

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 17 JUNE 2026 AT 7.00PM AT THE TOWN HALL**

Present: **Councillor** **Annette Eyre (Chair)**
 Matthew Bayliss
 Chris Botten
 Ginny Boxall
 Don Hammond
 Graham Hill
 Nick O'Brien
 Barbara Tansey

In attendance: **Tom Horwood (Town Clerk)**

7 members of the public and press

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Roger Lamb, John Quincey and Lorna Woodcroft.

2 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensation

No declarations of interest were received.

3 Chair's Announcements

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for coming. The Chair welcome Cllr Boxall to her first meeting since the by-election.

4 Written Representations from the Public

Correspondence was received in advance of the meeting from

- Cllr Ginny Boxall regarding planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, and
- Holybourne Village Association regarding planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT.

It was circulated to councillors on 15 June and published under supplementary papers on the Council website.

On the proposal of Councillor Eyre, seconded by Councillor Hammond, it was

RESOLVED
To note the written representations.

5 Questions and Statements by the Public

- 5.1 Jerry Janes of Holybourne Village Association spoke in opposition to planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, noting that refusal can still be agreed under policy in spite of the lack of the 5-year housing land supply, the continuing protections of the Neighbourhood Plan, the delays in the decision-making process at East Hampshire District Council, the unsuitability of the proposal for housing in that location and the recent refusal of a similar application in Bentley.
- 5.2 Robert Law, Chair of Holybourne Village Association spoke in opposition to planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, covering the reduction in parking (objected to by local schools), the traffic plan (which was desk-based), the impact on visitors due to the lack of spaces, the disregarding of the evidence and experience of local flooding.
- 5.3 Les Jackson of Cycle Alton spoke in opposition to planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, in particular the expectation of the negative impact and deterrence of cycling, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the cycling design standard. The East Hampshire Local Cycling and Walking
- 5.4 Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) is contrary to this proposal, which increases traffic. The Local Transport Note for Cycle Infrastructure Design has not been considered.
- 5.5 On the proposal of Councillor Eyre, seconded by Councillor Hill, it was

RESOLVED**To note the questions and statements by the public.****6 Planning Application EHDC-25-0748-OUT**

- 6.1 Councillor Eyre proposed that the Council authorise the Town Clerk to submit an appropriate response to the planning application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, based on the points made by councillors. This was seconded by Councillor Hill.
- 6.2 On parking, councillors noted that objections have grown at each stage of this application. The reduction of parking spaces on residents, carers, ambulances, schools and the shop was felt to be profound and negative. Developers ought to offer creative solutions that improve parking, whereas this application does the opposite. Constrained parking has impacts on road safety, for example, by forcing longer walking distances when pupils arrive and leave school. These proposals make a difficult situation worse by displacing parking. They create chaos, particularly during school traffic times. It was felt that the proposal has a significant detriment to the village. London Road itself is very important for the functioning of the community. Concern was raised that the streets are unsuitable for wheelchairs at present and these proposals

make it worse. Councillors were very concerned about the impact on existing residents and the heart of the community.

- 6.3 On traffic speed and congestion, it was felt that there was insufficient consideration of the impact on Eggars School and the wider village. London Road itself and its traffic lights cannot bear the increase in vehicles, which will create gridlock across the system.
- 6.4 On transport, it was noted that there is no significant public transport service. Councillors were interested in the comments of Cycle Alton and noted that an opportunity to improve cycling and safety has not been taken. They were very concerned that the Local Transport Note for Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN1/20), which ought to have significant weight in planning decisions, appears not to have been taken into account at all. Similarly, the LCWIP has significant material weight in determining planning applications (e.g. NPPF para. 111). Both of these frameworks would indicate that the application ought to be refused. The council supports the comments of Cycle Alton regarding how the LCWIP ought to be used to plan for more sustainable house-building with better cycle routes.
- 6.5 Construction traffic is a concern, exacerbated by the lack of alternative access in the application during the building of the site. This traffic will create a significant impact on the community for the years that the site is being built and damage on a historical road. Councillors noted the weight restriction on the bridge at Binsted. Modal shift aspirations in the application are extremely unrealistic and undeliverable, and will transform London Road into one of the most urbanised roads in East Hampshire district.
- 6.6 On heritage, it was noted that Holybourne is village with a distinctly rural character, with the ancient monument, listed buildings and conservation area. There is a substantial risk from the construction process to damage these. The site is also inappropriate in this setting and landscape.
- 6.7 On flood risk, councillors were concerned that long-standing experience of flooding in the village has seemingly been discounted in the application. The applicants rely on studies during atypical times. Their sequential test has only covered a very limited geography. They have not demonstrated how water on and from the site will be managed. There is strong concern that residences on the other side of London Road will be put at risk. The notorious Farringdon example was cited. The hydrogeological information included also does not provide a solution to groundwater flooding. The application appears to be directly counter to the recent EHDC motion on rivers, which has been endorsed by Alton Town Council.
- 6.8 On fresh-water supply and sewerage, it is quite clear that it is inadequate to sustain a development of this size in this location. Increasing evidence is emerging on the overall deficit of the water infrastructure. In addition, tankers are used to remove sewerage and there is a further threat on rivers. This issue

is being increasingly recognised in planning application determinations and in policy, including EHDC's and Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council's recent decisions on their respective draft Local Plans. It is incumbent on the applicant to demonstrate that proposed development can be supported by a sufficient and reliable water supply, without causing harm to the integrity of designated sites. This application makes no serious attempt to address this fundamental problem.

- 6.9 On the local green space, it was noted that Alton Town Council commented on 11 August 2025 and would wish to reiterate its position. In addition, the status of local green space provides protection akin to Green Belt. The playground's repositioning effectively turns it into a facility for the new development and not for the wider community, which would be a significant loss.
- 6.10 Overall, as a 'tier 4' settlement in EHDC's hierarchy, the application must be compliant in order to be approved. The scale of this application is substantially out of kilter with the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework. Councillors were in favour of recording a strong objection.
- 6.11 On the proposal of Councillor Eyre, seconded by Councillor Hill, it was

RESOLVED

to authorise the Town Clerk to submit an appropriate response to application EHDC-25-0748-OUT, Land To The Rear Of 136-150 London Road, Holybourne, Alton, Hampshire, based on the points made by councillors.

7 Planning Application EHDC-26-0489-CONVR

Councillor Eyre proposed that the Council authorise the Town Clerk to submit an appropriate response to the planning application EHDC-26-0489-CONVR, based on the points made by councillors. This was seconded by Councillor Hammond.

Most councillors were content to support the objection, and others content not to object.

On the proposal of Councillor Eyre, seconded by Councillor Hammond, it was

RESOLVED

to authorise the Town Clerk to submit an appropriate response to application EHDC-26-0489-CONVR, Russett Road, 10 River View, Alton, Hampshire, based on the points made by councillors.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm.