



ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN - CLARIFICATIONS

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 covers a number of clarifications/corrections to the evidence provided by the Council. It is not intended as a rebuttal, but a clarification of the facts. It consists of three parts.
- 1.1.2 The **first part** provides a summary table [see Table 1.2] of the various levels and distances of the existing and proposed buildings as described in the Proofs of Evidence of Mr. Burns, Mr. Wright and Mrs. Webb and confirmation of the appellants understanding of the levels/ differences based on digital measuring the proposed plans/ reviewing the topographic survey and the digital OS plan.
- 1.1.3 To supplement and illustrate the table, I include an update (revision A) of SK18 included in my PoE at appendix F with written levels and dimensions for clarity. The drawn information is unchanged; only dimensions and levels have been added.
- 1.1.4 Furthermore I include a new section drawing, SK19, which illustrates the relationship between numbers 17 and 18 Palmerston Street described by Mrs. Webb at paragraph 9.21 of her proof. It also shows the relationship between numbers 21 (Manor House) and 22 Palmerston Street.
- 1.1.5 The **second part** covers clarification of the Verified Visual Montages [see Table 1.3]. These Verified Visual Montages have been referred to in the Council's evidence but were never formally submitted to the LPA as part of the planning application. Images were provided to the case officer for illustrative purposes at the committee. The use of this document in the Council's evidence has proved problematic as the views and figures referred to do not tally with Appendix I of my proof. For clarity I have therefore tabulated which images are referred to in the Council's evidence with the correct references in my PoE Appendix I.
- 1.1.6 The **third part** concerns the reference within the Council's evidence to materials and design included in the DAS and original application drawings which are no longer relevant, having been superseded by the revised design [see Table 1.4]. The revised design is to be found at Core Documents Section 2. I have therefore identified where these superseded features are mentioned in the Council's evidence [see 1.4 at "Para 5.3", "Para 4.25/5.3" and "Para 97"] and which core documents supersede these.

I trust that clarifying these matters now by reference to the submitted documents will save inquiry time (and avoid confusion) hereafter.

1.2 Levels and Distances Table

	Mr. Burns PoE Design	Mr. Wright PoE Heritage	Ms. Webb PoE Amenity	Appellant
Length of 30-36 Palmerston Street Terrace	Some 11m (para. 4.2.4)			13.488m (CAD measure from OS plan)
Length of 38-46 Palmerston Street Terrace	c.19m linear (para. 4.2.4)			19.8m. Including No.48 is 27.790m. (CAD measure from OS plan)
Distance between edge of site boundary to face of buildings opposite	c.9.00m (para. 4.3.2)			11.2m (CAD measure from OS plan)
Distance between Proposed building line and existing No.48	c.14m		14.1m (para. 9.20)	14.185m at narrowest point (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)
Distance between Proposed building NE corner and existing No.36			18.3m from the proposed NE corner (para. 9.20)	17.773m building/ 18.3m window of No. 36 (CAD measure from OS plan)
Distance between No. 17 and No. 18 Palmerston Street			13.6m (para. 9.21)	13.559m (CAD measure from OS plan / additional section SK19)

	Mr. Burns PoE Design	Mr. Wright PoE Heritage	Ms. Webb PoE Amenity	Appellant
Proposed Scheme Plan difference to proximity to Palmerston Street to Edwina Mountbatten House (EMH)	c.0.80m (para. 4.3.2)	Approximately 0.8m (para. 77)	Approximately 0.8m (para. 9.20)	Varies - section drawn shows 0.775m. Rounding up to 0.8m.
Palmerston Street Level	c.15m AOD (para. 4.3.2)	15m (para. 76)		15m AOD nominal (varies slightly but broadly correct) (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)
Proposed Ground Floor FFL	16.70m AOD (para. 4.3.2)	16.75m (para 78)	1.75m above Palmerston Street (existing FFL) (para 9.19)	16.75m AOD as noted on CD2.3 Ground Floor Plan
Ridge: Edwina Mountbatten House (EMH)	5.4m above ground level / c.7.00m above Palmerston Street (para. 4.3.3)	7m (para. 81)		5.444m above ground/ 7.110m above Palmerston Street/ 22.11m AOD
Ridge: Proposed Scheme	c.10.50m above ground level/ c12.20m above Palmerston Street (para.4.3.3)	10.5m above ground level/ 12.25m above Palmerston Street (para.79 and 81)	12.2m (para. 9.9)	10.368m above GFFL/ 12.043m above Palmerston Street/ 27.043mAOD
Eaves: Proposed Scheme		5.4m above ground level and 7.15m above Palmerston Street (para.79)		22.09mAOD / 5.415m above ground level/ 7.09m above Palmerston Street

	Mr. Burns PoE Design	Mr. Wright PoE Heritage	Ms. Webb PoE Amenity	Appellant
Ridge: 30-36 Palmerston Street	c.7.60m AOD (para, 4.3.4)			22.67m AOD (7.67m above Palmerston Street) (taken from Topo survey)
Ridge: 38-48 Palmerston Street	c.6.70 AOD (para. 4.3.4)	6.72m (para. 81)		Ridge of No.48 = 21.72mAOD (6.72m above Palmerston Street) (taken from Topo survey)
Proposed Scheme Ridge difference to 38-48 Palmerston Street	5.50m (para 4.3.4)	5.5m (para. 81)	5.25m / 5.5m? (para. 9.9) 6.8m (table in para 9.24)	27.043 - 21.72 = 5.323m
Proposed Scheme Ridge difference to 30-36 Palmerston Street			4.2m	27.043 - 22.67 = 4.373m
Proposed Scheme Ridge difference to EMH	6.8m (para. 4.3.7)	5.25m (para. 81)	5.12m or 5.19m (table in para 9.24)	27.043 - 22.11 = 4.933m
Proposed Scheme Eaves difference to EMH		3.15m higher (para. 81)	3.15m higher (table in para 9.24)	3.15m higher (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)

	Mr. Burns PoE Design	Mr. Wright PoE Heritage	Ms. Webb PoE Amenity	Appellant
Proposed Scheme Eaves difference to 48 Palmerston Street		2.4m higher (para. 81)		21.96 - 19.75 = 2.21m higher (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)
EMH Eaves difference to 38-48 Palmerston Street		EMH 75cm lower (para. 80)		EMH 94cm lower (taken from Topo survey) (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)
EMH Ridge difference to 38-48 Palmerston Street		EMH 25cm higher (para. 80)		EMH 39cm higher (Mr Jackson Proof Appendix F Comparison Section Drawing.)

1.3 VVM Clarifications

DESIGN PROOF OF EVIDENCE , ROB BURNS, JULY 2024	Document Referred To	Core Document
Para. 4.1.6 <i>The visualisations provided as part of the planning application submission</i>	No VVMs formally submitted	CD7.10.1 Appendix I of Mr Jackson's PoE
Para. 4.1.9	Figure 6 in proof	CD7.10.1 Fig. 03: View 01 A3090 Bypass Road Proposed
Figure 5	Photo	CD7.10.1 Appendix I of Mr Jackson's PoE Fig. 04: View 02 Palmerston Street Existing
Figure 7	No VVMs formally submitted	CD7.10.1 Appendix I of Mr Jackson's PoE Fig. 05: View 02 Palmerston Street Proposed
HERITAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE , NICK WRIGHT, JULY 2024	Document Referred To	Core Document
Para. 74	Rev B of drawings Site Plan and Elevations	CD2.2, CD2.7, CD2.8, CD2.9, CD2.11
Para 75 <i>I will also make use of a set of Visually Verified Montages</i>	No VVMs formally submitted	CD7.10.1 Appendix I of Mr Jackson's PoE
Para 83	View 1 Existing (figs 02) / VVM02	CD7.10.1 Fig. 04: View 02 Palmerston Street Existing
Para 84	View 1 Proposed (figs 03) / VVM03	CD7.10.1 Fig. 05: View 02 Palmerston Street Proposed

HERITAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE , NICK WRIGHT, JULY 2024	Document Referred To	Core Document
Para 85	View 5 Existing (fig 11) / VVM11	CD7.10.1 Fig. 06: View 03 The Hundred Existing
Para 86	View 5 Proposed (fig 12) / VVM12	CD7.10.1 Fig. 07: View 03 The Hundred Proposed
Para 87	View 4 Existing (fig 08) / VVM08	Not included in core documents / evidence as view is not relevant to RfR. Acknowledged by Wright at para 70: <i>"...given that Broadwater Road dates only from the 1960s, and no viewpoint existed here historically, Broadwater Road and the view from it do not contribute to the significance of the conservation area."</i>
Para 88	View 4 Proposed (fig 09) / VVM09	
Para 89	View 2 Existing (fig 04) / VVM04	CD7.10.1 Fig. 02: View 01 A3090 Bypass Road Existing
Para 90	View 2 Proposed (fig 05) / VVM05	CD7.10.1 Fig. 03: View 01 A3090 Bypass Road Proposed
Para 82 <i>As noted above, no VVM showing this relationship has been supplied.</i>	-	CD7.10.1 Fig 08, 09, 10, 11 and 12 Views 04 and 05

1.4 Detailing / Materials Clarifications

DESIGN PROOF OF EVIDENCE , ROB BURNS, JULY 2024	Document Referred To	Core Document
Para 5.3 <i>chimneys are composite material</i>	-	Eg CD2.7 Elevation (and all revised elevations) Materials key (01) Prefabricated chimneys are shown as, and intended to be, brick
Para 4.2.5 and Para 5.3 <i>slate effect or clay effect tiles</i>	-	Eg CD2.7 Elevation (and all revised elevations) Materials key (02) Natural slate roof tiles & (03) Red clay roof tiles
HERITAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE , NICK WRIGHT, JULY 2024	Document Referred To	Core Document
Para 97 refers to DAS description of architectural detailing which has been superseded by the revised drawings (Core Documents Section 2):		
Para 97 Column 1 row 1 <i>roof tiles would be slate effect</i>	CD1.13 DAS p.46	Eg CD2.7 Elevation (and all revised elevations) Materials key (02) Natural slate roof tiles
Para 97 Column 1 row 3 <i>the casement window of 28 Palmerston Street</i>	CD1.13 DAS p.46	Eg CD2.14 Glazing Bar (& all revised elevations) Revised windows
Para 97 Column 2 row 1 <i>flat-topped dormer</i> And referred to in para. 99	CD1.13 DAS p.46	Eg CD2.7 Palmerston Street Elevation - pitched roof dormers
Para 97 Column 2 row 3 <i>rendered facade</i>	CD1.13 DAS p.46	Eg CD2.7 Elevation (and all revised elevations) Materials key (09) White painted brick No render.
Para 97 Column 2 row 4 <i>quoins</i>	CD1.13 DAS p.46	Eg CD2.9 Bypass Road Elevation (and all revised elevations) No quoins proposed.