

NE14 - Rural Character

- Support - 25
- Neither support of object - 13
- Object – 10

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

Comments in support of NE14 - rural character		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON- KSAR- NKHA-K	<p>1. Wickham village has a tight settlement boundary and WRA agrees with the policy “Outside defined settlement boundaries ” development will not be permitted that would have“...an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area, by means of visual intrusion, the introduction of incongruous features, the destruction of locally characteristic rural assets, or by impacts on the tranquillity of the environment.”</p> <p>2. WRA agrees with this policy and expects planners to reject proposals that infringe it</p> <p>In particular WRA supports the policy on Tranquillity as it affects landscapes outside the settlement boundary: “developments should not have an unacceptable effect on the rural tranquillity of the area, including the introduction of lighting or noise occurring as a result of the development, taking account of the relative remoteness and tranquillity of the location. New lighting will generally not be permitted in unlit areas and the type, size, design and operation of any lighting</p>	<p>Noted no changes to the policy required.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	<p>may be controlled where necessary by the use of conditions. It should be demonstrated that all opportunities to reduce light pollution have been taken, having due regard to the following hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The installation of lighting is avoided or minimised; and ii. If lighting cannot be avoided, it is demonstrated to be necessary and appropriate, for its intended purpose or use; iii. Any adverse impacts are mitigated with details of the mitigation scheme to be agreed prior to planning permission being granted. <p>Developments should not detract from the enjoyment of the countryside from the public realm or public rights of way.</p> <p>The impact resulting from the volume and type of traffic generated by the development will be assessed along with the ability of rural roads to accept increased levels of traffic without alterations that would harm their rural character”.</p> <p>3. There are developments being discussed in Wickham that would clearly infringe this policy and WRA urges planners to bear this policy in mind and decide accordingly.</p>	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5 Littleton and Harestock Parish Council</p>	<p>The aim of the policy is to protect the countryside from unnecessary new development. Where new development is justified it should not harm the rural character of the area outside settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Littleton and Harestock Parish Council supports the policy.</p> <p>Support Policy NE14</p>	<p>Noted and support welcomed. No changes to the policy required.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKXV-R</p>	<p>The inclusion of tranquillity as a key element of rural character is strongly welcomed. However, there is some potential conflict with this policy where tranquillity is protected and the noise pollution policy where noise levels up to SOAEL may be allowable. SOAEL represents up to 10dB of noise over existing levels and an effective doubling of sound levels. Potentially turning a very quiet rural area into a fairly noisy one.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The Policy in reference to Noise is D7. The policy is explicit in that development near the SOAEL (Significant observed adverse effect level) will not be allowed unless mitigation to lower it has been explored.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	<p>But as important as the absolute noise level is a change in noise characteristic (ie natural sounds of birdsong, wind, river noise etc. vs manmade sounds of humming, industrial, machine, engine noise). Preventing a change in noise character - particularly for rural areas - is critical not just absolute noise levels.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is considered that this is covered under the policy and tranquillity section.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8X5-4	<p>The Dever Society made detailed points on rural character in our response to the SIP consultation, with specific reference to the mid-Hampshire Downs and the Dever Valley. These points are still relevant and we would like them to be taken into account.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. SIP comments have been taken in into consideration.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N856-2	<p>In connection with this policy, I am concerned about the proposed plans, by the parish council, to build floodlit 3G football pitches outside the settlement boundary at Mill Lane, Wickham, The nature of the development may lead to intensification of uncharacteristic use in the area. Noise and lighting pollution will be more noticeable in this tranquil rural area adjacent to the South Downs National Park. I am pleased to read that, 'the rural character and tranquillity of the area will be taken into account when assessing the appropriateness of developments that may give rise to pollution'.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This is specific to planned development and does not require the policy to be amended.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	<p>A further concern about this planning proposal is traffic intrusion due to numbers of trips and the type of vehicles (e.g. cars, coaches & minibuses) as well as the suitability and capacity of historic rural lanes providing access. I agree that inevitable physical re-modelling of rural roads, the introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances for the development will have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This is specific to planned development and does not require the policy to be amended.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8T8-3 Olivers Battery Parish Council</p>	<p>Although there are references to protection of tranquillity from noise pollution and dark night skies from light pollution in the draft Local Plan, there is a need for identification and designation of tranquil areas which have remained undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 185.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. No evidence has been put forward in this representation about what parts of the district need to be identified and designated. It is important to read the LP as whole, Policy D7 deals comprehensively with Noise pollution.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8TZ-5</p>	<p>In the 'What we are aiming to achieve' box of Policy NE14 the reference to 'impacts' is a little confusing and should be re-worded to make it clear that development in rural locations should not cause harm to the countryside or rights of way as a result of building, lighting and increased traffic. Policy NE14 is worded correctly where it states that, "Developments should not detract from the enjoyment of the countryside from the public realm or public rights of way."</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is considered that the wording is already clear and does not need redrafting.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR-N87J- R Micheldever Parish Council</p>	<p>We support this policy, however feel that reference should be made to the role of Village Design Statements.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. VDS are in the design policies so don't need to be repeated here. The plan should be as a whole as VDS's are referred to in table in the Design Topic and they are valuable tool as they have been prepared by local people.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8BS-C</p>	<p>The policy identifies three measures that need to be considered when assessing the effect of development upon rural character. It is important that the policy makes clear each is applied in equal measure otherwise the factors could distort what is and is not acceptable beyond defined settlement boundaries. If proposals are landscape-led they have the ability to enhance rural character, for example and detailed in response to Policy NE9 the site at Lovedon Lane offers the potential to extend and continue the undeveloped edge of</p>	<p>Comment noted. The policy is not intended to be a hierarchy; they are all to be considered for each application. It is important to read Policy NE14 in its entirety.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	Kings Worthy whilst also enhancing the settlement gap between it and Abbots Worthy. The linking of existing green space (Eversley Gardens) will enhance the overall characteristics of Kings Worthy and in achieving this will also enhance the rural characteristic of the sites edge and relationship to the wider countryside.	
--	---	--

Comments which neither support nor object to NE14 - rural character		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKZU-S	<p>The policy is supported and if in accordance with these provisions, additional allocations should be considered across the Council in rural developments to continue to support and enhance the vibrancy of communities and the delivery of housing to meet local need.</p> <p>Policy NE14 should be expanded to include the delivery of self-custom build housing to deliver unmet housing needs within the borough, as this cannot be delivered (or the location is not always suited) to being located within an existing settlement boundary or on large scale housing developments.</p> <p>SH26 should be considered for such an allocation against the existing unmet need on the Right to Build register and national planning policy requirements.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. This is a housing matter rather than rural character matter.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKXA-3	<p>Policy NE14 (Rural Character) permits development where it accords with the development plan and would not harm the rural character of the area, including by means of visual intrusion and the introduction of incongruous features. As per our representations to the polices above, allowances should be made to the extension, expansion and improvements to existing tourism development within rural areas. The</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is important to read the Local Plan as whole as Leisure and recreation in the countryside is covered in Policy NE13.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	wording of the policy should include specific reference to the provision of glamping, pods, lodges and ancillary uses and buildings, including storage, that supports existing tourism development where it is sensitively and appropriately designed.	
ANON-KSAR-N8U2-X	<p>We note the approach within Policy NE14 which seeks to protect the rural character of the countryside within the District. Noting that it is not intended to include Sir John Moore Barracks within the settlement boundary, we consider that Policy NE14 should be amended as follows to ensure that there is no conflict with Policy W2. In our view, achieving the requirements of Policy NE14 would be challenging whilst delivering a large scale residential masterplan for the site, in accordance with Policy W2.</p> <p>Outside defined settlement boundaries, the Council will support development within the Countryside where this accords with Site Allocations within this Plan. For land that is not allocated for development, proposals outside defined settlement boundaries which accord with the Development Plan will be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area, by means of visual intrusion, the introduction of incongruous features, the destruction of locally characteristic rural assets, or by impacts on the tranquillity of the environment.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is not considered that a strategic policy needs to be amended. In relation to SJM Barracks this site has its own site specific policy and masterplanning process and it is fully accepted that this particular site is outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change.</p>
	<p>With regard to Policy NE14, we also consider that the following wording should be added to the supporting text of this policy (which is already contained within the supporting text to Policy W2 (Paragraph 12.20):</p> <p>With regard to Sir John Moore Barracks which is the subject of Policy W2, the site is currently located outside of the settlement boundaries of Littleton and Winchester in an area of countryside and it is not proposed to change the designation of the land at this point. Similar to the approach that the city council took with the Barton Farm Major</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The Council would not repeat wording in a site specific policy or elsewhere in the Local Plan, as this would lead to a lengthy and repetitive plan. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. The Policies Map will show both of sites remain outside of the settlement boundary. There is no need to include this text in the Local Plan.</p>

	Development Allocation, the settlement boundary would only be amended once a planning application had been approved to redevelop the site as currently the exact type, distribution and location of the development within the site being allocated has not yet been defined through the master planning process.	Recommended Response: No Change
ANON-KSAR-N8WJ-R	Building on greenfield sites is in direct contradiction of this policy.	Comments Noted. Specific justification, where applicable, would be set out in the site specific policies. Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N8TJ-N	<p>Policy NE14 (Rural Character) permits development where it accords with the development plan and would not harm the rural character of the area, including by means of visual intrusion and the introduction of incongruous features. As per our representations to the polices above, allowances should be made to the extension, expansion and improvements to existing tourism development within rural areas. The wording of the policy should include specific reference to the provision of glamping, pods, lodges and ancillary uses and buildings, including storage, that supports existing tourism development where it is sensitively and appropriately designed.</p> <p>Conclusions The presence of the Caravan and Motorhome Club helps provide economic benefits for the wider area by bringing visitors to the local region. Therefore, the protection and enhancement of important tourist locations will help to ensure the continued economic health and success of the site and local rural economy. It is The Club's primary desire to ensure that policies are included in the draft Local Plan that support and encourage tourism development, and its expansion. Great specificity is desired regarding the way in which improving the quality and diversity of the tourism offer is defined to benefit the rural economy in Winchester City Council. It would be</p>	<p>Comments Noted. Tourism is covered under Policy NE13. It is important that the Local Plan is read as a whole. It is considered that it the general wording of the policy is appropriate, rather than being specific and risk omitting something.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	beneficial for emerging policy to make provision for the upgrading of existing camping and caravan sites. Ideally making specific reference to the provision and adaptation of pods, lodges, glamping and ancillary buildings, including storage, and residential units for holiday lets. Overall, this ensures the future viability of the Club, and supports the tourism industry within Winchester City Council.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8T1-V	Policy states domestic extensions should be 'proportionate in size', and replacement dwellings should not be 'disproportionately larger'. This wording is ambiguous. It is noted that Policy H8 sets a threshold for smaller dwellings.	The policy already references H8 so does not require any further changes. Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N8Z7-8 South Downs National Park Authority	(1) Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Beauty of the Area The landscape is the foundation for all other special qualities of the SDNP, including its setting, views, tranquillity, and unspoilt places and its distinctive towns and villages. With this in mind, the SDNP covers approximately 40% of Winchester District and a significant proportion of the remainder of the District is within the setting of the SDNP. Development within the setting of the SDNP must be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise any adverse impacts on the SDNP in line with Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We welcome the emerging local plan's recognition for the need to protect and enhance landscape character. With this in mind, we recommend that the following policies are updated to include appropriate references to the need to avoid and/or minimise any potential adverse impacts on the SDNP, from development within its setting, in terms of landscape character, safeguarding views, tranquillity and dark night skies. These are; Policies D1 (High Quality, Well Designed and Inclusive Places), D2 (Design Principles for Winchester Town); D4 (Design Principles for Market Towns and Rural Areas), D5 (Masterplan), NE12 (Equestrian Development), NE13 (Leisure and Recreation in the Countryside), and NE14 (Rural Character).	Comments Noted. General support welcomed. The Council would welcome continuing to work with the SDNPA but it is important that the Local Plan is read as whole. As this is the case there is no need to cross refer to specific policies in the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No Change

<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8BR-B</p>	<p>We note the approach within Policy NE14 which seeks to protect the rural character of the countryside within the District. Noting that it is not intended to include Sir John Moore Barracks within the settlement boundary, we consider that Policy NE14 should be amended as follows to ensure that there is no conflict with Policy W2. In our view, achieving the requirements of Policy NE14 would be challenging whilst delivering a large scale residential masterplan for the site, in accordance with Policy W2.</p> <p>1.17 Outside defined settlement boundaries, the Council will support development within the Countryside where this accords with Site Allocations within this Plan. For land that is not allocated for development, proposals outside defined settlement boundaries which accord with the Development Plan will be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area, by means of visual intrusion, the introduction of incongruous features, the destruction of locally characteristic rural assets, or by impacts on the tranquillity of the environment.</p> <p>1.18 With regard to Policies SP3, NE7 and NE14, we also consider that the following wording should be added to the supporting text of this policy (which is already contained within the supporting text to Policy W2 (Paragraph 12.20))</p> <p>With regard to Sir John Moore Barracks which is the subject of Policy W2, the site is currently located outside of the settlement boundaries of Littleton and Winchester in an area of countryside and it is not proposed to change the designation of the land at this point. Similar to the approach that the city council took with the Barton Farm Major Development Allocation, the settlement boundary would only be amended once a planning application had been approved to redevelop the site as currently the exact type, distribution and location of the development within the site being allocated has not yet been defined through the master planning process.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is not considered that a strategic policy be amended to cover a site specific policy. The Council would not repeat wording in a site specific policy or elsewhere in the Local Plan, as this would lead to a lengthy and repetitive plan. The Local Plan should be read as a whole.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change.</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--

<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BF-Y</p>	<p>Clarification of what represents 'incongruous features' is needed - as drafted it is open to interpretation and individual judgement</p>	<p>Comments Noted. Planning is always a matter of judgment depending on the individual merits of a case. It is not considered necessary to define incongruous features as this will depend on the case.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BQ-A Historic Environment Link here</p>	<p>We recommend a minor change in wording, to clarify the focus when implementing this section of the policy.</p> <p>Visual - intrusion should be minimised, including the effect on the setting of settlements, key features in the landscape, or the significance of heritage assets. The cumulative impact of developments will be considered, including any ancillary or minor development that may occur as a result of the main proposal. - full doc in SP for mark ups</p>	<p>Comments Noted. Wording has been changed.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend the wording as specified.</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N863-Z</p>	<p><u>Policy NE14 Rural Character</u></p> <p>The opening paragraph of Policy NE14 indicates that it applies only to development that is compliant with the Plan. However, there may be instances where material considerations indicate that a decision not in line with the Development Plan is justified. Policy NE14 should be reworded to this effect.</p>	<p>The policy itself is allowing for development outside defined settlement boundaries if the other policies contained within the Local Plan are met. By stating 'unless material considerations indicate otherwise' would allow for development that is not in conformity with the Local Plan and undermine the policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

Comments which object to NE14 - rural character		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKBJ-P Soberton Parish Council	<p>NE14 Rural Character</p> <p>This policy should include a requirement that any development should not be detrimental to all road users in the countryside, namely walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Domestic extensions should be designed so a separate domestic unit can not subsequently be created.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The road user elements would be a matter for the Transport policies to consider (Policies T1-T3). In regards to house extensions, the policy already references H8 so does not require any further changes.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKHU-7 Oliver's Battery Parish Council	<p>Rural Character (Policy NE14)</p> <p>Although there are references to protection of tranquillity from noise pollution and dark night skies from light pollution in the draft Local Plan, there is a need for identification and designation of tranquil areas which have remained undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 185.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. No evidence has been put forward in this representation about what parts of the district need to be identified and designated. It is important to read the LP as whole, Policy D7 deals comprehensively with Noise pollution.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F	<p>In the 'What we are aiming to achieve' box of Policy NE14 the reference to 'impacts' is a little confusing and should be re-worded to make it clear that development in rural locations should not cause harm to the countryside or rights of way as a result of building, lighting and increased traffic. Policy NE14 is worded correctly where it states that, "Developments should not detract from the enjoyment of the countryside from the public realm or public rights of way."</p>	<p>Comments Noted. It is considered that the wording is sufficient and suggested changes to the wording are not appropriate as enjoyment of the countryside can mean different things to different people.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B	Domestic extensions - 'in keeping'. There is a lot of discussion about the visual aesthetic of the city - whilst this is understandable in conservation and heritage areas. Does this sometimes result in planning decisions that are not always the most climate friendly option? This policy should allow more flexibility to achieve the best overall outcome.	In regards to house extensions, The policy already references H8 so does not require any further changes. Recommended Response: No Change
ANON-KSAR-N8YM-W	<p>BSP recognise the importance of preserving rural character outside of defined settlement boundaries, and minimising visual intrusion. It should be acknowledged however, that development proposals can equally have potential to strengthen rural character through appropriate landscape-led design. The assessment of rural character based on visual, physical and tranquility indicators as outlined within policy NE14 therefore, needs to be applied in a balanced and measured way based on site specific circumstances.</p> <p>The opportunity at Land at Fairthorne Grange represents a good demonstration of such an approach, through the provision of a landscape, nature-led, green gap. The proposals will result in a clear and defensible edge to Whiteley, providing a transition between the urban and rural area and retaining a physical and visual settlement gap between Whiteley and Curdrige. The unique position of the site provides the opportunity to link the landscape at the edge of the site via a central green corridor, which can create a strong sense of character consistent with the site's rural edge location.</p>	Comments Noted. This representation is in relation to a specific omission site – please see comments on omission sites. Recommended Response: No Change.
ANON-KSAR-N81F-E	Bargate Homes consider that clarification is needed to allow for appropriate highways alterations that facilitate sustainable rural development without harming the overall rural character. As drafted, the wording can be interpreted such that any alteration to a rural highway is unacceptable, which is clearly unreasonable.	Comments Noted. It is not considered that the policy is worded to prevent alterations to rural highways, as long as the amendment was in accordance with this policy and the transport policies of the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No Change

<p>ANON-KSAR-N81B-A</p>	<p>Again, this policy needs to be strengthened to protect tranquility from noise pollution and dark skies from light pollution. Identification and designation of tranquil areas prized for their recreational and amenity value are needed, in accordance with NPPF para 185.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No evidence has been put forward in this representation about what parts of the district need to be identified and designated. It is important to read the LP as whole, Policy D7 deals comprehensively with noise pollution.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N819-1</p>	<p>The climate and biodiversity crises require latitude in land planning and hard and fast rural character regulations.</p> <p>Changes to land character should be permitted to further creative use of best and most versatile agricultural and other land which does not hinder land production or impact on climate and biodiversity issues. The aim should be to support changes to regulations whether NPA or otherwise. For example, if an opportunity to use the most versatile agricultural land is made with benefits to both carbon net zero and biodiversity then this should be allowed.</p> <p>Continuing blind acceptance of current legislation without a challenge to the guidance in planning for a "strong presumption" against solar farms on the best and most versatile (BMV) land is unacceptable and unethical in the face of the environment, energy and food crises.</p> <p>Crop and /or livestock production failing to use land and light twice for maximum net zero contributions inc. for biodiversity enhancement plus new green businesses and economy benefits is a missed opportunity for the two crises. Land production can be enhanced for economic benefits for land users and nature protection. This dual approach with twin income streams benefits agriculture land managers and communities.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The policy references 'development proposals' which would include renewable energy. The policy does not prevent solar farms coming forward as long as they are compliant with this Policy and Policy CN5.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>

	Solar farms have the potential to introduce a greater net gain in biodiversity for agricultural land. For example, Agrivoltaic schemes combine land production with solar energy generation which avoids the use of other greenfield sites for solar use which then allows more opportunities for nature/rewilding/nature recovery improvements.	
ANON-KSAR-NKFQ-1 Upham Parish Council	the introductory text should be amended to read development proposals which accord with the Development Plan will be permitted ONLY where they do not have an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area,	Comments noted. It is not considered appropriate to add such a reference. Instead, development will need to accord with the policy in order to be considered for approval, which is the same consideration. Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N86N-U	Clarification is needed to allow for appropriate highways alterations that facilitate sustainable rural development without harming the overall rural character. As drafted, the wording can be interpreted such that any alteration to a rural highway is unacceptable, which is clearly unreasonable.	Comments Noted. It is not considered that the policy is worded to prevent alterations to rural highways, as long as the amendment was in accordance with this policy and the transport policies of the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No Change

Comments which didn't answer NE14 - rural character		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N8TB-D	The recognition of the rural nature of the District and the importance of retaining the character and separation of the many small villages and settlements is positive. There are some inconsistencies to be	General support welcomed.

	<p>addressed, however. Hursley is included in the settlement hierarchy with larger, better provided settlements such as South Wonston and Waltham Chase, which seems wrong. In addition, there are many references to avoiding infilling between settlements, so the Settlement Gap between Olivers Battery and Winchester should be included in the list under policy NE7. The closing of this gap was one of the fundamental reasons for the massive public rejection of the Royal Down proposal.</p> <p>A related factor in retaining the character of the rural parts of the District is recognition of the importance not only of Gaps , but also beautiful landscapes. There is little mention of extending the Green Belt to the south of Winchester, or even defining the countryside south of Olivers Battery as a Valued Landscape, both of which were supported by the Save South Winchester Campaign against Royal Down. These should be revisited.</p>	<p>The NPPF does not require local authorities to designate ‘Valued Landscapes’. The majority of the district is protected ‘Countryside’ under current Local Plan policies MTRA4 and CP20 of the current local plan Part 1, and Policies DM15 and DM23 of the Local Plan Part 2. If Valued Landscapes were to be applied, it is unclear which part of the above policies would apply to valued landscapes. It is also unclear what additional protection would be given over and above the existing ‘Countryside’ designation</p> <p>In order for a landscape to be considered ‘Valued’, the Landscape Institute define this as an ‘area having sufficient landscape qualities to elevate it above other everyday landscapes’. The institute has produced a guidance note entitled ‘Assessing landscape value outside national designations’ which includes a range of factors to consider when assessing the value of a landscape.</p> <p>As the NPPF does not define what a ‘valued landscape’ is and contradictions in case law as to what defines a, ‘valued landscape’, the Local Plan will not be seeking to designate ‘Valued Landscapes’.</p>
--	---	---

		Recommended Response: No Change.
--	--	---

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	N/A	N/A
Comments from HRA		

Supporting Text

7.100. Developments in or adjoining rural areas need to take account of their location. If the principle of the development is acceptable, the main consideration is the impact on the rural character. There may be impacts from visual intrusion, physical effects on the landscape and effects on the tranquillity of the area.

7.101. Policy D1 details the need to take account of the local qualities and features that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the area. This includes characteristics of the surrounding landscape and features such as green and blue infrastructure. The Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment sets out the key characteristics and strategies for the landscape character areas in the district. In the rural area, proposals may need to be subject to landscape sensitivity assessment, in terms of their impact on the rural character of the landscape and the key local qualities that provide the sense of place.

7.102. The introduction of urban and domestic elements, such as large gates and forms of enclosure, significant areas of hard landscaping, structures for lighting and security measures can detract from the special qualities of the countryside. Similarly, the removal of particular features or elements of landscaping such as walls, fences or other structures constructed in the local vernacular, or landscape features such as bunds and ditches, water features, hedgerows and trees can detract from the rural character.

7.103. The nature of the development may lead to intensification of uncharacteristic use in the area. Noise and lighting pollution may be more noticeable in rural areas due to the relative tranquillity of the surroundings. The rural character and tranquillity of the area will be taken into account when assessing the appropriateness of developments that may give rise to pollution.

7.104. Traffic intrusion may adversely affect the character of the area due to numbers of trips and the type of vehicles (e.g. heavy goods vehicles). The suitability as well as the capacity of rural lanes should also be considered, as physical re-modelling of rural roads and introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances necessary for the development may have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character. Rural lanes are a particular characteristic of the district that have historic as well as landscape significance.

7.105. Domestic extensions and ancillary buildings should be well related to the existing building. Extensions should generally follow the style of or complement the original building in respect of proportions and positioning of features such as windows and doors, and may replicate features of the original building in their size, position and use of materials (unless it's existing character is not worthy of retention). Proposals for annexes or other ancillary buildings which could be subject to future proposals for conversion to independent dwellings will be determined having regard to Policies SP3 and H11, which resist housing development outside settlement boundaries other than for essential rural workers.

Amendments to policy

Outside defined settlement boundaries, development proposals which accord with the Development Plan will be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area, by means of visual intrusion, the introduction of incongruous features, the destruction of locally characteristic rural assets, or by impacts on the tranquillity of the environment.

The following factors will be taken into account when considering the effect on the rural character and sense of place:

Visual - intrusion should be minimised, including the effect on the setting of settlements, key features in the landscape, **or the significance of** heritage assets. The cumulative impact of developments will be considered, including any ancillary or minor development that may occur as a result of the main proposal.

Physical – developments will be encouraged to protect and enhance the key characteristics of the landscape and should avoid the loss of key features or the introduction of elements that detract from the special qualities of the place. Any remodelling of the landscape will also be taken into account.

Tranquillity – developments should not have an unacceptable effect on the rural tranquillity of the area, including the introduction of lighting or noise occurring as a result of the development, taking account of the relative remoteness and tranquillity of the location. New lighting will generally not be permitted in unlit areas and the type, size, design and operation of any lighting may be controlled where necessary by the use of conditions.

It should be demonstrated that all opportunities to reduce light pollution have been taken, having due regard to the following hierarchy:

- i. The installation of lighting is avoided or minimised; and
- ii. If lighting cannot be avoided, it is demonstrated to be necessary and appropriate, for its intended purpose or use;

- iii. Any adverse impacts are mitigated with details of the mitigation scheme to be agreed prior to planning permission being granted

Developments should not detract from the enjoyment of the countryside from the public realm or public rights of way.

The impact resulting from the volume and type of traffic generated by the development will be assessed along with the ability of rural roads to accept increased levels of traffic without alterations that would harm their rural character.

Domestic extensions should be proportionate in size to the existing dwelling and generally be subordinate to it, as should annexes and other ancillary development. Extensions should generally reflect the character of the existing dwelling or contemporary design if it is sympathetic to the existing building and its setting unless the existing character is not considered worthy of retention.

Replacement dwellings should not be disproportionately larger than the one being replaced (see policy H8).