

Neighbourhood Character Study for  
East Hampshire District Council

Final Report: Classification and Description

December 2018

**Section 5:**

**Chapter 5 to Chapter 7 (Conclusions) and  
Appendix 1**



## 5. Summary of Character Area Studies

5.1. The following tables provide comparative summaries of the key: data characteristics; issues and trends and; risks on all twenty study areas.

### Key Data 1

	H9, H10, other	Density rating	Density figure (net dpha)	Approximate number of dwellings	Study Area Size (ha.)	Typical mid range plot size (sq. m.)	Intervisibility with AONB or SDNPA	Tranquillity rating (CPRE mapping)*	Tranquillity rating - relative for district*	Dark night skies rating (CPRE mapping)*	
<b>North Western</b>											
1	E Ropley	VL	7.1	137	19	74	x	-12 to -4	M	7	
2	W Four Marks	L	18.8	300	16	67	x	-32 to -10	M	5 to 6	
3	N Four Marks	VL	10.9	458	42	73		-32 to -10	M	4 to 7	
4	Telegraph Lane	*	5.7	100	18	82		-30 to -8	M	5 to 6	
5	Beech	H10	VL	4	96	24	91		-10 to -7	M	8
6	Holybourne	H10	VL	3.3	24	7.3	75	x	-41	L/M	4 to 7
7	E Holybourne		M	23.1	268	12	52	x	-52 to -27	L/M	4 to 7
8	N Bentley		L	15.7	284	18	61		-19 to -2	M	6 to 7
<b>North Eastern</b>											
9	Headley Fields	H9	VL	3.1	22	7.1	56		-30 to +3	M	7 to 8
10	Headley Down	H10	VL	11.1	582	53	67		-39 to +2	L/M	6
11	Whitmore Vale*	*	VL	2.4	55	23	70	x	-24 to +5	M	8 to 9
12	Kingswood Firs	H9	VL	5.1	126	25	53		-25 to +7	M/H	5 to 6
13	Waggoners Way	*	VL	10	116	12	94		-41 to -8	L/M	7
14	E Liphook		L	19.1	306	16	49		-40 to -21	L/M	6
15	Chiltley Way	H9	VL	6.9	263	38	71	x	-26 to +11	M	5 to 6
<b>Southern Parishes</b>											
16	Catherington Lane		L	14.1	168	12	66	x	-56 to -26	L/M	7
17	Lovedean Lane		L	12	201	17	64	x	-48 to -11	L/M	4 to 7
18	Portsmouth Road	H9	VL	2.95	16	5.4	104		-59	L/M	4
19	Links Lane	H9	VL	3.93	51	13	85	x	-40 to -5	L/M	6
20	S Rowlands Castle		L	16.4	203	12	67		-49 to -12	L/M	6

Table 1: Key Data 1: Density, Tranquillity and Dark Night Skies.

## Key Data 2

	Landscape Character Area*	Main Townscape Type*	Conservation Area/ Listed Buildings	Other historic buildings or features*	Within Neighbourhood Plan area*	Village/community hall within 800m	Shop within 800m	Primary school within 2km	Recreation space within 800m*	Mainline station within 2km	Level of bus service
<b>North Western</b>											
1	E Ropley	3e	3	x	E	x	x	x	x		4
2	W Four Marks	2b	8		M		x	x	x		1
3	N Four Marks	2b	8		x	M	x	x			1
4	Telegraph Lane	2b	8			M		x	x		1
5	Beech	2b	8	x	x	E	x		x		4
6	Holybourne	4b	2,3	x		M	x	x		x	1
7	E Holybourne	4b	8			M	x	x		x	1
8	N Bentley	4b	3	x		M	x	x	x		1
<b>North Eastern</b>											
9	Headley Fields	8c	5,6,8				x	x			1
10	Headley Down	9b	7,8				x	x	x		1
11	Whitmore Vale	9b	2					x			0
12	Kingswood Firs	9b	8						x		0
13	Waggoners Way	9b	8			E		x	x		1
14	E Liphook	8c	8					x	x	x	1
15	Chitley Way	8c	8	x	x	E	x	x		x	1
<b>Southern Parishes</b>											
16	Catherington Lane	3f	3,7,8	x			x		x	x	0
17	Lovedean Lane	3f/10a	3,4,8	x	x		x		x		0
18	Portsmouth Road	10a	8				x	x	x		1
19	Links Lane	10a	8			E	x	x	x	x	2
20	S Rowlands Castle	10a	7,8		x	E	x	x	x	x	2

Table 2: Key Data 2 Landscape, Townscape, Historical Assets and Connectivity.

## Key Data

- 5.2. In summary the key data indicates that, the size of study area varies from 5.4ha to 42ha, with numbers of dwellings varying from 16 to 458. Whilst the size of study area varies significantly, the density is very consistently low to very low, with only one area, Eastern Holybourne, just edging into the bottom of the medium density range, at 23.1dpha.
- 5.3. Tranquillity ratings are for the most part, medium, with lower tranquillity more commonly seen on the Southern Parishes, consistent with their location on the edge of the South Hampshire Sub-region. The Dark Night Skies ratings are for the most part good, being in the medium range, with higher ratings seen in the North East and West of the District.
- 5.4. By far the biggest townscape type present is 8: Residential post 1945 – present (houses and bungalows). Some of the study areas exhibited more variety, growing up around earlier settlements, with the presence of townscape types 2 and 3: Rural settlement and post medieval. There are also a few examples of townscape from 1820- 1945, but for the most part, this isn't significant. There is a presence of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and some examples of other noteworthy locally distinctive buildings.
- 5.5. The presence of local facilities within a walkable distance of 800m/10minutes is low, with the areas in Ropley and Rowlands Castle being better supplied than most of the other study areas. Wider connection to facilities through sustainable modes of transport, such as train and bus, were only good in Four Marks, Holybourne, Liphook, and Rowlands Castle, due to their proximity to a railway station, and/or a frequent bus service on a main through route, to a larger local centre.

## Valued Characteristics and Distinctiveness

- 5.6. Characteristics common amongst the areas studied, considered to be locally attractive and distinctive to East Hampshire, have been identified as:
  - Spacious low-density suburban areas.
  - Housing estates, with retained open space with trees (usually large native species).
  - Where an older historic core is present, this tends to result in a compact intimate streetscape with distinctive historic features/buildings.
  - Tranquil rural character with green, leafy road and lanes, unspoilt by highways clutter and suburban detailing.
  - Development contained by Woodland.
  - Trees/vegetation within private residential plots.
  - Green frontages along private residential plot boundaries.
  - Pedestrian/cycle connections to local services, where present.
  - Pedestrian/cycle connections to the countryside, where present.
  - Views out to the wider landscape (and corresponding views in).

Photographic examples shown in Figures 6.1.-6.10 at the end of this chapter.



## Valued Characteristics and Distinctiveness

	Spacious, low density/suburban	Housing estate with open space & trees	Compact settlement - village/urban	Historic character	Tranquillity, rural character	Green, leafy roads and lanes	Development contained by woodland	Green frontages contain development	Trees/vegetation within plot/development	Undeveloped space within area	Ped/cycle connections to local services	Ped/cycle connections to countryside	Views out
<b>North Western</b>													
1 E Ropley			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 W Four Marks		x							x	x		x	x
3 N Four Marks	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
4 Telegraph Lane	x				x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
5 Beech	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
6 Holybourne			x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x
7 E Holybourne		x	x	x				x	x	x	x	x	x
8 N Bentley	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>North Eastern</b>													
9 Headley Fields	x				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
10 Headley Down	x				x	x	x	x	x			x	
11 Whitmore Vale					x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
12 Kingswood Firs	x				x	x	x	x	x			x	
13 Waggoners Way	x						x		x		x	x	
14 Eastern Liphook		x				x	x	x			x	x	
15 Chitley Way	x	x			x	x	x		x		x	x	
<b>Southern Parishes</b>													
16 Catherington Lane		x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
17 Lovedean Lane		x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x
18 Portsmouth Road	x						x	x	x		x		
19 Links Lane	x				x		x	x	x		x	x	
20 S Rowlands Castle		x	x					x	x		x	x	

Table 3: Valued Characteristics and Distinctiveness.

## Key Issues and Trends

	Extended parking, garaging, vehicle access	Loss of green frontages	Larger replacement dwellings/extensions	Plot intensification/Backland development	Loss of historic character	Greenfield housing development	Loss of vegetation within site	Loss of buffer/backdrop vegetation	Garden area beyond domestic curtilage	Dominance of busy road/railway	Impact on views from wider landscape	Visual impact of rooflines/development	Highway access issues
<b>North Western</b>													
1 E Ropley	x		x	x		x					x	x	x
2 W Four Marks				x		x				x		x	
3 N Four Marks	x			x		x	x	x			x	x	
4 Telegraph Lane	x	x	x						x				
5 Beech	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	
6 Holybourne			x								x	x	
7 E Holybourne	x			x		x				x	x	x	
8 N Bentley	x					x					x	x	
<b>North Eastern</b>													
9 Headley Fields		x	x	x					x				
10 Headley Down	x	x	x				x						
11 Whitmore Vale	x		x										x
12 Kingswood Firs	x	x	x				x		x				
13 Waggoners Way							x						
14 Eastern Liphook	x	x	x										
15 Chitley Way						x					x	x	
<b>Southern Parishes</b>													
16 Catherington Lane		x	x	x							x	x	
17 Lovedean Lane	x			x	x	x	x				x	x	
18 Portsmouth Road	x	x	x				x			x			
19 Links Lane		x		x							x		
20 S Rowlands Castle	x	x											

Table 4: Key Issues and Trends

## Key Sensitivities

	Impact on skyline views	Loss of small dwellings	Loss of tranquillity	Loss of views out	Loss of visual connection to countryside	Loss of undeveloped gaps within area	Increased traffic impact on lanes	Impact on SDNP/AONB landscapes	Loss of agricultural land	Impact on dark night skies	Lack of walkable local services	Car dependent for work
<b>North Western</b>												
1 E Ropley	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
2 W Four Marks	x				x	x	x		x	x	x	x
3 N Four Marks	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
4 Telegraph Lane		x						x		x		x
5 Beech	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
6 Holybourne		x		x	x	x			x	x		
7 E Holybourne	x			x		x			x	x		
8 N Bentley			x		x		x		x	x		x
<b>North Eastern</b>												
9 Headley Fields	x	x	x				x			x		x
10 Headley Down	x	x								x		x
11 Whitmore Vale	x	x	x				x	x		x	x	x
12 Kingswood Firs		x	x			x				x	x	x
13 Waggoners Way										x	x	x
14 Eastern Liphook					x					x		
15 Chitley Way							x	x		x		
<b>Southern Parishes</b>												
16 Catherington Lane	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
17 Lovedean Lane	x					x	x	x	x	x	x	x
18 Portsmouth Road												x
19 Links Lane								x		x		
20 S Rowlands Castle		x										

Table 5: Key Sensitivities

## Key Issues, Trends and Sensitivities

5.7. The following were observed as key issues and common trends:

- For existing bungalows or small two storey homes to be replaced by larger and taller buildings, resulting in the neighbourhood having more visible development and a more built up character.
- Suburban and urban treatment of frontages is eroding the rural or informal character of most neighbourhoods to a lesser or greater degree.
- Subdivision of plots, for example, with large new and replacement dwellings being built along Bridle Path at Catherington, and Peacock Gardens estate south of Portsmouth Road.
- A rapid increase in development affects some areas. For example, Four Marks, with green field sites becoming built up over a short space of time, without a clear integration with the surroundings. There is a corresponding loss of tranquillity as areas become busier.
- In most areas there is increased provision for vehicle access, with wider driveways and parking areas. New or enlarged garages have often been added. It is especially difficult to accommodate vehicle access on steep gradients.
- Loss of views and connection with countryside where development has been extended.
- Loss of historical character e.g. colonial bungalows replaced.
- Some inappropriate design of alterations, e.g. porches, replacement windows.
- Topography has a strong influence on how well settlements are integrated with their setting. New buildings are often set at a high level, resulting in prominent rooflines, visible on the skyline.
- Development close to the road on steep gradients can require more vegetation clearance, and introduction of features such as retaining walls, which introduce urban characteristics.
- Some modernist styles result in extensive areas of glazing, which can affect dark night skies in areas of high tranquillity.
- Loss of green frontages, including mature trees and replacement with fences or walls.
- Loss of vegetation within plots. Clearance of woodland to make way for development or to open up garden areas, as seen in Kingswood Firs and on the riverside at Eastern Liphook.
- Verge biodiversity can be affected by inappropriate maintenance.
- Lack of local services within walking distance in many areas is likely to encourage greater use of private cars.



- Intensification of land for development within and around areas is putting pressure on existing facilities and affecting the quality of the rights of way network.
  - Dominance of main roads and severance issues, for example A31.
- 5.8. It is not possible to control all of these trends through the planning system, as some of them fall under permitted development.
- 5.9. The study areas exhibit the following sensitivities:
- The balance between the built and green environment. Areas with large plots are sensitive to backland development or subdivision, or expansion of gardens into non-curtilage areas involving removal of trees.
  - The predominantly rural character of many areas.
  - Views and sense of connection to countryside. Many neighbourhoods benefit from an open outlook and connection with the countryside, for example, the skyline of the adjacent downland at Holybourne, where changes are very visible from the valley floor, the open fields and hedgerows along the Catherington Lane, and the open pasture between the lanes at Ropley. Views into a neighbourhood, from adjoining higher land, increases its sensitivity, for example at Ropley. At Holybourne, views to the village and church spire are sensitive.
  - The sense of tranquillity and seclusion created by the woodland cover and the rural setting. Dark night skies where there is no street lighting at present. Even where a busy road is close by, omission of street lighting and open views of the countryside, for example at Western Four Marks, ensures a relative sense of tranquillity.
  - Historic character, including listed buildings but also small incidental structures such as Catherington Granary, details of some of the older properties at Southern Rowlands Castle, and the vernacular boundaries on frontages within Conservation Areas, can easily be eroded by suburbanisation.
  - Archaeological monuments, such as the Roman settlement and road at Holybourne.
  - Buffer vegetation including hedgerows, woodland and individual trees that contain and absorb development. Examples include the woodland buffer at the edge of Ludshott Common, the wooded northern boundary and setting of River Wey, the wooded eastern backdrop to Telegraph Lane and Rowlands Castle. Without this woodland structure, development in these neighbourhoods could be visible from many miles away.
  - Green frontage and boundary vegetation is important to the landscape character, especially in elevated positions. Landscape character can be

particularly affected where naturally vegetated frontages are replaced with urban or suburban treatment, such as at Hammer Lane.

- Vegetation within plots, especially mature trees and woodland, is easily affected by subdivision or extensions, and its removal can open up views.
- Biodiversity value increases sensitivity, for example the SPA and SSSI at Ludshott Common and the SINCS adjoining Eastern Liphook, Telegraph Way and Rowlands Castle.
- Narrow secluded lanes, which contribute to the experience of travelling through many neighbourhoods and are vulnerable to traffic pressures and the erosion of verges and banks.

## Examples of the Valued Characteristics



*Figure 5.1 Spacious low-density suburban area - Chiltley Way*



*Figure 5.2 Retained open space and mature trees within housing estate - Western Four Marks*



*Figure 5.3 Intimate streetscape in historic core - Eastern Ropley*



*Figure 5.4 Tranquil rural character with leafy roads and lanes - Hammer Lane*





*Figure 5.5 Development contained by woodland - Headley Down*



*Figure 5.6 Trees and vegetation within private residential plots - Kingswood Firs*



*Figure 5.7 Green frontages to private residential plots - Beech*



*Figure 5.8 Pedestrian / cycle connections to local services - Rowlands Castle*





*Figure 5.9 Pedestrian / cycle connections to the countryside - Lovedean Lane*



*Figure 5.10 Views out to the wider landscape - Ropley*

## 6. Key Pressures for Change and Possible Policy Direction

- 6.1. The twenty study areas that were assessed are in a particular part of East Hampshire's settlement hierarchy. Most of the study areas are in settlements that are classified as small local service centres, with only Liphook and Horndean having a higher order of service provision, and Holybourne located very close to Alton, which is a market town. All study areas, bar one, sit in, but on the edge of, the boundaries of these small settlements and have a strong physical and visual link with the surrounding landscape. Whitmore Vale and Hammer Lane, is the one study area, comprising a series of clustered dwellings based wholly in the countryside.
- 6.2. All the sites studied are predominantly low to very low density 20<sup>th</sup> century residential developments with low levels of service provision and infrastructure (other than local access roads and the occasional open space). They are essentially car-based commuter neighbourhoods on a rural fringe, however, they display characteristics which play a significant part in forming East Hampshire's character.
- 6.3. The over-arching pressure for development comes in the form of private market residential development, much of it for large detached homes. This ranges in scale from individual landowner house expansions/remodelling, to small plot intensification (i.e. increasing the number of dwellings on a small plot) to larger more substantial development sites, on the edge of a settlement. There is little in the way of large sites that facilitate a whole settlement/urban extension master-planning approach, as has been seen at Whitehill and Bordon.
- 6.4. The landscape/townscape assessments of the twenty identified Neighbourhood Character Areas for this study highlight the following distinctive attractive and special qualities:

### Landscape Setting and Green Infrastructure

- a strong visual and physical relationship between current settlement edges and their landscape setting, seen in:
  - settlement edge treatments ('soft' edges being preferable to 'hard' or 'raw' edges)
  - a low rise roofscape settled in amongst mature vegetation
- a strong green infrastructure:
  - extensive tree cover with large tree species (mostly native)
  - high hedge boundary treatments (in native and non-native species)
  - grass verges.

### Urban Structure and Built Form:

- the majority of buildings in the areas studied are low-rise, detached residential properties (average two storey with pitched roof), face the road but are set back from it, with off-street parking, built as ribbon development (these offer some valuable pointers to plot layout and streetscape, but should not be seen as a prescriptive model to copy into new development)
- an overt lack of highways clutter, with the absence of urbanising signage, street furniture and road markings.

All the above help to create:

- a relatively tranquil environment with good dark night skies AND;
- residential buildings are subservient to and often 'hidden' amongst a screen of trees.

6.5. Currently these special qualities, particularly the green infrastructure, play an important role in providing an attractive setting for pleasant suburban development typical of its time. There is, for the most part, neither locally distinctive nor noteworthy architecture. These qualities are considered to be under threat to creeping suburbanisation and intensification, where the green screening is being gradually eroded through cumulative low scale changes to more significant plot intensification, resulting in:

- more visible rooflines
- wider driveways and 'harder' boundary treatments, and increasingly visible car parking arrangements generally
- insensitive extensions and individual plot redevelopments
- some insensitive infill (although quality is variable, as there are examples of well-designed infill also)
- increased glazing
- use of new materials that are not part of the local vernacular

6.6. In planning for new development, these special qualities need to be proactively incorporated into the site assessment and design process, for example through:

- the identification and preservation of views from the surrounding landscape into the settlement, and locally important views out to the countryside
- the rigorous application of Arboriculture Assessments and Method Statements for any new development plots that come through the Housing and Business Allocation Policy, with a view to preserving existing blocks of woodland planting and/or individual trees together with succession planting

- enabling Tree Officers to assess trees under threat and determine the need for TPOs.
- planning for layouts that include space for large trees, verges, and promote hedges as a boundary treatment, rather than walls or railings.

Within new development ensure that provision is made for creation of new green infrastructure using the following mechanisms:

- public open space (open areas and woodland), play areas, sports pitches and allotments to help meet existing deficit
- planning for layouts that include space for large trees
- provision of flood alleviation and SuDS features.

6.7. There are a number of other issues of note, which are described in the subsections below.

#### **Historical Development and Assets:**

6.8. Whilst much of the architecture is not particularly locally distinctive or noteworthy, there are a few instances where ‘special buildings’ were observed.

6.9. It is recommended that the potential value of developing and maintaining a Local List of buildings of architectural and/or cultural and historic interest be assessed. This list would help to promote the retention of a small number of locally important buildings and other built features within the context of evolving environments. Their status may not be worthy of national listing, but they add ‘time depth’ to local character, e.g. the tin tabernacle on Wellhouse Road, Beech.

#### **Urban Structure and Built Form:**

6.10. The land use in the study areas is predominantly residential, to the exclusion of many other activities, apart from small instances of public open space and farmland/woodland, and the occasional shop or community building.

6.11. The net residential densities of East Hampshire as a whole, and of these study areas in particular, demonstrate low to very low densities from a range of less than 3 dwellings per hectare (dpha) to around 23dpha. These densities represent suburban to semi-rural areas, with mostly large detached properties, with recent replacement dwellings representing considerable enlargement. More variety in dwelling types and sizes could be beneficial.

6.12. Whilst residential density and plot size and layout play a role in enabling space for green infrastructure to exist, it is the careful siting and layout of the green infrastructure elements in a development, that allow for their impact to be ‘felt’, rather than the net density and plot size per se (for densities up to around net 25-



30dpha, where urban elements become more apparent thereafter). Other factors such as scale of the development and location of open space also come into play.

- 6.13. Most of the study areas and the H9 and H10 areas in particular, demonstrate a coherent plot layout, with building frontage oriented towards the street. This plot layout plays a role in fostering natural surveillance on the street and directing activity to the public realm. These good urban design principles should prevail in new development, although the size and orientation of plot can and should vary, and each case needs to be assessed on its own merits.
- 6.14. Most of the study areas displayed very varied architectural styles, whether this was through their original building or through buildings modified or altered over time. In only a few locations, such as the Berg Development at Chiltley Way, was the continued uniformity of architectural style a significant issue, and worthy of proactive promotion.
- 6.15. Whilst it is known that there are a significant number of Conservation Areas and listed buildings in East Hampshire, the study did not encompass many sites where the original vernacular architecture was strongly present. With the wide variety in 20<sup>th</sup> century architectural styles present, there was no strong building style evident as being distinctive to East Hampshire, apart from in the overlap of areas with Conservation Area designation. This provides many options in terms of building design, although a clear demonstration of understanding context in site assessments should be part of the planning process and fundamental to approval, and the promotion of local traditional building materials may be appropriate in certain locations.
- 6.16. Apart from the promotion of the use of warm recessive colours, which are sympathetic to the landscape, rather than bright white, there are many options for building materials and architectural styles, although this should not be carried through to boundary treatments. It is recommended that boundary treatments concentrate on the promotion of hedge planting as a first option.
- 6.17. A common trend is for existing bungalows or small two storey homes to be replaced by larger and taller buildings, resulting in the neighbourhood having more visible development and a more built up character. There are also incidents of insensitive alterations, although some of this is difficult to control, as work occurs under permitted development rights.
- 6.18. To ensure that the built form of proposed development has been 'designed in context' the following high-level 'rules of thumb' are suggested:
  - For extensions to existing dwellings, the extensions should be subservient to the main original building.

- Extensions and significant alterations or re-modeling of existing dwellings should be sensitive to and respond positively to the original buildings design intentions, through materials choice, detailing, scale and massing.
- For small infill developments, where the development is new build, sensitivity to the scale and massing (particularly height ,roofline and building set back from the road) of the direct neighbours and those dwellings with inter-visibility, needs to be demonstrated.
- For larger developments where the development is new build, sensitivity to the scale and massing (particularly height ,roofline building set back from the road) of the direct neighbours and those dwellings with inter-visibility, needs to be demonstrated as for small infill, but there may be more flexibility towards materials choices and design detailing, where views are enclosed, within the development.
- For new development in or adjacent to Conservation Areas and also for areas that have grown up within historic settlements, greater consideration should be paid to the use of local vernacular materials.
- Height of buildings and their impact on longer views will also need careful consideration in all development.
- In all cases a demonstration of ‘designing in context’ should be well articulated in a Design and Access Statement that accompanies a Planning Application.

#### **Movement and connectivity:**

- 6.19 Whilst there is a strong and attractive network of PROWs into the countryside for informal recreation, it is clear that the majority of the settlements studied are reliant on car-based commuting to access work, significant retail and higher education.
- 6.20. It would be of benefit to the existing settlements if new development facilitated better provision of local pedestrian and cycling access with direct routes to local retail, e.g. local shopping parades, primary education, and train stations, to encourage more sustainable modes of transport, where that is possible.
- 6.21. The study did not bring to light a distinctive ‘East Hampshire’ pattern of street blocks. There was only one example of a formal rectangular street grid: Headley Down, and Ropley was the closest example of organic/irregular connected street blocks, as was the outer circuit of roads in Northern Bentley and Northern Four Marks. The study areas with a historic core tended to demonstrate more intricate, fine grained and diverse environments, with a stronger ‘sense of place’, and the potential for being more ‘walkable’ if local facilities were present. These environments tend to have a clear focal point, often provided by a church, community facilities and/or a Public House. But replicating this settlement pattern and movement network in new development whilst also incorporating modern parking and access requirements can be complex and not always directly relevant to the land uses proposed or location in the settlement hierarchy.

- 6.22. The existing H9 and H10 sites and the potential additional sites, were for the most part ribbon development, with rectangular plots laid-out along a road or a loop road, with direct access to the road from each plot. This type of development tends to have a clear and efficient use of space with a good inter-relationship between public and private space. It tends to foster activity on the street and provide natural surveillance. On it's own, ribbon development, doesn't serve to inform how a larger development should be laid out, but it can form part of the picture.
- 6.23. In several of the non-H9 and H10 areas of interest, there were examples of short and long cul-de-sac developments, connected to a main local through road. In Western and Northern Four Marks, Eastern Holybourne and Eastern Liphook, the creation of cul-de-sacs is in part due to the physical barrier created by the railway line. Piecemeal and small-scale nature of some development plots has resulted in cul-de-sacs being formed as development sites were considered in isolation and at different times, but leaving a gap at the end of a cul-de-sac for a potential future through route, might have aided local connectivity, for example in Northern Bentley Study Area.
- 6.24. In eastern Liphook, beyond the study area, there are examples of very long and winding road layouts, which end in cul-de-sacs, where the sinuous nature of the road did not directly relate to any local landform or distinctive feature. These types of environment, whilst peaceful for residents, can have poor legibility. It is generally recommended that long cul-de-sacs be avoided if possible, as they can increase journey times for residents (and discourage walking and cycling). Short cul-de-sacs of around 12 dwellings or less tend not to have such a significant impact on journey times or wayfinding, in part because the observer can usually see to the end of the cul-de-sac from the entrance point.
- 6.25. It is recommended for locations where new development may be proposed that the following principles be taken into consideration for streetscape design:
- Always plan for improved pedestrian and cycle connections to tie a development into its immediate surroundings.
  - Where a new road or roads are being created, aim for through roads that comprehensively integrate a new development into the existing movement network, in a way that encourages walking and cycling to local facilities (where they exist).
  - Avoid the use of long cul-de-sacs and overly complex sinuous layouts.
  - Design road layouts to retain and highlight existing locally distinctive features, for example a group of existing trees, using these features to aid wayfinding.
  - Avoid suburbanizing highway layouts and clutter, promoting developments that are sensitive to the locally distinctive lane characteristics.

### Services, facilities and public open space:

- 6.21. A characteristic of many of the areas studied is that they lack services and facilities. Of the smaller settlements, very few include any uses other than residential. It should be noted also that most have poor access to public transport.
- 6.22. Of particular relevance to this study is that the settlements have an apparent lack of publicly accessible open space. That includes recreational space, play space, sports pitches and allotments. This is supported by the findings of 'Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study for East Hampshire District' published 2008 which indicates a deficit in a number of areas.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.easthants.gov.uk/open-space-sports-and-recreation-study>



## 7. Conclusions

7.1. With the NPPF (Revised 2018) setting the tone and direction for the policy formulation, the emerging East Hampshire Local Plan, needs to plan “*positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development*”. Design policies that avoid unnecessary prescription or detail, but concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally would support this. It is therefore recommended that the Core Policies of the emerging East Hampshire Local Plan include strong policies for:

- Design of the Natural and Built Environment that covers a holistic approach to design, that includes expectations for designing in context and promoting the use of green infrastructure as a fundamental structuring feature of new development (not an add on)
- Green Infrastructure that promotes the retention, enhancement of existing green infrastructure and promotion of new, especially in residential developments, highlighting the value that it brings to the local identity of East Hampshire, as well as the wide range of environmental benefits.

### Special Character Areas Policies H9 and H10

7.2. Regarding specific area-based policies for the Special Character Areas:

If site specific policies are written with very prescriptive requirements, they may become increasingly unenforceable and subject to appeal. Written very flexibly they may not provide much added value over and above Core Policies on Design and Green Infrastructure, so could be essentially redundant. It is therefore recommended that whilst these Saved Policies have been a valuable way to identify and protect areas with special characteristics to date, there are other more effective options for continued protection/promotion of those qualities that make them special.

7.3. Strengthening both the Core Policy on Design and on Green Infrastructure to cover residential scale green infrastructure should provide adequate policy direction to guide expectations for development. An updated policy on design that emphasises designing in context and promotes green infrastructure, should protect the characteristics of the current ‘Special Character Areas’. Importantly, it will also enable these special qualities to be protected in other residential areas currently not covered by area specific policies.

- 7.5. Should there be local community demand for the continuation of area specific policies with identified boundaries, it is recommended that H9 and H10 be combined into one policy. That policy should provide more general guidance as to expectations and avoid specific measures, such as a 'one-to-one' replacement standard or a particular plot size.
- 7.6. Of the existing H9 and H10 identified areas, it is recommended that the central part of Holybourne does not need a special area designation, as it is also covered by a Conservation Area designation, as well as benefitting from a Neighbourhood Plan. These will have more impact in terms of guiding development, than the H10 designation.
- 7.7. Of the three potential areas put forward for consideration an H9/H10 policy site, it is considered that Telegraph Lane in Four Marks and Waggoners Way Estate in Grayshott fit the profile of the Special Character Areas, being low density suburbs on the periphery of small settlements. Whitmore Vale and Hammer Lane do not, being a series of clusters of houses set in countryside. It is presumed that an updated version of the Development in the Countryside Policy CP19 would give direction to housing development in the countryside.

### **Housing Allocations**

- 7.8. With regards to the use of the Neighbourhood Character Study to positively guide new development in local context the following is recommended:

Housing and Employment allocations should give clear direction to the urban design and green infrastructure expectations for each identified site, and make it known to developers if adjacent land has a Neighbourhood Character Study with valuable pointers to important features of those neighbourhoods.

- 7.9. Subject to resources, in areas where multiple housing allocation sites may be proposed, it is recommended that whole settlement assessments and subsequently whole settlement plans be produced, to enable new development to integrate well and add valuable infrastructure and services for the benefit of all the settlement.

### **Production of Supplementary Planning Guidance and Development Control Policies**

- 7.10. The production of supporting Supplementary Design Guidance which demonstrates expectations of layout with a specific reference to typical layouts and streetscapes found in East Hampshire is also strongly recommended. This guidance could for example be based on the PUSH Quality Places Model Supplementary Planning Document, but be tailored to suit the unique qualities of East Hampshire, particularly

highlighting examples of green infrastructure and low density tranquil and suburban/semi-rural small neighbourhoods, and the low key un-cluttered highways design.

7.11. Other supporting guidance and Development Control Policies to enable developers and/or private residential applicants to understand the expectations of the Client as the Local Planning Authority could include the continuation or development of, supporting guidance for individual household alterations on:

- Tree Preservation
- Extensions
- Garage layouts, scales and locations
- Driveway alterations, particularly on slopes
- Boundary treatments including hedge planting and management

# Appendix 1 Relevant Background Information

## Specific to East Hampshire and South Downs National Park:

- East Hampshire Adopted Joint Core Strategy, 8 May 2014  
<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/joint-core-strategy-part-1-local-plan>
- East Hampshire Saved Policies, Second Plan Review 2006  
<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/local-plan-second-review-2006-saved-policies>
  - Chapter 5: Housing  
[http://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Chapter%205%20Housing\\_0.pdf](http://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Chapter%205%20Housing_0.pdf)
- East Hampshire Landscape Character Assessment  
<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/landscape>  
<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/FinalReportChapters1to6.pdf>
- East Hampshire Landscape Capacity study 2013  
<https://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/EHDC%2BLandscape%2BCapacity%2BStudy%2BTEXT%2BAugust%2B2013.pdf>
- SDNPA Landscape Character methodology  
<http://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/ILCA-Technical-Document.pdf>
- SDNPA Viewshed  
<https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/national-park-local-plan/evidence-and-supporting-documents/viewshed-analysis/>
- Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment  
<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/landscape/integratedcharacterassessment>
  - Alton Townscape Assessment  
<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/landscape/HICATownscapeType-Alton-FinalAutumn2010.pdf>
  - Petersfield Townscape Assessment  
<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/landscape/HICATownscapeType-Petersfield-FinalAutumn2010.pdf>
- East Hampshire Green Infrastructure Strategy  
<https://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Part%2B1%2BEast%2BHampshire%2BGreen%2BInfrastructure%2BStrategy%2B2011%2B-%2B2028.pdf>
- South Downs National Park, Information on Neighbourhood Plans  
[https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Designated\\_Neighbourhood\\_Areas\\_20180313.pdf](https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Designated_Neighbourhood_Areas_20180313.pdf)
- SDNP Pre-submission Local Plan 2017



[https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/SDLP-01-Pre-Submission\\_South\\_Downs\\_Local\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/SDLP-01-Pre-Submission_South_Downs_Local_Plan.pdf)

- Headley Conservation Area leaflet pub. 1997  
<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/HeadleyConservationArea.pdf>
- Holybourne Conservation Area leaflet:  
<https://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/HolybourneConservationArea.pdf>
- Alton Neighbourhood Plan: <http://www.easthants.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plans/alton-neighbourhood-plan>

### **National Planning Guidance**

- National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 (NPPF) (specifically Chapter 12)  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- Planning Portal, Information on Permitted Development Rights  
[https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200187/your\\_responsibilities/37/planning\\_permission/2](https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200187/your_responsibilities/37/planning_permission/2)

### **Specific to Townscape Assessment:**

- Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 05/2017: Townscape Assessment, Revised April 2018  
<https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/tin-05-2017-townscape.pdf>
- Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 08/15: Landscape Character Assessment  
[https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Landscape-Character-Assessment-TIN-08\\_15-20160216.pdf](https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Landscape-Character-Assessment-TIN-08_15-20160216.pdf)
- Historic England, Understanding Place: Historic Area Assessments, April 2017  
<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-place-historic-area-assessments/heag146-understanding-place-haa.pdf/>
- Plymouth City <https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/jointlocalplanevidencebase> contains links to LUC landscape study (in 2 parts).
- South Bucks Townscape Character Study, Part 1, for South Bucks District Council, 2010, Chris Blandford Associates  
Townscape\_Character\_Study\_part\_one\_Chris\_Blandford\_Associates\_2010.pdf  
South Bucks Townscape Character Study, Part 2, for South Bucks District Council, 2015, Tibbalds  
South\_Bucks\_Townscape\_Character\_Study\_Part\_2\_-\_Tibbalds\_July\_2015.pdf  
<http://www.southbucks.gov.uk/article/7361/Evidence-Base-Superseded-Documents>