

Janeland 29336/008
EHDC Virtual Planning Committee – 21st May 2020
Objection Representation from a Resident of Willis Lane

[Commence representation]

I ask that the Committee **refuse** this application.

This District has until 2036 to identify just 2 remaining gypsy pitches to reach the target recommended by the Council's own GTAA report. Whilst the Planning Officer states the target isn't a ceiling, he fails to mention the importance of 'balance'. The GTAA work identified the 'recommended' need, a number already including 10% inflation compensating for shortfalls in research. Our District is significantly over-developed versus recommendation.

The PPTS states 'The LPA should **very strictly limit** traveller site development... outside areas covered within the Development Plan.' With East Hampshire enjoying 14.4 years supply of pitches, and no 'personal circumstances' or human rights argument offered by the applicant, there are no genuine material considerations carrying weight. As further evidence to the lack of 'need', **the existing Gypsy pitch at Janeland hasn't been occupied since 2018.**

Approving Janeland would not only set a new precedent for development in Four Marks (cul-de-sac layout vs. ribbon development) but would use land outside of settlement boundary to create a dense concentration of dwellings out-of-keeping with surroundings and generating a substantial increase in noise in the countryside. Whilst the landowner's motivation would be to maximise pitch count, a site this size cannot sustain 6 families, 12 caravans, 3 double day-rooms plus personal and commercial vehicles whilst remaining safe for residents. Following a site visit, Councillor Kemp-Gee suggested 'one extra pitch might work', if there were shortfall in delivery against GTAA 'need'.

In the recent 'Dismissal of Appeal [Ref: APP/M1710/W/19/3225766], Land at Friars Oak Farm, Medstead – Sept '19', Grahame Gould, Planning Inspectorate, using the same planning policies, threw out an Appeal for development outside of settlement boundary as the proposal demonstrated a 'lack of need' with an existing 5.3 year supply and 'had no proven or genuine need for a countryside location'. The Janeland application isn't distinguishable from this case - this Committee should confidently reach the same conclusion or enable the Planning Inspectorate to review the case by refusing today allowing the applicant to appeal.

Reading the Officer's report, our Planning Barrister was astonished by the recommendation and raised the question of 'Green Planning Studios' being afforded 'special treatment' – something which may require further investigation.

Julia Mansi previously stated we'd have a 'return to proper planning' once 5-year land supply was met. **With 16 years to deliver 2 remaining suitable pitches**, potentially within the Large Development Sites, I ask that this Committee seize the opportunity for 'proper planning' and weigh the interests of 81 objecting residents against the commercial interests of 1 to refuse what is an unsuitable, dense development outside of settlement boundary, significantly beyond GTAA recommendations and directly contravening the Development Plan and Design Statement.

Thank you.

[Representation ends]

Request for Conditions [separate to 450 word 'speech']

If this Committee are minded to approve, we request the following condition:

- To reduce noise pollution from six densely populated families and commercial vehicles at all hours, we ask that solid noise-cancelling barriers are erected along shared boundaries (with Hunters Farm and Southwood Farm). Whilst the boundary hedges provide a visible screening, they are proven to provide almost no audible barrier.