



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held at Benians Pavilion on
Wednesday 7th October 2026 at 7.30pm**

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

In attendance: Jo Tsigarides (Clerk), no members of the public.

26.89 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

26.90 PC OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

With no members of the public present, the Open Session concluded at 7.33pm and Standing Orders were applied.

26.91 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

26.92 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES

On the proposal of Cllr M Pullen, which was seconded by Cllr Thomson with all Cllrs in agreement, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on the 2nd September 2026.

26.93 PC FOR DISCUSSION:

26.93.1

Application Reference Number: [EHDC-26-0997-PIP](#)

Application Type: Permission in Principle

Application Proposal: Permission in principle for the erection of between 1-5 dwellings with access from Alton Lane

LAND BETWEEN OAK VIEW AND LANDPORT Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire

Comment:

Four Marks Parish Council – Objection

Four Marks Parish Council objects to this application for up to five dwellings on land at Alton Lane. The Parish Council considers that the proposal is in an unsustainable location, remote from the principal services and facilities of Four Marks, and would conflict with the spatial strategy for the settlement and with the National Planning Policy Framework published in August 2026.

1. Unsustainable location – approximately 2.4 km from services

The proposed development is approximately **2.4 km from the principal local services and facilities**. This distance is highly significant when assessing the sustainability of the location. Everyday facilities such as shops, education, medical services, community facilities and other services cannot reasonably be regarded as being within convenient walking distance for most future residents. Consequently, residents of the proposed five dwellings would be likely to depend substantially on private cars for ordinary day-to-day journeys.

The Parish Council considers that this is contrary to the fundamental objective of creating sustainable patterns of development and reducing unnecessary travel by private motor vehicle.

Initial:

East Hampshire District Council itself recognises that the availability and accessibility of services is a key factor in determining the sustainability of settlements. Its settlement-hierarchy evidence explains that higher-tier settlements are generally more sustainable because residents can access a broader range of facilities more easily and without travelling as far by car.

The applicant sites that there are other developments which are adjacent to this proposal which is not technically true. There are other nearby developments but there is no connectivity plan.

2. August 2026 NPPF – Policy S5

The application should be assessed against the **National Planning Policy Framework published on 17 August 2026**, rather than the December 2024 version.

Policy **S3** establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development but expressly directs decision-makers to Policy **S5** where development is outside settlements.

Policy **S5 – Principle of development outside settlements** provides that only specified forms of development should normally be approved outside settlements.

Importantly, S5(4) states that development proposals which do not fall within one of the categories identified in S5 should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including effects on **the character of the countryside and the promotion of sustainable patterns of movement**.

The proposed residential development does not appear to benefit from any of the specific exceptions in S5 that would establish a principle of residential development in this location.

In particular, this is not a proposal for development around a well-connected railway station, nor is it development allocated for housing in the development plan.

The substantial distance from services is particularly relevant to the S5 requirement to promote sustainable patterns of movement.

3. Sustainable transport and accessibility

The August 2026 NPPF Policy **TR3 – Locating development in sustainable locations** requires development proposals to be located where they can support sustainable patterns of movement and enable good accessibility for different users. Policy TR3 states that locations should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes where this is practicable. The Parish Council considers that a location approximately 2.4 km from the principal services of Four Marks does not provide future residents with a genuinely convenient choice of transport for normal daily activities.

The issue is not simply the straight-line distance between the site and the village centre. The actual pedestrian route, the availability and continuity of footways, road conditions, lighting, crossing arrangements, gradients and the safety and convenience of the route must all be considered.

The applicant should therefore be required to demonstrate, through robust evidence, that the proposed location provides safe, convenient and realistic pedestrian and cycle access to the services on which residents would depend.

4. Rural location and car dependency

The development would introduce additional residential occupation into a location where access to everyday facilities is poor. Five dwellings may appear modest in isolation, but each dwelling represents another household generating regular journeys for employment, education, shopping, healthcare, recreation and other purposes. Where those journeys cannot conveniently be undertaken on foot, by bicycle or by public transport, the practical consequence is increased reliance on private vehicles.

This conflicts with the direction of NPPF Policy TR3, particularly its requirement that development should limit the need to travel by private car.

5. Development outside the settlement boundary

The Parish Council understands that the site lies outside the established settlement policy boundary

Initial:

and therefore within the countryside.

East Hampshire's adopted Joint Core Strategy Policy **CP10** establishes the spatial strategy for development and seeks to focus development within settlement policy boundaries, while Policy **CP19** concerns development in the countryside.

The Council's own Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries Supplementary Planning Document explains that Policy CP10 applies particular tests to residential development outside settlement boundaries, including whether the proposal meets a community need, reinforces the settlement's role and function, cannot be accommodated within the built-up area and has appropriate support or identification through the neighbourhood planning process.

The proposal should therefore not be treated simply as a minor extension to Four Marks. The location of development is itself a fundamental planning consideration.

6. The development plan remains relevant

The Parish Council recognises that the August 2026 NPPF must be given significant weight as a material consideration. However, the NPPF itself emphasises that the planning system should be **genuine ly plan-led**, with development plans providing the framework for sustainable development. East Hampshire District Council confirms that the adopted Joint Core Strategy remains part of the adopted development plan.

The Council's evidence also identifies the importance of settlement boundaries in distinguishing the built-up areas of settlements from the countryside, where development is more strictly controlled.

7. Cumulative development pressure

The Parish Council is concerned about the cumulative effect of continued development around Four Marks and along Alton Lane.

The fact that this application proposes only five dwellings should not obscure the wider spatial consequences of permitting successive small developments outside the established settlement. The East Hampshire Land Availability Assessment already identifies substantial development opportunities around Four Marks, including land at Oak View/Alton Lane and larger sites in the Alton Lane/Blackberry Lane area.

There is therefore a need to consider whether permitting further isolated or peripheral development would undermine the planned pattern of growth for Four Marks.

8. Scale of the proposal does not overcome its locational problems

The Parish Council does not consider that the proposal's limited scale provides sufficient justification for development in an unsustainable location. Although small in scale, the five dwelling development would still generate five additional households using local amenities and putting increased strain on local infrastructure.

The appropriate question is not whether five houses would generate less traffic than fifty houses, but whether **this is an appropriate and sustainable location for five additional homes**.

The Parish Council considers that the evidence regarding accessibility to services raises significant concerns in this respect.

9. Conclusion

Four Marks Parish Council objects to the proposed development.

The principal reasons are:

- the site's approximately **2.4 km distance from the principal local services**;
- the resulting likely dependence of future residents on private cars;
- inadequate evidence that the site provides a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes;
- the site's location outside the established settlement boundary;
- conflict with the spatial strategy and countryside policies of the adopted development plan;
- the requirements of **NPPF August 2026 Policy S5** concerning development outside

Initial:

- settlements;
- conflict with the sustainable-location principles of **NPPF Policy TR3**; and
- the cumulative effect of further peripheral development around Four Marks.

In particular, the Parish Council asks the District Council to give substantial weight to the fact that the site is approximately 2.4 km from local services when assessing whether the proposal represents a sustainable pattern of development.

The Parish Council considers that the applicant has not demonstrated the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify this residential development in this location under the August 2026 NPPF.

Four Marks Parish Council therefore respectfully requests that planning permission in principle be refused.

26.93.2

Application Reference Number: [EHDC-26-0932-FUL](#)

Application Type: Full Planning Application

Application Proposal: Construction of agricultural building for hay and machinery storage

Application Location:

BARNS ADJACENT TO DELL HOUSE FARM Hawthorn Road, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 3ER (extension)

Comment: Four Marks Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

1. **Insufficient justification for the proposed building**

The applicant should demonstrate a clear agricultural need for the building, including the nature and scale of the enterprise, the storage required and why the existing building could not accommodate this. The necessity for the large scale building should be justified given the low income projection. The Council is concerned that the low income indicates that the business may not be viable and result in potential further applications.

2. **Impact on the Countryside and landscape.**

The site lies in a rural location on the edge of Four Marks. A substantial new building could harm the rural character of the area. The proposal should be assessed against Local Plan policies CP19 (development in the countryside), CP20 (landscape) and CP29 (relevance to design and character), having regard to the large scale, appearance, setting and the impact on the wider landscape.

3. **Cumulative development at the site**

The Council recently approved applications EHDC-26-0845-PA3Q2 and EHDC-26-0849-PA3Q2 in September 2026 for the conversion of recent agricultural buildings for residential use. The cumulative effect of these changes must be considered.

4. **Visual impact and scale**

The buildings height, footprint, roof form, materials and colour should be assessed from public viewpoints along Hawthorn Road and surrounding lanes and footpaths. The Council should be satisfied that the development would not be overbearing or unduly prominent/out of keeping.

5. **Traffic and Highway safety**

The proposal could generate additional movements by agricultural machinery and other vehicles along these rural roads which are already under considerable strain. The Council should consider the likely frequency and type of vehicle movements along with visibility, turning and maneuvering arrangements.

6. **Biodiversity and ecological impact**

The Council should ensure that any potential effects on hedgerows, trees, grassland, ditches and habitats have been sufficiently assessed in accordance with Local Plan policy CP21.

7. **Lighting, noise and disturbance**

Machinery storage, vehicle movements and loading activities could cause additional noise, disturbance and light pollution, and nearby property should be considered.

8. **Surface water and drainage**

The proposed roof and any associated hard-standing could impact surface water drainage. The Council should be satisfied that the development would not increase run off or any issues to neighbouring land. Policy CP25 should be considered in relation to any potential development.

Initial:

Four Marks Parish Council does recognise that agricultural buildings may be necessary to support genuine agricultural enterprises however the applicant should demonstrate the justification for the scale and size of this building for what appears to be a venture that will generate a low income.

26.94 P TO NOTE DECISIONS NOTIFIED AND PENDING

The Clerk provided an oral report on decisions notified and advised that there had been additional documents uploaded to application EHDC-26-0340-OUT (ref Cresland One) on the Planning portal including a connectivity plan. The Planning Officer had been contacted to secure an extension for Council comment until after the 21st October 2026. There were also additional documents on application EHDC-25-0055-OUT (ref Barn Lane) which would be considered at that same meeting.

26.95 PC ADDITIONAL PLANNING

26.95.1 To receive update on Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan had been progressed to Regulation 14 Consultation. There were some errors in the document which would be amended. Cllr McAllister advised that the deadline for the SEA screening advice was the 15th October and after that, the group would know what level of screening was necessary.

26.95.2 To receive any correspondence.

The Clerk advised that a letter had been sent to Adam Harvey, EHDC following the Full Council meeting on the 16th September 2026 (copy circulated) regarding the Environment Agency capacity position statement. A response had been received on the 23rd September 2026 advising that the letter would be sent to the relevant bodies and a response sent to the Council in due course. A full response had been received that day (7th October) and was circulated to the Committee. It would be included in the Full Council correspondence. The Clerk had been contacted by Heather Stevens, Planning Policy Manager that day and was asked to try and keep written correspondence to a minimum due to workload at EHDC and the time involved in responding. The Council had been asked to phone/have discussions about any issues. The Clerk had advised that it was important for the Council to evidence dialogue and contact with EHDC to the community and Councillors concurred that they would still like written contact.

The Leader of EHDC had written to all Councils to request that they consider a Community Asset Transfer of portions of EHDC land. Further information would be circulated to Councillors in advance of the next Full Council meeting where a map would be provided of all EHDC areas open to negotiation. The second part to the request was to consider whether the Council would be interested in taking ownership of any play areas within new developments. The Clerk had asked for specific details of where the play areas were and what exactly would be involved.

26.96 PC NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: Wednesday 4th November 2026

26.97 Meeting Closed at 8.45pm.

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

In accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the Council have the right to exclude the public and press from a meeting in respect of confidential or sensitive information which is prejudicial to the public interest and may pass a resolution, without notice, to do so.

Signature:

Date:

Initial: