW) to the Site within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape.

Scope of the Assessment

- 2.8 The scope of assessment for landscape and visual was established through the EIA Scoping process. The EIA Scoping Report was submitted to BDBC in February 2023, and the EIA Scoping Opinion was received in June 2023.
- 2.9 The current LVIA has been prepared with due regard to the agreed scope established for the previous assessment. The assessment of landscape receptors remains consistent with the scope adopted in the 2025 ES, thereby enabling continuity in the evaluation of likely effects on landscape character. Whilst the previous LVIA considered visual effects solely through the assessment of representative viewpoints and did not include an assessment of visual receptors, the current LVIA expands upon this approach by identifying and assessing visual receptors associated with the agreed representative viewpoints. The representative viewpoints have been retained as the primary means of illustrating the nature and extent of visual change and are used to demonstrate the likely significant effects experienced by the identified visual receptor groups. This approach is considered proportionate and appropriate, reflecting current good practice guidance whilst maintaining alignment with the scope previously agreed through the EIA process.

Effects Scoped Out

- 2.10 The following effect(s) have been scoped out since the EIA Scoping stage. Evidence is provided within **Appendix 2.1** which demonstrates why the potential impact on these receptors is found to be '*Not Significant*' and therefore not considered further in this Chapter:

Potential impact of the Proposed Development on landscape character and views from LCA16 - Basingstoke Down (Construction)

- 2.11 While construction activities would result in direct and noticeable, but temporary, changes to the character of the Site itself through the presence of exposed ground, construction plant, vehicle movements, site compounds and protective fencing, these effects would be limited in geographical extent and confined primarily to the Site. Within the wider LCA, the expansive scale of the downland landscape, together with the influence of existing landform, hedgerows and vegetation, would generally restrict intervisibility and reduce the extent of indirect effects. Any localised changes arising from construction activity would be temporary, reversible and would not materially alter the key characteristics or perceptual qualities that define the wider Basingstoke Down landscape. Consequently, significant effects on landscape character and views within LCA 16 during the construction stage are not anticipated and have therefore been scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential impact of the Proposed Development on landscape character and views from North Wessex Downs National Landscape (Construction and Operation)

- 2.12 The Proposed Development is located outside the designated landscape and would not result in any direct effects on its special qualities, landscape character or physical components during either the construction or operation stages.
- 2.13 During construction, temporary views of site activity, construction plant, hoardings and disturbed ground may be perceptible from limited locations along the eastern edge of the National Landscape; however, these effects would be distant, localised and restricted by intervening landform and vegetation.
- 2.14 During operation, the Proposed Development may be intermittently visible from some elevated locations and routes with open east-facing aspects, where it would be experienced as a small-scale and distant feature within the wider landscape context. Viewpoint assessment (provided within **Appendix 2.1**) demonstrates only a very limited extent of visibility from within the National Landscape, with the Proposed Development seen in the context of the settled edge of Basingstoke. Consequently, effects on the landscape character, setting and views from the North Wessex Downs National Landscape have been scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of footpath 161/6/1 to the west of the Site

- 2.15 Visibility of the Proposed Development would vary considerably along the route of the footpath as a result of changes in topography, vegetation cover and proximity to the Site.
- 2.16 During the construction stage, views from much of the footpath would be either screened, distant or imperceptible. While users at locations closest to the Site may experience temporary views of construction activity, including hoarding, construction

vehicles, exposed ground and the gradual installation of solar infrastructure, these effects would be localised and limited to sections of the route where breaks in existing tree cover permit views towards the Site.

- 2.17 During the operation stage, the greatest potential visibility would occur from the central section of the footpath, where solar PV arrays within the southern part of the Site would be visible in the middle distance. However, the slightly elevated position of the footpath relative to the Site would result in the Proposed Development being viewed below the horizon, reducing its perceived prominence and allowing it to appear relatively recessive within the wider landscape. Elsewhere, visibility would be restricted by intervening landform and vegetation, with only occasional filtered glimpses available through gaps in hedgerows and woodland. Therefore, effects on the Public Right of Way users of footpath 161/6/1 have been scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of footpaths to the southern edge of Sherborne St. John and Monk Sherborne

- 2.18 During the construction and operation stage, any changes to views would be experienced as small-scale and distant. These changes would be viewed within a broad rural landscape context and would not materially alter the overall composition or character of views due to the retention of the intervening landscape. Where visibility is indicated on the ZTV (**Figure 2.6**), principally from elevated locations on the southern edge of Sherborne St John, the Proposed Development would generally be perceived as a very small and distant component of the wider landscape. Therefore, visual effects on the Public Right of Way users of footpaths to the southern edge of Sherborne St. John and Monk Sherborne have been scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of Byway 258/9/2 within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape to the west of the Site

- 2.19 During construction, changes to views would be small-scale and distant, limited to construction activity such as vehicle movements, temporary hoarding, exposed ground and installation of solar infrastructure. These would form a minor element in distant views and would not materially alter the route's visual experience. During operation, visibility would be limited to sections of the byway with open east-facing views. At about 1.3 km from the route and filtered by landform, hedgerows and vegetation, only parts of the Proposed Development would be visible. Where seen, it would appear as a very small, distant feature towards the edge of Basingstoke, rather than within the principal views across the National Landscape. As such, visual effects on the Public Right of Way users of Byway 258/9/2 have been scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Road users of the A339

- 2.20 During both the construction and operation stages, road users would experience a noticeable but temporary change within the middle distance of views arising from construction activity, including vehicle movements, temporary hoarding, areas of exposed ground and the progressive installation of solar infrastructure. However, these changes would affect only a limited portion of the wider view and would be experienced as brief and transient due to the fast-moving and sequential nature of

views available from the road corridor. Given the transient nature of views experienced by road users, the distance to the Proposed Development and the retention of the wider landscape character and visual context, effects on users of the A339 are anticipated to be no greater than minor adverse and not significant, and are therefore scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Road users of Rookery Farm Lane

- 2.21 During both the construction and operation stages, the Proposed Development would result in noticeable changes to views from sections of the lane due to its close proximity to the Site. During construction, users would experience views of construction traffic, site hoarding, enabling works, areas of exposed ground and the progressive installation of solar infrastructure, introducing temporary urbanising elements that would contrast with the existing rural and agricultural character of the landscape. During operation, solar arrays and associated infrastructure would form a new engineered component within near-field views, particularly from short sections of the route where the lane passes adjacent to, or between, development parcels. However, the solar arrays would appear as low-height horizontal features, and views would be partially filtered by existing roadside hedgerows, boundary vegetation and subtle variations in landform. Furthermore, visual effects would be experienced sequentially and transiently by road users travelling along the route, with clearer views generally limited to localised gaps in vegetation and field access points rather than forming a continuous visual influence. Consequently, road users of Rookery Farm Lane are scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Users of the Church of All Saints including Churchyard

- 2.22 During both the construction and operation stages, the Proposed Development would be experienced as a localised and peripheral element within a limited proportion of views from the churchyard (as demonstrated by **Figure 7.24** of **Appendix 2.1**). Existing mature vegetation along the southern edge of the churchyard and field boundary planting west of Rookery Farm Lane would partially filter views, reducing the prominence of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Proposed Development would form a small component within the wider landscape setting of the church and would not materially alter the overall character of views or the experience of the churchyard. Therefore, users of the Church of All Saints are scoped out of further detailed assessment.

Effects Scoped In

- 2.23 The following effects (**Table 2.2**) were considered likely to be significant and are considered within this Chapter.

Table 2.2: Likely Significant Effects for Assessment

Effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable Stage(s)
Changes to key characteristics of the Landscape character	Site/Landscape Fabric	Construction and Operation

Effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable Stage(s)
Changes to visual amenity	Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1)	Construction and Operation

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

- 2.24 The following legislation and national and local planning policy and guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 2.1: LVIA**.

Legislative Context

- 2.25 The relevant legislative context includes:

- European Landscape Convention (ELC)ⁱ; and
- Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act)ⁱⁱ.

Policy Context

- 2.26 The relevant policy context includes:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026)ⁱⁱⁱ;
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure^{iv}
- National Policy Statement for energy^v
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2016)^{vi};
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update 2021 to 2040 Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation (2024)^{vii}; and
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024 to 2042 Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation (2025)^{viii}.

Guidance and Best Practice

- 2.27 The following guidance / advice has also informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter:

- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)^{ix};
- National Design Guide^x;
- North Wessex Downs National Landscape – An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2025-2030 (2025)^{xi};

- Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity Study (2021)/Landscape Sensitivity Study Addendum (2025)^{xii};
- Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity to Wind and Solar Energy Development Rev D (2024)^{xiii};
- Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment (2021)^{xiv};
- Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document (2018)^{xv};
- Basingstoke and Deane Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document - Appendix 14 – Countryside Design Summary (2008)^{xvi};
- North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study (2010)^{xvii};
- Green Infrastructure Strategy for Basingstoke and Deane (2018 to 2029)^{xviii};
- North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement Renewable Energy (2012)^{xix};
- North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement Setting (2019)^{xx};
- North Wessex Downs Landscape Character Assessment (2025)^{xxi};
- Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment (2012)^{xxii}; and
- Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan 2011 to 2029 (as modified 2024)^{xxiii}.

Study Area

- 2.28 The study area for the landscape and visual assessment comprises the area within which there is potential for the Proposed Development to result in significant landscape or visual effects. The extent of the study area is established as part of the baseline appraisal. It is likely that the Proposed Development would be visible from some points beyond the study area but the effects of this would be so minor that detailed assessment is not warranted (as they would not be significant effects for the purposes of an EIA). This approach is supported by Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA 3)^{xxiv}, which states that the scale of assessment should be appropriate and proportional to the nature of the development proposed.
- 2.29 The study area for the assessment includes both the Site and the surrounding wider landscape context within 2km (landscape character study area) (**Figure 2.1**) and 5km (visual amenity study area) (**Figure 2.6**) radius of the Site. The landscape character assessment considers the Site at a local level, through the determination of local landscape character areas within a defined study area, and the identification of landscape features. The visual assessment considers the existing and potential views experienced within this defined study area, but it may also include other identified views that may be from locations beyond the study area, such as from vantage points from elevated landscapes.

Baseline Data Collection

2.30 The background studies that have informed this Chapter are set out below:

- **A preliminary desk study** - undertaken to establish the physical components of the Site and its surroundings along with potential key visual receptors. Ordnance Survey (OS) maps and aerial photography were utilised to identify these features.
- **A field study** - undertaken by an experienced chartered landscape architect from Turley LVIA team on 14th January 2026, during which the visibility was good. The field study recorded the Site and surrounding context landscape features and verified the key visual receptors identified in the desk study. It involved travelling throughout the study area and producing a working photographic record of the area.
- **Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (Figure 2.6)**
- **Accurate Visualisations of the Proposed Development (AVRs)** prepared by Ocean CGI (included within **Appendix 3 of Appendix 2.1**)

Assessment Process

2.31 This assessment considers the likely landscape and visual effects arising during both the construction and operation stages of the Proposed Development. Decommissioning has not been assessed separately in detail, as any effects associated with the removal of the Proposed Development are anticipated to be temporary and broadly comparable in nature, extent and duration to those identified for the construction phase. It is therefore reasonable to assume that decommissioning effects would not give rise to materially different landscape and visual effects from those already assessed for construction.

2.32 The methodology for LVIA) is based on current best practice as set out in:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA 3) (Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013) and related documents;
 - Landscape Character Assessment, 2016 (Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 08/2015)^{xxv};
 - Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations, 2021 (Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21)^{xxvi}; and
 - Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 06/2019)^{xxvii}.

2.33 GLVIA 3 states that this type of assessment provides a tool for identifying and assessing “...the effects of change resulting from development on both the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people’s views and visual amenity” (Paragraph 1.1). The guidance emphasises the importance of carrying two interlinked

elements in assessments; landscape (or townscape) as a resource; and, visual amenity, including views. The effects of both must be addressed in the assessment.

2.34 For EIA purposes, a definition of the environmental effects to be considered in the LVIA is provided in GLVIA3 as below:

- **Landscape effects** relate to the predicted effects of change and development on the landscape as a resource. Landscape effects can be generated by a development's effect upon the elements that make up the landscape, the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape and its distinctive character (GLVIA3, page 70). These include physical effects on landscape features such as loss of trees or removal of structures. This also includes how the addition of new elements or features will influence the character and distinctiveness of the landscape.
- **Visual effects** relate to the predicted change to the view and the related impacts on the general visual amenity experienced by people – the visual receptors, (normally restricted to views from publicly accessible locations). A view is defined in GLVIA3 as a single sight or prospect that can be seen from a particular place or location. The visual amenity is defined as the overall pleasantness of what people can see in their surroundings (GLVIA3, page 158). Therefore, a view may have elements within it that change significantly, but the overall pleasantness could remain the same. Visual receptors typically include pedestrians, users of public rights of way/recreational facilities and drivers and passengers of vehicles/rail passengers.

Reporting the Environmental Effects and Significance

2.35 The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity, magnitude of change, the level of effect and significance.

Identifying Landscape Receptors and Sensitivity to Change

- 2.36 The sensitivity of landscape receptors relates to the value attached to that receptor and the susceptibility of the receptor to the type of change or development proposed.
- 2.37 The key landscape receptors (landscape character areas, landscape features or landscape characteristics) with potential to be affected by the Proposed Development are identified and a judgement is made on the value of each of these receptors. This judgement is made based on the approach set out in GLVIA3 and Technical Guidance Note 02/21 (Assessing landscape value outside national designations) and as described below.
- 2.38 The value of each of the identified landscape receptors is assessed with reference to the following criteria and the definitions of level of value set out in **Table 2.3**:
- Any designations or policies (both national and local), which may be present; and,
 - The presence or absence of other attributes, which contribute to landscape value, such as natural heritage, cultural heritage, landscape condition,

associations (with notable people, events and the arts), distinctiveness, recreation value, perceptual aspects (scenic, wildness and tranquillity) and functional aspects including links with designated landscapes.

Table 2.3: Value of Landscape Receptors

Value	Typical Level of Designation/ Rarity	Potential Attributes
High	International, National, Regional	Landscape of notable character with unique or place-defining features and elements. Could include National Parks, National Landscapes, World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens and/or a high level of highly graded heritage assets. Clearly coherent landscape character with distinctive features and strong aesthetic qualities, high levels of tranquillity and relative wildness. Minimal detracting elements and landscape features typically in good condition. High presence of good quality open space or multi-functional green infrastructure or public rights of way that contribute positively to the experience and usability of the landscape. No or limited potential for substitution.
Medium	Regional, Local	Landscape of some character, which is attractive, but with limited unique or place-defining features and elements. Could include local landscape designations, valued landscapes, some heritage assets and or other undesignated areas or features of notable scenic quality or recreational value with value perhaps expressed through non-official publications or demonstrable use. Some detracting elements and variety in the condition of landscape features. Some presence of open space or public rights of way that make a moderate contribution to the experience and usability of the landscape. Some potential for substitution.

Value	Typical Level of Designation/ Rarity	Potential Attributes
Low	Local	Landscape of little scenic value or importance. Could include ordinary / commonplace or unremarkable areas of landscape. Unremarkable landscape features or areas of landscape that are commonplace and not locally distinctive. Presence of dominant detracting elements and landscape features in poor or declining condition. Areas that are vehicle focussed or dominated by industrial or commercial uses. Considerable potential for substitution.

- 2.39 A range in value may be given to a landscape receptor depending on the combination of attributes (present or absent), and/or the level of designations present. For example, if an area is subject to a national landscape designation but has a high presence of detracting elements or a mixed landscape quality and condition then a high to medium value may be given.
- 2.40 GLVIA3 defines susceptibility as “...the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies” (Ref: 7.9 Paragraph 5.40).
- 2.41 Judgements on the susceptibility to change of each of the identified landscape receptors are made based on the scale set out in **Table 2.4**.

Table 2.4: Susceptibility to Change of Landscape Receptors

Susceptibility to change	Description
High	Landscape receptor ¹ would be unlikely to accommodate the type of development proposed without unacceptable negative consequences for the maintenance of the baseline landscape character and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. Landscape receptor has little or no relationship to the type of development proposed and/or would be difficult to replace or substitute if lost (e.g. veteran trees, historic or unique buildings and parkland). Characteristics of the landscape, which contribute to the landscape character are highly sensitive and would be fundamentally altered by the type of development proposed.
Medium	Landscape receptor would be compromised by the type of development proposed and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies would be compromised. Landscape receptor has some relationship to the type of development proposed and/or could be partially replaced or substituted if lost. Landscape receptor is moderately sensitive and characteristics of the receptor would be altered by the type of development proposed. The general landscape character would remain but would be weakened by the type of development proposed.
Low	Landscape receptor would be likely to accommodate the type of development proposed without unacceptable negative consequences for the maintenance of the baseline landscape character and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. Landscape receptor has a close relationship to the type of development proposed and could be easily replaced or substituted if lost. Landscape receptor is of low sensitivity and characteristics of the landscape would not be significantly altered by the type of development proposed. The general landscape character is resilient to change.

- 2.42 A judgement on the overall sensitivity of each landscape receptor (ranging from High to Low) is made. This is based on the combined evaluation of susceptibility and value attached to the receptor, together with informed professional judgement and guidance provided in GLVIA3. For example, a landscape receptor that has a High Sensitivity is likely to have a High Value and a High Susceptibility to change, a landscape receptor that has a Low Sensitivity is likely to have a Low Value and a Low Susceptibility to change.

¹ Includes landscape character areas, landscape features or components and particular aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape.

Identifying Visual Receptors and Sensitivity to Change

- 2.43 The sensitivity of the visual receptor comprises a judgement on the value attached to the views and an assessment of the susceptibility of each receptor to the type of change proposed.
- 2.44 The baseline visual appraisal establishes the area in which the Site, and Proposed Development, may be visible; the different groups of people who may experience the views of the development (defined as visual receptors); and the nature of these views. These factors interrelate, but for the purpose of the assessment are dealt with in that order.
- 2.45 In most visual assessments, unless specifically requested by the local planning authority (LPA), visual receptors are restricted to groups of people in publicly accessible places, and their experience of views/viewing experience. Representative views are identified to reflect typical views experienced by the visual receptor in order to inform the visual assessment.
- 2.46 A judgement on the value attached to the views is made with reference to the following criteria and the definitions of value set out in **Table 2.5**.
- Planning designations (e.g. Designated Views or Protected Vistas identified in local or regional planning policy);
 - Other designations relating to landscape features, landscape designations or heritage assets (e.g. key views identified in conservation area appraisals or National Landscape Management Plans); and,
 - Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors (e.g. views identified in guidebooks or on tourist maps, official viewpoints (often with sign boards and interpretive material) or views referenced in literature or art).

Table 2.5: Value attached to Views

Value	Typical level of designation / Rarity	Attributes
High	International, National, Regional,	View or views experienced by the receptor identified or protected at international, national or regional level recognised through designation or planning documents. View or views experienced by the receptors having a designed relationship with wider landscape features of high importance, and/or having a high aesthetic/scenic quality.
Medium	Regional, Local	View or views experienced by the receptor that are identified or protected at local level (e.g. identified in local planning policy or guidance). May also include views experienced by the receptors which are undesignated, but value perhaps expressed through non-official publications or its contribution to

Value	Typical level of designation / Rarity	Attributes
		enjoyment of the significance of a heritage asset or public open space or have some aesthetic quality that that contribute positively to the visual amenity experienced by the receptor.
Low	Local	The view or views experienced by the receptors is/are not related to designated, or non-designated, heritage assets, or a planning designation; and/or mentioned in guidebooks or on tourist maps; and/or referenced in art and literature. Typical or unremarkable view or views or little visual amenity importance or views that do not contribute positively to the visual amenity experienced by the receptor.

2.47 A range in value may be given for the views depending on the combination of attributes (present or absent), and/or the level of designations present. For example, if identified views are experienced in a national landscape designation but has a high presence of visual detractors then a high to medium value may be given.

2.48 The assessment of susceptibility of visual receptors is based on the approach set out in paragraph 7.32 of GLVIA3, which states:

“...the susceptibility of different visual receptors to changes in views and visual amenity is mainly a function of:

- The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations: and,*
- The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focussed on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.”*

2.49 Judgements on the susceptibility of a visual receptor to change are broadly based on the descriptions of susceptibility set out in **Table 2.6**.

Table 2.6: Susceptibility to Change of Visual Receptors

Susceptibility	Description
High	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of high importance to the experience or activity, including: people engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and on particular views (e.g. waymarked walks through the landscape); and visitors to heritage assets or other attractions, where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience.
Medium	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of moderate importance to the experience or activity including: travellers on most road or rail routes.
Low	Receptors for whom the view and visual amenity is of low importance to the experience or activity, including: people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape; and people at their place of work whose attention may be focussed on their work, not on their surroundings, and where the setting is not important to the quality of working life.

- 2.50 A judgement on the overall sensitivity of each visual receptor (ranging from High to Low) is made. This is based on the combined evaluation of susceptibility and value attached to the receptor, together with informed professional judgement and guidance provided in GLVIA3. For example, a visual receptor that has a High Sensitivity is likely to have a High Value and a High Susceptibility to change, a visual receptor that has a Low Sensitivity is likely to have a Low Value and a Low Susceptibility to change.

Assessing Significance of Effect

Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 2.51 The assessment of landscape effects considers the sensitivity of the landscape receptor and the magnitude of change. The level of effect is then concluded as major, moderate, minor or negligible, and professional judgement is used to determine whether the effect is Significant.
- 2.52 Potential landscape effects arising during the operational stage of the Proposed Development have been assessed at Year 1 (i.e. the year after the completion of the construction works), and Year 15, once the mitigation planting has established and matured, and would therefore offer some filtering or screening to views.

Magnitude of Change on Landscape Receptors

- 2.53 The magnitude of change considers the size or scale, the geographical extent and the duration and reversibility of the change. Judgements on the magnitude of landscape effect are broadly based on the descriptions of magnitude of change set out in **Table 2.7**.
- 2.54 Consideration is also given to the type of effect in terms of whether it is Adverse, Beneficial or Neutral. GLVIA3 states that an informed professional judgement should

be made about whether the landscape/townscape effects should be categorised as positive or negative (or in some cases neutral), with the criteria used in reaching this judgement clearly stated. Therefore, a judgement is made on the nature of the overall effect which is based on the following terms:

- **Adverse:** overall harm to landscape character/feature.
- **Beneficial:** overall improvement to landscape character/feature.
- **Neutral:** no overall harm or improvement to landscape character/feature (likely to be the result of a combination of both adverse and beneficial effects or very small changes).

Table 2.7: Defining Magnitude of Change – Landscape Receptors

Magnitude of Change	Definition
Large	Substantial change to all or most of the key characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of major new elements and landscape features. Changes would substantially alter the character of a large area.
Medium	Partial change to some of the key characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of new elements, which would be notable features. Changes would result in a large change to the character of a small area or a noticeable change to a larger area.
Small (or very small)	Limited (or very limited) or localised change to common characteristics of a landscape receptor and/or addition of new elements or features in keeping with the existing character. Changes would result in a small (or very small) change to the character of a large area or a noticeable change to a small area. Also includes temporary and/or reversible changes of larger scale or extent.
Negligible	No, or barely discernible, change to landscape receptor.

Assessment of Visual Effects

- 2.55 The assessment of visual effects considers the sensitivity of the visual receptor and the magnitude of change. The level of effect is then concluded as major, moderate, minor or negligible and professional judgement is used to determine whether the effect is Significant.
- 2.56 Potential visual effects arising during the operational stage of the Proposed Development have been assessed at Year 1 (i.e. the year after the completion of the construction works), and Year 15, once the mitigation planting has established and matured, and would therefore offer some filtering or screening to views.

Magnitude of Change on Visual Receptors

- 2.57 The magnitude of change considers the size or scale, the geographical extent and the duration and reversibility of the change. Judgements on the magnitude of visual effect are broadly based on the descriptions of magnitude of change set out in **Table 2.8**.

2.58 The assessment of the magnitude of change on visual receptors takes into account the following factors:

- Type and relative numbers of people, and their occupation or activity;
- Nature and characteristics of the location within the landscape and proximity to the Site;
- Nature, composition and characteristics of the views (including directions);
- Elements which may interrupt, filter or otherwise influence the views; and
- Seasonal changes in the view.

2.59 As per the landscape assessment, consideration is then given to the type of effect in terms of whether it is Adverse, Beneficial or Neutral as follows:

- **Adverse:** overall harm to the character and appearance of the view, and the viewing experience.
- **Beneficial:** overall improvement to the character and appearance of the view, and the viewing experience.
- **Neutral:** no overall harm or improvement to the character and appearance of the view, and the viewing experience (likely to be the result of a combination of both adverse and beneficial effects or very small changes).

2.60 A range for the magnitude of change experienced by the visual receptor along different parts of a route was considered and the full range of effects is described in the assessment. An overall effect on visual amenity is then provided which considered the overall change to visual amenity experienced by a visual receptor travelling on the identified route.

Table 2.8: Defining Magnitude of Change – Visual Receptors

Magnitude of Change	Definition
Large	Substantial change to the key characteristics of the views / visual experience and/or addition of major new elements, which would be prominent features. Changes would substantially alter the character and appearance of views experienced by the receptor.
Medium	Partial change to some of the key characteristics of the views / visual experience and/or addition of new elements, which would be notable features. Changes would result in a large change to the character and appearance of a small extent of views or a noticeable change to a larger extent of views experienced by the receptor.
Small (or very small)	Limited (or very limited) and localised changes to views / visual experience and/or addition of new elements, which would be noticeable features but largely in keeping with the existing character and appearance of views experienced by the receptor. Changes would result in a small (or very small) change to the character and appearance of a large extent of views or a noticeable change to a small extent of views. Also includes temporary and/or reversible changes of larger scale or extent within the views experienced by the receptor.
Negligible	No, or barely discernible, change to the views experienced by the receptor.

Level of Effect

- 2.61 The level of effect is informed by the sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of change and is determined using professional judgement. **Table 2.9** (reproduced from **Chapter 2**) is used as a tool to assist with this process. The level of effect is expressed as Major, Moderate, Minor or Negligible.
- 2.62 Whilst **Table 2.9** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement.

Table 2.9: Matrix of effects

Magnitude of change	Sensitivity (or value/importance)				
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
	Large	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

2.63 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be 'beneficial' or 'adverse' or 'neutral':

- **Major effect:** where the Proposed Development is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability, or is of the highest sensitivity;
- **Moderate effect:** where the Proposed Development is likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor, which has a degree of adaptability, tolerance or recoverability, or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability;
- **Minor effect:** where the Proposed Development is likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor, which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Proposed Development is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor, which can adapt, is tolerant of the change, or/and can recover from the change; and
- **Negligible:** where the Proposed Development is unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity, or there is a considerable change at a receptor, which is not sensitive to a change.

2.64 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is, up to 1 year, medium-term is, between 1 and 10 years, and long-term is greater than 10 years.

2.65 For each effect assessed, the following characteristics have been considered and reported:

- Whether the effect is adverse or beneficial;
- Whether the effect is direct or indirect;

- Whether the effect is permanent or temporary; and
- The duration of the effect (short-term, medium-term, or long-term).

Significance

- 2.66 For each effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is 'Significant' or 'Not Significant'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and/or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable.
- 2.67 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 2.68 A baseline landscape and visual appraisal of the Site and its surroundings was undertaken by a chartered landscape architect and is set out in full within the standalone LVIA (**Appendix 2.1**). A summary of the landscape and visual baseline conditions for receptors that are subject to significant effects and therefore considered within this Chapter is set out below. Baseline conditions for other receptors are set out within the standalone LVIA. The landscape comprises a number of resources or receptors; these are defined within GLVIA3 as the "*...constituent elements of the landscape, its specific aesthetic or perceptual qualities and the character of the landscape in different areas*". These form the elements or 'units' which need to be considered when assessing the potential landscape effect of a proposed scheme or other change. The final stage of the baseline landscape appraisal was therefore to identify the key landscape receptors with potential to be affected by the Proposed Development. **Appendix 2.1** includes detailed information on the landscape character context of the Site at national and local level. It also includes the identification of Local Landscape Character Areas (LLCA) and a description of the key characteristics of these areas.

Site/Landscape Fabric

- 2.69 The Site itself comprises of a series of agricultural fields, contained by rural roads and boundary hedge planting. The area has a transitional character between the North Wessex Downs National Landscape to the west and the fringe of Basingstoke urban area to the east.
- 2.70 In summary, the principal landscape features which contribute to the character of LLCA2 have been identified as:
- Rolling landform;
 - Field hedgerows and hedgerow trees (eroded in places by removal as a result of twentieth century farming practices);
 - Fringes of the urban area of Basingstoke; and
 - Generally arable/pastoral farmland.

Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1) (Figure 2.2)

- 2.71 St James' Way runs along the eastern edge of the Site forming the boundary of the Site with the neighbouring Weybrook Park Golf Club. The route is a long distance footpath which follows a north–south alignment as it passes the Site. The route then turns into the Site in a westerly direction where it forms part of byway 161/4/1 and 161/5/1 eventually wrapping around the eastern side of All Saints Church where it travels onwards in a northerly direction towards Monk Sherborne and beyond. As the route passes the Site, it is defined by a mature, scrubby field edge which contains views into the Site, more open views to the Weybrook Park Golf Club (to the east of the Site and PRow) are possible from this route. The footpath has a predominantly rural character despite the proximity of urban development and managed golf course to the east.
- 2.72 The byway section of the path follows a gently curving, hedgerow corridor within an agricultural landscape which passes through the Site between two of the eastern fields. Views from the footpath are predominantly short-range and filtered, with the hedgerow limiting lateral visibility and directing views along the line of the route. Intermittent and limited breaks in vegetation allow views across rolling arable fields and pasture (as demonstrated by **Figure 7.5 of Appendix 2.1**). In some limited instances, these views are long distance, and wide in character.
- 2.73 Views from the footpath are generally short-range and filtered, with the scrubby field boundary limiting views into the Site and focusing views along the line of the path or into the more open landscape of the golf course. Intermittent gaps allow oblique views across the Site. Longer-distance views from this footpath are often limited by vegetation and local topography.

Future Baseline

- 2.74 Without the implementation of the Proposed Development, the baseline conditions would continue to evolve with key changes being the continued growth of trees and hedgerows, albeit this is sometimes restricted due to hedge-clipping operations. As vegetation grows, this has the potential to result in an increase in visual containment and screening for some views from the adjacent roads and network of PRow. Agricultural practices within the Site would continue to be carried out. The overall value, susceptibility to change and sensitivity of the receptors would remain unchanged as a result of the anticipated future baseline.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

- 2.75 The assessment within this Chapter takes account of mitigation that is either inherent in the design of the Proposed Development (primary mitigation) or will be implemented through standard practice or statutory requirements (tertiary mitigation), as described in **Chapter 1**.
- 2.76 The following measures have been taken into account in the assessment of effects:

Construction

- 2.77 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which have been evaluated as part of the construction stage assessment are outlined below:

- 2.78 At the construction stage, potential landscape and visual effects arising from the construction operations would be mitigated through the use of site hoardings, tree and hedgerow protection measures, management of construction traffic, control of working hours and other appropriate housekeeping on the Site in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Operation

- 2.79 The primary and tertiary mitigation measures embedded in the Proposed Development, and which have been evaluated as part of the operation stage assessment are outlined below. These measures will be secured through the Landscape Strategy that is submitted with the application:

- **Respect for Landscape Character and Openness** – The design aims to conserve the inherent openness and expansive character of the chalk downland landscape, avoiding the introduction of features or planting that would result in undue enclosure or suburbanisation.
- **Topography-Led Layout** – The siting of solar arrays responds directly to the gently rolling landform, with development directed towards lower-lying and less visually prominent areas, and away from skylines and elevated ground.
- **Minimisation of Visual Effects through Siting** – The Proposed Development establishes sensitive placement of infrastructure, rather than reliance on extensive new planting. Existing landform and vegetation would be utilised to reduce intervisibility and visual intrusion.
- **Protection and Enhancement of Existing Landscape Features** – Established hedgerows, tree belts and woodland would be retained and enhanced where appropriate, with measures focused on strengthening structure, improving condition, and infilling gaps in a manner consistent with local character.
- **Avoidance of Incongruous Mitigation Measures** – Proposed landscape interventions reflect traditional land management practices and consider the established landscape character of the Site including those characteristics identified in aforementioned landscape character appraisals. In particular, excessive hedgerow heights or substantial woodland belts that are uncharacteristic of the chalkland landscape shall be avoided.
- **Targeted Landscape Enhancement** – Where mitigation planting is required, it shall be localised and proportionate, focusing on reinforcing existing features (e.g. hedgerows and tree belts) rather than introducing new large-scale planting blocks.
- **Protection of Key Views and Visual Receptors** – The layout seeks to minimise effects on sensitive visual receptors, including:
 - Views to and from the Church of All Saints and its setting;
 - Views from the North Wessex Downs National Landscape; and

- Public rights of way, particularly St James' Way.
- **Setback from Sensitive Boundaries and Routes** – Solar arrays would be offset from visually sensitive edges, including road corridors and footpaths, to maintain a sense of openness and reduce perceived visual dominance.
- **Reduction of Intervisibility** – In areas of weak landscape structure, opportunities would be taken to reduce intervisibility through subtle enhancement of existing vegetation, including hedgerow reinforcement and understorey planting.
- **Reinforcement of Historic Landscape Pattern** – Where appropriate, the reinstatement of historic field boundaries is proposed to break up the scale of the development and improve landscape integration.
- **Integration with the Wider Landscape Context** – The Proposed Development has regard to its role within the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, ensuring that design decisions align with relevant management objectives, including those relating to landscape character and visual quality.

Assessment of Effects

Construction Stage

Potential impact of the Proposed Development on landscape character of Site/Landscape Fabric

- 2.80 During the construction stage, the landscape character of the Site would experience a noticeable but temporary change in its currently open, rural and gently undulating downland character. Topsoil stripping across sections of the field would introduce areas of bare ground and create a more exposed and utilitarian appearance. This would contrast with the prevailing agricultural landscape. The introduction of construction plant, vehicles, and temporary site compounds would further urbanise the localised area, adding movement, noise, and vertical elements that are uncharacteristic of the otherwise tranquil and sparsely developed landscape. Protective fencing around retained vegetation would add to this perception of enclosure and change, although it would help safeguard existing landscape features.
- 2.81 As construction progresses, the gradual installation of built elements would incrementally alter the site's character from simple agricultural fields to a more engineered landscape.
- 2.82 The sensitivity of the Site/landscape fabric is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium - large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, short-term, **adverse** effect which is considered to be **moderate to major**.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.83 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the construction stage over and above those identified in the section within this Chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.84 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for the Site/fabric is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.85 The effect would be **significant**.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1)

- 2.86 When passing the Site, users of this long distance footpath would experience close range views of construction works when seen through localised gaps in vegetation. The majority of views would be screened from this footpath by the established mature vegetation that runs along the western edge of the path as it passes the Site, and either side of the path running through the Site where the route becomes a byway. From the majority of the long distance footpath, beyond the immediate surroundings of the Site there would be no change to views from this PRoW, as evidenced by the visibility shown on the ZTV.
- 2.87 The sensitivity of the receptor is high . The overall magnitude of change to short distance views from this receptor at construction stage would be medium (due to a combination of negligible changes and large changes where localised breaks in the mature vegetation allow). From the wider long distance footpath, there would be no change to views, as demonstrated by the visibility shown in the ZTV.
- 2.88 Whilst the Proposed Development would introduce discernible change into views from sections of the route, the affected extent of the PRoW is relatively limited in the context of the overall length of the footpath within the study area. Furthermore, views of the Proposed Development are generally restricted to short sections of the route and, where available, are often partial in nature, with only components of the Proposed Development visible.
- 2.89 As users would experience these views as a transient receptor, moving along the route rather than remaining in a fixed location, the duration of exposure would be limited. Taking these factors into account, the magnitude of change is assessed as medium. Although the receptor sensitivity is high, the combination of the limited spatial extent of the affected route, the partial nature of available views, and the transient visual experience reduces the overall level of effect. Therefore, applying professional judgement, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, **adverse** effect which is considered to be **moderate**.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.90 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the construction stage over and above those identified in the section within this Chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.91 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.92 The effects would be **significant**.

Operation Stage

Potential impact of the Proposed Development on landscape character of Site/Landscape Fabric

- 2.93 The Proposed Development would result in direct effects on the Site/Landscape Fabric through the change in land use from arable farmland to an operational solar farm and the introduction of solar PV arrays and associated infrastructure (including fencing, access tracks and small ancillary equipment). This would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. The extent of effect would be moderated by the relatively low height of the PV arrays, and the retention of existing field boundaries and vegetation. In the early operation period, the Proposed Development may be perceived as increasing urbanising influences locally; however, as the Landscape Strategy establishes and matures, reinforcement planting would strengthen landscape structure, reduce intervisibility and assist in integrating the solar farm within the receiving landscape, reducing its prominence and influence on local character over time.
- 2.94 The retention of the existing field pattern, and introduction of historical field boundaries is considered a positive change to the Site's landscape fabric.
- 2.95 The sensitivity of the Site/landscape fabric is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium - high (at both year 1 and 15). Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, long-term, **adverse** effect which is considered to be **moderate to major**.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.96 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this Chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.97 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Site/Landscape Fabric is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.98 The effects would be **significant**.

Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1)

- 2.99 St James' Way runs immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Site, along the western edge of Weybrook Park Golf Club and through the north eastern part of the Site. Along the section that sits adjacent to the golf course the route sits within a shallow depression, with land rising toward both the Site and the golf course. A generally continuous belt of mature vegetation along the Site boundary substantially limits views into the Site, whereas views to the golf course are typically more open. The managed, recreational character of the golf course (including manicured fairways and associated features) introduces a more urban-fringe influence and reduces the sense of tranquillity and rural remoteness that may be experienced on other routes within the surrounding countryside.

- 2.100 Beyond the golf course, where the route passes through the Site, it becomes more enclosed by established vegetation on both sides, which limits outward views for much of its length. Visibility of the Site and Proposed Development would therefore be largely confined to field entrances and occasional breaks in the hedgerow/vegetation. Where such openings occur (as demonstrated by **Figure 7.3 of Appendix 2.1**), views across the adjacent fields would allow clearer, localised views of the solar panels and associated infrastructure. The layout has been designed to respond to landform by locating panels on lower parts of the fields where practicable; nonetheless, where visible, the engineered form and regular pattern of the arrays would contrast with the existing green, largely undeveloped rural view and would reduce perceived rurality at these locations.
- 2.101 St James' Way passes around Queens Cottages and alongside the eastern side of the Church of All Saints, at which point field boundaries are more fragmented and vegetation cover is less continuous. As a result, there is potential for more open, short-range views into the north-eastern field. The layout has been designed to limit the prominence of the Proposed Development from this section of the route by setting the solar PV arrays on the lower part of the field and increasing the offset from the Byway. This would help to retain a foreground of agricultural land in view and reduce the extent to which the solar arrays are perceived in direct association with the route (as demonstrated by **Figure 7.5 of Appendix 2.1**).
- 2.102 For large parts of the footpath, there would be a lack of visibility into the Site. As demonstrated by **Figure 7.3 of Appendix 2.1**, there are points where breaks in this treed edge, allowing for views into the Site. At these localised points, there would be short-distance views of the Site where the fencing, panels and associated infrastructure would be visible. These elements would detract from the existing character of views which is generally green and undeveloped.
- 2.103 The sensitivity of the receptor is high. At year 1, the overall magnitude of change to views from this receptor would be medium (due to a combination of negligible changes and large changes where localised breaks in the mature vegetation allow).
- 2.104 Whilst the Proposed Development would introduce discernible change into views from sections of the route, the affected extent of the PRow is relatively limited in the context of the overall length of the footpath within the study area. Furthermore, views of the Proposed Development are generally restricted to short sections of the route and, where available, are often partial in nature, with only components of the Proposed Development visible.
- 2.105 As users would experience these views as a transient receptor, moving along the route rather than remaining in a fixed location, the duration of exposure would be limited. Taking these factors into account, the magnitude of change is assessed as medium. Following the establishment of the landscape mitigation, the overall magnitude of change on views would reduce to small.
- 2.106 Although the receptor sensitivity is high, the combination of the limited spatial extent of the affected route, the partial nature of available views, and the transient visual experience reduces the overall level of effect. Therefore, applying professional

judgement, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, **adverse** effect which is considered to be **moderate** at year 1 and **minor to moderate** at year 15.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.107 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.108 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.109 The effects would be **significant** at year 1 and **not significant** by year 15.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

- 2.110 All cumulative projects identified within **Table 1.4** have been considered within this Assessment of Cumulative Effects.
- 2.111 The cumulative effect on the landscape character and visual receptors for the construction stage would be similar to those changes experienced during the operational stage. The effects experienced during the construction stage would be short term and temporary therefore have not been separately reported.
- 2.112 Whilst Cumulative Project 3 shares some visual receptors with the Proposed Development, there is no intervisibility between the schemes. Furthermore, Cumulative Projects 4, 5, 6 and 7 are either not intervisible with the Proposed Development and/or are experienced within different landscape receptors. On this basis, no cumulative landscape and visual effects are anticipated for these projects.

Cumulative Project Number 1: 23/02622/OUT Weybrook Park Golf Club Rooksdown Lane Basingstoke Hampshire

Shared Landscape Receptors

- LCA16 - Basingstoke Down

In combination text: Landscape Character

- 2.113 There would be a direct change to the character of a localised part of LCA16 as a result of the cumulative scheme. The cumulative scheme is approximately 660m east of the Site. The two sites occupy close landscape parcels within the same broad landscape setting. Consequently, there is potential for the developments to be experienced within the same landscape context, particularly from elevated locations and public rights of way within the surrounding countryside.
- 2.114 The residential development would increase the perception of built form within the landscape, whilst the Proposed Development would introduce a distinct but non-urban land use. Although both developments would result in the loss or alteration of areas of open land, they would be perceived as fundamentally different forms of development. The residential scheme would read as an extension of the existing settlement pattern,

whereas the Proposed Development would remain characteristic of a rural land use associated with renewable energy generation rather than urban expansion. As a result, the developments would not combine to create a continuous urbanised landscape or significantly increase the apparent extent of the settlement edge.

- 2.115 The cumulative influence on landscape character would therefore be limited by the relatively modest scale of Cumulative Scheme 1 in comparison with the wider landscape context, the retention of intervening vegetation and landscape structure, and the differing characteristics of the two developments. Existing hedgerows and topographical variations would continue to provide separation between the sites and help maintain the distinction between the residential edge of Basingstoke and the wider agricultural landscape. The key characteristics of the surrounding landscape, including its rural field pattern and relationship with the adjacent settlements, would remain evident despite the introduction of both developments.
- 2.116 Therefore, the magnitude of change on the wider character area of this development in combination at year 1 and year 15 is considered to be Small-Medium magnitude of change to the character of LCA16 which would give rise to a Minor to Moderate Adverse effect.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.117 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.118 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual in combination effect for LCA16 - Basingstoke Down is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.119 The effects would be not significant at year 1 and year 15 for LCA16.

Shared Visual Receptors

- Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1);

In combination text: Visual

- 2.120 The cumulative effect of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 would be simultaneous from this footpath and golf course, with both developments capable of being perceived from sections of the footpath/course at the same time. Sequential cumulative effects would occur as walkers progress along the route/move through the golf course.
- 2.121 The combined presence of renewable energy infrastructure and urban expansion would increase the perception of development within the landscape and reduce the extent to which users experience an undeveloped rural setting. However, the developments would remain visually distinct in character and location, with the residential scheme appearing as an extension to the existing settlement and the solar farm retaining its agricultural/rural context. Changes to views would be greatest from St James' Way and due to the proximity of the proposals to the route.

- 2.122 Following the establishment of the proposed planting mitigation, the likely effects of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in combination would reduce on some views.
- 2.123 Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath – Overall Level of Effect - Yr 1 = Moderate Adverse; Yr 15 = Minor to Moderate Adverse.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.124 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.125 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual in combination effect for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.126 The effects would be **significant** at year 1 for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath.

Cumulative Project 2: 17/00818/OUT Many down Lane, Basingstoke

Shared Landscape Receptors

- LCA16 - Basingstoke Down (in part)

In combination text: Landscape Character

- 2.127 There would be a direct change to the character of a localised part of LCA16 as a result of the cumulative scheme. The cumulative scheme is approximately 720m south of the Site, therefore there are limited locations where landscape effects would be perceived in combination. When considered cumulatively, the developments would contribute to a greater overall reduction in the extent of undeveloped agricultural land north and west of Basingstoke. The residential development would increase the perception of urban influence within the wider landscape, while the solar farm would introduce a different form of land use associated with renewable energy generation.
- 2.128 However, due to the physical separation between the schemes, the differing land-use characteristics of each development, the retention of intervening countryside between the sites, the presence of established vegetation, and the fact that the solar farm would not extend the urban form of Basingstoke, the developments would generally be perceived as separate components within the wider landscape rather than a single continuous area of development.
- 2.129 Consequently, the cumulative effect would not fundamentally redefine the character of the wider landscape north and west of Basingstoke. The principal landscape characteristics, including the rolling landform, rural settlement pattern and agricultural field structure, would remain evident notwithstanding localised change associated with each scheme.
- 2.130 Therefore, the magnitude of change on the wider character area of these developments in combination at year 1 and year 15 is considered to be Medium

magnitude of change to the character of LCA16 which would give rise to a Moderate Adverse effect.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.131 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.132 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual in combination effect for LCA16 - Basingstoke Down is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.133 The effects would be not significant at year 1 and year 15 for LCA16.

Shared Visual Receptors

- Potential visual impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1).
- 2.134 In combination changes to views experienced by PROW users of St James' Way relating to the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project Number 2 would be simultaneous with both developments capable of being perceived from sections of the footpath at the same time. Sequential cumulative effects would occur as walkers progress along the routes. Due to the separation distance between the two developments, it is unlikely that these would be seen together but would effect overall views from the path.
- 2.135 Following the establishment of the proposed planting mitigation, the likely effects of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 2 in combination would reduce.
- 2.136 Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath – Magnitude of Change -Yr 1 = Medium Adverse; Yr 15 = Small Adverse. Overall Level of Effect - Yr 1 = Moderate Adverse; Yr 15 = Minor to Moderate Adverse.

Secondary Mitigation

- 2.137 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 2.138 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual in combination effect for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 2.139 The effects would be **significant** at year 1 for Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath.

Cumulative Project 3: 23/00205/OUT Land At Kiln Farm Kiln Road Sherborne St John Basingstoke Hampshire

Shared Landscape Receptors

- LCA16 - Basingstoke Down

2.140 There would be a direct change to the character of a localised part of LCA16 as a result of the cumulative scheme. The cumulative scheme is approximately 1.3km east of the Site with the village of Sherborne St John sitting between the cumulative scheme and the Proposed Development, therefore there are limited locations where landscape effects would be perceived in combination. In combination, the two schemes would locally impact on the rural edge of Basingstoke by reducing greenfield land, moving and redefining the developed edge of the town outwards into open landscape, therefore the magnitude of change on the wider character area of these development in combination at year 1 and year 15 is considered to be Small - Medium magnitude of change to the character of LCA16 which would give rise to a Minor to Moderate Adverse effect.

Secondary Mitigation

2.141 No further additional mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures are proposed for the Proposed Development at the operation stage over and above those identified in the section within this chapter on primary and tertiary mitigation.

Residual Effect and Significance

2.142 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual in combination effect for LCA16 - Basingstoke Down is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

2.143 The effects would be not significant at year 1 and year 15 for LCA16.

Limitations and Assumptions

2.144 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions apply to this assessment:

- In considering the effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape, character areas and visual receptors the assessment is based on the supporting application plans and elevations submitted for approval and the design specification contained within **Chapter 1: Introduction**. This approach has allowed for a balanced assessment that considers all the relevant material and allows for judgements to be made on design quality and associated mitigating effects.
- In regard to the visual assessment, it does not attempt to predict the visual effects of seasonal changes throughout the year, or the difference between day and night time effects, but describes the 'worst case' position in terms of the view for the receptors (i.e. in the winter the trees would have lost their leaves, making the Proposed Development more visible).

Summary

2.145 **Table 2.10** summarises the assessment of effects on landscape character and visual amenity, including pre-mitigation effects, secondary mitigation measures, and residual effects. A full compilation of all mitigation measures (primary, tertiary and secondary) is provided in the Environmental Management Plan (**Volume 3**).

Table 2.10: Summary of Effects

Effect	Receptor	Stage	Pre-Mitigation Level of Effect	Secondary Mitigation	Residual Level of Effect	Significant?
Changes to local landscape character	Site/Landscape Fabric	Construction	Moderate to Major Adverse	None	Moderate to Major Adverse	Yes
Changes to the character and amenity of visual receptors	Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1)	Construction	Moderate Adverse	None	Moderate Adverse	Yes
Changes to local landscape character	Site/Landscape Fabric	Operational	Moderate to Major Adverse	None	Moderate to Major Adverse	Year 1 = Yes Year 15 = Yes
Changes to the character and amenity of visual receptors	Public Right of Way users of St James' Way long distance footpath (Ref: 267/7013; 208/1/3; 161/4/1 and 161/5/1)	Operational	Moderate Adverse	None	Moderate Adverse	Year 1 = Yes Year 15 = No

-
- ⁱ Council of Europe (2000) *European Landscape Convention*.
- ⁱⁱ Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) *National Planning Policy Framework*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6a8334c03bd75b81e2329ac4/National_Planning_Policy_Framework.pdf. (Accessed 26 August 2026).
- ^{iv} Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023) National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). Crown copyright. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a7889996a5ec000d731aba/nps-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en3.pdf> (Accessed: 8 July 2026)
- ^v Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2026) Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), 2025. London: Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1-2025> (Accessed: 8 July 2026)
- ^{vi} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2016) *Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 to 2029*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/1592.pdf>. (Accessed: 6 July 2026)
- ^{vii} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2024) Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update 2021 to 2040: Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://consult.basingstoke.gov.uk/system/files/materials/17/Local%20Plan%20Update%20Regulation%2018%202024%20-%20online%20version.pdf>. (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{viii} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2025) *Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024 to 2042: Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: [https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/91413/Draft%20BDLP%202024-2042%20Updated%20Spatial%20Strategy%20\(Reg18%20Con\)%20Nov%202025.pdf](https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/91413/Draft%20BDLP%202024-2042%20Updated%20Spatial%20Strategy%20(Reg18%20Con)%20Nov%202025.pdf). (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{ix} Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2016) *Planning practice guidance*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^x Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021) *National Design Guide: planning practice guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xi} North Wessex Downs National Landscape Partnership (2025) *North Wessex Downs National Landscape Management Plan 2025–2030*. Hungerford: North Wessex Downs National Landscape Partnership. Available at: <https://www.northwessexdowns.org.uk/our-work/management-plan/> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xii} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2021) *Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity Study*. Basingstoke: Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-evidence> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xiii} Hankinson Duckett Associates (2024) *Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity to Wind and Solar Energy Development. Rev D*. Prepared for Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Wallingford: Hankinson Duckett Associates. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-evidence> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).

-
- ^{xiv} Hankinson Duckett Associates (2021) *Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment*. Prepared for Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Wallingford: Hankinson Duckett Associates. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-evidence> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xv} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2018) *Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/Landscape-and-biodiversity> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xvi} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2008) *Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document: Appendix 14 – Countryside Design Summary*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/design-and-sustainability-spd> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xvii} Land Use Consultants (2010) *North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study*. Prepared for Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Hart District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/ENV10> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xviii} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2018) *Green Infrastructure Strategy for Basingstoke and Deane 2018 to 2029*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/green-infrastructure-strategy> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xix} North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (2012) *Position Statement: Renewable Energy*. Hungerford: North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Available at: <https://www.northwessexdowns.org.uk/planning/position-statements/> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xx} North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (2019) *Position Statement: Setting (Development Affecting the Setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB)*. Hungerford: North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Available at: https://www.northwessexdowns.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Setting_Position_Statement_2019_Final.pdf (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xxi} North Wessex Downs National Landscape (2025) *North Wessex Downs Landscape Character Assessment*. Hungerford: North Wessex Downs National Landscape. Available at: <https://www.northwessexdowns.org.uk/the-landscape/landscape-character/> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xxii} Hampshire County Council (2012) *Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment*. Winchester: Hampshire County Council. Available at: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/landscape/integrated-characterassessment> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xxiii} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2024) *Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan 2011–2029 (as modified 2024)*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/SSJNP> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{xxiv} The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (Third Edition 2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment*
- ^{xxv} <https://landscapeinstitute.org/publication/landscape-character-assessment-tin/>
- ^{xxvi} <https://landscapeinstitute.org/publication/tgn-02-21-assessing-landscape-value-outside-national-designations/>
- ^{xxvii} <https://landscapeinstitute.org/news/new-visual-representation-guidance-2019/>

