

LAND AT SATCHELL LANE

HAMBLE-LE-RICE

HAMPSHIRE

SUMMARY OF URBAN DESIGN PROOF OF EVIDENCE
OCTOBER 2022

CONTENTS

1.0 Qualifications and Experience.....	3
2.0 Design Refusal Considerations.....	4
3.0 Summary of Proof.....	6



Project Ref:	34441-Id-M-02
Status	Final
Issue/Rev	01
Date	03/10/2022
Prepared by	LH
Checked by	JDH/RP
Authorised by	JDH

Land at Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice, Hampshire

Appeal against refusal of planning permission by Eastleigh Borough Council (Application Reference: F/20/89488) of a full planning application for residential development of 61 no. dwellings with associated public open space, landscaping and amenity areas with access off Satchell Lane.

Summary of Urban Design Proof of Evidence
Prepared by Barton Willmore, now Stantec
on behalf of Foreman Homes

Design Statement of Luke Hillson
BSc (Hons), Dip UD, MRTPI, RPUD,
Design Director at Barton Willmore, now Stantec

LPA Application Reference: F/20/89488
This Proof Reference: 34441-Id-M-02 Rev: 01

Barton Willmore, now Stantec, Bank House, Cherry Street,
Birmingham B2 5AL
Tel: 0121 711 5151

email: luke.hillson@bartonwillmore.co.uk

This artwork was printed on paper using fibre sourced from sustainable plantation wood from suppliers who practice sustainable management of forests in line with strict international standards. Pulp used in its manufacture is also Elemental Chlorine Free (ECF).

J:\34000\34441 - Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice\A5 - Reports & Graphics\Reports\Masterplanning\34441 - Id-M-01 - Summary of Design Proof of Evidence 02.indd

© The contents of this proof must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of The Barton Willmore, now Stantec Partnership. All plans are reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with the permission of the Controller of HMSO. Crown Copyright Reserved. License No. 100019279

1.0 QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND INVOLVEMENT

- 1.1 This proof is prepared by Luke Hillson. I am a 'Recognised Practitioner in Urban Design' as awarded by the Urban Design Group and a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (MRTPI). I hold a Bachelor of Science degree (with Honours) in City and Regional Planning and a Post-Graduate Diploma in Urban Design from Cardiff University. I am a past Chairperson of the West Midlands RTPI and the current Chairperson of the West Midlands Urban Design Forum. I am a visiting tutor at Coventry University on Urban Design. I am a Built Environment Expert on the national design review panel for the Design Council and an expert design advisor for Design : Midlands, a regional design review panel throughout the Midlands. I am an Academician at the Academy of Urbanism.
- 1.2 I am a Design Director at Barton Willmore, now Stantec and based in the practice's Midlands Office. Barton Willmore was the UK's largest independent Planning and Design Consultancy, with 13 UK offices, employing some 350 professionals nationwide in the field of town planning, masterplanning, architecture, heritage and landscape planning. Barton Willmore has recently joined Stantec, a global firm with over 1,700 people working in development and infrastructure across the UK.
- 1.3 I have 17 years' experience as an urban designer and masterplanner in the private sector. I undertake a wide range of professional design consultancy work advising private developers, national and regional house builders, landowners and public sector clients on a broad range of design issues, and in particular the residential sector; an area of which I have considerable experience and expertise across the country.
- 1.4 Whilst not involved in the design of the original proposals or the submission of the planning application, I have made myself aware of the proposals, as well as the policy background and the urban design issues relating to this Appeal.
- 1.5 The evidence that I have prepared and provided for this Appeal in this proof is true and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true professional opinions.

2.0 DESIGN REFUSAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 This Urban Design Proof of Evidence addresses the Urban Design Points raised within Reason for Refusal 4. (RfR4) Landscape aspects of RfR4 are covered within the Landscape Proof of Evidence.
- 2.2 **Reason for Refusal** - There is just one reason for refusal listed on the Decision Notice (17th January 2022).
- 2.3 *“The proposal, by means of its scale, form, layout, design and appearance would result in a poor quality and car dominated development, which fails to take the opportunity to provide safe and appealing footpath routes, fails to provide well integrated and attractive recreational spaces and landscaping, and fails to provide a defined sense of place which takes account of its surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Saved Policies 59.BE, 73.H & 100.T of the adopted Eastleigh Local Plan (2001-2011), Draft Policies S10, S13, DM1, DM13 & DM35 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036; and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council’s Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.”* - (Decision Notice, 13th August 2021, Eastleigh Borough Council).
- 2.4 This reason for refusal alleges that the scale, form, layout, design and appearance of the scheme would result in a poor quality and car dominated development.
- 2.5 The reason for refusal also alleges that it fails to provide safe and appealing footpath routes, well-integrated attractive recreational spaces and landscape and lacks a defined sense of place that takes account of its surroundings.
- 2.6 The reason for refusal also refers to Saved Policies and Draft Policies of the Eastleigh Local Plan, a summary table (Table 3.1) of these is included with the corresponding now adopted policies listed. The reason for refusal also alleges that the proposals are contrary to the provisions within the NPPF and the Council’s Quality Places SPD.
- 2.7 In response to the reason for refusal this proof will consider the following key design principles:
- Scale
 - Form
 - Layout
 - Design and Appearance
 - Parking and Car Dominance
 - Safe and Appealing Footpaths
 - Recreational Spaces and Landscaping
 - Sense of Place in Response to Surroundings
- 2.8 The following **key design policies** specifically referenced within the reason for refusal 4 are now included within the Adopted Local Plan.

Table 3.1 - Adopted Local Plan Policies 2016-2036

Submission Policy	Adopted Policy
S10 Green Infrastructure	S9 Green Infrastructure
S13 Strategic Footpath, Cycleway and Bridleway Links	S12 Strategic Footpath, Cycleway and Bridleway Links
DM1 General Criteria for New Development	DM1 General Criteria for New Development
DM13 General Development Criteria - Transport	DM13 General Development Criteria - Transport
DM35 Provision of Recreation and Open Space Facilities with New Development	DM33 Provision of Recreation and Open Space Facilities with New Development

2.9 Reason for Refusal 4 also references the following local and national policy, but doesn't specify any particular section(s):

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Quality Spaces SPD (Eastleigh Borough Council, 2011)

2.10 The final decision notice and reasons for refusal don't reference any other national or local policies or guidance. It follows that therefore the proposals are not considered contrary to any other national or local policies or guidance than those referenced.

2.11 Within the **Officer's Report** there are also aspects of design referred to. For completeness these design aspects will be considered and analysed within this proof, these are:

- Street Hierarchy
- Play Area
- Western PRoW Connection
- Residential Amenity

2.12 The proof considers these points in turn.

3.0 SUMMARY OF PROOF

- 3.1 The Urban Design Proof of Evidence provides careful consideration and analysis of the design proposals which form part of this application and their appropriateness from an Urban Design perspective for the site and the context.
- 3.2 In terms of the specific reasons within **Reason for Refusal 4**, the proof has been demonstrated that the proposals are appropriate for the site and context. Landscape aspects of RfR4 are covered within the Landscape Proof of Evidence. An illustrative landscape masterplan (SL1) has been produced in response to Condition 11 which addresses further landscape aspects.
- 3.3 The **Scale** of the proposals is appropriate in terms of both the storey heights (2 storeys proposed in an area with 1.5-2 storey homes) and dwelling sizes (9-11m wide by 8.5-9.5m deep proposed in an area with approximately 8-11m wide by 8.5m-11m deep homes).
- 3.4 The **Form** of the proposals, including the Shape In Plan (rectangular forms with some L-shaped), the Massing (hipped roofs with some gable fronts and side gables), the Building Lines (rectilinear as per context) and Relationship to Plot Boundaries (setbacks in-keeping with context, albeit smaller overall in places) has all been shown to be appropriate.
- 3.5 The **Layout** in terms of structure and grain is responsive to the local context. The density of the development (20.7 dph net) is appropriate for the surrounding context (approximately 20 to 23 dph net). In terms of the land use, residential use (on a site previously approved for residential use) on a site bordered by residential use is entirely appropriate.
- 3.6 The **Design Appearance** of the proposals has been informed by consideration of the local vernacular and design cues drawn from it to guide the design proposals. The vernacular and character of the context is varied along Satchell Lane with a more consistent character within the development to the east. This proof has demonstrated how the appearance proposed development is appropriate for the site in both terms of materials, vernacular and architectural details.
- 3.7 The **Car Parking** proposed utilises a variety of parking typologies, in-line with guidance, many of which remove parked cars behind the building line to reduce the visual impact of cars on the street. The proposals do not constitute a car dominated development and have been shown to be appropriate.
- 3.8 Proposed **Footpaths** within the development are safe and appealing, they are overlooked and meet the policy guidance (minimum 1.8m width proposed meets the 1.5m width minimum). Pedestrian movement is prioritised above vehicular movement. Therefore in terms of internal footpaths, they have shown to be appropriate for the site.
- 3.9 The **Recreational Spaces and Landscaping** on the site are well integrated and attractive. The public open spaces are in accordance with Key Design Principle 9 (Quality Places SPD) and are appropriate for the site.

- 3.10 The proposals will deliver a **Defined Sense of Place** that has been informed by its surroundings. A clear Character Area Strategy will inform design aspects of the development to ensure it is appropriate for the site and context.
- 3.11 The **Key Design Policies** referenced within the refusal have been addressed with the Proof and the proposals shown to be in accordance.
- 3.12 In terms of the **Adopted Local Plan Policies**, the proposals have been shown to be in accordance with all the policies noted.
- 3.13 It is unclear what elements of the **NPPF** the proposals are considered to be contrary to. The proof has however demonstrated how the proposals accord with the key design sections of the NPPF including Paragraphs 124 and 130.
- 3.14 Similarly, the specific aspects of the **Quality Places SPD** that the proposals are contrary to is unclear. The proof however has demonstrated that the proposals adhere to all 17 of the Key Design Principles included within the Quality Places SPD.
- 3.15 In terms of the **Other Considerations** which were raised within the Officer's Report, the proof has demonstrated that the proposals are appropriate for the site and context.
- 3.16 There is a clear **Street Hierarchy** proposed which is in accordance with the Council's Quality Places SPD.
- 3.17 The **Play Area** is located within just 230m of all dwellings and is well overlooked by adjacent homes (Plots 53 and 54) providing good surveillance over the space.
- 3.18 It is acknowledged that the proposed footpath link on the western boundary of the site to the **PRoW** (Footpath 1) was unclear in the application. This is a proposed connection and the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (SL1) provided as part of Condition 11 can address this matter. As such, it is considered that the proposals are appropriate for the site.
- 3.19 Within the Officer's Report, it is agreed that the development meets the necessary **Residential Amenity** and separation distances required and complies with the Council's Quality Places SPD.
- 3.20 Therefore it is considered on balance that all of the reasons for refusal discussed within the proof have been addressed with a clear design rationale for the proposals and why they're an appropriate design response for the site and context and in accordance with policy.
- 3.21 Therefore the high quality responsive design proposals for Land at Satchell Lane should not be refused on urban design grounds.

