

**From:** Lyster, Dominic <[DLyster@Fareham.Gov.UK](mailto:DLyster@Fareham.Gov.UK)>  
**Sent:** 18 December 2020 12:11  
**To:** Wright, Richard <[RWright@Fareham.Gov.UK](mailto:RWright@Fareham.Gov.UK)>  
**Subject:** Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Land to the south of Funtley Road, Funtley

Richard,

Final comments re Funtley South. Happy to discuss.

**Ref: P/20/1168/OA**

**Land To The South Of Funtley Road, Funtley**

**Outline application to provide up to 125 one, two, three and four-bedroom dwellings including 6 Self or Custom build plots, Community Building or Local Shop (Use Class E & F.2) with associated infrastructure, new community park, landscaping and access, following demolition of existing buildings.**

## **Urban Design**

### **Context and planning history**

A development site south of Funtley Road has been identified as a housing site in the Publication Plan 2037, currently progressing through the Regulation 19 consultation stage of plan preparation. The site has also been subject to a previous outline application, which was approved in 2020 for up to 55 dwellings. This outline permission was granted with an approved parameter plan that identified a spatial arrangement and quantum of land uses. The parameter plan largely followed the guiding Framework Plan that accompanied an earlier version (HA10 Draft Plan, published 2017) of the Publication Plan 2037.

The development rationale for the Framework Plan responded to the acknowledged sensitive landscape character and peripheral edge location of the site to Funtley village. This was set out in Draft Policy HA10, which stated:

*In light of the landscape setting, this development allocation is required to take a looser, less dense approach, applying a density of around 20 dwellings per hectare (dph). In light of the rural setting, significant natural landscaping should be incorporated, so that proposals are assimilated into the landscape. Part of this assimilation includes the incorporation of view corridors, between Funtley Road and the open space south of the site, which are required to maintain visual and physical connections through the site.*

Funtley village grew from a farming and later brickworks community built up along Funtley Road comprising simple Victorian farm worker cottages. This was supplemented with later early and mid 20<sup>th</sup> century roadside infill development followed by later 20<sup>th</sup> century cul-de sac development off Funtley Road. Funtley Road displays typical linear ribbon development characteristics within Fareham borough, of modest remnant Victorian terraces and largely detached dwellings with front gardens and deep plots. Later 20<sup>th</sup> century development is also largely detached but with more standard plots and less space about dwellings, in typical suburban forms. These arrangements give density parameters of some 15dph up to 30 dph. It is not unreasonable to identify development west of the railway bridge as dominated by more recent suburban development, which typically is at 25-30dph. Density and development forms are variable, but it is recognised that development becomes less dense as dwellings are sited along Funtley Road towards the edges of the built up areas.

On the basis of the development form characteristics of Funtley, it was considered appropriate therefore to limit development on this housing site so that it was of a more spacious form, getting less and less dense as it moved away from Funtley Road. This would help the development visually 'bleed' into the landscape such that built form was dominated by landscape. This form is typical of some of the green lanes that project off principal roads, which exist in other ribbon development within the borough.

### **The proposal**

The application includes a parameter plan, an illustrative masterplan together with supporting evidence contained in a character assessment of historic Meon Valley villages, a Design and Access Statement and updated landscape visual assessment.

Key questions in the assessment of this proposal, from an urban design perspective:

What relevance does the Meon Valley village assessment have?

Does the parameter plan take account of key views and is its structure appropriately arranged having regard to the sites location on the edge of the village?

Does the illustrative masterplan provide sufficient evidence to support a figure of 125 dwellings?

Does the illustrative masterplan demonstrate key requirements in terms of standards and the principle of decreasing density? notwithstanding the need to be of a decreasing density?

### **The Meon Valley historic village assessment and illustrative masterplan**

The Meon Valley character assessment is a useful document in setting out qualitative built form and visual townscape elements associated with historic villages in the Meon Valley. The study appears to be used to provide evidence as to justify a rationale for a much higher density approach than the previous permission or Draft Plan had identified. However assessment focuses on attractive townscape design vignettes rather than complete street patterns and overall structure of the villages. It appears not to highlight the importance of the villages' dwelling mix, variable house sizes and plots and openness and the lack of dedicated parking, which are typically difficult to deliver through standard housebuilder development approaches and the adoptive street design requirements of Hampshire Highways. Importantly, it is noted that the assessment focuses on the 'urban' core of the villages rather than identify the edge characteristics (which is the context for the Funtley Road site) whereby development diminishes in very loose and low, spacious density arrangements. Indeed the figure ground plans of most of the villages (excepting Wickham) show very low density and spacious forms in core areas. Even in Wickham, the village core dwellings are only one dwelling deep with very long plots. In this regard, the submitted development proposals appear to be an attempt to reflect the creation of a new

higher density 'urban' core to Funtley village, but without the low and decreasing density and looseness that comes with edge locations as identified in the Council's Draft Plan and related development assumptions, and indeed in the village character assessment itself.

The illustrative masterplan is assumed therefore to be a reflection of the qualitative design elements of the assessed historic village cores. However the illustrative masterplan shows very compact, small perimeter blocks rather than the linear principal route and linked lanes typical of many of the historic examples identified in the study. It is appreciated that the assessment was picking up design vignettes rather than complete street patterns, but the masterplan suggests a much more uniform block approach that will be reflected in the visual character of the streets without the variety in form and density, spaciousness of plot depth and architectural expression as seen in the historic examples. There does not appear to be any supporting evidence to identify how Reside (or other future housebuilder if the site is sold on), using their standard house types, will be able to deliver such an arrangement (as illustrated) in conjunction with the need to meet required parking standards, minimum garden sizes, and highway adoption geometry and finishes.

I have examined the illustrative layout as far as is possible to identify more detailed matters taking account of concerns expressed above:

- It is unclear whether the illustrative masterplan actually shows 125 units within the perimeter blocks. In my view, more evidence is needed to demonstrate that this is achievable.
- With the exception of some parking courts it is unclear how parking for the 125 dwellings will be delivered. Historically, this would be largely unallocated on street, except where the low density examples allow for on plot arrangements. However, these low density historic forms are not likely given the number of dwellings proposed, unless standards are reduced.
- Most of the plots have substandard gardens and separation distances. As a result the perimeter blocks are actually of a much higher density and visual intensity and without spacious plots than historic forms. That is in addition to the difficulty of precisely identifying how many units are in each block and the level of parking provision. As a result, the blocks will be much more visually cramped than both historic examples or contextual development that exists within Funtley.

I have attached a pdf of some key dimensions which illustrates the above.

I am not convinced therefore, at this stage, that the qualitative elements identified in the Meon Valley village assessment have been demonstrated within the illustrative masterplan whilst meeting adopted parking, garden and other requirements at the same time. As such I do not find that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that 125 units can be achieved satisfactorily in the manner illustrated nor having regard to the context of the site.

I would also suggest that the small, compact perimeter blocks shown on the illustrative masterplan are not, taken as a whole, a street pattern that is derived from the historic examples nor an assessment of the more immediate context of Funtley itself. That is not to say that such a pattern couldn't be made to be attractive and characterful if the outstanding detailed matters to be submitted were of an appropriate form and of high quality and met necessary garden, separating, parking and other standards.

At a more detailed level, this more dense form will be difficult to accommodate within the natural slope of land without many and varied retaining structures, regraded slopes and or large cut and fill flat platform creations to help provide the level ground for housing development.

### **Parameter Plan**

The parameter plan shows a different spatial structure to the Draft Framework Plan and the subsequent approved parameter plan under the previous outline consent. The submitted plan reflects an approach having regard to the Meon Valley assessment, though not the small compact perimeter blocks as identified above. It also differs in that it extends development parcels southwards further up the slope and provides for a greater development area from 2.8ha under the previous outline consent to appx 3.5ha under the current proposal. The structure also does not provide the strategic view corridor from the north west to the top of the slope where the bridge crossing is located. That is considered a missed opportunity.

I find that, from an urban design perspective, there is no added benefit to justify a move away from the parameter plan previously approved. The proposal appears to be merely seeking additional housing units and a more extensive development site.

### **Design and Access Statement**

The Design and Access Statement (DAS) seeks to demonstrate the evolution of the design process and how it has utilised the Meon Valley village assessment to generate a suitable development approach. In addition it sets out the site's credentials as a sustainable and a quality new place and associated environment, which the Council has previously acknowledged through the proposed allocation and previous outline consent. It shows the use of the previous parameter plan (see p10), but it is not apparent why this was not pursued utilising the Meon Valley study. It is not clear whether SuDS and other systems and building blocks and infrastructure could not have been incorporated into the previous parameter structure. The DAS does not lead me to alter the concerns expressed above relating to development pattern and site capacity.

### **Landscape**

The visual impact assessment is an addendum update to the LVIA that was carried out to support the previously approved outline application. The addendum seeks to demonstrate how the new outline proposal is acceptable in landscape terms. In my view, the fundamental difference between the two proposals relates to the increase southwards of the development areas, further up the lower slopes of the site, and the much more intensive and dense form of development..

The proposed housing allocation and previous outline consent sought to limit the southern expansion, so as to avoid development creeping into the upper slopes as it is an acknowledged sensitive location in landscape terms. The original LVIA recognised this in para 5.1, which identified the Landscape Development Parameters thus:

*The landscape development parameters illustrated on **Figure 5.1** have been prepared by considering the landscape features of the Site and other areas within the Site along with landscape policy, landscape character and the visual constraints associated with the local landscape.*

*The parameters therefore seek to: (amongst other elements)*

- *Locate the development parcels on the lower slopes of the Site to the north to minimise cut and fill as well as in-keeping wiithin*

the local residential character of Funtley and the northern fringe of Fareham.

- Minimise the visual impact of the future development by providing landscape buffer planting along the development boundaries.

## 5. Illustrative Proposed Development Parameters



Figure 5.1 – Plan showing the illustrative landscape development parameters (fabrik, 2018)

I find that this original LVIA has set out the appropriate and reasonable balance of development to landscape and supports the previous outline permission and its approved parameter plan in terms of where the edge ought to be and how it should be treated. I would also expect, returning to the issue of density, for this southern area to be much more loose, sporadic and spacious than the illustrative masterplan indicates. This is likely to have a greater visual impact than was envisaged in the preparation of the original LVIA. As necessary, FBC may need to undertake further analysis and appraisal of the addendum to the LVIA in due course once other matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

### Other issues identified

- Th LEAP is located away from the community centre. It is also therefore furthest away from the existing community of Funtley. That is the wrong approach in my view as a playground helps provide a community focus and could be a linked trip.
- The illustrative masterplan show dwellings with back gardens to open space. That is not acceptable (design out crime issue)
- The illustrative masterplan shows a road to serve a development parcel that is inside the greenspace identified on the parameter plan (linking roads are however accepted)
- The parameter and masterplan erodes the planting surrounding the existing stables, where the community centre is proposed. The ecological and tree loss needs to be justified and accepted before a revised parameter plan is approved.

Dominic Lyster  
Urban Designer  
Fareham Borough Council  
01329824371



**From:** [devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk) <[devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 19 October 2020 14:04

**To:** Lyster, Dominic <[Dlyster@Fareham.Gov.UK](mailto:Dlyster@Fareham.Gov.UK)>

**Subject:** Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Land to the south of Funtley Road, Funtley

I am writing to consult you on a planning application I have received (P/20/1168/OA). Details of the application and how to respond are in the attached PDF document.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this.

Richard Wright  
Principal Planner (Development Management)  
Fareham Borough Council  
01329 824758