



The Parish Office
Uplands Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AF
Tel: (01420) 768284
Email: clerk@fourmarksparishcouncil.gov.uk
www.fourmarksparishcouncil.gov.uk

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held at Benians Pavilion on Wednesday 3rd June 2026, at 7.00pm

Members' Present: Cllrs McAllister, Smith, R Pullen, M Pullen and Medhurst, Thomson

In attendance: 2 Members of the public & Mrs Debbie Batley (Locum Clerk)

26.50 Election of Chairman

RESOLVED: That Cllr Paul McAllister would be Chairman for the coming year. Purposed by Cllr R Pullen seconded by Cllr Thomson and unanimously agreed by all.

26.51 Election of Vice Chairman

RESOLVED: That Cllr R Pullen Vice Chairman for the coming year. Purposed by Cllr Smith seconded by Cllr M Pullen and unanimously agreed by all

26.52 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

26.53 PC OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Member of the Public asked for the Parish Council's consideration on the planning application on 17a Lymington Bottom Road, as it was affecting their everyday life. The Parish Council agreed to look at the retrospective application and comment on it. Also discussed was the EIA Screening request for proposed development at Land Off Alton Way, Four Marks, Hampshire. The Chair confirmed that it will be discussed later in the meeting.

26.54 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

26.55 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES

On the proposal of Cllr R Pullen which was seconded by Cllr Medhurst and with all Cllrs in agreement, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on the 6th May 2026.

26.56 PC FOR DISCUSSION

[EHDC-26-0534-EIA](#) - EIA Screening Opinion

Application Proposal EIA Screening request for proposed development at Land Off Alton Way, Four Marks, Hampshire. This request is made pursuant to Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as updated) (the 2017 EIA Regulations')

Applicant: (none) C/O Agent (Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land)

Please see attached document in reference to the Committees reply to this application.

26.57 PC TO NOTE DECISIONS NOTIFIED AND PENDING

None

26.58 PC ADDITIONAL PLANNING MATTERS

Neighbour Plan - An agenda item for full council will be needed to consider allocations and proposals.

NP update

The utilities are not a reason to pause the current stage of the NP and are not relevant to allocations at this stage, other than that it is not possible to connect.

Utilities are statutory consultees at reg 14, which is why we need to get to issuing reg 14 asap.

NP is not required to have a 5yr HLS, only a local plan is required to have one. The NP is only required to meet its housing obligations in the form of the LPA-supplied indicative number; there is no time phasing required, only to deliver in the plan period.

If in the reg 14 stage the utilities do not raise any problems to deliver the allocation over the plan period, then that is it. All the problems identified can be solved by the end of the plan period, so it is unlikely that they will raise concerns.

In the absence of a Local Plan, utilities are dealt with on a site-by-site basis, so this is where we should concentrate our efforts.

Based on the advice given, the PCs will continue to collect information about utility stress for responding to applications. The NP will concentrate on getting to reg 14 and onwards to reg 16 asap. It is not in the NP gift to say no water no houses.

17 a Lymington Bottom Road – Retrospective application- EHDC-26-0298-HSE

Please see attached document in reference to the Committees reply to this application.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: Wednesday 1st July 2026

26.60 MEETING CLOSED: 7.45pm

Signature:

Date:

Parish Council Objection to EIA Screening Request – Land off Alton Way, Four Marks

To: Head of Planning, East Hampshire District Council

From: Four Marks Parish Council

Subject: Objection to EIA Screening Opinion Request – Land off Alton Way, Four Marks

Date: 5th June 2026

Summary Position

Four Marks Parish Council strongly recommends that East Hampshire District Council issue a **positive EIA Screening Opinion**. The scale, location, and cumulative context of this proposal mean that **significant environmental effects are likely** and cannot be robustly assessed without a full Environmental Impact Assessment.

1. Scale, Density and Urbanising Impact

- A development of **230 dwellings** on currently open pastureland represents a **major urban extension** in a rural valley landscape.
- The proposal would introduce a **dense estate** entirely out of keeping with the surrounding settlement pattern.
- The Planning Practice Guidance states EIA is more likely where development would have **“significant urbanising effects in a previously non-urbanised area.”** This threshold is clearly met.

2. Loss of Pastureland and Natural Drainage Function

- The site is actively farmed and currently contributes to **natural surface-water management**, biodiversity support and landscape character.
- Replacing permeable pasture with hard surfacing will **increase runoff**, reduce infiltration, and heighten downstream flood risk.
- The valley topography amplifies this risk and requires **EIA-level hydrological modelling**.

3. Environmental Sensitivity and Protected Habitats

The applicant’s own Screening Report confirms:

- The site lies within the **Impact Risk Zone of Selborne Common SSSI**.
- The **South Downs National Park** is 630m east.
- A **SINC** lies directly adjacent to the southeast boundary.
- Habitats suitable for **roosting bats, dormice, reptiles, and breeding birds** are present.

Additional local sensitivities:

- **Protected verges** along Alton Lane support the **rare Violet Helleborine Orchid**.
- The lane is a valued rural walking route connecting to **St Swithun’s Way**.

These factors indicate a **highly sensitive ecological context** where indirect impacts (light, noise, hydrology, recreation pressure) require full EIA assessment.

4. Landscape and Visual Impact

- The site rises from **175m to 190m AOD**, forming part of the rural approach to the South Downs National Park.
- It is visible from Alton Lane, Blackberry Lane, nearby footpaths, and residential properties.
- A development of this scale would **permanently alter the rural character**, erode tranquillity, and diminish the amenity value of the surrounding landscape.

5. Traffic, Highway Safety and Rural Lane Constraints

- The site fronts a **straight 60mph rural lane** with **no footpaths**, mature trees close to the carriageway, and **existing flooding along much of its length**.
- Additional traffic from 230 dwellings would increase:
 - Accident risk
 - Pressure on an already compromised road surface.
 - Pedestrian safety concerns
- The A31 is already congested at peak times, and cumulative growth will worsen this.

These impacts are **significant environmental effects** under Schedule 3 and cannot be screened out.

6. Construction and Operational Emissions

- A development of this magnitude will generate **noise, dust, waste, lighting, and vehicle emissions** during construction and operation.
- These will materially affect the amenity of nearby residents and the wider rural area.
- Mitigation cannot be relied upon at screening stage to dismiss significant effects.

7. Cumulative Impact – A Critical Material Consideration

Within a 3km radius, over **1,600 dwellings** are approved, pending, or screened. This includes the **Cresland development (100 homes)** in close proximity.

Cumulative impacts on:

- Highways
- School and healthcare capacity
- Biodiversity
- Landscape character
- Flood risk

...are already being felt. Assessing this proposal **in isolation** would be contrary to Schedule 3 requirements.

Conclusion

The proposal is likely to give rise to **significant environmental effects** due to:

- Its scale and density
- Its proximity to sensitive ecological assets
- The presence of protected species
- Landscape and visual impacts.
- Highway and infrastructure constraints
- Flood risk and hydrological complexity.
- The substantial cumulative development context

A **full Environmental Impact Assessment** is necessary to ensure these issues are properly understood and mitigated.

Yours sincerely

Debbie Batley

Parish Council Objection to Retrospective application- EHDC-26-0298-HSE

In Reference:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) no extensions and outbuildings otherwise permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class(es) A, B, or E of said Order shall be carried out on the dwellinghouses or within their curtilage without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - It is considered that further extension/alteration of these dwellings could result in an adverse effect upon the adjacent properties and/or the visual character of the area.

Any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved unless a suitable alternative species are otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Note: The scheme shall include boundary treatment details. Specifically, the rear western boundary should comprise low level planting; to prevent overshadowing of neighbouring gardens and new fencing should the existing condition of the fence not be satisfactory.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and to enable proper consideration to be given to the impact of the proposed development on existing trees

The Parish Council find this building

1. Overbearing Scale and Proximity to Boundary

The building is excessively large and has been constructed, very close to the shared boundary. Due to its height and mass, it is visually intrusive and creates an overbearing presence when viewed from my property.

2. Height Exceeding Boundary Treatment

The structure significantly exceeds the height of the existing fence line, making it highly prominent and out of keeping with typical outbuildings. This results in an unacceptable impact on the character of the surrounding residential area.

3. Loss of Light and Amenity

The size and positioning of the building adversely affect the enjoyment of the property, including loss of light and a sense of enclosure.

4. Removal of Trees Subject to Restriction

Trees previously present in the garden have been removed, despite being subject to a 5-year restriction. These trees provided important screening and contributed to local amenity. Their removal has exacerbated the visual and environmental impact of the development.

5. Retrospective Nature of the Application

It is concerning that this structure has been erected without prior planning permission. Granting retrospective approval risks setting an undesirable precedent and undermines the planning process.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this application be refused. The development is out of scale, harmful to residential amenity, and contrary to local planning policies designed to protect neighbours and the character of the area.

Your sincerely,

