



**PINS ref APP/U2235/W/24/3351435  
LPA ref: 23/504471/OUT**

**Appeal by**

**Catesby Strategic Land Ltd and The Master  
Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John  
the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge**

**in relation to**

**LAND AT MOAT ROAD  
HEADCORN, KENT**

**SUPPLEMENTARY PROOF OF  
EVIDENCE ON LANDSCAPE AND  
VISUAL MATTERS**

**prepared by**

**Peter Radmall, M.A., B.Phil, CMLI**

**on behalf of**

**Maidstone Borough Council**

**February 2025**

# Contents

|    |                                         |   |
|----|-----------------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Introduction                            | 1 |
| 2. | Replacement Table 6.1                   | 1 |
| 3. | Implications for my Analysis of Effects | 3 |

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Peter Radmall. I am the Council's witness on landscape and visual matters. Relevant details are set out in my main proof of evidence.
- 1.2 The information issued in support of Mr Mylchreest's proof at exchange included photomontages that were additional to and different from those provided as part of the LVIA. They also included winter versions (the original images were taken in summer). The montage locations are shown on Mr Mylchreest's **Plan CM9**, and the winter versions in his **Appendix EDP6**.
- 1.3 As a result, I have reviewed relevant sections of Section 6 of my proof. Specifically, the section dealing with winter views and Table 6.1, which comments on the impacts as shown in the montages. A replacement **Table 6.1** is presented below, reflecting the new montages (winter versions). As before, I have categorised the impacts on the basis of a high/medium/low descriptive scale.

## 2. Replacement Table 6.1: Impacts as shown in the Photomontages

| Montage Ref/Location             | Existing View                                                                                                                                                     | Relevant Receptors                                               | Impact @ Y1                                                                                                                                | Impact @ Y15                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A1: Moat Road looking north-west | Unattractive fencing to right of road frontage, with an established but scrubby hedgerow to centre/left. The site is seen beyond as open and partially vegetated. | Users of Moat Road, including walkers accessing PRow across site | HIGH: Unattractive fencing removed. Height and density of new dwellings infill and obstruct views across the site beyond the middle-ground | MEDIUM: Reinforced hedgerow and new tree planting partially screen the dwellings, although a perception of built development remains |
| A2: Moat Road looking north-east | Unattractive structures on site frontage, beyond                                                                                                                  | Users of Moat Road, including walkers                            | HIGH: Unattractive frontage replaced by                                                                                                    | LOW-MEDIUM: Established roadside hedgerow, with                                                                                      |

|                    |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    | which vegetation associated with the site perimeter is glimpsed                                                                             | accessing PRow across site                                            | managed hedgerow, with open space beyond, allowing views towards the new dwellings, which extend up the slope from the middle-ground. The new building to the right is the reconstructed curtilage-listed building. | scattered trees, largely obstruct views into the site, including screening of dwellings.                                |
| B: Black Mill Lane | Attractive, partially screened view across Beult Valley, including glimpse of church                                                        | Walkers accessing PRow KH590, nearby residents, occasional road users | LOW-MEDIUM: Cluster of new dwellings visible across left-hand quarter of view, partially unscreened and forming skyline. Church view not obstructed.                                                                | LOW: New dwellings substantially screened by new planting, although some rooflines remain visible on skyline.           |
| C. New House Lane  | View across Beult floodplain – site seen as partially vegetated and open pasture on rising ground, with parts of the settlement edge beyond | Road users                                                            | NEGLIGIBLE: Density of appeal scheme is perceptible, creating a wholly developed skyline – but the overall character of the view remains                                                                            | NEGLIGIBLE: Some screening achieved by established trees within the site, but no material change to the level of impact |

|                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                          |                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D: Moat Road at access road junction | Scrubby roadside hedgerow provides dense frontage, although the site beyond remains visibly open. Location of PRoW 591 indicated by sign. Structures within site visible to right. | Road users, walkers accessing PRoW KH591 | HIGH: New views into site created along access road, but obstructed by dwellings from middle-ground. Existing structures within site removed.        | MEDIUM/HIGH: Infilling and urbanising effect of development remains, although new planting along road corridor provides a degree of screening. |
| E: New House Lane                    | View across Beult floodplain – site visible as elevated pasture, but with glimpse of Miller Close housing beyond.                                                                  | Road users, walkers using nearby PRoWs   | NEGLIGIBLE: Density of development displaces the open and rural appearance of the site, but no material change to the overall character of the view. | NEGLIGIBLE: Some screening may be achieved by new planting within the site, but no material change to the level of impact.                     |

### 3. Implications for my Analysis of Effects

3.1 I would highlight the following points as illustrated by the montages (with montage refs):

- The urbanising effect of the development when seen at close range (A1, A2, D);
- The limited effect of the landscape mitigation when also seen at close range from some locations (A1, D);
- The ability of the access road to create a viewing corridor into the site (D);
- The beneficial effect of removing the unattractive structures from the site (A1, A2, D);
- The potential for the appeal scheme to create a developed skyline in countryside views from the west (B);

- The loss of the open pasture character of the site in views from the Beult Valley (C, E);
- The urbanising effect of the development, consolidating existing glimpses of the settlement edge, as seen from the same locations (C, E);
- The relative prominence of the development, compared to the currently greenfield character of this locally elevated site, when also seen from these locations (C, E); and
- The limited effectiveness of the landscape strategy when also seen at distance from these locations.

3.2 The replacement montages confirm the main themes arising from Section 6 and elsewhere in my proof, and have not caused me to revise my opinion of the landscape and visual effects of the appeal scheme as set out in my evidence.

Peter Radmall, 10<sup>th</sup> February 2025