

ADDENDUM NOTE



DR CHRIS MIELE ADDENDUM NOTE TO PROOF OF EVIDENCE

REASON FOR REFUSAL 1: CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE INCLUDING HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT MATTERS APP/W0340/W/25/3359935

- 1.1 In my main proof, at paragraphs 7.40 to 7.42 (in the assessment section), I explain that at the time of writing I had not been able to visit the viewpoint in Goldwell Park, AVR G, and which was produced in response to a request made, I am informed, prior to the January Committee.
- 1.2 My paragraph 7.42 explained I would prepare a note 'to confirm my findings' on the scheme's impact on the view in which one can see the upper parts of the tower of St Nicholas Church (grade I listed) and the upper stage of the Town Hall tower (grade II).
- 1.3 This note comprises my evidence on that impact.
- 1.4 I visited the viewpoint the day before the Inquiry opened, 2 June, at about 6:30 pm in dry and very bright conditions, with very good visibility.
- 1.5 My observations follow.
- 1.6 First, the Telephone Exchange is quite prominent in the view, and it appears behind the tower of the Town Hall which can be clearly discerned. The church tower is recognisable off to the left, and one can to some extent appreciate its proportions and fine detailing.
- 1.7 The distant ridgeline is a prominent feature, and the three buildings just mentioned project above that. There are other buildings visible, including housing rising up the slope of the distant ridge. The view point selected for modelling is about 50 metres from a bench which is positioned to enjoy the view.
- 1.8 The upper parts of the proposals would be discernible to the right of the tower, albeit filtered. The proposals do not project above the ridge line. The roofscape is varied.
- 1.9 I consider that they would be noticeable but not harmful for these reasons.
- 1.10 First, in relation to the Town Hall, they are visually separated from it, and that building has a distinctive form appreciable even against the broad backdrop comprised of the Telephone Exchange.
- 1.11 Second, the proposals are clearly behind the church tower, occluded to the left of it and filtered to the right. The light-golden colour the stone facing to the church tower, taken together with its pinnacles, ensure it is a prominent feature of strong character. The proposals would present as a series of low-pitched sloping roofs with some brick upper parts (I surmise), and set below the ridgeline of the distant hill. Accordingly, they are not prominent and the church tower would remain readily discernible, and the ability to appreciate its proportions and pinnacles as defining characteristics would not be impeded.

ADDENDUM NOTE



- 1.12 Therefore, there would be no harm to the ability to recognise or appreciate the two historic buildings in the view.
- 1.13 The character and composition of the scene would not be harmfully affected because the proposals are in the middle ground, associated with the town, have a broken form, and sit below the ridgeline. They are also seen in a heavily vegetated scene which frames the town centre, softening many building forms, including the proposals.
- 1.14 This note is prepared on the same basis as my main evidence, as per the signed Affirmation concluding my main Proof.

Dr Chris Miele MRTPI IHBC

Senior Partner, Montagu Evans LLP

3rd June 2025