

Eileen Marshall

From: Eileen Marshall
Sent: 17 March 2022 12:39
To: Emma Worley
Subject: 22/00201/OUT - Land at Kidderminster Road, Hampton Lovett.

Emma,

As I advised at the site meeting with representatives of the applicants last week, my landscape concerns remain the same as for the previous refused application (17/01631/OUT) which was dismissed at appeal less than 18 months ago (October 2019).

The various landscape concerns that I raised at that time were fully examined at Public Inquiry, with the Inspector acknowledging in her Decision the adverse impacts of development on this site on the landscape - including location in open countryside, adverse impact on the dispersed settlement pattern of Hampton Lovett (both as identified for the Principal Timbered Farmlands Landscape Type, within which the site is located, and as is found on the ground in the locality), and adverse impact on views from The Forest (which also forms part of Monarch's Way Long Distance Footpath) and the A442. The Inspector also acknowledged the Strategic Gap separating the site from the town of Droitwich, the existing settlement pattern of Hampton Lovett being of wayside dwellings, that the Hampton Lovett Industrial Estate across the Kidderminster Road *'does not prevent the appeal site from being perceived as countryside'*, the suburban character between the railway line and the A442 that would result from development on the site, and the presence of the adjacent mobile home park as a *'very specific and well-defined element'* with its own character, being *'the type of land use that can be found in rural locations and sometimes in the most scenic of places.'* The Inspector considered that *'the proposed development, as a whole, would be harmful to the open countryside, landscape character, and upon the character of the settlement of Hampton Lovett.'* She found *'development in this location would have a harmful visual impact upon the open countryside and upon the character of the settlement of Hampton Lovett'* and did *'not consider this to be appropriate to, or integrate with, the character of the landscape setting'*, and so she concluded that *'in this respect the proposal fails to accord with Policy SWDP25.'* The Inspector considered that despite benefits of the scheme, including landscape benefits and the provision of public open space, the *'harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the landscape harm,..... is such that the appeal should fail.'*

The proposal now before us is not dissimilar to the proposed scheme examined at that appeal. I acknowledge the reduction in numbers of dwellings (102 as opposed to 144 in the previous scheme) and that development is now proposed to be set back further from The Forest. Nonetheless, all of my landscape and visual concerns that were raised for the last application, and which were examined at appeal, apply equally to this latest proposal. Whilst noting the separation distance now proposed from The Forest/Monarch's Way, dwellings would still be visible in views from there as well as from the A442 – and the impact on landscape character and the character of the settlement pattern of Hampton Lovett would be, in my professional opinion, equally harmful in this latest iteration.

I advise that the proposals do not accord with Policy SWDP25 for the reasons previously outlined and echoed above, and that have already been examined at appeal.

Thanks.

Eileen Marshall (Mrs) BSc (Sp Hons), DipLA, MA, MCIHort
Landscape Officer (Mon, Tues & Thurs all until approx. 2.30pm)

Wychavon District Council
Civic Centre, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Pershore, Worcs., WR10 1PT
Tel: 01386 565309
www.wychavon.gov.uk