

## **FOUR MARKS PARISH COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the Meeting of the Full Council Held on Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017, commencing at 7.30pm At the Village Hall, Four Marks**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Cllr Janet Foster (Chairman) Cllrs Karin Black, Tim Brake, John Davis, Davie Edgar, John Hammond, Shaun McCarthy, Dave Mills, Simon Thomas and Anne Tomlinson

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mrs Sarah Goudie (Clerk/RFO)  
District Councillor Ingrid Thomas  
68 members of the public

**APOLOGIES:** District Cllr Deborah Jackson

#### **17.160 OPEN SESSION**

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcomed the members of the general public and thanked all Councillors for attending. Attendees were advised of the general housekeeping procedures, meeting protocol and how the meeting would be structured. The Clerk read the Council's protocol for reporting at meetings and, following the Chairman's request, a member of the public confirmed they would be recording the meeting. The Parish Council, also recorded part of the meeting, for minute taking purposes.

The Chairman handed over to the Planning Committee Chairman, Cllr Simon Thomas, who gave a detailed background on his role and experience, the Parish Council's role, general history and the phases of the planning system process.

The Chairman then advised that the open session would run for 30 minutes, and asked everyone who wished to speak to stand, give their name and speak for a maximum of 3 minutes, asking for no repetition of points previously made, to ensure everyone had the opportunity to speak.

Mr David Aston, 36 Lymington Bottom, opened his speech by thanking the Parish Council, firstly for hosting this extra ordinary meeting and addressing the audience, expressed his thanks for the support of both the Council and District Councillors acknowledging the fact that Councillors are all volunteers working on behalf of the residents.

Mr Aston's general concerns over this application were the fact that the site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary, conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan and other Local Plan policies, lack of local infrastructure and the topography of the site, citing other developments where the new houses built completely dominate the landscape.

Mr Daniel Monument, 34 Lymington Bottom, raised in detail his concerns over his own loss of amenity, as will be directly affected by the proposed development. Due to the topography of the land his privacy will be lost, and believes the site is unsustainable. The development itself will be seen by a local footpath, which will result in loss of view over open fields. Mr Monument confirmed he had read every document contained within the Planning Application and raised queries over the statistics, errors and contradictions contained within the various statements. It is not a SHLAA site. He also raised concerns over the noise disturbance, surface water and potential hazardous waste that would undoubtedly ensue both during and after the development.

Diana Tennyson, spoke in her capacity as our local wildlife conservation advisor and representative. She had recently carried out a site visit and referred to the developer's ecology report where no surveys had been carried out between April and July, and if they had the findings would have been varied. However wildlife noted on site were different variety of bats, including the very rare Barbastelle bat, migrating birds, and red kites.

This is also a foraging point for badgers, who previously foraged on land off Brislands Lane, and provision was made following the development at Medstead Farm for wildlife corridors and green spaces to pass from the SINC to forage on fields off Lymington Bottom, and that this would be the extent of their foraging range, so development here would have an effect on their survival.

Mrs Tennyson also raised concerns over the serious health issues from dust particles that were encountered during the Medstead Farm development, which would have implications again for both human and animal were this development be granted permission.

Finally raising concerns over flooding, and reminding everyone that Lymington Bottom is a river bed, and development will not only effect Four Marks, but the knock on effect that could be felt by other areas, taking into consideration the height of Four Marks and the flooding issues that have been exacerbated in Chawton and Farringdon since the high level of development in Four Marks and Medstead.

It was also suggested that both Chawton and Farringdon Parish Councils should be made aware of this proposal and that they may wish to add their comments.

Mr Russell Prince-Wright, Brislands Lane, emphasised that the 175 minimum agreed target in the Neighbourhood Plan, set by a government inspector, was a reasonable target for the facilities within this small local service centre, the term minimum is deceptive, and whilst there is no maximum figure, having already exceeded this target by 80% means that the infrastructure is no longer sustainable for the agreed figure.

Emma Monk, Lymington Bottom, raised concerns that going against policy and the local neighbourhood plan would set a precedent for other applications. She also raised concern that this being the main route to school, and although the speed limit is 30, is regularly not adhered to, and the proposed access is near a bend. Also concerned about the water run-off and adding to the already regular flooding issues.

Mr Nick Stenning, Neighbourhood Plan, Steering Group Chairman, spoke of the amount of time and effort that had been put in by many volunteers in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, and this should be respected. In the referendum to adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, he confirmed a turnout of 41% with 93% of those saying yes. There would be a good deal of frustration felt if the plan was now to be ignored and all the preparation and work in producing the plan was undermined by a decision to allow development against the Plan itself. The Committee would be submitting their own response to this application separately.

Mr Robert Hughes, resident for 7 years, wished to know where the Parish Council stood in relation to the planning authority. Unfortunately, Mr Hughes missed the opening statement by the Planning Committee Chair, which would have answered the majority of his questions, he was worried that persistence would overcome resistance. It was suggested that the Parish Council publish an article in the Four Marks News summarising Cllr Thomas's statement in an attempt to demystify the planning process, and the Parish Council's role and stance.

Mrs Joanne Sanders, Blackberry Lane, was extremely concerned about the company themselves who had submitted the application and their advertised statistics of success rate, and having also read the documents, was concerned over the inaccuracies contained within the planning documents. She highlighted that the present use of the land for development was garden use, which is clearly not the truth, as this is agricultural land, historically used for sheep grazing. She also raised concern with the proposed density of the development.

There were no further comments.

**The Open Session concluded at 8.15pm. Standing Orders were applied.**

#### **17.161 APOLOGIES AND APPROVAL OF ABSENCES**

District Councillor Deborah Jackson had sent an apology for absence.

#### **17.162 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## 17.162 PLANNING APPLICATION

**Reference No:** 56082/001

**Location:** Mount Royal, 46 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks, GU34 5AH

**Proposal:** Outline application – residential development of up to 65 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and demolition of one dwelling to form a vehicular access point from Lymington Bottom (means of access to be considered)

Four Marks Parish Council STRONGLY OBJECT to this application in every respect, and comment on the various aspects of the submission, as follows:

### Community Engagement.

- The applicant has completely disregarded pre-application advice by East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) officers that the proposal is outside the settlement policy boundary and that a proven five year land supply exists, and therefore the application is against policies. The Parish Council fully support and endorse the Officer's detailed pre-application response.
- A leaflet drop to some 700 neighbouring houses, which in many cases was assumed to be junk mail and therefore discarded, is not engaging this community of over 2,500 households.
- The letter from Gladman Developments to the Parish Council was incorrectly addressed. Therefore it was received well after the leaflet drop and only a few days prior to the submission of the application, which itself was only less than a month after the first leaflet drop. There was no attempt to contact the Parish Council further, or hold any form of public consultation that we requested.
- A misleading local newspaper article was published, stating the land is to the East of Lymington Bottom, when it is in fact to the West.

### Planning Statement (see Policies below)

- The applicant disputes the published Local Planning Authority's (LPA) Five Year Land Supply for housing. The LPA published 5YLS document and Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17 presented to the EHDC DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING PANEL on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017, Appendix 3, both demonstrate a 5YLS, applying both the Liverpool and Sedgfield methods of calculation, with 5% or 20% buffers. Therefore the LPA can clearly demonstrate a fully robust and proven land supply of 7.23 years with the Liverpool Method and a 5% buffer, as acknowledged and supported by multiple recent Appeal Inspectors.
- The Neighbourhood Plan, which the applicant has attempted to dismiss as non-compliant, has been inspected and scrutinised by the appointed Government Inspector, passed and subsequently adopted by the LPA in May 2016 after an overwhelming referendum of 93% yes on a 41% electors' turnout. Therefore it is a lawful planning document carrying maximum weight. The extract from the ministerial statement being quoted by the applicant is misinterpreted and taken out of context. Therefore the applicant's statement cannot be taken into consideration or given any weight.
- There is much irrelevant and diversionary information contained within the application's documents as a whole for an Outline plus Access only application, perhaps designed to obscure the relevant content of the documentation. There are numerous errors, inconsistencies and factual inaccuracies throughout the various documents, some of which appear to be the result of copy and pasting from other applications, as clearly not relevant to Four Marks. We would also question the accuracy of some alleged facts and statistics provided in the various surveys.

### Density

- The proposal is for 65 dwellings at 33 per hectare. This density is more suited to urban dwellings and not the outside edge of a semi-rural settlement where, even on the recent local greenfield sites, density is between 14 and 21 dwelling per hectare, see example below:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Hectares</u>	<u># dwellings</u>	<u>dph</u>
Bellway	3.87	80	21
Bargate	3.64	51	14
Cala	3.98	75	19

## Topography

- The topography of the land is such that any development would be visually dominant and overbearing on the surrounding amenity, harming the edge of settlement landscape and causing both amenity loss of the countryside and with loss of privacy for adjacent properties. There is a 175 metre contour through the centre of the plot which compares with the Lymington Bottom spot height of 167 metres, demonstrating an 8 metre height rise whereby new housing would unacceptably dwarf the dwellings in Lymington Bottom. The topography in this area has been raised in previous applications and not taken into proper consideration at the application stage. Consequently we now have clear evidence of inappropriate heights at Medstead Farm, Brislands Lane, where existing homes in Brislands Lane, and one of the new dwellings has already had to be strengthened due to subsidence. Three, or even two and half, storey dwellings are neither acceptable nor appropriate on this site.

## Drainage

- Lymington Bottom is a historical river bed, clearly shown on Figure 7.3 of the applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment. The water runs down from either side of the river valley slopes and regularly floods Lymington Bottom at multiple locations, despite whatever drainage solutions have been implemented by either developers or the County Council. The water run-off is a real concern, particularly as the current drainage proposal appears to have the water draining away up-hill un-assisted. Whilst not a reason for refusal, there must be a fully compliant and detailed condition in place that ensures the drainage proposals will meet requirements, and are robustly reviewed and challenged by the LPAs own drainage experts.
- Due to the fact that Four Marks is of higher altitude than the villages of Chawton and Farrington, and excess run off and sub-strata water will flow down to the A32 valley it could ultimately have a wider knock on effect as has already been noted, increasing water volumes in both locations where serious flooding incidents have been recorded, in one case causing multiple months closure to the vital A32 route to south Hampshire.

## Access, Transport and Traffic

- The proposed access onto Lymington Bottom is a well-used road as the cut through between the A31 to the A32 by commuters in cars, vans, and commercial HGVs. Lymington Bottom is the main car, cycling and walking route to the primary school with a single narrow easterly pavement only. An additional 130 cars plus, accessing the road at a bend and opposite an elderly persons care home, would cause substantial hazards, the school pedestrian traffic only adds to the concerns.
- The site, although near the primary school, is some distance from local transport services, even further for those resident further into the site. The local shops are also distant, and despite the suggested theoretical travel plan, common sense (and practical experience from the multiple allocated and windfall sites with over 400 dwellings already built in Four Marks recently) indicates that, as the shops are up-hill, and particularly after dusk in the dark winter months, people will drive, not walk or cycle.
- Concern is also raised that there is only one access point for emergency vehicles, for 65 homes, and we question if this is adequate? Are the emergency services satisfied there would be safe access and evacuation capacity in an urgent situation?
- The traffic surveys were carried out in July at the end of the summer term. According to the statistics in the surveys, one in 10 cars were travelling over 40mph, 10 mph over the speed limit of 30 mph, therefore the proposed splays are inadequate.
- The crash map statistics are not up to date, as it only contains information up to 2016, so therefore the recent accident of a girl being knocked over and seriously injured the near the school is not included. We would also respectfully suggest that waiting for further accidents and resulting injuries or fatalities especially to school children is unreasonable and irresponsible planning.
- The travel plan figures have been taken from the 2011 Census, the village has a hugely increased population since then, so the figures are inaccurate, and under estimate the impact on the community.
- None of the statistics quoted appear to reflect the true picture, so how can they be used to accurately assess the actual situation?
- A recent report (the Atkins Report for HCC Highways / EHDC Highways) identified that the Lymington Bottom/A31/Lymington Bottom Road junction is already over capacity and the report did not take into account the new development of 75 houses in Lymington Bottom Road itself.
- It is widely documented and acknowledged that there is a serious daily problem with school traffic. Due to the location and health and safety concerns, 80% of the pupils are driven to school, as many pupils are fearful of walking with the current volume of traffic and alleged daily incidents. The junction by the

school floods every time there is heavy rain, and once cleared leaves a layer of slippery mud and debris, a significant risk to both vehicles and pedestrians.

- The travel plan information is incorrect. Page 4, paragraph 2.1.10 there are not footways on both sides of Blackberry Lane. Paragraph 2.1.11, there are no footways on either side of Alton Lane other than at the junction crossing and only on the school approach in Kitwood Road.

### **Amenity and Landscape**

- The proposed site is semi-rural and agricultural land, with in the past primarily sheep grazing, it currently offers a rural amenity and landscape for neighbouring properties and surrounding area, and is not, as stated, used as an extended garden. However even if that is the case, then this is a clear case of inappropriate back garden development (please reference both Appeal Inspectors Decision comments on “claimed gardens” outside SPBs for Virginia, 115 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks and 68-70 Lymington Bottom Road Medstead).

### **Affordable Housing**

- The applicant states that there will be the requisite provision of 40% affordable homes, however this site is outside the settlement policy boundary so therefore would be an exception site, so should be 70% to comply with Policy CP 14, and only for proven need for rural and agricultural workers.

### **Infrastructure**

- The 175 minimum agreed target for homes set by the government inspector for Four Marks and south Medstead in the Local Plan was considered a reasonable target for the facilities within this small local service centre (as defined in 2008, updated 2012). Whilst the term minimum can be deceptive and whilst there is no maximum figure quoted, this target has already been exceeded by over 80% in the first 5 years of the Plan, which means that the reduced infrastructure is no longer sustainable for the agreed figure. With 316 allocated homes completed or still under construction, plus over 80 windfall dwellings, there is clearly not a demonstrable need for more new homes in within this planning area.
- Additional local services including school and doctors / dentists are already under strain.
- No additional community infrastructure has been provided recently except two Toucan light crossings and remedial works to the shopping area and equipment for the recreation ground, whereas the community has lost the Post Office, a second petrol garage, and the only public house “The Windmill Inn”.

### **Wildlife**

- A superficial ecology report, with surveys only being carried out from July to September, which is not a true reflection, and if they had carried out surveys from the April to July, the findings would have been very different.
- Various species of bat have been found on the site, including the very rare Barbastelle bat, migrating birds and red kites, and on a neighbouring site, the great crested newt.
- Although the badger report contained within the documents is confidential, it is a known foraging point for the badgers who reside in the SINC, and due to the development at Medstead Farm, and the mitigation within that site providing wildlife corridors, the fields the other side of Brislands Lane as a result are now their feeding site, and this would be the extent of their foraging range, therefore development here would have an effect on their breeding, feeding and survival.

## **POLICIES**

### **EHDC JCS Local Plan**

The proposed development is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary. There is a proven and robust Five Year Land Supply, the JCS Local Plan Part 1, and Part 2 Allocations are examined and adopted, and the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan is examined, passed at public referendum and adopted. All carry full weight in the Framework.

Policy CP1      *Presumption in favour of sustainable development*, for all the issues raised previously, this development is not sustainable.

Policy CP2      *Spatial Strategy*. Four Marks and south Medstead have already over delivered.

- Policy CP10 *Spatial Strategy*. As for CP2, allocation sites have already been exceeded by 80%. A 5 year housing land supply can be robustly demonstrated by both the Liverpool and Sedgefield calculation with provision for a 20% buffer.
- Policy CP13 *Affordable Housing on residential development sites*, this is not an allocated nor windfall site.
- Policy CP14 *Affordable Housing for rural communities*. There are four separate sites all under construction within the plan area, all providing 40% affordable housing, therefore local and district need is already being addressed, and arguably not actually affordable.
- Policy CP19 *Development in the Countryside*. The only development that will be allowed in the countryside will that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location. There is no demonstrable need.
- Policy CP20 *Landscape*. The site is currently open landscape, and development would encroach and harm the rural character of the area.
- Policy CP21 *Biodiversity*. The development would diversely affect the current natural wildlife, this site contributes towards maintaining a district wide network of local wildlife corridors and sites.
- Policy CP25 *Flood risk*. Lymington Bottom is a river bed with historic regularly flooding issues.
- Policy CP29 *Design*. This development would be on the edge of settlement and at odds with the surrounding amenity.
- Policy CP31 *Transport*. Part G, volume of traffic, recent surveys have confirmed that the nearest junction is already over capacity.

#### **Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan:**

**The proposed development is contrary to Policy 1 of the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan.**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework:**

This proposal is contrary to the NPPF, paragraphs:

*14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.*

*For plan-making this means that:*

- *local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area*
- *Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:*
  - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole*
  - *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted<sup>1</sup>*

*For decision-taking this means<sup>2</sup>*

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay and*

<sup>1</sup> *For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion*

<sup>2</sup> *Unless material considerations indicate otherwise*

- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted

**This application's proposals are in direct conflict with multiple policies in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan, none of which are silent as the Development Plan is in force, nor are there any material considerations to indicate otherwise.**

*50. To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:*

- plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand
- where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time

*55. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:*

- the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside
- where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets
- where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting
- the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling

*Such a design should:*

- be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas
- reflect the highest standards in architecture
- significantly enhance its immediate setting
- be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area

*64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.*

### **Relevant recent Planning Refusals and Appeal Outcomes**

**Virginia, 115 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5AH**

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/2/17/3174135**

**5 new dwellings after demolition of existing dwelling**

**Decision date: 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

The site was on the East side of Lymington Bottom nearer the primary school, part of the site was outside of the settlement policy boundary.

The Inspector concluded *'that the failure to comply with the development plan and environmental harm that has clearly been identified would mean that the proposal would not constitute sustainable development. There are no material considerations of such weight to lead me to the conclusion that the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the resultant benefits.'*

**Land to the rear of 131 Winchester Road, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5HY**  
**Appeal Ref. APP/M1710/W/17/3168191**  
**6 new dwellings**  
**Decision Date: 27<sup>th</sup> June 2017**  
**APPEAL DISMISSED**

The site was outside the SPB and abutting a SINC

The Inspector concludes that *'the proposal would clearly conflict with Policies CP2, CP10, CP14 and CP19 of the JCS. As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the presumption in favour of sustainable development means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. It is implicit therefore that development that does not accord with the development plan should be refused. There is no dispute between the parties that the Council has a robust five year housing land supply, which, although this does not automatically rule out further development, it does mean these policies are not 'out-of-date' for the purposes of paragraph 14 of the Framework.*

*I conclude that even taken together, the modest benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the proposal's conflict with the development plan. This harm is not something which could be overcome at reserved matters stage. Therefore, having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.*

**103 Blackberry Lane and land to the rear of 97, 99, 101 and 105 Blackberry Lane, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5DJ**  
**20252/003 | Outline application - Residential development comprising up to 68 residential units, with associated access, landscaping and parking.**  
**REFUSAL : June 2016**

Officers Decision

- 1. The application site lies outside the Settlement Policy Boundary of Four Marks and the proposed residential development of this site would be contrary to local and national policy which seek to focus development in sustainable locations within Settlement Policy Boundaries and to resist development in the countryside save for exceptional circumstances. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies CP1, CP2, CP10, CP14, and CP19 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), saved policy H14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (2006), policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 2. The application proposes 40% affordable housing provision, which falls short of the 70% provision required by policy CP14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) and fails to provide a range of dwelling tenures and types reflective of local affordable housing need, contrary to policy CP11 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014).*
- 3. The Council is able to demonstrate a robust 5 year housing land supply using both 'Liverpool' and 'Sedgefield' methodologies and therefore the proposed development, by virtue of the committed number of additional dwellings already approved for this settlement, would result in a disproportionate number of additional homes above and beyond the identified housing figure for Four Marks/South Medstead as set out in the adopted East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core*

*Strategy (2014). Having regard to the harmful impacts arising from the proposal, which outweigh the benefits of additional housing, together with deficiencies and inadequacies in existing local infrastructure and services, this would have an adverse impact on the sustainability of the settlement so early in the plan period. As such, the proposal is contrary to the policies CP1, CP2, and CP10 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

4. *Notwithstanding any ecological mitigation measures proposed, the application is not supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in a detrimental impact on protected species, in particular Bats, Badgers, Slow-Worms, and Hazel Dormice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the policy CP2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.*
5. *The application is not supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed number of dwellings and the density of the development are capable of being satisfactorily accommodated on the site without detrimental impact to the character and appearance of this part of Four Marks and the Four Marks Clay Plateau Area. In consequence, the development is contrary to policies CP1, CP19, CP20, CP21, and CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (2016), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **CONCLUSION**

**The proposal is contrary to the JCS Local Plan Policies CP1, CP2, CP10, CP13, CP14, CP19, CP20, CP21, CP25, CP29 and CP31, Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan, and relevant paragraphs 50, 55 and 64 of the NPPF. Taking all of the concerns raised above, and within excess of 350 local residents' objections posted, this proposal is not sustainable. The harm that this proposed development would cause far outweighs any the benefits (real or fictional), and the Parish Council respectfully ask the Planning Officer to REFUSE this application.**

### **17.163 NEXT MEETING:**

Full Council; Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> December 2017, 7.30pm Village Hall.

### **17.164 The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.30pm.**

.....  
**CHAIRMAN**