



Electors meeting held at 7.00pm on Wednesday 30th September 2026 at Four Marks Village Hall.

Present on panel: Howard Briggs, Chairperson of Four Marks Parish Council, Cllr McAllister, Antonia Cox, County Councillor, Dr Arthur Barlow, Fight4FourMarks

86 members of the public

Jo Tsigarides, Parish Clerk.

Welcome and introductions

Cllr Briggs welcomed the members of the public and reminded them that this was an Electors' meeting called by six residents of Four Marks Village. General housekeeping was covered. The Agenda was explained and the panel was introduced.

Presentation from Fight4FourMarks

Dr Arthur Barlow, Chair of Fight4Four Marks, thanked the Parish Council for facilitating the meeting and proceeded to give an overview of F4FM. A presentation as then given (Slides attached).

Questions to County Councillor

Cllr Cox introduced herself to the audience, explaining that she had a lot of detailed information about how the Highways officers are reacting to the housing demands in the area. She explained that she felt that if the infrastructure was not present, that building should not happen. As half of East Hampshire is in the SDNP, it is restrictive causing the housing targets being put into the rest of East Hampshire. Observations were made about the Watercress Line and the junctions at the railway bridges.

Pre-submitted questions were then discussed (attached):

Scope of the VISSIM Modelling/Telegraph Lane/A31 Junction.

It was noted that EHDC approved application 50216/002 on the basis that Highways had agreed although the Telegraph Lane Junction not been sufficiently considered. It was advised that standard modelling was carried out on this junction and that the application would not be revisited with the enhanced modelling. The cumulative impact of the various developments had not been taken into consideration.

AC referred to a series of slides, and it was felt that there was not a comprehensive list of all of the current applications included. It was suggested that a FOI request was made for the raw data included. There were various scenarios considered with differing numbers of developments and it was advised that where the Service Level D was listed, that the traffic would then be at an unacceptable level.

MOPs generally:

- Concern over the information being out of date and the inevitability of reaching Service Level D.
- Questions about what Four Marks can do as a community.

Traffic survey data and model validation.

AB stated that a lot of the surveys took place in school holidays and asked about whether the model really represented what was happening now.

AC stated that the inputs were based on a series of surveys from 2024 which was then validated with on site collection. The forecast for trip generation, 'Trips' national software was used plus a survey of how traffic had developed after people had moved into Lapwing Way.

AC suggested that a FOI was submitted to access the data.

Application of Policy LPT4

AB – General question as to why there and how it is justified. There was a general discussion about encouraging people to cycle and walk more and why this was not as relevant in Four Marks as in Alton Town and similar places. Although it was recognised that the initiative has good intention, practically it was thought to be less relevant to Four Marks.

Observations from the public included the following points:

- Roads being narrowed would increase hazards and accidents.
- Removal of a pedestrian crossing as included on one of the diagrams would cause an increase in accidents.
- Noise and air pollution were concerns.
- That the study should also be about feasibility and whether the contents were actually practical and deliverable.
- Why the A31 was classed as a 'Hampshire Road' rather than a national road.
- The data and information was out of date (first presented in 2024)
- That there was a lack of disclosure – the Taylor Wimpey application was referred to specifically, and because this is not at 'pre-app' stage, all information should be disclosed.

- That public perception is that Highways often object, but then when funding is offered by a developer, the decision is reversed.

Improved routes to school and measurable trip reduction.

AC explained that there had been a delay in completing this work due to some habitat protection issues.

MOP raised that Highways were meant to be writing to residents of Alton Lane regarding the riparian ditches along the Lane and their relevant responsibilities. There was then a broader discussion about road safety, parent parking and the congestion around five lands end along with safety issues around Belford House.

There was a discussion about accountability and that some responsibility needed to be taken for potential accidents and hazards on the roads particularly in this area. There was disappointment that neither the portfolio holder for Hampshire Highways nor any representatives/officers had been in attendance that night.

Junction Capacity thresholds and cumulative development

AC advised that there will be a point reached where Hampshire Highways will be unable to advise EHDC to give permission to developments. The County Councillor spoke about the Chawton Park Farm development, where the applicant was told to revise the traffic plan. She then spoke about the evidence that the roads in Four Marks cannot cope with further development but noted that authorities are reluctant for applications to be heard by the Planning Inspectorate.

Comments from MOPS;

- Noted that Highways is not exercising its duty of care to residents.
- Went to a strategy workshop with Alton Town Council where there was a bottom-up approach. Suggested that Four Marks needs a transport strategy.
- Chair of NPSG confirmed that the group are preparing a transport statement but that this is separate from a strategy.
- County Councillor asked whether the public would like her to instigate the same process of a transport strategy, members of public enthusiastically agreed.
- Suggestion that the Chair of the EHDC Planning Committee said in previous summing up that infrastructure is typically in place ten years after development and that this was archaic and unacceptable.
- Concerns over older population and how safe the roads, particularly crossings were for them.

In the public question and answer session, the crossings were discussed in relation to traffic flow through the village, speeding through the village with the placement of speed

signs, whether the Chawton section of the Shrave could be included in Four Marks as this was realistically where it sat.

There were several residents who thanked the County Councillor for her time and appreciated that although this was not her area of expertise, she had made a huge effort to understand the local issues. She agreed to feed back the main issues and investigate the possibility of a Transport Strategy for Four Marks.

Meeting Closed at 9.10pm