

Good evening, I propose to make this statement short and to the point and to follow roughly the page numbering of the agenda for easy reference.

With that in mind there seems to be a significant omission on page 32. The planning history of 25256/48 should also mention two previous applications for 45 houses, first one refused, taken to appeal and appeal dismissed, the second application refused as it was too soon after the first appeal dismissal to be a legal application and is now back again.

We all, this committee, officers, planning policy panel and many residents involved both as members of neighbourhood planning groups and private individuals have spent a huge amount of time putting together our Local Plan and our Neighbourhood Plan. These documents as we all know are written with care, checked, consulted on and inspected before being adopted and in the case of the neighbourhood plan also voted on at referendum then made. Every aspect of these plans is debated, thought about and are legal documents.

We are here tonight because this application is a departure from those plans. The Local Plan review as we have been told many times currently has no weight. On page 32 it is brought to our attention that the draft local plan policies currently are afforded no weight.

The SPB is currently as shown in the Local Plan and neighbourhood plan, both documents agree and have been passed by an Inspector as correct and defensible.

This has been further strengthened but ruling in 2017 of which I was previously unaware but could have significant effect on future applications. This is the case reference which you may have time to look up...

*Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd & Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council [2017] UKSC 36.*

**Judgement:** <https://cornerstonebarristers.com/cmsAdmin/uploads/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>

If not....

To quote from the ruling;

“The plot therefore lies outside the SPB, which as currently drawn does not fall out of date when the local plan is out of date, because the SPB is not deemed to be part of a 5 year housing land supply policy as decided by the Supreme Court in 2017, and therefore remains valid until redrawn by an in date and adopted local plan, and is in force to protect the countryside from inappropriate development such as this application.”

This application uses a departure notice, usually used for large sites not 4 houses. This was advertised in the Hampshire Independent a newspaper I am told with a Portsmouth base, not available in any local shop or the local library, does this count as being advertised? Incidentally the notice was not sent to either parish or district councillors surely an omission?

There is no argument here the site is outside SPB. As such it is development in the countryside, it does not matter if it is a small pocket of land it is still in planning terms in the countryside outside the SPB.

CP19 is a policy to protect areas outside SPB for its own sake. It does not state the land must be surrounded by fields or woods just outside SPB. Unless there is an overwhelming demonstrable benefit to challenge the policy like an exception site of affordable homes. This is not such a site. So CP19 is not adhered to.

CP14 is linked to above there are no affordable homes for local communities on the site so it fails on this policy too.

As the officer says CP10 and CP2 are more policies that this site does not meet, it is not redevelopment nor within the SPB. Nor incidentally has every inspector at appeal considered that sites close to here are sustainable as most journeys including to schools and work would need to be done by car.

Turning to the neighbourhood plan policy 1 is supportive of development inside the SPB it is not supportive of building in gardens or changing the character of an area. By filling this space with houses and removing a large number of trees - see page 65 for the tree removal plan it will change the landscape and feel of homes nearby. Some trees now have TPOs so will be initially saved but for how long with houses built close to them.

On page 42 the five year housing land supply is discussed, we have one! From a 2017 judgement the SPB would still be relevant even if we did not have the 5yhl.

The material considerations made by the officer goes into whether the site can be truly regarded as countryside. The purposes of the SPB are also mentioned and the fact that the SPB is a legacy of the East Hampshire District Local Plan (April 2016).

Of course it is a legacy of our CURRENT LOCAL PLAN. THAT IS THE PLAN THAT WE ARE ALL WORKING WITH!

It is not out of date, neither is the Neighbourhood Plan.

The SPB may change as part of the Local Plan Review but that currently as we have been told has no weight so should not be included here as an argument at all.

Fellow members of the planning committee I ask you please to have due regard to all the training and experience we have gained as members of this committee.

Please refuse this application as being contrary to policies CP19, CP10, CP14 and additionally policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. All these policies being current and tested.

Thank you

Ingrid Thomas  
April 2022