

Land at Cranesfield, Sherborne St John

Technical Note – Landscape

Introduction

1. This Technical Note has been prepared by HCUK Group on behalf of B.Yond Homes Ltd for the Proposed Development at Land at Cranesfield, Sherborne St John (henceforth referred to as 'the Site').
2. For the purposes of this document the 'Proposed Development' relates to the construction of a residential development of the Site with access, roads, parking, open space, SuDs and associated infrastructure.
3. The purpose of this technical note is to respond to several landscape and visual matters raised as part of the consultation on the planning application for the Proposed Development. The Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) planning application reference number is 25/02051/FUL.
4. The BDBC Landscape Officer kindly provided initial written comments on the 29/09/2025.
5. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) and this Technical Note was completed by a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI), who is trained and experienced in undertaking landscape and visual appraisals, bound by the code of conduct of the Landscape Institute.

Landscape and visual matters

6. This section of the document will discuss and respond to each matter raised (grouped where appropriate) in the written comments.

Matter 01 –Visual Effects

"Photograph viewpoint 6 demonstrates that the proposed development would still be pronounced in the rural landscape." Landscape Officer written comments 29/09/2025.

7. It is acknowledged that following construction there will be open views of the Proposed Development from the 160m (approx.) section of the PRoW 208/14a/2 directly north of the Site. Further west and east along the PRoW views of the

Proposed Development will be screened by the intervening vegetation. This section of PRoW with views across to the Site is approximately 200m from the northern edge of the Proposed Development. As illustrated by Figure 8 Wider Landscape Strategy there are three layers of proposed planting in the area between the PRoW and the built form of the Proposed Development.

8. The LVA appraised the level of effect at year 15 in the summer as per the methodology. It is considered that the layers of proposed planting block all but glimpsed views of the built elements of the Proposed Development at year 15 in the summer. This view will be similar to the settlement edge views already experienced along this section of the PRoW with glimpsed of built form seen through gaps in the intervening vegetation. This is characteristic of experiences further along the PRoW to the west and east.
9. Although the Proposed Development will be visible initially from PRoW 208/14a/2. Once established, the layers of the intervening vegetation between the PRoW and the Site will effectively screen views of the Proposed Development from users of the path and this mitigation is considered to be appropriate for the landscape character around the Site.

Matter 02 – Landscape Effects

"The distinctive quiet, rural character and appearances of the village would be harmed." Landscape Officer written comments 29/09/2025.

10. Landscape and visual harm are phrases not used within Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (GLVIA3) (Third Edition 2013). The Site is on the edge of the settlement and is adjacent to existing residential development. Its character is not wholly rural in nature, as it forms part of the edge of the settlement.
11. The LVA acknowledges that there will landscape effects on the landscape of the Site and its immediate environs. It also acknowledges that there will be landscape effects on the 4. North Sherborne LCA over the localised area of the LCA that the Site sits within.
12. Landscape harm is not a phrased used within GLVIA 3. The Site is not wholly rural in nature and forms part of the settlement edge which influence it landscape character, including its levels of tranquillity. The LVA acknowledges the

landscape effects on the landscape character of the Site and the LCA that it sits within.

Matter 03 – Landscape Value

"The site lies within the High Importance of the landscape setting of Sherborne St John." Landscape Officer written comments 29/09/2025.

13. The LVA found that the landscape elements on the Site, landscape character of the Site itself and 4. North Sherborne LCA are considered to be of medium sensitivity, taking into account the medium judgements recorded for both value and susceptibility.
14. An analysis of The Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity Study (2021) (The Study) was undertaken as part of the LVA. It is considered that the Site, assessed on its sensitivities as defined by The Study will have medium sensitivity, compared to a high sensitivity of the Site SSJ001 within the Study that the Site sits within.
15. The LVA found that the landscape of the Site is not valued in terms of the NPPF, paragraph 187, as it is not covered by any statutory designations or identified as having high quality in any of the development plan documents or published landscape character study documents. Also, the assessment with LVA did not identify the Site as having sufficient landscape qualities to elevate it above other more everyday landscapes.
16. The Site is not covered by any designations related to landscape quality and is not considered to be of a high importance in landscape terms. Any form of development (new built form) in rural areas, is likely to have adverse effect on landscape character and is considered as part of the wider planning balance when determining planning applications.

Matter 04 – The Conservation Area

"Development on this site would likely have adverse effects on the landscape setting of the Conservation Area." Landscape Officer written comments 11/06/2025).

17. It is surprising that the landscape officer is commenting on effects on the setting of the Conservation Area. Assessing the effects on the historic environment is a

separate specialist topic to landscape in EIA. The LVA has been written with reference to GLVIA3 which states:

LVIA should consider the implications of the full range of statutory and non-statutory designations and recognitions and consider what they may imply about landscape value. GLVIA 3 (para 5.222).

18. The LVA has considered the Conservation in regard to implications for landscape value and views in and out of it. It is not within the scope of the LVA to consider the effects on setting of designated heritage asset. This should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

Matter 05 – Play Equipment

"The Inspector pointed out that the visual harm could potentially be moderated by landscape planting and infilling an area on the edge of the village rather than projecting out into open countryside. The new scheme has slightly set the development inward. However, play provision (which is an urban element), is protruding out into the countryside. The layout shows no room to accommodate play within the development, which indicates an over-development." Landscape Officer written comments 11/06/2025.

19. The layout of the Proposed Development has been revised in the new application, in line with the Inspector's comments. As illustrated in the Design and Access Statement that accompanied the application. The proposed play equipment will be to the north of the built form within the landscape area. It will be made of natural materials, low lying and unobtrusive. It can be conditioned as such by BDBC as part of any planning permission to ensure it is of complementary style to its surroundings and made of appropriate materials.
20. The Proposed Development is not over-development of the Site and the play equipment is appropriate to its setting in landscape terms. The proposed landscape scheme integrates the built form into the surrounding landscape framework. The layout of the built form is complementary to the wider settlement pattern and has taken into account the Inspectors comments from the previous appeal in this layout.

Matter 06 – Night Time Effects

"In reference to Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan, map 11, page 52. The site lies on the transition between the 1-2 NanoWatts (village edge) and 0.5-1

NanoWatts (rural countryside). The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, would introduce significant light spill into the dark countryside.” Landscape Officer written comments 11/06/2025.

21. The LVA that accompanied the application did not include a nighttime appraisal. It was guided by the Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01 (2024) which states:

A night-time assessment should not be a routine requirement and will only be required where lighting will have a potential significant influence on landscape character and/ or visual amenity, as a result of the combination of the sensitivity of the receiving night-time environment and the nature of the proposed lighting. LITGN-2024-01, 8(2).

22. The Site sits on the edge of the settlement and as such will be influenced by the adjacent residential lighting. It is not a dark skies Site or within or close to a protected landscape where dark skies would be an important consideration. As such it was not considered proportionate not to include a nighttime appraisal as part of the LVA. Large, bright light sources that would produce significant levels of light, such as flood lighting, do not form part of the Proposed Development. As such the author of the LCA disagrees with the statement that the Proposed Development would introduce significant light spill to the landscape around the Site.
23. Map 11 contained within the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan (2024) is part of high-level study and does not consider light at a field-by-field level. The Study is based of grid squares. Other areas of residential development also occur within the and 0.5-1 NanoWatts (rural countryside) zone such as the houses along West End to the north-west of the Site.
24. The Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan Policy 8: Reducing light pollution outside of the Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary states that:

Development proposals outside of the Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary that include external lighting which requires planning permission must be accompanied by a lighting scheme that has regard to the latest national design guidance published by the Institute of Lighting Professionals. Development proposals should employ energy-efficient forms of lighting which reduce light scatter. Where appropriate, conditions will be imposed that seek

to control the times of external illumination. Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan, page 54.

25. The plan policy does not indicate that development that introduces additional lighting should be refused, but rather that lighting levels are controlled. BDBC can control lighting on Site by way of planning condition should the Proposed Development be consented.
26. Although there will be an increase in the lighting levels of the Site as a result of the Proposed Development, the Site is already affected by light from the adjacent residential development. As such it is not considered a dark skies site, and the inclusion of a nighttime assessment is not considered proportional.

Summary

27. The LVA was completed by a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI), who is trained and experienced in undertaking landscape and visual appraisals, bound by the code of conduct of the Landscape Institute.
28. Although the Proposed Development will be visible initially from PRoW 208/14a/2, it is considered by the author of the LVA that once established, the layers of the intervening vegetation between the PRoW and the Site will effectively screen views of the Proposed Development from users of the path. It is considered that this mitigation planting is appropriate for the landscape character of local area.
29. It is acknowledged that any form of development (new built form) in rural areas, is likely to have adverse effect on landscape character. Whether it be renewable energy, housing, commercial or agricultural.
30. The Site is not covered by any designations related to landscape quality and is not considered to be of a high importance in landscape terms. It is considered by the author of the LVA that the landscape value and that the Site is not a 'valued landscape' as described the paragraph 187 of the NPPF.
31. It should be noted that it is not within the scope of an LVA to describe whether the Proposed Development is compliant with planning policies as directed by Notes and Clarifications on aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3).
32. It should be noted that judgements of landscape and visual changes brought about the by the Proposed Development are not judgements of acceptability

considering the policy context, which is a matter for decision-makers. It may be the case that the LVA concludes that the Proposed Development will result in adverse effects on receptors, but the Proposed Development could still be considered acceptable when judged alongside other factors in the overall planning balance.

33. Visual effects of the Proposed Development from the PRoW within the wider landscape to the north of the Site have been adequately mitigated with proposed planting. These landscape measures will not only screen views of the Proposed Development but will enhance biodiversity value of the Site and integrate it into the wider landscape framework.
34. The LVA has considered the Conservation Area in regard to implications for landscape value and views in and out of it. It is not within the scope of the LVA to consider the effects on setting of designated heritage asset. This should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.
35. The Proposed Development is not over-development of the Site and the play equipment is appropriate to its setting in landscape terms. The proposed landscape scheme integrates the built form into the surrounding landscape framework. The layout of the built form is complementary to the wider settlement pattern and has taken into account the Inspectors comments from the previous appeal in its layout.
36. Although there will be an increase in the lighting levels of the Site as a result of the Proposed Development, the Site is already affected by light from the adjacent residential development. As such it is not considered a dark skies site, and the inclusion of a nighttime assessment is not considered proportional.

No text or imagery within this report has been generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Issue 02 – 23/10/2025