

Land at Broom Hill / Brislington Meadows, Broomhill Road,
Brislington, Bristol

Rebuttal to Evidence by Mr. Crawford - Landscape

PINS REF: APP/Z0116/W/21/3308537

Introduction

The below bullet points focus on some key points raised with the purpose of clarifying certain issues for the inquiry. It does not seek to address all the points made in the Landscape and Urban Design matters.

- From a placemaking perspective the retention of the hedgerows and trees would be appropriate to the context and be considered a constraint to development. It would appear from the narrative within Mr Crawford's Proof of Evidence that the starting point was accommodating 260 units onto the site rather than recognising the important natural assets of the site. See section 1.4.4 of Mr Crawfords Proof of Evidence
- **Landscape Value:**
Mr Crawford's attributes the landscape as having a 'community value' from his assessment Section 6.3.7 page 60 and 61. In the below table (Fig 1) I have set out Mr Crawford's value attributed to the factors that determine the landscape value and my assessment. Where there is a difference in value I have set out the evidence from which the value is derived.

Fig 1. Shows the landscape factors that determine landscape value showing Mr Crawford's assessment of value compared to my assessment of value. Where there is discrepancy between myself and Mr Crawford evidence is provide to support the value attributed.

| Landscape Value Factors | Mr Crawford's assessment of value | Ms Whatmore's assessment of value | Evidence |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Natural Heritage | Local | Local | |
| Cultural Heritage | Local | Local | |
| Landscape Condition | Community | Local | The site host's 1840's field pattern and has intact ecology of city-wide importance. |
| Associations | Limited | Limited | |
| Distinctiveness | Community | Local | The 1840's field pattern are distinctive feature of city-wide importance. |
| Recreational | Community | Local | The site makes a contribution to the local Green Infrastructure |
| Perceptual (Scenic) | Community | Local | Distinctive features of |

| | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---|
| | | | landform, hedgerows and trees and waterway corridor along the southern edge |
| Perceptual (Wilderness and Tranquillity) | Limited | Limited | |
| Functional | Limited | Local | Landscape forms the function as part of natural hydrological system (the brook) and form part of a green infrastructure strategy. |

It is concluded that of the nine factors seven have a local value determining the landscape as having a 'Local' value increased from a 'Community' value.

- **The Summary of Effects on Landscape and Townscape Character**

Mr Crawford's proof of evidence provides a Summary of Effects on Landscape and Townscape Character in Table 1 Section 6.2 page 55. In my opinion using Mr Crawford's methodology the effect on the Landscape and Townscape character for TLCA3 Victory Park should be 'Adverse' for the appeal site. Also 'Adverse' for areas beyond the extent of the appeal site. Developing the site would cause this landscape to be permanently changed diminishing the integrity of the historic field pattern - a key characteristic of the landscape character.

- **The Summary of Visual Effects**

Mr Crawford's proof of evidence provides a The Summary of Visual Effects in Table 2 Section 6.2 page 56. In my opinion the visual effect on the Visual Receptor Group 2 - Victory Park, should be increased to 'Adverse'. Victory Park is a sensitive location used by all ages for recreation. Developing the site with housing as set out in the parameter plans and design codes increases the detrimental visual prominence of the housing due to the removal of the hedgerows, topographically elevating the houses due to the reprofiling and inclusion of three storey houses with gable roof forms.