

LAND AT SATCHELL LANE

HAMBLE-LE-RICE

HAMPSHIRE

Rebuttal to Design Proof of Evidence of G Osmond

OCTOBER 2022

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.

Rebuttal to Design Proof of Evidence of G Osmond

Prepared by Barton Willmore, now Stantec on behalf of Foreman Homes

Luke Hillson

BSc (Hons), Dip UD, MRTPI, RPUD,

Design Director at Barton Willmore, now Stantec

LPA Application Reference: F/20/89488

This Document Reference: 34441-A3-11 Rebuttal to Design Evidence of G Osmond

Issue: Final

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I have prepared this rebuttal following receipt of the design proof of evidence prepared by Mr Osmond.

2.0 HIGHWAYS MATTERS

2.1. Mr Osmond presents his evidence on highways matters including alleged over engineering of the roads within the layout and priority of vehicular traffic movement over pedestrians at paragraphs 6.4 to 6.6 of his proof.

2.2 It has been demonstrated within my urban design proof of evidence that the layout is not a vehicular dominated layout, with a number of routes where pedestrian movement is prioritised.

2.4 Within my proof I include a section on 'Safe and Appealing Footpaths' (Paragraphs 4.66 – 4.78) which demonstrates how pedestrian movement has been considered and accommodated within the design proposals.

2.5 Within my proof there are four examples given (Images 4.50 – 4.53) where pedestrian movement has been prioritised over vehicular movement.

2.6 Also within my proof is a plan (Image 4.54) which demonstrates a comprehensive network of dedicated footpaths and shared surface links which provide an appropriate movement network for pedestrians.

2.7 Furthermore within my proof the section on 'Parking and Car Dominance' (Paragraphs 4.61 – 4.65) demonstrates that careful consideration has been given to parking typologies to ensure that the impact of vehicles on the streetscene is reduced.

2.8 Therefore it has been demonstrated that the proposals accord with County Highway's and Manual for Streets requirements whilst also providing an appropriate environment for pedestrians that isn't car dominated.

3.0 ARCHITECTURAL VERNACULAR

3.1. The conclusion of Mr Osmond's proof introduces a new design aspect of disagreement at 7.4:

"The architectural design of the dwellings is confused and of a generally poor quality, with no rationale for why certain designs have been proposed." (Paragraph 7.4, G Osmond Proof of Evidence).

This is the first time that the architectural design of the dwellings has been in question.

3.2 There is no evidence provided within Mr Osmond's proof of evidence on why he considers the architecture to be of a '*generally poor quality*'. The first time it is mentioned is within the Conclusion.

3.3 The agreed Statement of Common Ground with Mr Osmond identifies the matters of dispute within 3.0, which does not raise architectural design as a matter of dispute.

3.4 Reason for Refusal 4 within the Decision Notice does not raise architectural design as a matter for refusal.

3.5 The Officer's Report (Ref: F/20/89488) does not raise architectural design as a matter of contention.

3.6 It is therefore unclear why the matter of architectural design is now being raised as a matter of dispute. It is also unclear what aspects of architectural design are in dispute as no evidence has been provided.

3.7 Notwithstanding, the proposals are in accordance with the NPPF, particularly Section 12 and are '*visually attractive as a result of good architecture*' (NPPF, 130. (b)).

3.8 Section 4 of my proof gives evidence on a number of design elements, including Scale and Form, including Shape in Plan, Building Lines and Plot Boundaries (Paragraphs 4.11 – 4.43). The proposals are shown to be responsive to the existing surrounding context and an appropriate design response.

3.9 Furthermore, the Design and Access Statement (December 2020, Foreman Homes Ltd.) provides additional information on Architectural Character (Paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12) and the Supporting Design Document (September 2020, HGP Architects) also provides further information on the architectural appearance of the proposals (Pages 12 – 17), demonstrating why they are responsive to the existing architectural vernacular of Hamble Le Rice.

3.10 Therefore it remains unclear why architectural design is now raised within Mr Osmond's proof conclusion, due to a lack of evidence the aspects of architecture which are poor quality are unclear; however irrespective it has been demonstrated that the design proposals are appropriate for the site.

4.0 LANDSCAPE MATTERS

- 4.1. Within Mr Osmond's design proof of evidence (Paragraphs 6.28 to 6.34) the topic of landscape is raised.
- 4.2 All landscape matters have been covered by the appellant within Mr J Smith's landscape proof of evidence (October 2022, SLR).
- 4.3 The landscape aspects raised by Mr Osmond can be broadly summarised as the proposals not providing enough space for appropriate landscape planting.
- 4.4 Mr Smith's proof on behalf of the appellant includes an illustrative landscape masterplan (SL1) in response to Condition 11. This plan demonstrates how an appropriate landscape planting proposal could be delivered on the site.
- 4.5 Mr Smith concludes with the following:

"174. I have considered how the illustrative landscape masterplan might help to address some of the concerns expressed by Officers. In particular the illustrative plan includes additional native tree and shrub planting around the edges of the site, hedgerows and trees within streetscapes, a multi-functional Village Green, potential footpath connections with the footpath to the west, a central LAP and a new orchard and seating area at the south of the site.

175. I have concluded that the illustrative landscape plan therefore addresses the landscape design concerns raised in Reason 4 and the comments of Landscape and Urban Design Officers." (Mr J Smith, Landscape Proof of Evidence, October 2022).

- 4.6 **Therefore it has been demonstrated within Mr Smith's report that there is appropriate space for greening and landscape planting.**

5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1. The Proof of Evidence of Mr G Osmond has covered a number of matters, including Highways, Architectural Design and Landscape.
- 5.2 My proof has demonstrated that the layout does not result in a car dominated development.
- 5.3 The Architectural Design concerns are a new one, which has not been raised prior to Mr Osmond's proof of evidence and for which no evidence is provided. Notwithstanding, the proposals have been shown to be an appropriate design response.

- 5.4 Landscape matters are also raised within Mr Osmond's design proof of evidence. All landscape matters have been comprehensively covered within the appellant's landscape proof of evidence by Mr J Smith, which demonstrates there is adequate space for appropriate landscape proposals and greening.
- 5.5 **In summary, it is demonstrated that these points raised within Mr Osmond's proof of evidence have been appropriately addressed.**

Luke Hillson

Design Director

Barton Willmore now Stantec

17 October 2022