



# Medstead Parish Council

## Minutes of the Full Council Meeting – 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2026, 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs. Mike Smith, Mark Brayford, Phil Quinlan, Frank Maloney, Jez Hood, Anthea Dore, Janet King, Ken Kercher.

**Also in attendance:** Julie Russell (Parish Clerk), 6 members of the public.

		ACTION
<b>26.001 OPEN SESSION</b>		
a. Cllr Quinlan noted the recurrence of flooding at Five Ash Road		
b. The Chair of SMASH shared with Councillors the findings of the group’s consultation to date with the community over the proposed development by Bewley Homes / Cala.		
c. A resident shared his objections to EHDC-25-1411-OUT, Land East of Common Hill, citing concerns. He noted it has been continually-grazed paddock land for 40 years, it is next to Hook Wood (a SINIC), the entrance is on a dangerous corner that gets icy in winter, it is away from local amenities with poor footpaths to the village.		
d. A second resident noted that the development is unsustainable and outside the Settlement Policy Boundary.		
e. A third resident noted distances via footpaths to the village, the mud and poor stiles on the footpaths, the 60mph speed limit and lack of pavements on Common Hill, the site’s location on a blind bend, the large size of the 4-bed houses (contrary to the village design statement) and the need or the development to remove ancient hedgerows.		
f. Residents felt it would set a precedence for dozens of large gardens and paddocks, including the Dell, Homestead Road.		
<b>26.002 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>		
Apologies were approved for Cllr Mitchell (holiday). District Cllrs Day and Richardson also sent their apologies.		
<b>26.003 DECLARATION OF INTEREST</b>		
None		
<b>26.004 FULL COUNCIL MINUTES</b>		
Councillors <b>resolved</b> to confirm the minutes of the Full Council meeting on 10 <sup>th</sup> December and they were signed.		
<b>26.005 COMMITTEES AND REPORTS</b>		
<b>a. Planning Committee</b>		
<b>i. Chair’s Report (Last meeting in full Council 10<sup>th</sup> December)</b> The Chair’s report was circulated in advance and is attached in the Appendix.		
<b>ii. Planning applications</b>		
Ref	Address / description	MPC comment
a) <a href="#">EHDC-25-1411-OUT</a>	Land East Of Common Hill, Medstead, GU34 5NA Outline planning permission for residential development. Erection of four dwellinghouses with access, parking, landscaping and associated works. All matters reserved except for access and layout.	Councillors agreed a strong objection to this application. The full response is in the Appendix.

<p>b) <a href="#">EHDC-26-0021-EIA</a></p>	<p>Land At Lymington Bottom Road, Four Marks , GU34 5EP Request for Screening Opinion - Residential development for up to around 900 dwellings in total, plus a new 2-form entry primary school, supporting infrastructure, access, drainage, public open space and landscaping. The total site area is approximately 45.48ha</p>	<p>The Council strongly supports the applicant in seeking the EIA, particularly as this is a possible major development more than doubling the housing in the ‘South Medstead’ part of the Parish.</p> <p>The impact of this development of up to 900 dwellings with the expected 2,000 plus increase in residents and is of great concern to the Council, especially regarding the highways constraints of introducing such numbers into the Parish, and the additional EHDC Planning Policy requirement to provide an additional 480 dwellings by 2042.</p> <p>The Council realises that this is an EIA request, not a Planning Application. It would be delinquent in its duty if it did not press EHDC for all information to be available to the prospective promoter to ensure the production of the best possible development. This will enable MPC to properly assess the application when it comes before the Council.</p>
<p>c) <a href="#">EHDC-25-1494-FUL</a></p>	<p>The Dell Homestead Road, Medstead, GU34 5PW Demolition of existing outbuilding, construction of three dwellings and associated access, parking, means of enclosure, landscaping (including hard and soft landscaping, additional tree planting and selected removal), SuDs, biodiversity net gain and other associated works.</p>	<p>Councillors agreed a strong objection to this application. The full response is in the Appendix.</p>
<p>iii. Late Application <a href="#">EHDC-25-1396-LDCP</a></p>	<p>Grestock Lodge Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5NJ Single storey side/rear extension</p>	<p>The Councillor defers the decision to the Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>a. Planning Committee (continued)</b> <b>iv. Planning Decision Notices</b> The EHDC decisions since the last meeting were noted are in the Appendix. <b>v. Planning Enforcement and Appeals.</b></p>		

<a href="#">EHDC-25-0252-PIP</a>  <a href="#">Ref. 6002082</a>	Southview, Medstead, GU34 5BP Appeal for the refusal of planning permission for Permission in Principle for 9 dwellings, following demolition of existing dwellings, stables and barns and removal of caravan	The Council agreed to support EHDC in the Appeal and has written a letter to be submitted, in the Appendix.
<p><b>a. Planning Committee (continued)</b></p> <p><b>vi. Changes in Government Policy</b>          Cllr Maloney outlined some of the changes in the latest NPPF currently undergoing consultation (covered in the Chair's report in the Appendix).</p> <p><b>vii. Any other planning matters arising</b>          Cllr Hood agreed to pull together a response to the consultation on Farnborough Airport (in the Appendix).</p> <p><b>b. Maintenance Committee (No meeting since last Full Council)</b></p> <p><b>i. Chair's Report</b>          There was no written chair's report.          The Allotment fencing repairs will be completed in the next week, and the dragon's teeth replacement is scheduled for the February half term when there will not be school traffic in the layby. The tree work is still behind schedule and the Clerk keeps pushing the contractor. Alternative contractors will be arranged if they do not complete the work soon.</p> <p><b>c. F&amp;GP Committee (No meeting since last Full Council)</b></p> <p><b>i. Chair's Report</b> There was no chair's report</p>		
<p><b>26.006 MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL CHAIRMAN'S REPORT</b>          There was no Chairman's report.</p>		
<p><b>26.007 CLERK /RFO'S REPORT</b>          The Clerk's report was circulated in advance and is included in the Appendix.</p>		
<p><b>26.008 EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCILLORS' REPORT</b>          There was no written report this month, and no District Councillors in attendance.</p>		
<p><b>26.009 PUBLIC MEETING ON THE CALA BEWLEY HOMES DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>a. The Council agreed that a public meeting would be held once the planning application has been submitted in order to avoid predetermination and for the Council to have all information available and to hear resident's views on the actual application.          The Council agreed to put out a statement on this for the public and press, which the Clerk will draft.</p> <p>b. The Council agreed to invite Highways and other relevant representatives to this public meeting and final decisions on who to invite will be made nearer the time.</p> <p>c. The meeting date will be publicised on the website, noticeboards and local Facebook channels.</p>		<b>Clerk</b>
<p><b>26.010 CIL PROJECTS</b>          Councillors were reminded that the bidding window is open until May for CIL projects. Suggestions were made for Five Ash Pond flooding improvement, surface water drainage and a men's shed. However, the first two are under HCC Control.</p>		
<p><b>26.011 ASSET BASED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PILOT</b>          Councillors agreed that the same people who attended the EHDC workshops will remain as the key representatives on the pilot. The feedback to Council on the events was broadly positive and the Council agreed to complete the asset maps before determining how much further to progress with the work.</p>		
<p><b>26.012 TREE WORK</b>          The contractor is a long way behind schedule on the tree work and although there were</p>		

<p>some delays initially due to poor weather, there are other factors, including that it appears to taking many more days than the contractor allocated. The contractor has turned up for a further two days immediately prior to the Council meeting, so the Clerk will monitor the situation to see if this latest effort continues. There is still a some clearing up of removed wood needed for some of the trees, again with the contractor being reminded to do it. The oak tree in the Knapp still needing work will be changed to a different contractor.</p>	<b>Clerk</b>
<p><b>26.013 POLICIES</b>  The Council <b>resolved</b> to approve the following policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Data Protection Policy</li> <li>b. Subject Access Request Policy</li> <li>c. Data Breach Policy</li> <li>d. Data Retention Policy</li> <li>e. General Privacy Notice</li> <li>f. Staff and Councillor Privacy Notices</li> </ol> <p>For (g) Record of Processing Activity, the Clerk has a bit more work to do to finalise it, but will go through the first draft with Cllr Brayford.</p> <p><b>Councillors resolved to extend the length of the meeting by a further 30 minutes</b></p>	<b>Clerk</b>
<p><b>26.014 CORRESPONDENCE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Council noted correspondence from residents on the Bewley / Cala proposals, to which the Clerk has already replied in acknowledgement. Cllr Maloney will draft a reply on behalf of the Council to one of the letters that was directed to him.</li> <li>b. The Council agreed to</li> <li>c. meet with a representative of the A31 Alliance who wrote requesting a meeting, and the Clerk will liaise to arrange dates.</li> <li>d. The Clerk reminded Councillors of the HALC County Forum on 29<sup>th</sup> January.</li> <li>e. Councillors were informed of the Community-led Transport Grant, and it was agreed that the Clerk will inspect the bus shelter in Greenstiles to see if it needs any work.</li> <li>f. The Council agreed a request from a football club to regularly hire the football pitch and asked the Clerk to research the pricing for neighbouring pitches. Councillors requested that the Clerk ask the club whether they are interested in using the pavilion.</li> </ol>	<b>Cllr Maloney</b>  <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Clerk</b>
<p><b>26.015 REPORTS FROM COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Speedwatch</b> Nothing to report</li> <li>b. <b>EHAPTC</b> Nothing to report.</li> <li>c. <b>Village Hall</b> The Clerk will request the dates of MVH Committee meetings for Cllr King</li> <li>d. <b>Medstead Sports Club</b> The Club has removed waste items that were stored by the cricket nets.</li> <li>e. <b>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</b> This has already been covered. In addition, Cllr Maloney noted that the NPSG is considering engaging a transport specialist consultant.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>26.016 DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  The next meeting was confirmed as 11<sup>th</sup> February at 7.30pm.</p>	

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 9.44pm.

**Signed Chairman .....**

**Date.....**

## **Appendix December 2025**

### **0126.1 Planning Chairman's Report**

One would have thought that there would have been a lull in Planning activity over the Christmas period.

With regards to planning applications published by the District Council, this was true but national government as published a new NPPF document for planning policy.

#### **Planning Applications**

Only one regarding a new Planning Application:

- EHDC-25-1411-OUT Land East Of Common Hill, before the Council this evening

Three regarding Conditions:

- EHDC-25-1423-DCON Rampore Paice Lane, Materials
- EHDC-25-1451-DCON Land To The Rear Of Brackenbury Gardens And Boyneswood Close, Materials Determined
- EHDC-25-1431-DCON Paddock View Stoney Lane, Detail of frontage

#### **Appeal**

We have been notified regarding an Appeal against the EHDC decision of refusal for

- EHDC-25-0252-PIP Southview, Abbey Rd

#### **Government Policy**

The changes to the MPF include the total renumbering of all the policies. Instead of a plane number the paragraphs are prefixed by a letter. These letters group similar policies on the same subject together. I believe this makes the policy much easier to understand and follow through.

A key change is the direction not to repeat clauses 'piece meal' in Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans, but only use clauses to enhance local requirements. With regards to the NDP, in the last chapter all plans that have not reached the regulation 15 stage at publication date, i.e. the presentation to EHDC prior to examination, must be presented in compliance with the new NPPF. This consultation runs until February.

#### **Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Development Plan**

The M&FMNP Steering Group held two successful 'Drop In' sessions in December, one in Medstead and one in Four Marks. Attendances were Medstead 61 and Four Marks 78, a total 139. Further data was gathered both in hard copy and an online survey. It is currently being analysed particularly with regard to residents' thoughts on the sites to be allocated by the NDP.

The NPSG met with EHDC Planning Policy Team last week to discuss the proposed NDP. EHDC were unable to advise their final housing need as it's due diligence exercise to cooperate with the adjacent LPAs has not been completed. They are expecting this to happen towards the summer, prior to the DLP Reg 19 Submission

The EHDC planning Policy Committee met last Wednesday evening to note some revised chapters for the DLP 2024 to 2042.

The chapters were:

*02: vision and objectives*

*05: Safeguarding our Natural, Built and Historic Environment*

*08: Enabling Communities to Live Well*

*11: Development Management Policies*

It included the amalgamation of two of the original chapters. Further chapters are expected to come before the committee in March. The Sites Allocation chapter is expected to be the last to come forward.

The current thoughts of the NPSG is that the proposed NDP will move to Regulation 14 stage in the Spring, possibly coming before this committee at its March meeting. If this Council is so minded, and Four Marks Parish Council also agrees, it will be submitted to EHDC for the public consultation of the Draft Plan.

As noted above it will need to be written with the forthcoming NPPF in mind, but it will also need to be written with regard to the housing data currently published by EHDC, but with the caveat that additional housing may need to be allocated. It will also need to be written to be standalone to cover the possibility that the EHDC Regulation 19 DLP will not be sent to the examiner before the 31st of December 2026. Local Plans submitted after this date will need to be formulated under the new NPPF when this is published. There is a financial risk that the NDP may not be able to move to the Regulation 15 stage as proposed to happen in the Autumn 2026 without returning to the stage 14 Consultation. To this end to confirm this the NPSG may need to seek legal opinion. It is believed that only a few NDPs have proceeded to be made without a current local plan in place.+

#### **Other Issues:**

##### *Neighbourhood CIL*

The 25256/50 CIL payments programme is being published I recommend that the PC creates a shopping list to earmark its expenditure before it is appropriated by EHDC, HCC a unitary authority, a mayoralty or another PC.

I would suggest we consider:

- Flood prevention works at Five Ash Pond
- Raist the footway at Medstead Pond, on South Town
- Assistance to the expansion of Medstead Pre School
- Possible development of the flower meadow to become a village asset.

##### *Proposed Bewley and CALA Development of 850 houses in 'South Medstead'.*

I believe that most Councillors who were able attended the presentations. There were no firm proposals being put forward, other than the land for the development – all the proposals were 'illustrative'.

When asked if the development was 'strategic', EHDC advised that the Council thought about its needs and the 'good to have' items that could be provided

#### **0126.2 Comments on EHDC-25-1411-OUT**

***Outline planning permission for residential development. Erection of four dwelling houses with access, parking, landscaping and associated works. All matters reserved except for access and layout. Land East Of Common Hill, Medstead.***

The Council strongly objects to this Planning application for a speculative development of two 3 bedroomed houses and two 4 bedroomed houses on Common Hill, Medstead.

Although the site has no previous planning history, the site immediately to the north, recently came forward but was rejected by the LPA.

The site is located at the foot of Common Hill to the east of the road, adjacent to its junction with Homestead Road and Bighton Road. The junction is 158m above datum. To the south of the site is Footpath 155/14/4 and bordered on its eastern boundary by is a Site of Importance for Nature and Conservation SINCC, Hook Wood.

The site is currently agricultural pastureland, with the curtilage of the site being hedgerow / woodland, with the access through an agricultural style metal gate some 3m wide.

The development size and location are considered to be significant, especially as it will be visible from the surrounding countryside. Apart from Footpath 155/14/4 and the bridle way, 155/15/1, to the south, it will be overlooked from other footpaths in the area, particularly from 155/9/2 and 155/6/3 to the west of the road that traverse the hill to the Hattingley hamlet around 185m above datum. Other footpaths in the local Medstead PRow network meet at the top of the hill and the site will be visible from footpaths 155/5/1, 155/5/2, 155/6/1, 155/6/2, 155/7/1, 155/8/1 and 155/8/3.

The Council opines that the proposed development will have a significant impact on the view.

This speculative proposal is for a 4 dwelling cul-de-sac development of two 3 bedroomed houses and two 4 bedroomed houses outside the Medstead Village SPB. Although the application form identifies carparking for nine cars, the Studio Four Architects drawing, (*No 020 Revision P3, Proposed – Site Plan*), show seventeen. With notes suggesting the architect's ideas as of this time, the only 'concrete' proposal is four dwellings.

Due need, the proposed road layout has been tracked to ensure that all vehicles, including refuse lorries, can enter and leave the site in a forward gear, with suitable turning areas, as shown in the Connect Consultants drawing (*No 250632-SK250626.1, Visibility Splay*). The drawing shows that the site entrance has expanded from about 3m to 10m. This change in the hedgerow from the existing field gate creates a significant breach in the wildlife corridor on the important route on the east side of the Common Hill road.

The Planning statement indicates that the layout provided is similar to those on Bighton Road and Homestead Rd; this is not true both Homestead Road and Bighton Road are ribbon developments. This development is a cul-de-sac development.

The Statement notes EHDC JCS 2013 to 2028 Policies CP2, CP10, CP19, and the Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

CP2 points to land North of the South Downs National Park and identifies Medstead as

*'Other settlements with a settlement policy boundary', not as incorrectly stated in the Planning Statement as a Small Local Service Centre.*

CP10 considers the housing need between 2013 and 2028 a minimum of 150 dwellings at other villages outside the National Park and housing and other small scale development outside settlement policy boundaries will only be permitted where it:

- *meets a community need or realises local community aspirations;*
- *reinforces a settlement's role and function;*
- *cannot be accommodated within the built up area; and*
- *has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan or has clear community support as demonstrated through a process which has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Parish or Town Council.*

These 150 dwellings are to be built across the 20 defined locations; about 8 for the Plan period.

From 2013 to 2024, 36 dwellings have been built in Medstead, which far exceed the expected contribution of CP10.

This Application is contrary to CP 10. This application is for speculative 'market' housing and was not subject to pre application advice from EHDC. It does not meet a community need, as the current assessment of 'Affordable Housing' needs of people with a 'local connection to the village' provided by the EHDC Housing Officer, referenced in multiple applications for Medstead and Four Marks, is more than exceeded by the current number of 'Affordable' houses with permission to be built.

This proposed development does not reinforce the settlement's role and function as the site is divorced from the village and infrastructure, particularly as it could be accommodated in a better location closer to the village. The Council is aware of other land within the village that could come forward should the landowner wish. There is no known community need or aspiration to build houses in this area.

With regards to Policies CP19, the development is contrary to the policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake, and the only development allowed will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location. Policy CP6 *Rural Economy and Enterprise* identifies activities where development will be permitted as

- a) *For farm diversification schemes and enterprises that help maintain the viability of farm businesses engaged in sustainable land management;*
- b) *For the conversion of rural buildings for appropriate uses;*
- c) *For the reasonable extension of existing firms in the countryside and new small- scale employment uses within the settlement policy boundaries of rural settlements.*

This application does not comply with a, b, or c, and regarding H14 '*housing outside settlement policy boundaries where it is essential for a full-time worker in agriculture, forestry or other enterprise who must live on the site rather than in a nearby settlement*', the applicant has not identified an outstanding need. Indeed, the Parish has a surfeit of 'Affordable Housing'.

With regards to the Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries SPD, the proposed development does not meet a community need or realise local community aspirations or reinforce a settlement's role and function, it has not been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan nor has clear community support as demonstrated through a process which has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Parish or Town Council. It could that be accommodated within the SPB.

As co-sponsor of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Council notes that the emerging NBP's Housing Needs Assessment by the Consultancy AECOM has not identified the need for such housing.

The Council believes that NPPF Paragraph 82 does not apply, as there is no local housing need that is not being met by granted Planning Permissions already on site or moving to that stage.

With regard to Paragraph 83, the Applicant presumes that the proposal is sustainable: it is not. It does not support the HCC Transport Policy regarding 'modal shift', as by the Applicant's own admission a car will be needed.

Unfortunately, the author of the Planning Statement has been sadly misinformed:

- Medstead village has not been designated 'Small Local Service Centre' but 'Other settlements with a settlement policy boundary'

- Medstead does not have a public service bus service, it has the benefit of an HCC subsidised ‘market day’ service serving Alton and other villages.
- Four Marks does not have a main line railway station, making the author’s presumption on the sustainability of the proposed site deficient.

The Applicant references NPPF Paragraph 110, Promoting sustainable transport ‘*through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes*’. The Council believes that, due to its location in the community, no alternative transport modes are offered apart for leisure activities. The need to commute for employment has been omitted.

The Council has concerns regarding the benefits of the development under NPPF Paragraph 8, ‘*Achieving sustainable development*’ in meeting its economic, social, environmental objectives:

- Economically, it will add to the CIL and Council Tax; to the local economy little will be added.
- Socially, being an isolated cu-de-sac development, the development will not be an addition in supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
- Environmentally – due to commuting it will not assist in moving to a low carbon economy.

With regard to NPPF Paragraph 11, *Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development*, with its associated Footnote 8, the Applicant particularly notes point d(ii) of the NPPF is engaged, subject to the proposal’s compliance with other relevant planning policies, to engage tilted balance.

The Council notes the Footnote 9, which is particularly attached to d(ii), refers consideration of the decisions regarding ‘tilted balance’ to other Paragraphs that must be considered.

At the recent EHDC Planning Committee meeting regarding *60425/001 Land to the Southeast of Semaphore Farm, Telegraph Lane, Four Marks*, the Officer noted that Paragraph 66 refers to sites offering Affordable Housing, and Paragraph 91 to larger settlements, such as in the settlement of Alton and will be omitted from this document.

*84. ... development of isolated homes in the countryside ...*

Due to the sites location and those of the adjacent properties the Council has measured the approximate distances from the closest facilities:

FACILITY / AMENITY	ACTUAL DISTANCE	
	Foot Path	Road
Convenience Shop/PO	1.32	1.22
School and Pre-school	1.9 & 1.95	1.8 & 1.85
Day Nursery	1.8	1.66
Pub	1.45	1.12
Church	1.35	1.14
Village Hall	1.83	1.7
Co-op Four Marks 4.5km (road distance)		4.5
Bus route (208)	1.3	1.2
Bus route (64)		3.3

The Officer will be aware that Highways’ current direction, recently restated in 25-0055-OUT, is to use ATE advice when assessing walking distances,

*‘ a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities within a 10-minute walking distance 800m via an **accessible route.**’*

With regards to NPPF 11 d(ii), significant severe harms are demonstrated regarding the measured distances above.

Walking to school or a shop with infants or a buggy would be difficult; it would be problematic for older residents. At the EHDC Planning Committee Meeting, November 2024, Councillor Lewison commented when examining 58788/002/OUT, *Land to the west of Longbourn Way, Medstead*:

*“Most journeys will be made by car”*

The 58788/002/OUT site is some 3.3km from the nearest daily bus stop.

The 208 bus service referred to in the table is the HCC subsidised ‘market day’ service, running three times on a circular route from Alton, Lasham, Bentworth and Medstead. between 10.00 and 14.00 on Tuesdays and Fridays.

The nearest public bus service, the Stagecoach 64, is on the A31 in Four Marks some 3.3km distant.

Due to the distances between other dwellings and the resident’s work life balance, it is unlikely that informal social meetings between neighbours will be able take place.

The Officer should note that there is no footway on Common Hill nor on Homestead Road, and that there is no streetlighting in Medstead Parish.

The Council notes that the Consultation on the Draft NPPF, 2025 advises the use of the Department of Transport Connectivity Tool<sup>1</sup> to assess the connectivity of sites, particularly in reference to Local Plans which guides the decisions of the EHDC Planning Committee.

This tool can be used to identify the connectivity of any site within England and Wales by both destination and mode of transport. Each location has a connectivity score from 0 to 100. A location’s Connectivity score is calculated as a percentage of the highest score in England and Wales, which is always 100.

<b>Comparison on site connectivity, using the Department of Transport Connectivity to compare ease of movement for sites to infrastructure</b>	
<b><i>Land East of Common Hill</i></b>	<b><i>Land behind Junipers</i></b>
<b>Overall</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Department of Transport Connectivity tool

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/connectivity-tool>

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	15	Very low (10-20%)	Overall (except driving)	34	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	16	Very low (10-20%)	Public transport	34	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	9	Lowest (0-10%)	Walking	32	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	32	Below average (30-40%)	Cycling	43	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	69	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower, particularly for the ease in walking to infrastructure, which is amongst the lowest connectivity in the country.

A fuller comparison of connectivity is shown in Appendix 2

110. ... development focused on locations or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel...

Due the size of the development, there is no mitigation offered to prevent the need to travel to school, medical and retail needs. There may be an opportunity to ‘work from home’, that may not be available for all residents. If commuting to work private transport will be required

115.

- a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised; ...
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all ...

There is no sustainable transport service available to this site. Cycling is a possibility, but the site is towards the foot of a hill, some 60 m below the centre of Medstead Village. Due to its position ‘safe and suitable access to the site’ cannot be achieved, particularly for those going to school or shop as walking with infants or buggy would be difficult; and problematic for older residents. As noted above, at the EHDC Planning Committee Meeting, November 2024, Councillor Lewison said, regarding the area, “Most journeys will be made by car”.

129. ... decisions should account for:

- c) availability and capacity of infrastructure and services to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;

There is no availability of infrastructure or services to promote successful sustainable travel modes.

*135 ... developments function well, ... are sympathetic, maintain a strong sense of place, ... create places that are safe, support local facilities and transport networks, ... inclusive and accessible*

This development is outside the SPB, extending the settlement, downgrades the road's current 'sense of place, increases road network use as residents' rely on private transport and is not accessible to all.

It will become a dormitory development, divorced from village life. It adds four houses and taxes, a minimal gain.

#### *Housing Need*

As previously mentioned the Council is the co-sponsor of the emerging *Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Development Plan*. As part of its due diligence a Housing Needs Assessment was commissioned from the Consultancy AECOM., delivered in September 2025.

It identified that the Parish was over endowed with four bedroom dwelling, compared to the EHDC average, and that a minimal number were required to be built across the Parish between 2024 and 2042 should be between 0% and 25% to return the area to balance following the speculative building carried out between 2013 and 2021.

The Assessment did not identify any local need apart from bungalows, to enable older residents to downsize, and a quantified number of affordable 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings for Affordable or Social housing.

#### *Statutory Consultee Comment HCC Highways*

The Parish Council notes that the Statutory Consultee, HCC Highways, advises:

*'Based on the observed vehicle speeds, visibility splays of 2.4m by 215m are shown to the north, and 2.4m by 33.9m to the south. The visibility splays are shown within the demarcated Highway Boundary. Based on site observations, the visibility splays as currently presented would appear to require significant removal of vegetation to be achievable. At this stage it is unclear as to the extent of this potential clearance since the vegetation is not denoted on Drawing 250632-SK250626.1. This information is required by the Highway Authority before being in a position to set out a recommendation.*

#### **Recommendation**

*Having regard to the above comments the Highway Authority require further information as set out above.'*

The removal of vegetation on the significant wildlife corridor on the hedgerow will be detrimental to the transit needs of the rich fauna biodiversity in the locality.

#### *Significant Harm to other villagers*

The Council has a concern that the adjacent residents on Homestead Road will be overlooked. This is particularly sensitive regarding the privacy of the existing rear gardens.

#### *Safety Concerns*

The site is located on an incline on a derestricted (60 mph) country lane, without the benefit of footway, street lighting or a passing bus route. At around 195m above datum and being exposed to the prevailing southwest wind, the Council is aware that the road adjacent to the site access is recognised by HCC Highways as a 'black ice cold spot' with the provision of a salt bin at this

point. The Council is aware of many vehicles leaving the highway and being retrieved by local residents' tractors on this road during cold spells.

The Council noted the Planning Appeal APP/M1710/W/25/3361919, in which the Inspector decided to reject the appeal against the EHDC decision to reject application 57295/002 Land East of Paddock Grange, Homestead Road, adjacent to this site.( amended Judgement in Appendix 1, below). He considered, amongst other things,

- Character and appearance
- Location for housing
- River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA

in reaching his decision. In his conclusions in rejecting Appeal, the Inspector noted:

'Planning balance and conclusion

35. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
36. I have found that the proposal is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would also harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. Harm associated with these matters and conflict with the development plan attracts substantial weight.
37. Having taken account of the other considerations in support of the proposal, I do not consider these to be sufficiently forceful, to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan I have identified. Consequently, in the circumstances of this case, the material considerations do not justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.
38. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.'

The Inspectors decision has been used by EHDC in its defence to Planning Appeal 6001958 – Walden Common Hill, Medstead, the adjacent northerly plot on Common Road, which strengthens the case against this application.

For the above reasons, Medstead Parish Council asks EHDC to refuse this application.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Extract from Planning Appeal adjudication APP/M1710/W/25/3361919 57295/002 Land East of Paddock Grange, Homestead Road,**

#### **Reasons for refusal**

##### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal site ('the site') comprises a field with a rectangular footprint located away from the main developed area of Medstead, along Homestead Road, which is a roughly surfaced bridleway. This bridleway serves a limited number of detached dwellings that are scattered along its length, interspersed with large areas of undeveloped agricultural land.
5. To the west of the site is Paddock Grange a dormer bungalow. To the east is a historic hedgerow boundary to the property known as Little Barn.
6. Whilst there are some examples of dwellings along Homestead Road that are fairly closely spaced, most of these are located away from the site. Therefore, the scattered nature of existing dwellings defines its rural identity.

7. ... Its largely undeveloped nature is consistent with other agricultural land parcels along Homestead Road. Overall, the site contributes to the low-density, informal character of the area and reinforces the areas largely rural identity.
9. On the information before me, the Medstead Village Design Statement emphasises the importance of preserving visual gaps between buildings in rural areas. Notwithstanding the presence of nearby dwellings, the area retains a spacious, undeveloped feel, introducing a new dwelling would erode this openness, particularly by infilling the gap between Paddock Grange and Little Barn and by creating a more continuous built frontage. Thereby, diminishing the area's rural character.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would fail to accord with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy ('JCS'), which along with other matters seeks to ensure that development proposals are designed to a high standard that is appropriate and sympathetic to spaces around buildings and landscape features.

#### *Location for housing*

11. The site lies beyond the defined settlement boundary of Medstead and is therefore, in accordance with the development plan, designated as a countryside location.
12. In accordance with Policy CP19 of JCS, development in such areas is only permitted where a genuine need for a countryside setting can be demonstrated. Similarly, Saved Policy H14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review ('LP') imposes comparable restrictions on residential development outside settlement boundaries. The proposed development does not satisfy the requirements set out in these policies. Additionally, Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan ('NP') stipulates that new development within the plan area should be located within the designated settlement boundary.
13. Along with other development plan policies, the above policies aim to direct new development to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the district, in line with its spatial strategy. This includes an approach to sustainable development in the countryside, defined as areas outside settlement policy boundaries where a policy of general restraint is applied to protect the countryside for its own sake, save for uses that have a genuine functional need to be located in the countryside.
14. The wider area offers a modest range of amenities, including a primary school, nursery, public house, and church located approximately 1 kilometre from the appeal site in Medstead. Additional services are available in Four Marks, designated as a Small Local Service Centre, and in Alton, identified as a Market Town with a broader range of facilities including retail, employment opportunities, and a railway station. These settlements, situated approximately 2 kilometres and 7 kilometres from the site respectively, are understood to be served by the local bus network.
15. Notwithstanding the fact that the site is not considered isolated in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and relevant case law, the accessibility of the site remains constrained. Homestead Road is a narrow, unlit lane with no dedicated footways, rendering it unsuitable for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly during adverse weather conditions or outside daylight hours. Consequently, it is unlikely that future occupants would access nearby services on foot or by bicycle, or walk to the nearest bus stop, which lies approximately a ten-minute walk away in Medstead. Given the site's poor accessibility, visitors to the proposed dwelling are also likely to be largely reliant

on private motor vehicles. Therefore, the location of the appeal site would not minimise demand for travel.

16. Even when taking account of the Framework, which acknowledges that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, the location of the appeal site does not offer genuinely sustainable travel choices to a range of nearby shops, facilities and services. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that residents would be predominantly reliant on private motor vehicles to access day-to-day services and facilities, even if journeys are likely to be relatively short and limited in association with a small scale rural development.
17. For the above reasons and given that I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, the appeal site is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the development plan. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policy CP19 of the JCS, Saved Policy H14 of the LP and Policy 1 of the NP.

#### *River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA*

18. The site is located within the drainage catchment area for the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA.
19. The Council has been made aware by Natural England that there are potential strategic issues regarding the level of nitrogen and phosphorus deposition in the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA resulting in evidence of eutrophication, caused by agriculture, existing communities and proposed development. New housing development therefore needs to be appropriately assessed to address the uncertainty about the deterioration of the water environment.
20. River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA are protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In order for development to be acceptable, these Regulations require it to be demonstrated that it will have no likely significant effect on the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA, either alone or in combination with other proposals. If it cannot, measures must be proposed to remove the impact, for example, a satisfactory scheme of mitigation (i.e. one that can demonstrate the nutrient neutrality of the proposed development), or the proposal should be refused.
21. As the competent authority, I am responsible for undertaking an Appropriate Assessment as to whether the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA would be affected by the development.
22. The submitted Nitrate Budget Assessment Report, identifies that the proposed scheme would support an additional population of 2.4 persons, resulting in an annual increase in nitrogen and phosphorous loads.
23. As the proposal would lead to an increase in nutrient deposition, mitigation is required. Given that there is no opportunity to implement a mitigation scheme on-site, the purchase of credits from an authorised provider would be necessary. Provided that the proposed mitigation measures are secured and implemented, the development is unlikely to result in a significant effect on nutrient levels within the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA.
24. By referring me to another appeal decision, the appellant advises that mitigation measures could be secured via a condition that prevents the development from commencing until the mitigation measures have been approved in writing by the Council, which demonstrate that the additional nutrient loading generated by the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected sites.
25. Irrespective, the suggested mitigation measures include the appellant committing to securing off-site credits. This still requires that there is certainty and transparency about

the delivery of mitigation in order to ensure that the identified potential for an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected sites is not realised and to avoid an unimplementable planning permission. In this case, the Council advises that there are no schemes in place to secure phosphate credits in the district.

26. Therefore, without the submission of a satisfactory scheme of mitigation (i.e. one that can demonstrate the nutrient neutrality of the proposed development) I am unable to conclude that the development would not add to the unfavourable nitrate / phosphate levels within the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CP21 and CP22 of the JCS. Together, these policies require that development proposals must maintain, enhance and protect the district's biodiversity and its surrounding environment, including designated sites.

#### *Other considerations*

27. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. Therefore, Paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. However, the application of policies in the Framework in so far as they protect habitat sites provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. This is reiterated by paragraph 195 of the Framework and as such, the proposal would not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework.
28. Although I do not dispute that the site was previously developed, on the information before me, I cannot be certain that this is Previously Developed Land, as defined in the Framework.
31. Accordingly, should the appeal be allowed and subject to the subsequent approval of reserved matters, the proposal would deliver an additional dwelling. This would make a modest but important contribution to the objectives of the Framework, particularly in significantly boosting the supply of housing and encouraging the delivery of small sites for self-build and custom-build homes.
32. There would also be jobs created during construction of the development and notwithstanding the site's poor accessibility, occupiers are likely to support local services and facilities.
33. The proposal is likely to deliver new on-site habitats through planting, and the new home is likely to be of sustainable construction. These factors contribute to the environmental benefits of the scheme.
34. Therefore, there would be some social, economic and environmental benefits arising from the proposal. However, given the modest scale of the proposal (single dwelling) any associated benefits attract less than moderate weight.

#### *Planning balance and conclusion*

35. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
36. I have found that the proposal is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would also harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. Harm associated with these matters and conflict with the development plan attracts substantial weight.
37. Having taken account of the other considerations in support of the proposal, I do not consider these to be sufficiently forceful, to outweigh the harm and conflict with the

development plan I have identified. Consequently, in the circumstances of this case, the material considerations do not justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.

38. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

## Appendix 2

### Comparison on site connectivity, using the Department of Transport Connectivity to compare ease of movement for sites to infrastructure

#### *Land East of Common Hill*

#### *Land behind Junipers*

#### Overall

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	15	Very low (10-20%)
Public transport	16	Very low (10-20%)
Walking	9	Lowest (0-10%)
Cycling	32	Below average (30-40%)
Driving	69	Above average (60-70%)

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	34	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	34	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	32	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	43	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower, particularly for the ease in walking to infrastructure, which is amongst the lowest connectivity in the country.

#### Education

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	7	Lowest (0-10%)
Public transport	12	Very low (10-20%)
Walking	3	Lowest (0-10%)
Cycling	16	Very low (10-20%)
Driving	48	Slightly below average (40-50%)

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	26	Low (20-30%)
Public transport	31	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	22	Low (20-30%)
Cycling	33	Below average (30-40%)
Driving	55	Slightly above average (50-60%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower, for public transport and cycling and particularly for the ease in walking to educational establishments, which is amongst the lowest connectivity in the country scoring 3.

**Leisure**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	17	Very low (10-20%)	Overall (except driving)	38	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	18	Very low (10-20%)	Public transport	36	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	14	Very low (10-20%)	Walking	37	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	33	Below average (30-40%)	Cycling	48	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	68	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	72	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower, for public transport, cycling and for the ease in walking for leisure activities.

**Health**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	7	Lowest (0-10%)	Overall (except driving)	22	Low (20-30%)
Public transport	10	Very low (10-20%)	Public transport	29	Low (20-30%)
Walking	2	Lowest (0-10%)	Walking	12	Very low (10-20%)
Cycling	15	Very low (10-20%)	Cycling	29	Low (20-30%)
Driving	60	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	67	Above average (60-70%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower; very low, for public transport and cycling, and lowest for the ease in walking to Health Facilities.

**Shopping**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	9	Lowest (0-10%)	Overall (except driving)	37	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	10	Very low (10-20%)	Public transport	36	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	7	Lowest (0-10%)	Walking	38	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	23	Low (20-30%)	Cycling	49	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	65	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are markedly lower; low for cycling, very low, for public transport and lowest for the ease in walking for shopping.

**Residential**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	28	Low (20-30%)	Overall (except driving)	40	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Public transport	27	Low (20-30%)	Public transport	37	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	25	Low (20-30%)	Walking	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Cycling	46	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Cycling	50	Slightly above average (50-60%)
Driving	81	Very high (80-90%)	Driving	82	Very high (80-90%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are considerably lower; low for public transport and for the ease in walking to other houses.

--

**Workplaces**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	20	Low (20-30%)	Overall (except driving)	30	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	21	Low (20-30%)	Public transport	31	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	9	Lowest (0-10%)	Walking	22	Low (20-30%)
Cycling	38	Below average (30-40%)	Cycling	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	74	High (70-80%)	Driving	74	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *Land East of Common Hill* are considerably lower; low for public transport and lowest for the ease in walking to workplace.

**0126.3 Comments on EHDC-26-0021-EIA**

**Request for Screening Opinion - Residential development for up to around 900 dwellings in total, plus a new 2-form entry primary school, supporting infrastructure, access, drainage, public open space and landscaping. Land At Lymington Bottom Road, Four Marks , GU34 5EP**

The Council strongly supports the applicant in seeking the EIA, particularly as this is a possible major development more than doubling the housing in the 'South Medstead' part of the Parish.

The impact of this development of up to 900 dwellings with the expected 2,000 plus increase in residents is of great concern to the Council, especially regarding the highways constraints of introducing such numbers into the Parish, and the additional EHDC Planning Policy requirement to provide an additional 480 dwellings by 2042.

The Council realises that this is an EIA request, not a Planning Application. It would be delinquent in its duty if it did not press EHDC for all information to be available to the prospective promoter to ensure the production of the best possible development. This will enable MPC to properly assess the application when it comes before the Council.

#### **0126.4 Comment on EHDC-25-1494-FUL**

***Demolition of existing outbuilding, construction of three dwellings and associated access, parking, means of enclosure, landscaping (inc. hard and soft landscaping, additional tree planting and selected removal), SuDs, biodiversity net gain and other associated works. The Dell Homestead Road, Medstead,***

The Council strongly objects to this Planning Application for the reasons below.

#### ***Location***

The site is located on 'backland' behind the Dell on the northern side Homestead Road. To the north of the site is footpath 155/14/4 which runs along the northern curtilage of the enclosed pasture adjacent to the development.

The site is currently agricultural pastureland with woodland to its south, including some trees with TPOs. The current access to the site is through the Dell, but the proposed access is via a crescent around the Dell from Homestead Road, an unmade bridle way, 155/15/1, 155/15/2 and 155/15/3.

The proposed development of this site is significant, and will be visible from the surrounding countryside it will be overlooked by the footpath.

#### ***The Proposal***

This speculative proposal is for three 2 ½ story 6 bedroom dwellings, set back behind the existing dwelling, outside the Medstead Village SPB. Access is via the unmade Homestead Road. The current dwellings on Homestead Road are individual, and are spaced along the road with gaps between the developments. This proposal is for a 'backland' development behind the existing housing plot, especially as the current dwellings on Homestead Road are individual, spaced along the road and with gaps between the developments. This site is set behind the line of the existing housing. The only other buildings set this distance from the road are those for current and past agricultural uses.

The Council notes the comment regarding the Statement of Engagement. It is Council Policy not to engage with promoters of speculative development and in line with this Policy, it offered a three minute opportunity to address the Council before its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2025. Following the Agent presentation, it was countered by the residents present. The Council made no comment.

#### ***The Planning Statement***

The Planning Statement indicates that the layout provided is similar to those existing on Homestead Road and Bighton Road which is not true: both are ribbon developments along the sides of roads. This development is a backland cul-de-sac development.

The Statement notes EHDC JCS 2013 to 2028 Policies CP2, CP10, CP19, and the Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

CP2 points to land North of the South Downs National Park and identifies Medstead as

*'Other settlements with a settlement policy boundary'*

CP10 considers the housing need between 2013 and 2028 a minimum of 150 dwellings in other villages outside the National Park and housing and other small scale development outside settlement policy boundaries will only be permitted where it:

- *meets a community need or realises local community aspirations;*
- *reinforces a settlement's role and function;*
- *cannot be accommodated within the built up area; and*
- *has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan or has clear community support as demonstrated through a process which has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Parish or Town Council.*

These 150 dwellings were to be built across the 20 defined locations. This is confirmed by the emerging Draft Local Plan 2021 to 2040 Reg 18, Policy H 1 that requires only some of 100 dwellings re to be built across all 20 tier 4 and 5 settlements, i.e. an average of 5 over the 19 year plan period.

Between 2013 to 2024, 36 dwellings have been built in Medstead, which far exceeds the expected contribution under CP10.

The proposal in this Application is contrary to CP 10. This application is for speculative 'market' housing. It does not meet a community need as the current EHDC assessment of 'Affordable Housing needs of people with a 'local connection to the village' provided by the EHDC Housing Officer, referenced in multiple applications for Medstead and Four Marks, is more than exceeded by the current number of 'Affordable' houses with permission to be built.

This proposed development does not reinforce the settlement's role and function as the site is divorced from the village and infrastructure, particularly as there are possible opportunities for similar development to be accommodated in a better location closer to the village and the Council is aware of land that could come forward should the landowner wish. There is no known community need or aspiration to build 'market' houses in this area, especially of this size.

With regards to Policy CP19, the development is contrary to the policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake, and the only development allowed will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location. Policy CP6 *Rural Economy and Enterprise* identifies activities where development will be permitted as:

- a) For farm diversification schemes and enterprises that help maintain the viability of farm businesses engaged in sustainable land management;*
- b) For the conversion of rural buildings for appropriate uses;*
- c) For the reasonable extension of existing firms in the countryside and new small-scale employment uses within the settlement policy boundaries of rural settlements.*

This application does not compliant with a, b, or c.

Regarding H14 '*housing outside settlement policy boundaries where it is essential for a full-time worker in agriculture, forestry or other enterprise who must live on the site rather than in a nearby settlement*', the applicant has not identified an outstanding need. Indeed, as noted above, the Parish has a surfeit of 'Affordable Housing'.

With regards to the Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries SPD, the proposed development does not meet a community need, realise local community aspirations, reinforces a settlement's role and function, been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan nor has clear community support as demonstrated through a process which has been agreed by the Local

Planning Authority in consultation with the Parish or Town Council. The Council believes that a similar development could be accommodated within the SPB.

As co-sponsor of the emerging Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Council notes that the emerging Medstead and Four Marks NBP's Housing Needs Assessment by the Consultancy AECOM has not identified the need for such housing, Indeed the Report identified the oversupply of 4 bedroom dwellings the Parish. From the setting, size and design of these dwellings the Council suggest that this speculative development is being designed to fulfil the needs of a 'niche' market – note the 'library'.

The Council has concerns regarding the benefits of the development under NPPF Paragraph 8, *Achieving sustainable development* in meeting its economic, social, environmental objectives. Particularly the Council notes the statement within the Planning statement

*' Each dwelling will have its own gated access and a private tree-lined driveway, enhancing both security and visual appeal'.*

With that in mind these three gated houses do not comply to the three required objectives.

- Economically, it will add to the CIL and Council Tax; to the local economy little will be added.
- Socially, these isolated gated houses add little to the social activity of the area, and will not support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. The mention of gates promotes the sense of exclusion.
- Environmentally – The Council has considered the marketability of these dwellings. When considering the market price of each property it is extremely probable that residents must commute to their places of work, which will not assist in moving to a low carbon economy.

The Applicant references NPPF Paragraph 110, Promoting sustainable transport '*through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes*'. The Council believes that, due to its location in the community, no alternative transport modes are offered apart for leisure activities and there is the continuing need to travel for employment.

With regard to NPPF Paragraph, 11. *Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development*, with its associated Footnote 8, the Applicant particularly notes point d (ii) of the NPPF is engaged, subject to the proposal's compliance with other relevant planning policies, to engage tilted balance.

The Council note the direction of Footnote 9, which is particularly attached to d(ii), refers consideration of the decisions regarding 'tilted balance' to other Paragraphs that must be considered.

At the recent EHDC Planning Committee meeting regarding 60425/001 *Land to the Southeast of Semaphore Farm, Telegraph Lane, Four Marks*, the Officer noted that Paragraph 66 refers to sites offering Affordable Housing, and Paragraph 91 to larger settlements, such as in the settlement of Alton, which identifies the remaining paragraphs.

To be considered:

*84. ... development of isolated homes in the countryside ...*

Due to the sites location and those of the adjacent properties the Council has measured the approximate distances from the closest facilities

FACILITY /AMENITY	DISTANCE km
	<b>Road</b>
Convenience Shop/PO	1.4
School and Pre-school	1.3 & 1.35
Day Nursery	1.5
Pub	1.6
Church	1.5
Village Hall	1.25
Co-op Four Marks 4.5km (road distance)	4.5
Bus route (208)	1.4
Bus route (64)	2.8

The Officer will be aware of Highways current direction, recently restated in 25-0055-OUT, is to use ATE advice when assessing walking distances,

*‘ a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities within a 10-minute walking distance **800m via an accessible route.**’*

The Council notes that the Consultation on the Draft NPPF, 2025 advises the use of the UK Government Connectivity Tool<sup>2</sup> to assess the connectivity of sites, particularly in reference to Local Plans which guides the decisions of the EHDC Planning Committee.

This tool can be used to identify the connectivity of any site within England and Wales by both destination and mode of transport. Each location has a connectivity score from 0 to 100. A location’s Connectivity score is calculated as a percentage of the highest score in England and Wales, which is always 100.

**Comparison on site connectivity, using the Department of Transport Connectivity to compare ease of movement for sites to infrastructure**

<sup>2</sup> UK Government Connectivity tool  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/connectivity-tool>

<i>The Dell, Homestead Road</i>			<i>Land behind Junipers</i>		
<b>Overall</b>					
Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	31	Below average (30-40%)	Overall (except driving)	34	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	32	Below average (30-40%)	Public transport	34	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	27	Low (20-30%)	Walking	32	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Cycling	43	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	69	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower, particularly for the ease in walking to infrastructure, which is identified as ‘Low’ against ‘Below Average’.

The Council believes that these distances traversed without footways or street lighting fall outside the direction of HCC policy document LPT4.

With regards to NPPF 11 d(ii), significant severe harms are demonstrated regarding the measured distances above.

Walking to school or shop with infants or buggy would be difficult; and problematic for older residents. At the EHDC Planning Committee Meeting, November 2024, Councillor Lewison commented regarding *58788/002/OUT, Land to the west of Longbourn Way, Medstead*:

*“Most journeys will be made by car”*

when examining a local Planning application. The *58788/002/OUT* site is some 850m from the nearest bus stop.

The 208 bus service referred to in the table is the HCC subsidised ‘market day’ service, running on a circular route from Alton, Lasham, Bentworth and Medstead. between 10.00 and 14.00 on Tuesdays and Fridays.

The nearest public bus service, the Stagecoach 64, is on the A31 in Four Marks some 3.3km distant.

Due to the distances between other dwellings and the residents work life balance, it is unlikely that informal social meetings between neighbours will be able take place.

The Officer should note that there is no footway on Common Hill nor on Homestead Road, and that there is no streetlighting in Medstead Parish.

*110. ... development focused on locations or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel...*

Due the size of the development, there is no mitigation offered to prevent the need to travel to school, medical and retail needs. There may be an opportunity to 'work from home', that may not be available for all residents. If commuting to work private transport will be required

115.

- c) *sustainable transport modes are prioritised; ...*
- d) *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all ...*

There is no sustainable transport service available to this site. Cycling is a possibility, but the site is towards the foot of a hill, some 60m below the centre of Medstead Village. Due to its position '*safe and suitable access to the site*' cannot be achieved, particularly for those going to school or shop as walking with infants or buggy would be difficult; and problematic for older residents. At the EHDC Planning Committee Meeting, November 2024, Councillor Lewison said, regarding the area, "*Most journeys will be made by car*".

129. ... *decisions should account for:*

- c) *availability and capacity of infrastructure and services to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;*

There is no infrastructure or service offered in this proposal to promote successful sustainable travel modes.

*135 ... developments function well, ... are sympathetic, maintain a strong sense of place, ... create places that are safe, support local facilities and transport networks, ... inclusive and accessible.*

This development is outside the SPB, extending the settlement outward from the bridleway, downgrades the road's current 'sense of place, increases road network use as residents' rely on private transport and is not accessible to all.

It will become a dormitory development, divorced from village life. It adds three 6 bedroom houses and taxes, a minimal gain.

#### *Housing Need*

As previously mentioned, the Council is the co-sponsor of the emerging *Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Development Plan*. As part of its due diligence, a *Housing Needs Assessment* was commissioned from the Consultancy AECOM., delivered in September 2025.

It identified that the Parish was over endowed with four bedroom dwelling, compared to the EHDC average, and that a minimal number were required to be built across the Parish between 2024 and 2042 should be between 0% and 25% to return the area to balance following the speculative building carried out between 2013 and 2021.

The Assessment did not identify any local need, apart from bungalows, to enable older residents to downsize, and a quantified number of affordable 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings for Affordable or Social housing.

The Council noted the Planning Appeal APP/M1710/W/25/3361919, in which the Inspector decided to reject the appeal against the EHDC decision to reject application 57295/002 Land

East of Paddock Grange, Homestead Road, opposite this site on Homestead Road ( amended Judgement in Appendix 1, below). In reaching his decision he considered, amongst other things:

- Character and appearance
- Location for housing
- River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA

In his conclusions in rejecting Appeal, the Inspector noted:

Planning balance and conclusion

35. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
36. I have found that the proposal is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would also harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. Harm associated with these matters and conflict with the development plan attracts substantial weight.
37. Having taken account of the other considerations in support of the proposal, I do not consider these to be sufficiently forceful, to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan I have identified. Consequently, in the circumstances of this case, the material considerations do not justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.
38. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.'

For the above reasons and evidence presented, Medstead Parish Council asks EHDC to refuse this application.

## Appendix 1

### Extract from Planning Appeal adjudication APP/M1710/W/25/3361919 57295/002 Land East of Paddock Grange, Homestead Road,

#### Reasons for refusal

##### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal site ('the site') comprises a field with a rectangular footprint located away from the main developed area of Medstead, along Homestead Road, which is a roughly surfaced bridleway. This bridleway serves a limited number of detached dwellings that are scattered along its length, interspersed with large areas of undeveloped agricultural land.
5. To the west of the site is Paddock Grange a dormer bungalow. To the east is a historic hedgerow boundary to the property known as Little Barn.
6. Whilst there are some examples of dwellings along Homestead Road that are fairly closely spaced, most of these are located away from the site. Therefore, the scattered nature of existing dwellings defines its rural identity.
7. ... Its largely undeveloped nature is consistent with other agricultural land parcels along Homestead Road. Overall, the site contributes to the low-density, informal character of the area and reinforces the areas largely rural identity.
9. On the information before me, the Medstead Village Design Statement emphasises the importance of preserving visual gaps between buildings in rural areas. Notwithstanding the presence of nearby dwellings, the area retains a spacious, undeveloped feel, introducing a new dwelling would erode this openness, particularly by infilling the gap between Paddock Grange and Little Barn and by creating a more continuous built frontage. Thereby, diminishing the area's rural character.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would fail to accord with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy ('JCS'), which along with other matters seeks to ensure that development proposals are designed to a high standard that is appropriate and sympathetic to spaces around buildings and landscape features.

##### *Location for housing*

11. The site lies beyond the defined settlement boundary of Medstead and is therefore, in accordance with the development plan, designated as a countryside location.
12. In accordance with Policy CP19 of JCS, development in such areas is only permitted where a genuine need for a countryside setting can be demonstrated. Similarly, Saved Policy H14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review ('LP') imposes comparable restrictions on residential development outside settlement boundaries. The proposed development does not satisfy the requirements set out in these policies. Additionally, Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan ('NP') stipulates that new development within the plan area should be located within the designated settlement boundary.
13. Along with other development plan policies, the above policies aim to direct new development to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the district, in line with its spatial strategy. This includes an approach to sustainable development in the countryside, defined as areas outside settlement policy boundaries where a policy of general restraint is applied to protect the countryside for its own sake, save for uses that have a genuine functional need to be located in the countryside.

14. The wider area offers a modest range of amenities, including a primary school, nursery, public house, and church located approximately 1 kilometre from the appeal site in Medstead. Additional services are available in Four Marks, designated as a Small Local Service Centre, and in Alton, identified as a Market Town with a broader range of facilities including retail, employment opportunities, and a railway station. These settlements, situated approximately 2 kilometres and 7 kilometres from the site respectively, are understood to be served by the local bus network.
15. Notwithstanding the fact that the site is not considered isolated in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and relevant case law, the accessibility of the site remains constrained. Homestead Road is a narrow, unlit lane with no dedicated footways, rendering it unsuitable for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly during adverse weather conditions or outside daylight hours. Consequently, it is unlikely that future occupants would access nearby services on foot or by bicycle, or walk to the nearest bus stop, which lies approximately a ten-minute walk away in Medstead. Given the site's poor accessibility, visitors to the proposed dwelling are also likely to be largely reliant on private motor vehicles. Therefore, the location of the appeal site would not minimise demand for travel.
16. Even when taking account of the Framework, which acknowledges that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, the location of the appeal site does not offer genuinely sustainable travel choices to a range of nearby shops, facilities and services. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that residents would be predominantly reliant on private motor vehicles to access day-to-day services and facilities, even if journeys are likely to be relatively short and limited in association with a small scale rural development.
17. For the above reasons and given that I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, the appeal site is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the development plan. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policy CP19 of the JCS, Saved Policy H14 of the LP and Policy 1 of the NP.

#### *River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA*

18. The site is located within the drainage catchment area for the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA.
19. The Council has been made aware by Natural England that there are potential strategic issues regarding the level of nitrogen and phosphorus deposition in the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA resulting in evidence of eutrophication, caused by agriculture, existing communities and proposed development. New housing development therefore needs to be appropriately assessed to address the uncertainty about the deterioration of the water environment.
20. River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA are protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In order for development to be acceptable, these Regulations require it to be demonstrated that it will have no likely significant effect on the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA, either alone or in combination with other proposals. If it cannot, measures must be proposed to remove the impact, for example, a satisfactory scheme of mitigation (i.e. one that can demonstrate the nutrient neutrality of the proposed development), or the proposal should be refused.
21. As the competent authority, I am responsible for undertaking an Appropriate Assessment as to whether the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA would be affected by the development.

22. The submitted Nitrate Budget Assessment Report, identifies that the proposed scheme would support an additional population of 2.4 persons, resulting in an annual increase in nitrogen and phosphorous loads.
23. As the proposal would lead to an increase in nutrient deposition, mitigation is required. Given that there is no opportunity to implement a mitigation scheme on-site, the purchase of credits from an authorised provider would be necessary. Provided that the proposed mitigation measures are secured and implemented, the development is unlikely to result in a significant effect on nutrient levels within the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA.
24. By referring me to another appeal decision, the appellant advises that mitigation measures could be secured via a condition that prevents the development from commencing until the mitigation measures have been approved in writing by the Council, which demonstrate that the additional nutrient loading generated by the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected sites.
25. Irrespective, the suggested mitigation measures include the appellant committing to securing off-site credits. This still requires that there is certainty and transparency about the delivery of mitigation in order to ensure that the identified potential for an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected sites is not realised and to avoid an unimplementable planning permission. In this case, the Council advises that there are no schemes in place to secure phosphate credits in the district.
26. Therefore, without the submission of a satisfactory scheme of mitigation (i.e. one that can demonstrate the nutrient neutrality of the proposed development) I am unable to conclude that the development would not add to the unfavourable nitrate / phosphate levels within the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CP21 and CP22 of the JCS. Together, these policies require that development proposals must maintain, enhance and protect the district's biodiversity and its surrounding environment, including designated sites.

#### *Other considerations*

27. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. Therefore, Paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. However, the application of policies in the Framework in so far as they protect habitat sites provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. This is reiterated by paragraph 195 of the Framework and as such, the proposal would not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework.
28. Although I do not dispute that the site was previously developed, on the information before me, I cannot be certain that this is Previously Developed Land, as defined in the Framework.
31. Accordingly, should the appeal be allowed and subject to the subsequent approval of reserved matters, the proposal would deliver an additional dwelling. This would make a modest but important contribution to the objectives of the Framework, particularly in significantly boosting the supply of housing and encouraging the delivery of small sites for self-build and custom-build homes.
32. There would also be jobs created during construction of the development and notwithstanding the site's poor accessibility, occupiers are likely to support local services and facilities.
33. The proposal is likely to deliver new on-site habitats through planting, and the new home is likely to be of sustainable construction. These factors contribute to the environmental benefits of the scheme.

34. Therefore, there would be some social, economic and environmental benefits arising from the proposal. However, given the modest scale of the proposal (single dwelling) any associated benefits attract less than moderate weight.

*Planning balance and conclusion*

35. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

36. I have found that the proposal is not in a suitable location for housing with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would also harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the River Itchen SAC and Solent SPA. Harm associated with these matters and conflict with the development plan attracts substantial weight.

37. Having taken account of the other considerations in support of the proposal, I do not consider these to be sufficiently forceful, to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan I have identified. Consequently, in the circumstances of this case, the material considerations do not justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.

38. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

**Appendix 2**

**Comparison on site connectivity, using the Department of Transport Connectivity to compare ease of movement for sites to infrastructure**

*The Dell, Homestead Road*

*Land behind Junipers*

**Overall**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	31	Below average (30-40%)	Overall (except driving)	34	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	32	Below average (30-40%)	Public transport	34	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	27	Low (20-30%)	Walking	32	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Cycling	43	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	69	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower, particularly for the ease in walking to infrastructure, which is identified as ‘Low’ against ‘Below Average’.

**Education**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	23	Low (20-30%)	Overall (except driving)	26	Low (20-30%)
Public transport	29	Low (20-30%)	Public transport	31	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	18	Very low (10-20%)	Walking	22	Low (20-30%)
Cycling	20	Below average (30-40%)	Cycling	33	Below average (30-40%)
Driving	48	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Driving	55	Slightly above average (50-60%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower, for public transport and cycling and particularly for the ease in walking or using public transport to access educational establishments.

**Leisure**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	33	Below average (30-40%)	Overall (except driving)	38	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	33	Below average (30-40%)	Public transport	36	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	31	Below average (30-40%)	Walking	37	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	44	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Cycling	48	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	65	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	72	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower for public transport, walking, cycling and driving for leisure activities.

**Health**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	21	Low (20-30%)	Overall (except driving)	22	Low (20-30%)
Public transport	28	Low (20-30%)	Public transport	29	Low (20-30%)
Walking	11	Very low (10-20%)	Walking	12	Very low (10-20%)

Cycling	30	Below average (30-40%)	Cycling	29	Low (20-30%)
Driving	62	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	67	Above average (60-70%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower for public transport, walking, and driving, apart from cycling, when accessing Health Facilities.

**Shopping**

Type	National score	National distribution	Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	32	Below average (30-40%)	Overall (except driving)	37	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	32	Below average (30-40%)	Public transport	36	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	31	Below average (30-40%)	Walking	38	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	45	Slightly below average (40-50%)	Cycling	49	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	66	Above average (60-70%)	Driving	73	High (70-80%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are lower for public transport, walking, cycling and driving when accessing shops.

**Residential**

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	39	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	36	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	39	Below average (30-40%)
Cycling	30	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Driving	73	Above average (60-70%)

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	40	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Public transport	37	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)
Cycling	50	Slightly above average (50-60%)
Driving	82	Very high (80-90%)

Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of *The Dell Homestead Road* are considerably lower for public transport, walking, cycling and driving to other houses.

### Workplaces

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	30	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	30	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	21	Low (20-30%)
Cycling	40	Slightly below average (40-50%)

Type	National score	National distribution
Overall (except driving)	30	Below average (30-40%)
Public transport	31	Below average (30-40%)
Walking	22	Low (20-30%)
Cycling	41	Slightly below average (40-50%)

Driving	73	High (70-80%)	Driving	74	High (70-80%)
Compared to the Junipers site on the edge of the Village SPB, the percentile figures for the overall connectivity of <i>The Dell Homestead Road</i> is comparable when considering work places.					

**0126.5 Comment on Appeals Reference: 6002082, Southview, Abbey Road**

Medstead Parish Council supports the EHDC reasons for refusal.

The site is outside the SPB, over 1.5 km from the village centre, without street lighting. There is no back land development this far out of the village.

The Council notes the Planning Inspectors’ comments regarding APP/M1710/W/20/3249161, paragraphs 29 and 30 regarding the use of Abbey Road; and APP/M1710/W/23/3332870, paragraphs 13,14, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 regarding the housing on the ‘Radio Site’.

**Appellants Statement of Case**

The current EHDC Local Plan Policy CP2 identifies Medstead within ‘Other settlements with a settlement policy boundary’.

This Application is contrary to CP10, which considers a minimum of 150 dwellings in other villages outside the National Park, across the 20 defined locations, some 8 per location. There are 36 dwellings already built in the village. In the south of the Parish is the settlement of ‘South Medstead’ together with adjacent Four Marks. Of the 175 dwellings in this combined settlement expected in the LDP, completions to 2024 are already 563, with an additional 124 to be completed. Of those, 387 are in Medstead Parish with an additional 203 ‘South Medstead’ permissions granted in 2025.

Medstead is not deficient in providing land for development but, this development is speculative, providing no planned infrastructure for the area.

The Application does not meet a community need. The EHDC assessment of the community needs for ‘local connections’ is exceeded by the current planned supply.

This development is divorced from the village and infrastructure, not reinforcing the settlement’s role and function. LAA sites indicate better locations closer to the village.

This development is contrary to LP Policies CP19, Policy CP6, paragraphs a, b, or c; H14 as no outstanding need has been identified; and the ‘*Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries* SPD, there is no community need, aspirations, reinforcement of role and function, or Neighbourhood Plan identification

With regards to the M&FMNP ‘*Policy 1 Spatial Plan for the Parishes*’, areas outside the SPB defers to EHDC Policy CP19.

The Appellant references NPPF 110, Sustainable Transport . Due to location, no alternative transport modes are offered, apart for leisure activities. The residents in ‘South Medstead’, which is a more sustainable location, have easier walking access to the 64 bus service to Alton and Winchester and railway stations . The Appellant’s site is served by a twice weekly market service, running three times on each of the two days. The nearest public bus service is in Four Marks, some 3.3 km distant.

Due to the distances between other dwellings (combined with the residents likely work life balance), it is unlikely that informal social meetings between neighbours will be able take place.

The Council refers the Inspector to the HCC PRoW Map showing local footpaths, noting the lack of street lighting, and the footpaths' non metalled surfaces. The Appellant suggests walking and wheeling access to the village can be made safely by public footpath.

The Council disputes the Appellant's comment at 5.20, as the current Highway Code rules 204 to 213, when vehicles overtake or approach cyclists, postdate the quoted cycling documents.

### **Connectivity**

The Council refers the Inspector to the current MHCLG Draft NPPF consultation, which advises the DoT Connectivity Tool to guide planners to in the determination of site connectivity. This national tool identifies 'connectivity' as a percentage against the national maximum.

The Council has compared the Appeal site with a site on the EHDC LAA map, LAA/MED-011, *Land behind Junipers*, on the edge of the village SPB.

**Overall:** Compared to the Junipers site, to the south of Greenstiles, the percentages for the overall connectivity are Southview 25% vs. Junipers 34%, and it is much lower for travel to infrastructure: Southview 25% vs. Junipers 34% for public transport and Southview 22% vs. Junipers 32% for walking.

**Education:** For travel to school the results are lower for public transport (Southview 23% vs. Junipers 31%) and walking (Southview 13% vs. Junipers 22%) and overall scoring (Southview 19% vs. Junipers 26%).

**Leisure:** For travel to leisure activities, the results are lower for public transport (Southview 28% vs. Junipers 36%), walking (Southview 28% vs. Junipers 37%) and driving (Southview 68% vs. Junipers 72%) and overall scoring is lower (Southview 29% vs. Junipers 38%).

**Health:** For travel to health facilities, the results are lower for public transport (Southview 18% vs. Junipers 29%) and walking (Southview 5% vs. Junipers 12%) and on overall scoring (Southview 13% vs. Junipers 22%).

**Shopping:** For travel to shops, the results are lower for public transport (Southview 18% vs. Junipers 36%) and walking (Southview 22% vs. Junipers 40%) and overall scoring Southview 24% vs. Junipers 37%).

**Residences:** The results are equivalent for connectivity of residences, with overall scoring Southview 36% vs. Junipers 40%).

**Workplaces:** The results are lower for public transport (Southview 26% vs. Junipers 31%) and walking (Southview 22% vs. Junipers 22%).

### **EHDC Second Reason for Refusal**

The Council notes EHDC's second reason for refusal, commenting that Redwood Lane is a road leading to Meadow View Farm, not a cul-de-sac serving a back land development.

From the evidence above, Medstead Parish Council asks the Inspector to support EHDC and dismiss this Appeal.

### **0126.5 Comment on Application 25/00615/REV, Farnborough Airport**

Medstead Parish Council wishes to comment on planning application 25/00615/REV relating to proposed variations to operational conditions at Farnborough Airport.

Although the Parish is not directly impacted by the majority of low-level movements, due to our position on the westerly side of the airspace (Medstead Parish), the Council is mindful that we may still see and hear some of any increase in traffic, particularly with changes to overall movement levels, aircraft types, and patterns of operation.

While the application is presented as a change to conditions rather than an increase in the overall annual cap, the Council is concerned that the combined effect would represent a material intensification of activity in real terms, particularly at weekends and in relation to heavier aircraft operations.

Firstly, the proposal to adjust the “heavy aircraft” threshold from 50 tonnes to 55 tonnes is significant. Under the existing arrangements, there is a limit of 1,500 heavy aircraft movements per year, and recent published monitoring indicates that Farnborough currently records around 1,007 movements per year above 50 tonnes, meaning roughly two-thirds of the heavy aircraft cap is already being used. If the threshold is raised to 55 tonnes, aircraft in the 50–55 tonne range (including newer long-range business jets) would no longer count towards that cap, which effectively frees up capacity for more flights by heavier aircraft without any formal change to the cap itself. From the Council’s perspective, this is an operational expansion in practice and increases the potential for additional higher-impact movements.

Secondly, the proposed increase in permitted weekend and bank holiday movements from 8,900 to 13,500 per year (an increase of 4,600 movements annually) represents a substantial change. Weekends and bank holidays are periods when residents are most likely to experience disturbance and when community amenity is particularly sensitive. The scale of this increase is therefore a major concern in terms of noise, quality of life, and the cumulative impact on the area.

Thirdly, the application proposes replacing the existing risk contour conditions (1:10,000 and 1:100,000) with a new condition requiring updated Public Safety Zone mapping in line with current Department for Transport requirements. The Parish Council supports the principle of ensuring risk mapping is consistent with current national methodology, however the Council considers it essential that any updated PSZ maps are clearly published and properly assessed in the context of the other changes proposed—especially where increased weekend movements and higher-weight operations may affect the underlying risk inputs and cumulative exposure.

Taken together, the Council is concerned that these changes could realistically enable a significant increase in annual movements compared with the current operating level, despite the headline 50,000 annual cap remaining unchanged. In practical terms this feels like a substantial intensification of operations being delivered through “rebalancing” and re-classification rather than through a transparent increase in the main movement limit.

For the reasons above, Medstead Parish Council requests that Rushmore Borough Council gives careful consideration to the full cumulative effects of the proposals on residential amenity, noise impacts, and public safety, and objects to the application as currently presented.

## 0126.6 EHDC Planning Decision List

Ref	Description / Location	Date	Decision
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1301-TPO</a>	2 The Oaks, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PS Tree Preservation Order	15/12/2025	Consent
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1260-LDCP</a>	Medstead Lodge Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5LY Use of the land to site a mobile home for ancillary use to the main dwellinghouse	19/12/2025	Permission
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1087-TPO</a>	2 The Oaks, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PS Tree Preservation Order	16/12/2025	Withdrawn
<a href="#">EHDC-25-0433-FUL</a>	White Oaks Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5JF Detached self-build dwelling with associated landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling (amended description)(as amended by plans uploaded 26/11/2025)	19/12/2025	Permission
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1360-TPO</a>	Little Copse Windsor Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5EF Tree Preservation Order	06/01/2026	Consent
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1338-FUL</a>	Broadlands Riding Centre Lower Paice Lane, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PX Repurpose existing tack room to a rest room, including a new window and a kitchenette. Temporary siting of a storage container - 3 to 5 years.	08/01/2026	Permission
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1197-HSE</a>	Oakfield Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5LP Approval is sought for rear and front / side extensions	05/01/2026	Permission
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1451-DCON</a>	Land To The Rear Of Brackenbury Gardens And Boyneswood Close, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, Discharge Condition 2 (Materials) of approved application 25256/050 - 54 dwellings, associated landscaping and open space, with access from Holland Drive (Amended plans, amended description and updated technical reports dates 7th June 2024)	05/01/2026	Condition determined
<a href="#">EHDC-25-1335-HSE</a>	Beeches Hussell Lane, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PD Single-storey rear extension, raised patio and garage conversion	14/01/2026	Permission

<a href="#">EHDC-25-1116-TPO</a>	1 Bilberry Close, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5QJ Tree Preservation Order	01/12/2025	Consent
----------------------------------	---	------------	---------

### **0126.7 Clerk's Report**

In the last month the main bulk of time has been spent on policies and other admin tasks. CiCLA is taking up a lot of my time outside of work, but there are also overlaps between CiLCA work and tasks required to get policies in line with legal requirements, particularly with the end of year AGAR in mind.

I have completed work on data protection policies and am still progressing the pay policy, IT policy and other employment related policies.

The pavilion broadband and electricity supply have continued to cause problems, but we finally have broadband installed and a smart meter is being installed at the pavilion this week.

There has been a lot of activity in the cemetery, with plot purchases and burials. I am continuing to work on improving guidance notes, policies and application forms to help make cemetery work easier and smoother.

The tree contractor is causing a lot of problems with slow work, failing to clear-up after themselves, failing to turn up and poor communication and they have wasted a lot of my time in chasing things up. Before the next Council meeting I plan to walk the whole areas affected to take stock of where they have got to so that we can better decide next steps.

The fence post for the allotments and the dragon's teeth have been ordered by the contractor and I will chase up committed timescales for the work before the Council meeting.

I attended the kick-off workshops for EHDC's Asset Based Community Development pilots together with several councillors and am looking forward to working out how we can make this work useful for the Council.

### **0126.8 Payments for approval**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Supplier</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount £</b>
31-Dec	Green Frontiers	Removal of Cherry Tree	720.00
31-Dec	Bespoke Garden Projects	Playground inspection	120.00
31-Dec	Darwin Ecology	Ecological Survey	347.40
31-Dec	Idverde Ltd	Litter bin emptying	499.56
31-Dec	Paul Grace	Mowing contract	6403.50
31-Dec	Clerk	December pay + backpay for payrise	2014.75
31-Dec	Total Pest Control	Mole treatment	370.80
31-Dec	Unity Trust	Service charge	6.00
1-Dec	Scribe Accounts	Accounting software	58.80