

Our Landscape consultant Jon Etchells has reviewed the Place Services consultation response. They have set out some brief comments below.

Comments from Jon:

The Place Services response seems to be generally detailed and reasonable, but I would note a few points on it:

1. The response suggests that visualisations (i.e. photomontages, with the proposed houses superimposed over a photograph of the site as it stands) are prepared to show whether the proposed development would break the skyline, given the potential for that to happen expressed in the previous reason for refusal. My view (see Photographs 3 and 4 at the end of my previous comments) is that the development would break the skyline, but if visualisations are to be prepared then the location for the viewpoints would have to be carefully considered (and preferably agreed by the Council and yourselves in advance), as the visibility of the new houses in relation to the skyline would vary with location.
2. Furthermore, even if the visualisations show that the houses would not break the skyline in some views, that would not remove the harm – the houses would still be a new, extensive and incongruous element in the view.
3. I agree with the statements in the response that '*the development area looks largely similar*', and that '*the issues raised in the 2021 Refusal are still pertinent to this scheme*' – the conclusion of my previous comments was that: '*The current proposals are for a similar overall quantum and nature of development on the same site, covering effectively the same areas of land, and there have been no significant changes in the site or surrounding area since the previous refusal - the landscape and visual effects would therefore be at effectively the same level as those for the refused proposals, and the same reason for refusal should in my view therefore also apply to the current application.*'