



ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROOF OF EVIDENCE - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rob Jackson BArch MArch RIBA ARB

**EDWINA MOUNTBATTEN HOUSE, BROADWATER ROAD, ROMSEY, HANTS
S051 8GH**

CHURCHILL RETIREMENT LIVING LTD.
CHURCHILL HOUSE
PARKSIDE
RINGWOOD
BH24 3SG

JULY 2024

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document summarises my Architectural Design Proof of Evidence for the proposed redevelopment of Edwina Mountbatten House, located on Broadwater Road in Romsey, Hampshire. The project seeks to erect 47 retirement apartments with communal facilities, access, car parking, and landscaping.
- 1.1.2 The proposed design was supported by the Case Officer and Conservation Officer but refused at planning committee. The Reasons for Refusal my evidence relates to are RfR 1 and RfR 2.
- 1.1.3 The key themes in these RfR are i) whether the scale bulk and design of the proposal is acceptable, or adversely affects Heritage Assets and ii) whether the proposal causes an unacceptable sense of enclosure or overbearing to the dwellings opposite on Palmerston Street.

1.2 Context

- 1.2.1 The evidence outlines the characteristics of the appellant and their brief, the appeal Site and the site context. The prevailing character of the context is reviewed based on the findings of the Conservation Area Appraisal, the Romsey Town Design Statement, the appellant's DAS and Mr Scott's townscape evidence.
- 1.2.2 This concludes that there is a consistent reading of the character of the local area. This is that the site is adjacent a fine grained conservation area, with coarser grain larger footprint buildings to the west. The area is residential, and buildings typically align with streets and are set at the back edge of the pavement with continuous frontages. The scale is typically a mix of 2, 2.5 and 3 storeys with variations in mass. Roofs are pitched, running parallel to the street with varying eaves and ridge heights. Roofs are clay or slate and walls typically red or white painted brick. Windows are white framed casement or sliding sash and detailing is modest.

1.3 Policy

- 1.3.1 The evidence outlines the national and local planning policy context including SPDs and material considerations that the proposal should be assessed against.

1.4 Proposal

- 1.4.1 The evidence describes the design development process including pre-application design and design development via two design review panels and discussion with the Conservation Officer. This outlines the changes to layout, mass, bulk and detail design that occurred through the iterative process and then describes the final design, including the key features for retirement living.

1.5 Response to Reasons for Refusal

1.5.1 My evidence identifies two design and one amenity themes from the Reasons for Refusal:

Theme 1: Size, scale, mass and bulk / Theme 2: Appearance / Theme 3: Amenity

1.5.2 In order to assess the quality of the proposed design, the evidence considers what constitutes 'High Quality Design'. This is defined as 'Firmness, Commodity and Delight' and I explore each of these aspects.

1.5.3 In terms of Size, Scale, Mass and Bulk, the proposed design is compared to the context, and it is found that the proposal is in accordance with the identified prevailing character.

1.5.4 I assess the proposed design compared to the existing Site and the existing context in terms of eaves height and street width. Using a height-to-width ratio I find that the proposed height to width ratio is both in line with the character of the town and within best practice urban design guidance.

1.5.5 The requirement to make best use of brownfield land, and how the proposal meets this requirement whilst still according with the character of the area is considered.

1.5.6 I then review the amenity of the properties opposite the proposed Site on Palmerston Street, considering the alleged harm of overbearing and an excessive sense of enclosure.

1.5.7 It is proven in quantitative terms that the height-to-width ratio, which defines enclosure, is both in line with the character of the town and within best practice urban design guidance.

1.5.8 In qualitative terms I review the independently prepared Verified Visual Montages, and I determine that there would be no excessive sense of overbearing or enclosure to numbers 30-36 or 38-48 Palmerston Street.

1.6 Policy

1.6.1 I review the design against National and Local policies and find that the proposal accords with all design policy requirements.

1.7 Conclusion

1.7.1 The Proof of Evidence concludes that on a detailed analysis not only are the Reasons for Refusal in design terms and amenity terms not borne out, but that the proposal would be an improvement compared to the existing vacant Edwina Mountbatten House.