

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden NP  
**Date:** 08 March 2024 10:14:42

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Dear Sir


I wish to object to the removal of ENV5 from the Neighbourhood Plan.

My Reasons are:

- The Valued Landscape Study is too broad in its approach and takes no account of specific areas
- The slopes from Ellisfield down to the Cliddesden school are identical to those already designated as VL around Ellisfield

I also wish to comment on the fact that the report was not shared with the Cliddesden NP team whilst the plan was in preparation even though the CNP team were in close contact with BDBC planning throughout the process. The VL report was prepared in Feb 2023 so there would have been time for the Cliddesden NP to be amended and save this exercise.

Yours sincerely  
Alan Tyler

**From:**   
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Sophy Pashley](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Parish - Proposed Deletion of Neighbourhood Plan Policy ENV5  
**Date:** 10 March 2024 16:42:58

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

It is proposed by the Examiner of this plan that ENV5 regarding Valued Landscapes should be deleted.

Reviewing BDBC's own Valued Landscape Study in February 2023, it would seem that a grave oversight has been made. The land to the South of Hackwood Lane is of good landscape condition, of natural heritage, has associations with North Hampshire, is distinctive, has recreational uses (walkers, runners, cyclists), is perceptual and functional. It's the chalk ridges that form the North Downs.

The leader of the Council has been very clear with the Parish that the Council will seek to protect this land.

It's one of the most beautiful country landscapes/ views in the whole of North Hampshire. Of that I doubt the Examiner could contest by a visit. It's unspoilt by new developments which have been detrimental to so many landscapes/views in North Hampshire.

BDBC should seek to explain the oversight to the Examiner and undertake a supplemental update to its own study to include this landscape.

I do not support the deletion of ENV5 from Cliddesden's Neighbourhood Plan because a substantial element of the land covered by ENV5 in the Neighbourhood Plan appears to me to meet the definition of Valued Landscapes.

Best regards

David Raggett  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Study by Hankinson Duckett Associates  
**Date:** 18 March 2024 18:40:06

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Dear Sirs

I am a resident living on the Cliddesden/Winslade border in North Hampshire and have read the Valued Landscape Study of February 2023 relating to the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan, prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates.

I agree with the comments(quoted below) made by the Chair of the CPRE North Hants District Group regarding this Study.

I believe that many of the decisions within the Study about the local landscape and countryside are questionable.

- There are many anomalies in the Study that render the document unsuitable
- The document should be rejected
- Need a new full comprehensive Study to include all aspects of Valued Landscapes

"Valued Landscapes are highly important areas of countryside and must be protected along with the content - archaeological, social, wildlife and historical valued heritage"and Farmland.

"I am grateful that the Council has considered the completion of a Valued Landscape Study for the Local Plan Update 2021-2040 Draft Regulation 18.

CPRE in their response to the Reg 18 Consultation, requested that the evaluation of valued landscapes is kept under review with a view to adding more to this designation over the life of the plan. I add the relevant paragraphs below:

*" The identification of five Valued Landscapes in ENV1 using the Landscape Institute's TGN methodology aligns with the NPPF paragraph 180(a) and is fully supported by CPRE Hampshire. The identification of the Valued Landscapes is a demonstration of the importance of the borough's landscape and a demonstration of an implicit landscape led approach to the plan which is currently unstated. This needs to be stated in the plan.*

*In terms of the five identified Valued Landscapes CPRE Hampshire would seek that these are kept under review and that the assessments continue to see whether other areas in the borough are out of the ordinary enough to be designated. The borough has fantastic landscape all of which needs to be recognised."*

However, on reading the Study prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates in February 2023, I note there are many anomalies in the categorisation of the landscape values; areas are classed as 'poor', as much of the heritage, archaeological and historical factors within, have not been considered valuable, although they warrant the status but, have not been incorporated.

Table 1: Landscape Value Assessment Factors, in the Study highlights the definitions. Also, the landscape Institute defines landscape value as "the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities" and suggests that value assessments should be carried out by landscape professionals, taking into account the criteria set out in the Landscape Institute's 2021 guidance on assessing landscape value outside of national designations (TGN 02/21).

- Heritage,
- Cultural Heritage
- Landscape condition
- Distinctiveness
- Perceptual (Scenic, Wilderness, Tranquillity)
- Functionality (important farmland)
- Recreational

I believe there are many anomalies in this Study which render the document unsuitable, for example 'K' is too large. Therefore, I request as a matter of urgency, that the Council review their position and reject this document and, obtain a new full study for the associated Valued Landscapes to allow inclusion of the missing archaeological, social and historical valued heritage, which would allow the landscapes to be valued properly."

Chair  
of  
CPRE  
North  
Hants  
District  
Group

Yours Faithfully

Emma Bedford

--

Emma Bedford



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Study by Hankinson Duckett Associates  
**Date:** 17 March 2024 19:08:50

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Hi. I would like to add my name to this email sent to you earlier today. I too am a resident of Ellisfield and I too think your report on Valued Landscapes is questionable.  
Thank you.

Gordon Dunse  
[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Hannah Houstin-Lacey [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 17 March 2024 at 10:34:24 GMT  
**To:** Gordon Dunse [REDACTED] Dee Haas [REDACTED], Alison [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Study by Hankinson Duckett Associates

For information  
Hannah

---

**From:** Hannah Houstin-Lacey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 March 2024 10:27  
**To:** local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk <Local.plan@Basingstoke.Gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Study by Hankinson Duckett Associates

For the attention of the Planning Team

Dear Team,

I am a resident of Ellisfield in North Hampshire and I have now had a chance to read the Valued Landscape Study of February 2023 relating to the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan, prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates, and respond as follows.

Valued Landscapes are highly important areas of countryside

and must be protected along with the content - archaeological, social, wildlife and historical valued heritage.

I am grateful that the Council has considered the completion of a Valued Landscape Study for the Local Plan Update 2021-2040 Draft Regulation 18.

CPRE in their response to the Reg 18 Consultation, requested that the evaluation of valued landscapes is kept under review with a view to adding more to this designation over the life of the plan. I add the relevant paragraphs below:

*" The identification of five Valued Landscapes in ENV1 using the Landscape Institute's TGN methodology aligns with the NPPF paragraph 180(a) and is fully supported by CPRE Hampshire. The identification of the Valued Landscapes is a demonstration of the importance of the borough's landscape and a demonstration of an implicit landscape led approach to the plan which is currently unstated. This needs to be stated in the plan.*

*In terms of the five identified Valued Landscapes CPRE Hampshire would seek that these are kept under review and that the assessments continue to see whether other areas in the borough are out of the ordinary enough to be designated. The borough has fantastic landscape all of which needs to be recognised."*

However, on reading the Study prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates in February 2023, I note there are many anomalies in the categorisation of the landscape values; areas are classed as 'poor', as much of the heritage, archaeological and historical factors within, have not been considered valuable, although they warrant the status but, have not been incorporated.

Table 1: Landscape Value Assessment Factors, in the Study highlights the definitions. Also, the landscape Institute defines landscape value as "the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities" and suggests that value assessments should be carried out by landscape professionals, taking into account the criteria set out in the Landscape Institute's 2021 guidance on assessing landscape value outside of national designations (TGN 02/21).

- Heritage,
- Cultural Heritage
- Landscape condition
- Distinctiveness
- Perceptual (Scenic, Wilderness, Tranquillity)

Functionality (important farmland)

- Recreational

I believe there are many anomalies in this Study which render the document unsuitable, for example 'K' is too large.

Therefore, I request as a matter of urgency, that the Council review their position and reject this document and, obtain a new full study for the associated Valued Landscapes to allow inclusion of the missing archaeological, social and historical valued heritage, which would allow the landscapes to be valued properly.

Yours faithfully

Hannah

*Hannah Houstin-Lacey*

*Chair of CPRE North Hants District Group*



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Study by Hankinson Duckett Associates  
**Date:** 17 March 2024 10:28:07  
**Importance:** High

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

For the attention of the Planning Team

Dear Team,

I am a resident of Ellisfield in North Hampshire and I have now had a chance to read the Valued Landscape Study of February 2023 relating to the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan, prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates, and respond as follows.

Valued Landscapes are highly important areas of countryside and must be protected along with the content - archaeological, social, wildlife and historical valued heritage.

I am grateful that the Council has considered the completion of a Valued Landscape Study for the Local Plan Update 2021-2040 Draft Regulation 18.

CPRE in their response to the Reg 18 Consultation, requested that the evaluation of valued landscapes is kept under review with a view to adding more to this designation over the life of the plan. I add the relevant paragraphs below:

*" The identification of five Valued Landscapes in ENV1 using the Landscape Institute's TGN methodology aligns with the NPPF paragraph 180(a) and is fully supported by CPRE Hampshire. The identification of the Valued Landscapes is a demonstration of the importance of the borough's landscape and a demonstration of an implicit landscape led approach to the plan which is currently unstated. This needs to be stated in the plan.*

*In terms of the five identified Valued Landscapes CPRE Hampshire would seek that these are kept under review and that the assessments continue to see whether other areas in the borough are out of the ordinary enough to be designated. The borough has fantastic landscape all of which needs to be recognised."*

However, on reading the Study prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates in February 2023, I note there are many anomalies in the categorisation of the landscape values; areas are classed as 'poor', as much of the heritage, archaeological and historical factors within, have not been considered valuable, although they warrant the status but, have not been incorporated.

Table 1: Landscape Value Assessment Factors, in the Study highlights the definitions. Also, the landscape Institute defines landscape value as “the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities” and suggests that value assessments should be carried out by landscape professionals, taking into account the criteria set out in the Landscape Institute’s 2021 guidance on assessing landscape value outside of national designations (TGN 02/21).

- Heritage,
- Cultural Heritage
- Landscape condition
- Distinctiveness
- Perceptual (Scenic, Wilderness, Tranquillity)
- Functionality (important farmland)
- Recreational

I believe there are many anomalies in this Study which render the document unsuitable, for example 'K' is too large. Therefore, I request as a matter of urgency, that the Council review their position and reject this document and, obtain a new full study for the associated Valued Landscapes to allow inclusion of the missing archaeological, social and historical valued heritage, which would allow the landscapes to be valued properly.

Yours faithfully

Hannah

*Hannah Houstin-Lacey  
Chair of CPRE North Hants District Group*



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Representations To the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan Policy ENV5  
**Date:** 18 March 2024 15:03:33  
**Attachments:** [Neighbourhood Plan Reprs 18.3.24.pdf](#)

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Please find enclosed my representations on the current consultation for the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan (Policy ENV5, Valued Landscapes).

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt.

Many thanks  
Kelly Rogers



Planning Policy Team  
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
London Road  
Basingstoke  
Hampshire  
RG21 4AH

18 March 2024

Dear Officers

**Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan: Policy ENV5**

I write regarding the current consultation on the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version; specifically, the proposed deletion of Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape Policy). My family and I reside in the village.

**I strongly support the retention of Policy ENV5** in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The fields that buffer Cliddesden from Basingstoke and beyond form an intrinsic and vital contribution to the setting of the village; and a harmonious link between the current built form and the natural world. These landscapes are a vital green lung and an important part of our cultural heritage, having defined and enhanced the village boundaries for many centuries.

The landscape remains an essential resource and important part of maintaining the quality of life and amenity for residents and visitors from Basingstoke and elsewhere. It provides a valued place for recreational pursuits, energetic dog walks and quiet reflection alike, with beautiful views across the countryside and an ever-changing pattern of activity related to the very active seasonal crop rotations.

The landscapes further provide a wealth of biodiversity, containing much wildlife (red-kites, badgers, deer, butterflies, rabbits), treasured hedgerows and special trees skirting the peripheries of the fields. The underlying geology, soils and topography of the land make them unique and highly valued.

As a small village, on the precipice of a major town, the character of the landscape around Cliddesden is distinctly different to what lies on the other side of the M3 and beyond. Without such a designation in place there would be a much easier path towards development of our precious landscapes, which would erode the very special character of the village, as an essential resource for everyone.

There has been significant development in Basingstoke in recent years, and more planned in years to come to tackle the housing crisis. Development is essential in the right places. However, with the substantial amount of development taking place in Basingstoke, there is an even more pressing need to ensure that there is easy access to the countryside for all – which Cliddesden neatly provides.

For the above reasons, I strongly advocate for the retention of the valued landscape designation in the Neighbourhood Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'KJR'.

Kelly Rogers

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [Local Plan](#); [Jessica Wells](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Parish Council ENV5 proposed deletion response.  
**Date:** 14 March 2024 13:26:32  
**Attachments:** [CliddesdenParishCouncil\\_Response\\_to\\_Examiner's\\_open\\_letter.pdf](#)

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Policy ENV5 of the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan has been recommended for deletion and the examiner has offered a consultation period so comments can be made regarding this policy before any final decision.

Cliddesden Parish council would like to respectfully submit the attached response in the defence for the retention of this policy.

Kind regards.

Mark Gifford (Cliddesden Parish Councillor).

## Cliddesden Parish Council's response to the Examiner's open letter

Cliddesden Parish Council would like to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to comment on the proposed deletion of Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape) of the Submission Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan (CNP).

The Parish Council and the volunteers that have prepared the CNP have tried to reflect the aspirations of the wider community in policies which can influence and guide future development in the Parish.

From the first engagement with residents at the Neighbourhood Plan Open Day on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2018 the importance of the local landscape was clear. Throughout the preparation of the CNP the community have highlighted the local landscape as being an important local characteristic which needs to be conserved and where possible enhanced. In the issues and options consultation, the community stressed the importance of the local landscape, in particular there was strong support for the CNP to include a policy to preserve the character and landscape of the Parish. This endorsement from the community continued into Regulation 14 consultation with comments stating, 'support for the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan with regard to retaining Cliddesden's rural character, protecting the surrounding beautiful landscape and wildlife'.

As set out in Planning Practice Guidance neighbourhood planning provides the opportunity for communities to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years in ways that meet identified local need and make sense for local people. The CNP has been prepared to achieve that objective.

It is reassuring that the Examiner recognises that significant changes can lead to concerns over community ownership of the plan, as extensive modifications may mean the CNP effectively becomes a very different plan to the draft submitted for examination and may not represent the intentions of the community. We are particularly grateful to the Examiner offering us this opportunity to comment on the proposed deletion of Policy ENV5, as it is such a key part of our Plan and gives the Parish Council, and the volunteers that have prepared the CNP an opportunity to set out our position. As set out in the Examiner's letter there was the opportunity for the Parish to withdraw the CNP. However, we feel that the wider community would prefer to progress with a plan which includes a range of policies that cover a wide range of matters of local importance, which we hope can progress through Examination and be tested at Community Referendum. We are taking this opportunity, to stress that the Parish Council have taken this decision reluctantly, and feel this option is preferable to withdrawing our plan.

The CNP team would like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the representations made at Regulation 14 and Regulation 16. A number of representors directly challenged our approach to identifying valued landscapes outside those which are designated at a national level. Interestingly we were challenged by landowners and developers that this approach was not appropriate, and that valued landscape was a matter reserved for the nationally important landscapes. It is refreshing to see this approach, of assessing and identifying landscape value outside national designation, and reassures the Parish Council that this is an approach which may be considered appropriate for neighbourhood planning.

Responses from a number of landowners and developers challenged the approach taken by CNP in identifying valued landscape, we are reassured that this approach is not inappropriate, and welcome the Boroughs ambitions to identify valued landscapes. We feel this is an

endorsement of our approach, albeit we accept that there are issues with ENV5 as identified by the Examiner.

The Parish Council would also like to take this opportunity to emphasise our disappointment in the Borough Council and their support in the development of the CNP. As stated in the examiner's letter a local planning authority should share relevant evidence, including that gathered to support its own plan-making, with a qualifying body. (Extract from PPG Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211). We should stress that overall, the support has been good, and we have received advice at key stages of plan preparation. However, the Borough Council have been aware of the CNP Policy ENV5 since the Pre-Submission consultation in February 2022. At that point the Borough Council made no representation on the policy, but comprehensive comments on other areas of the CNP. We have continued to engage with the Borough Council in the lead up to the Submission of the plan, sharing draft plans, attending a meeting to discuss the key policies of the plan, and inviting the Borough Council to carry out a 'critical friend' review of the plan. The CNP team met with the Borough Council on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2023, where we discussed a number of matters including Policy ENV5. At that meeting officers from B&DBC did highlight some concerns about the extent of the area identified but concluded that there was no other evidence available to use to justify the approach, and that the CNP team should proceed with the policy, which would be tested at Examination. We believe that the Borough Council were aware of the development of the Local Plan Update landscape policy, and the valued landscape study that supported it at this time. The study itself has a published date of February 2023. It is unfortunate that the Borough were not able to share information at this stage, which would have allowed the parish to consider this matter carefully and commission further evidence to support our approach.

Moving onto the matter of the Valued landscape policy of the LPU and its supporting evidence paper. The evidence prepared by HDA provides an assessment of a wider parcel of land than that identified in CNP policy ENV5 but the evidence paper recognises the value of the local landscape in this area. The valued landscape evidence paper identifies that the wider assessment parcel scores 'good' in the recreation and distinctiveness assessment factors. The study goes on to identify Farleigh Hill from which the landscape slopes as a recognisable landscape feature from which the distinctive open slopes fall. It also identified the importance of the Public Rights of Way to the east of the assessment parcel, which descend the slopes towards Cliddesden, providing walkers with impressive views and a keen appreciation of the landscape. The assessment concludes that the wider parcel of land does not warrant valued landscape designation, but it should be noted that there are elements of this landscape which hold value, both locally, but also to the wider Borough. The perceptual test identifies that there are long distant views across parts of the landscape, particularly from elevated viewpoints to the south providing a strong sense of the scale of the landscape. We accept that the overall conclusion was that the wider area does not warrant valued landscape designation, but believe the area identified in the CNP, a smaller area, could have been considered appropriate for designation. The LPU states at paragraph 7.9 that the identified valued landscape areas are large scale areas of particularly high value which are significantly 'out of the ordinary', but other landscapes of value may not have been identified in the maps by virtue of their scale. We believe that the area identified by the CNP, or a part of this area would warrant designation as a valued landscape. We believe that this area is of particular importance given its proximity to the urban area of Basingstoke town. Many of the residents of Basingstoke town and the wider surrounding area visit Cliddesden, and in particular the valued landscape for recreation and other benefits offered by spending time in open countryside (mental health, physical health,

leisure and recreation). We believe the relative value or importance attached to this landscape by local people on account of its landscape qualities, warranted its designation as a valued landscape. It is worth noting that the HDA valued landscape assessment states that the areas identified as valued landscapes are judged to be particularly valuable to the local community and visitors, but that does not imply that other areas are without landscape value. Many of the other assessment parcels possess notable value in certain areas as identified in the assessment but are not exemplary and/or above average as a whole generally and are therefore considered less suitable for a local designation than the five areas identified. We believe that it is appropriate for Neighbourhood Plans to identify areas which have particular landscape value, both to the local community but also that offer value to the wider community. It was for this specific reason we sought to identify and designate a valued landscape.

In considering the Local Plan Update (LPU), the parish council would like to highlight that the proposed Policy ENV1 of the LPU is not proposing anything significantly different to the intention of Policy ENV5 of the CNP. Policy ENV5 was drafted with a positive approach, identifying where development would be supported. Both ENV1 of the LPU and ENV5 of the CNP encourage development which is sympathetic to the character and visual quality of the area, encouraging development proposals that respect, enhance and are not detrimental to the character or visual amenity of the landscape. We believe the intention of the CNP policy ENV5 aligns closely with the approach set out in the landscape policy ENV1 of the LPU.

In summary we recognise the role of the examiner, and understand it is a difficult task. We are disappointed that the policy is being considered for deletion, we are proceeding with examination to safeguard the other important policies in the CNP and feel this is critical to ensure local views and aspirations are reflected in future decision making.

We are disappointed in the Boroughs engagement with CNP, we feel this situation could have been avoided, but we are pleased that the Borough recognise the importance of identifying areas of landscape with local value outside national designations.

We will consider the HDA assessment and respond accordingly in the progression of the LPU, but we believe the area identified by ENV5 is appropriate for designation as a valued landscape, and we will consider the matter of valued landscape in any future review of the CNP as we understand the importance of this matter for local community.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] [Jessica Wells](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Parish Council ENV5 proposed deletion response.  
**Date:** 14 March 2024 13:26:32  
**Attachments:** [CliddesdenParishCouncil\\_Response to Examiner's open letter.pdf](#)

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Policy ENV5 of the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan has been recommended for deletion and the examiner has offered a consultation period so comments can be made regarding this policy before any final decision.

Cliddesden Parish council would like to respectfully submit the attached response in the defence for the retention of this policy.

Kind regards.

Mark Gifford (Cliddesden Parish Councillor).

## Cliddesden Parish Council's response to the Examiner's open letter

Cliddesden Parish Council would like to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to comment on the proposed deletion of Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape) of the Submission Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan (CNP).

The Parish Council and the volunteers that have prepared the CNP have tried to reflect the aspirations of the wider community in policies which can influence and guide future development in the Parish.

From the first engagement with residents at the Neighbourhood Plan Open Day on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2018 the importance of the local landscape was clear. Throughout the preparation of the CNP the community have highlighted the local landscape as being an important local characteristic which needs to be conserved and where possible enhanced. In the issues and options consultation, the community stressed the importance of the local landscape, in particular there was strong support for the CNP to include a policy to preserve the character and landscape of the Parish. This endorsement from the community continued into Regulation 14 consultation with comments stating, 'support for the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan with regard to retaining Cliddesden's rural character, protecting the surrounding beautiful landscape and wildlife'.

As set out in Planning Practice Guidance neighbourhood planning provides the opportunity for communities to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years in ways that meet identified local need and make sense for local people. The CNP has been prepared to achieve that objective.

It is reassuring that the Examiner recognises that significant changes can lead to concerns over community ownership of the plan, as extensive modifications may mean the CNP effectively becomes a very different plan to the draft submitted for examination and may not represent the intentions of the community. We are particularly grateful to the Examiner offering us this opportunity to comment on the proposed deletion of Policy ENV5, as it is such a key part of our Plan and gives the Parish Council, and the volunteers that have prepared the CNP an opportunity to set out our position. As set out in the Examiner's letter there was the opportunity for the Parish to withdraw the CNP. However, we feel that the wider community would prefer to progress with a plan which includes a range of policies that cover a wide range of matters of local importance, which we hope can progress through Examination and be tested at Community Referendum. We are taking this opportunity, to stress that the Parish Council have taken this decision reluctantly, and feel this option is preferable to withdrawing our plan.

The CNP team would like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the representations made at Regulation 14 and Regulation 16. A number of representors directly challenged our approach to identifying valued landscapes outside those which are designated at a national level. Interestingly we were challenged by landowners and developers that this approach was not appropriate, and that valued landscape was a matter reserved for the nationally important landscapes. It is refreshing to see this approach, of assessing and identifying landscape value outside national designation, and reassures the Parish Council that this is an approach which may be considered appropriate for neighbourhood planning.

Responses from a number of landowners and developers challenged the approach taken by CNP in identifying valued landscape, we are reassured that this approach is not inappropriate, and welcome the Boroughs ambitions to identify valued landscapes. We feel this is an

endorsement of our approach, albeit we accept that there are issues with ENV5 as identified by the Examiner.

The Parish Council would also like to take this opportunity to emphasise our disappointment in the Borough Council and their support in the development of the CNP. As stated in the examiner's letter a local planning authority should share relevant evidence, including that gathered to support its own plan-making, with a qualifying body. (Extract from PPG Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211). We should stress that overall, the support has been good, and we have received advice at key stages of plan preparation. However, the Borough Council have been aware of the CNP Policy ENV5 since the Pre-Submission consultation in February 2022. At that point the Borough Council made no representation on the policy, but comprehensive comments on other areas of the CNP. We have continued to engage with the Borough Council in the lead up to the Submission of the plan, sharing draft plans, attending a meeting to discuss the key policies of the plan, and inviting the Borough Council to carry out a 'critical friend' review of the plan. The CNP team met with the Borough Council on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2023, where we discussed a number of matters including Policy ENV5. At that meeting officers from B&DBC did highlight some concerns about the extent of the area identified but concluded that there was no other evidence available to use to justify the approach, and that the CNP team should proceed with the policy, which would be tested at Examination. We believe that the Borough Council were aware of the development of the Local Plan Update landscape policy, and the valued landscape study that supported it at this time. The study itself has a published date of February 2023. It is unfortunate that the Borough were not able to share information at this stage, which would have allowed the parish to consider this matter carefully and commission further evidence to support our approach.

Moving onto the matter of the Valued landscape policy of the LPU and its supporting evidence paper. The evidence prepared by HDA provides an assessment of a wider parcel of land than that identified in CNP policy ENV5 but the evidence paper recognises the value of the local landscape in this area. The valued landscape evidence paper identifies that the wider assessment parcel scores 'good' in the recreation and distinctiveness assessment factors. The study goes on to identify Farleigh Hill from which the landscape slopes as a recognisable landscape feature from which the distinctive open slopes fall. It also identified the importance of the Public Rights of Way to the east of the assessment parcel, which descend the slopes towards Cliddesden, providing walkers with impressive views and a keen appreciation of the landscape. The assessment concludes that the wider parcel of land does not warrant valued landscape designation, but it should be noted that there are elements of this landscape which hold value, both locally, but also to the wider Borough. The perceptual test identifies that there are long distant views across parts of the landscape, particularly from elevated viewpoints to the south providing a strong sense of the scale of the landscape. We accept that the overall conclusion was that the wider area does not warrant valued landscape designation, but believe the area identified in the CNP, a smaller area, could have been considered appropriate for designation. The LPU states at paragraph 7.9 that the identified valued landscape areas are large scale areas of particularly high value which are significantly 'out of the ordinary', but other landscapes of value may not have been identified in the maps by virtue of their scale. We believe that the area identified by the CNP, or a part of this area would warrant designation as a valued landscape. We believe that this area is of particular importance given its proximity to the urban area of Basingstoke town. Many of the residents of Basingstoke town and the wider surrounding area visit Cliddesden, and in particular the valued landscape for recreation and other benefits offered by spending time in open countryside (mental health, physical health,

leisure and recreation). We believe the relative value or importance attached to this landscape by local people on account of its landscape qualities, warranted its designation as a valued landscape. It is worth noting that the HDA valued landscape assessment states that the areas identified as valued landscapes are judged to be particularly valuable to the local community and visitors, but that does not imply that other areas are without landscape value. Many of the other assessment parcels possess notable value in certain areas as identified in the assessment but are not exemplary and/or above average as a whole generally and are therefore considered less suitable for a local designation than the five areas identified. We believe that it is appropriate for Neighbourhood Plans to identify areas which have particular landscape value, both to the local community but also that offer value to the wider community. It was for this specific reason we sought to identify and designate a valued landscape.

In considering the Local Plan Update (LPU), the parish council would like to highlight that the proposed Policy ENV1 of the LPU is not proposing anything significantly different to the intention of Policy ENV5 of the CNP. Policy ENV5 was drafted with a positive approach, identifying where development would be supported. Both ENV1 of the LPU and ENV5 of the CNP encourage development which is sympathetic to the character and visual quality of the area, encouraging development proposals that respect, enhance and are not detrimental to the character or visual amenity of the landscape. We believe the intention of the CNP policy ENV5 aligns closely with the approach set out in the landscape policy ENV1 of the LPU.

In summary we recognise the role of the examiner, and understand it is a difficult task. We are disappointed that the policy is being considered for deletion, we are proceeding with examination to safeguard the other important policies in the CNP and feel this is critical to ensure local views and aspirations are reflected in future decision making.

We are disappointed in the Boroughs engagement with CNP, we feel this situation could have been avoided, but we are pleased that the Borough recognise the importance of identifying areas of landscape with local value outside national designations.

We will consider the HDA assessment and respond accordingly in the progression of the LPU, but we believe the area identified by ENV5 is appropriate for designation as a valued landscape, and we will consider the matter of valued landscape in any future review of the CNP as we understand the importance of this matter for local community.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Policy  
**Date:** 15 March 2024 14:50:55  
**Attachments:** [Farleigh Wallop Estate response to examiner letter re CNP.pdf](#)

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please see attached response on behalf of Farleigh Wallop Estate to the Examiner's letter 28.02.24 and the Council's email 01.03.24 regarding the recommended deletion of emerging policy ENV5.

Yours sincerely

Martin Harradine

Martin Harradine BA MA MSc MRTPI  
Director (Planning)

AZ Urban Studio  
2 John Street  
London  
WC1N 2ES

[REDACTED]

Regulated by RICS

Reg No: 3072755

VAT No: 66 2 8061 32

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. If you receive this e-mail by mistake, please advise AZ Urban Studio immediately by return and destroy all copies. Any attachments should be checked for viruses by the recipient. AZ Urban Studio does not accept responsibility for damage caused by viruses.

---

**From:** Local Plan <Local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 1, 2024 4:03 PM  
**To:** Local Plan <Local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Policy

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to you because you responded to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's

consultation on the Regulation 16 Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan.

The neighbourhood plan is now at examination, and the examiner has written to BDBC and the Parish Council indicating her intention to recommend the deletion of Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape Policy). She has asked the council to publicise this matter and seek comments on the intended change prior to the publication of her report.

Further details about the examiner's letter, the policy that would be deleted, and information about how to comment is available to view on the council's website:

[www.Basingstoke.gov.uk/ClidNP](http://www.Basingstoke.gov.uk/ClidNP).

Any comments on this matter must be submitted to the council before 5pm on Monday 18 March. Please note that the examiner will not accept correspondence on any other aspects of the neighbourhood plan.

If you have any queries, please contact the Planning Policy Team on [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk) or on 01256 845464.

Yours faithfully

**Planning Policy Team**  
**Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council**

---

Data Protection – personal data you provide to the council will be processed in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018. For more information on how your information is used; how we maintain the security of your information and your rights, including how to access information that we hold on you and how to complain if you have any concerns about how your personal details are processed, please see our [privacy statement](#)

---

This Email, and any attachments, may contain Protected or Restricted information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. All GCSx traffic may be subject to recording and / or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation



2 John Street  
London WC1N 2ES  
020 7234 0234  
azurbanstudio.co.uk

Planning Policy Team  
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
London Road  
Basingstoke  
Hampshire  
RG21 4AH

15<sup>th</sup> March 2024

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Re: Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan – response to the Examiner’s open letter dated 28 February 2024**

We refer to your communication of the 1<sup>st</sup> March referencing the fact that the appointed Neighbourhood Plan Examiner has written to the Borough and Parish Councils indicating intention to recommend the deletion of emerging Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape).

Further to your invitation for comments on that intended change, on behalf of our client The Farleigh Wallop Estate, we provide the following response to the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s open letter of the 28<sup>th</sup> February.

We agree that the deletion of emerging Policy ENV5 is a necessary modification to the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan.

We set out a detailed case on the matter of emerging Policy ENV5 within our representations to the Regulation 16 consultation. In essence, those submissions highlighted no technical or credible landscape, ecological or arboricultural assessments had been undertaken to justify inclusion of draft Policy ENV5. We also made the case that the move to secure a Valued Landscape designation at this location was wrong and that it failed to meet the required tests.

Subsequent to our Regulation 16 submissions, a Basingstoke & Deane Valued Landscape Study has been published. That work was prepared by Hankinson Duckett Associates on behalf of the Borough Council. The Study applies the Landscape Institute definition on such matters and approaches the subject in a systematic and competent manner. We note the Study concludes there is no justification for any areas of Valued Landscape within the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan area.



In commenting on 'Area G4', within which the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan largely falls, the Basingstoke & Deane Valued Landscape Study describes the landscape condition as being limited with '*...a relatively loose landscape structure*' and concludes '*...the majority of factors are considered to be average or limited and overall therefore, the parcel is **judged to be unsuitable for designation as a Valued Landscape.***' (our emphasis).

In summary we welcome and support the Examiner's approach to ENV5 and believe any other approach would undermine the plan making process and would destabilise the technical evidence produced by Hankinson Duckett Associates, as well as the ability of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council to use that technical baseline work as part of its plan making and development management duties across the Borough.

Should the Examiner decide to hold any exploratory meetings or hearing sessions on this matter, we would welcome an opportunity to contribute to such sessions. However, we share the Examiner's initial reflection that the documented technical evidence is robust and that no further Examination time is needed on this issue. The published evidence is clear, there is no justification for emerging Policy ENV5, and it should be deleted.

Yours sincerely

Martin Harradine BA MA MSc MRTPI  
Director

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden neighbourhood plan ENV5 Valued Landscape consultation  
**Date:** 14 March 2024 20:13:10

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed deletion of ENV5 from the Cliddesden Neighbourhood plan.

From the very start of the Neighbourhood Planning process and through subsequent consultations, the local community has shown great concern over the importance of the local landscape and the local character of the parish, such that any future developments should not negatively impact the landscape and the rural character of the village.

Since the 1960s many small villages in the local area have been swamped by local development and lost their character as a result. Many areas of local landscape continue to be lost as a result of the pressure to meet housing targets. Cliddesden has a special character of its own, sitting in its natural landscape. If measures are not taken to retain the local landscape, it is in danger of becoming yet another rural village in a rural landscape that is lost.

The landscape in Cliddesden forms an important backdrop, not just to Cliddesden but to Basingstoke as well. The rising hills to the south of the Cliddesden parish, towards Swallick farm can also be seen from the North side of Basingstoke. This landscape needs to be afforded protection, not just for the sake of Cliddesden but also for the wider area. The landscape around Cliddesden is a resource for people of Basingstoke. Given its proximity to Basingstoke, it is accessible to people of the town to enjoy for walking and cycling. Indeed the Basingstoke half marathon passes through the parish.

The examiner has commented about the robustness of evidence provided. However there is no standard approach that clearly sets out how to define a Valued Landscape.

Cliddesden is a small village with limited resources. Local people have worked hard over a period of several years to create evidence that they believed to be proportionate. Greater consideration should be given to what is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Planning group, given they do not have the same resources as the local planning authority.

I sincerely hope that the examiner will reconsider their decision and will allow the Valued Landscape policy to proceed. I am supportive of the decision to proceed with the plan, rather than withdrawing the plan. This will enable the other policies in the plan which have received strong community support to proceed.

Thank you.

Mr B.P. Karley



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Policy  
**Date:** 16 March 2024 15:05:40

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to convey to you my objection to the Examiner's proposed deletion of Policy ENV5 'Valued Landscape Policy' from the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan.

The landscape of Cliddesden forms an important and beautiful feature, of significance not just to Cliddesden but to the whole of Basingstoke. The rising hills to the south of the Cliddesden parish, towards Swallick farm, can also be seen from the North side of Basingstoke. This rolling chalk hill landscape needs to be afforded protection, not just for the sake of Cliddesden but also for the wider area. The landscape around Cliddesden is a resource for people of Basingstoke, and given its proximity to Basingstoke, it is accessible to people of the town to enjoy for walking and cycling, and to escape the bustle of the town. Indeed the Basingstoke half marathon passes through the parish.

The local landscape is of great value to the local community, and to the whole area of Basingstoke. Cliddesden has a special character of its own, sitting in its natural landscape. If measures are not taken to retain the local landscape, it is in danger of becoming yet another rural village in a rural landscape that is lost. Considering how much rural landscape surrounding Basingstoke has been lost to development already, I find it extraordinary and am very disappointed that the Examiner considers this surviving landscape should not be deemed 'valuable'.

The Examiner has commented about the robustness of evidence provided. However, there is no standard approach that clearly sets out how to define a Valued Landscape. Cliddesden is a small village with limited resources. Local people have worked hard over a period of several years to create evidence that they believed to be proportionate. Greater consideration should be given to what is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Planning group, given they do not have the same resources as the local planning authority.

I sincerely hope that the Examiner will reconsider their decision and will allow the Valued Landscape policy to proceed. I am supportive of the decision to proceed with the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan, rather than withdrawing the Plan. This will enable the other policies in the Plan which have received strong support from the community to proceed.

Thank you.

Mrs E J Karley

Resident of Cliddesden

**From:** Local Plan <Local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 March 2024 16:03  
**To:** Local Plan <Local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - Valued Landscape Policy

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to you because you responded to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's consultation on the Regulation 16 Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan.

The neighbourhood plan is now at examination, and the examiner has written to BDBC and the Parish Council indicating her intention to recommend the deletion of Policy ENV5 (Valued Landscape Policy). She has asked the council to publicise this matter and seek comments on the intended change prior to the publication of her report.

Further details about the examiner's letter, the policy that would be deleted, and information about how to comment is available to view on the council's website:

[www.Basingstoke.gov.uk/ClidNP](http://www.Basingstoke.gov.uk/ClidNP).

Any comments on this matter must be submitted to the council before 5pm on Monday 18 March. Please note that the examiner will not accept correspondence on any other aspects of the neighbourhood plan.

If you have any queries, please contact the Planning Policy Team on [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk) or on 01256 845464.

Yours faithfully

**Planning Policy Team**  
**Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council**

---

Data Protection – personal data you provide to the council will be processed in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018. For more information on how your information is used; how we maintain the security of your information and your rights, including how to access information that we hold on you and how to complain if you have any concerns about how your personal details are processed, please see our [privacy statement](#)

---

This Email, and any attachments, may contain Protected or Restricted information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print

or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. All GCSx traffic may be subject to recording and / or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Legal Mail](#)  
**Subject:** Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan - policy ENV5 Valued Landscape in Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan  
**Date:** 07 March 2024 15:15:07

---

\*\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails \*\*\*\*

---

FAO: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Planning Department

Dear BDBC planning team,

I have been a resident of Cliddesden for over 30 years.

My understanding is that an examiner, Janet Cheesley, has been reviewing the Cliddesden Neighbourhood Plan [1] and is suggesting that policy "ENV5 Valued Landscape" be deleted [2] from the plan.

I do not agree with this.

I wish to register my objection to the deletion of policy "ENV5 Valued Landscape".

Cliddesden has a unique and much loved character because of its setting in this rural area.

The deletion of policy "ENV5 Valued Landscape" would enable unrestricted development around the village which will destroy the special character of the village.

It should be noted that policy "ENV5 Valued Landscape" does not exclude development proposals that would be in keeping with and preserve the character of Cliddesden for future generations.

The benefit of policy "ENV5 Valued Landscape" is that it will ensure that potential development will be sympathetic and in harmony with the village instead of being unrestricted.

Yours sincerely

Paul Blackburn, Cliddesden village resident

References:

[1] Cliddesden Neighbourhood - policy ENV5 Valued Landscape  
<https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/ClidNP>

[2] Letter from Janet Cheesley, examiner:

[https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/83010/Letter%20from%20examiner%20raising%20concerns%20about%20Policy%20ENV5%20\(Valued%20Landscape%20Policy\).pdf](https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/83010/Letter%20from%20examiner%20raising%20concerns%20about%20Policy%20ENV5%20(Valued%20Landscape%20Policy).pdf)