

DON'T LET FOUR MARKS BECOME THE TARGET OF YET MORE OVER-DEVELOPMENT!



- PLEASE NOTE: This guidance sheet is **specific** to “**LAND SOUTH OF WINCHESTER ROAD, FOUR MARKS**”. It provides details of key factors relevant to this site. You may find it helpful in formulating your own responses about this site.

- You are also encouraged to submit feedback in **SUPPORT of OTHER SITES** (see example factors on page 3, below)

- As per the leaflet from the Parish Council, you are also kindly requested to provide feedback on three other sites within Four Marks and South Medstead and for one in Chawton Park Wood.

EHDC MUST RECEIVE YOUR RESPONSES NO LATER THAN 15 OCTOBER 2019!

- Make sure you state that your feedback is an **OBJECTION** and it is for the “**EHDC Large Development Sites Consultation**”
- **Every ADULT over the age of 18** may submit a response (they do **NOT** need to be a resident)
- **All representations need to have a name, address (and either a contact email or phone number)**
- **Please either send your free format replies** (incorporating as many of the below items as you wish) via email to; localplan@easthants.gov.uk or by post to; Planning Policy, East Hampshire District Council, Penns Place, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU31 4EX or if you prefer, you can use the EHDC online portal or their Word questionnaire both found at; <https://www.easthants.gov.uk/large-development-sites-consultation>.
- If you need to **add further points** after you have made a submission, you may do so, by using any of the alternative methods described above.

Make sure that your response title includes the official EHDC Name of the Site:
“Land South of Winchester Road, Four Marks”

I **OBJECT** to this proposal for the following reasons;

1. Flooding and Drainage

- a. Surface water runoff from large site on elevated/ sloped site leads to further flooding of lower areas e.g. Grosvenor Road Junction with A31, (a River Arle Augmentation Scheme site). Water from here flows into the rivers Arle and Itchen (both designated SSSIs and SACs)
- b. Site requires nitrate mitigation (being within the catchment area of the River Itchen and a threat exists to the Solent’s international biodiversity designation).

2. Employment

- a. Very little local employment means creating even more of a commuter/dormitory town.
- b. Employment centre is on opposite side of dual carriageway with no pedestrian/cycle access.

3. Highways and Travel

- a. No commuter rail link exists and an inadequate bus service will mean additional load on already busy A31 through Four Marks caused by commuters travelling North-East to nearest large employment centres.
- b. Construction traffic, causing delays and danger to other road users and noise and dust pollution for up to a decade of building work.
- c. Single track railway bridge with blind bends on Grosvenor Road for Basingstoke-bound traffic increases danger and congestion.
- d. Grosvenor Road and Gravel Lane are unsuitable for access since both are single track with no pavements and there are no pavements into Four Marks.
- e. A roundabout at the bottom of the hill on the A31 will exacerbate problems and dangers of traffic climbing/descending the hill in snowy and icy conditions.

4. Education

- a. 600 new dwellings need estimated additional 180 primary and 126 secondary places -not catered for in the proposal.
- b. Routes to schools are congested and parking extremely limited, more pupils require more car journeys, more congestion and more school buses to remote secondary schools.
- c. Single track lanes without pavements and unlit/unmade muddy bye-ways cause real dangers to pedestrian school children and parents
- d. Phasing of development will cause further strain on already over-burdened school (e.g. proposed school is only planned for in Phase 5)

5. Local Character and surrounding Landscape

- a. This large sloping site will cause considerable damage to the intrinsic character of the local, rural landscape, known as the “Hampshire Alps” and an area of “Significant Visual Prominence” (as defined in the Ropley Neighbourhood Plan). Also, the CPRE has designated the land on which the site is proposed, as “valued landscape” as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- b. The Development Site would be visible from public roads (e.g. A31), the steam railway and historic walking routes (e.g. Pilgrim’s Way) and would negatively-impact the area as an amenity and tourist attraction.
- c. The Development would adversely affect the setting of the entrance to the settlement and be disproportionate to the existing built form.
- d. Long distance vistas (both to and from the site) would be ruined (e.g. to Cheesefoot Head)
- e. Damage to Historic Hedgerow and Trees (e.g. Pilgrim’s way hedge and the Ancient Old Down Wood)
- f. Development will affect the character and setting of the listed buildings and heritage assets in Parish of Ropley (e.g. North St Farmhouse, Manor Farmhouse, Turnpike Cottage)
- g. Light pollution from the sloping site will be highly-visible from the SDNP (violating its Dark Skies policy), as well as destroying any “romantic atmosphere” during the Watercress Line evening dinner services.

6. Spatial Strategy, Social Cohesion and Sustainability

- a. A strategic/local gap should be maintained between neighbouring settlements to prevent coalescence, keep individual identity and maintain the retention of the open character between settlements. The Land South of Winchester Road site spans Ropley and Four Marks and would completely remove any such gap.
- b. Green Infrastructure must be respected (as per the adopted M&FM Neighbourhood Plan). The proposed site will create damage to such green open space adjacent to it.
- c. The Development Proposal is in conflict with the Neighbourhood plan which favours a “Hub-centric” location for further amenities, based close to existing Shopping Parade and Railway Station. For example, the proposed site would elongate the “Ribbon Development” pattern of the settlement by almost a third (increasing the overall length from 3km to 4km)
- d. Because of the steep incline of 50 metres within the site (and 74 m to the village centre), residents of the Proposed site will be discouraged from walking or cycling anywhere.
- e. The Land South of Winchester Road site, being at the far end of the settlement would result in segregation and isolation of new residents from the existing village.
- f. Alternative sites (such as Northbrook Park) are distant from any nearby village and provide a clearly separable and identifiable, self-sufficient settlement, as opposed to an “abutment” to an existing village such as Four Marks and Medstead.

7. Ecology/Climate Change

- a. Building on open countryside or arable farming land increases carbon emissions, both during and after construction, contradicting the Paris Agreement on Climate Change
- b. With the lack of local infrastructure and employment, some residents will have to now travel 2.5 miles to get from one end of the village to the other. As a result the site is not environmentally-sound and will increase car journeys due to insufficient local employment and the 33% elongation of the village.
- c. Due to increased risk of serious flooding at the river Arle Augmentation Scheme Production Site located at Grosvenor road/A31 junction, the site poses a pollutant threat to river Arle and Itchen trout fisheries and to endangered species (e.g. white-clawed crayfish, only found in Arle and Candover valleys.)

8. Amenity and character of the open countryside:

- a. Ramblers, dog-walkers, cyclists and horse-riders of all ages use the historic, rural Brislands Lane, (forming part of the “Pilgrim’s Way”) and other public paths and bridleways in the vicinity of the proposed site for health and enjoyment. Government policy is to encourage use of open spaces such as this, to improve public health. A development of the scale proposed will have an adverse effect on access to the open countryside and historic landscape and will erode the rural character of the area and detract from current usage by residents.
- b. Due to the Site’s negative impact on the Significant Visual Prominence of the area, there would be dire consequences in terms of the amenity of the Heritage Watercress line. Passengers enjoyment would be affected and the downturn in their numbers (currently over 150,000 bringing in £11m to the local economy) would threaten the ongoing viability of this (East Hampshire’s most popular) tourist attraction and would lead to a significant reduction in the number of tourists visiting the area from London and further afield.

9. General

- a. The Planning Inspector recommended that a “settling period” be allowed for the assimilation of people from all the new developments already approved.
- b. Four Marks and South Medstead have already exceeded their obligations toward the overall housing targets for EHDC, delivering 627 already built or approved from a target minimum of 175 this is a 358% over-achievement.
- c. Four Marks and South Medstead have grown too randomly and quickly. We now have no real centre for retail or social purposes. We have lost employment spaces and have not gained anything tangible from an infrastructure perspective.

Advantages of other sites (make sure your comments clearly state your SUPPORT for each Site)

Northbrook Park

I **SUPPORT** this proposal for the following reasons:

1. A self-sustaining, well-defined, development, supported by a village trust.
2. Detailed plans in place for various types of infrastructure including; a new school, a pub, shops, a coffee house and a village hall.
3. 80 acres of Public Open Space, along with a wildlife pond and children's play-area.
4. Preservation of heritage buildings and existing dwellings,
5. There is safe, scalable access to the A31, via a new roundabout.
6. There are no narrow railway bridges constraining traffic flow into and out of the site in any direction.
7. The site is conveniently yet distinctly located (2 miles from Bentley and Farnham, where at both there are direct mainline rail links to London, with ample parking).
8. The plan commits to new bus links to Farnham/Farnham Station
9. New cycling and walking routes to both Bentley and Farnham (with gentle inclines of no more than a total of 15 metres in overall elevation gain).
10. The site will not depend on the existing amenities at Bentley or other neighbouring villages.
11. There is an Innovative Village Charter, providing guaranteed funding for new community facilities, events and a potentially free village bus service (via the Trust fund being established)
12. The proposal contains over 9 ha of local employment area and public open space with sports and recreation facilities all within easy, level walking distance from the centre of the proposed development.
13. For additional local employment, Northbrook is only 2 miles from Farnham and is also very close to extensive employment centres in Aldershot, Farnborough and Guildford.
14. There has been no significant housing development in the immediate area that requires time to settle and assimilate and there would be very little or no disturbance or disruption caused by construction to the existing residents of either Bentley or Farnham.
15. The site appears deliverable, having a single landowner and developer.
16. The site does not possess an elevated topology and therefore will not impinge on vistas or affect the setting of the surrounding countryside.
17. The proposed site provides an adequate SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space) of 15.4 ha.
18. The landowner has further land (equivalent in size and adjacent to the proposed site) should EHDC need to consider further requirements in the future.

Whitehill and Bordon

I **SUPPORT** this proposal for the following reasons:

1. The majority of the area being a new development around the existing town with new infrastructure being developed in real time to support the houses as they are being built.
2. Employment is well-catered for as there are realistic estimates of thousands of new local jobs in Bordon.
3. A new secondary school will open this year, providing up to 8 form entry to accommodate the additional educational needs
4. It is well served by buses to reach adjacent towns, particularly Havant, Farnborough, Basingstoke, Alton and Haslemere. Also the newly completed relief road, running through/near the development, will take the bulk of site-generated traffic
5. It is only 3.8 miles from Liphook railway station (with a car park) serving the London Waterloo to Portsmouth line. It is also commercially feasible (according to a 2009 report by ATOC) to provide a new railway station and link line closer to Bordon.
6. A significant proportion of the site will be redeveloped Brownfield land, lessening its carbon footprint.
7. Having one majority landowner (MOD) and a single developer, the site appears to be deliverable

Liphook and Liss

I **SUPPORT** this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Are each on the London Waterloo – Portsmouth line
2. Via bus, Liss connects with Petersfield, Alton and Havant; and Liphook with Basingstoke, Alton, Whitehill, Haslemere and Havant.

Horndean

I **SUPPORT** this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Abuts the new development in Havant.
2. Buses link the site to Alton, Clanfield, Havant, Horndean, London, Petersfield, Portsmouth and Southsea
3. Rail services on the London Waterloo – Portsmouth line.