

Individual emails making general comments

Below reports the comments received by email from individuals. Where comments were repeated, they are not duplicated below.

As a resident of Bordon and Whitehill, I am writing to you to tell you that we do not need any more housing applications in this area approved. We have too many houses, with hundreds more already approved, yet zero infrastructure, zero job prospects, and zero additional school places for incoming children.

Already, my children have to attend schools at opposite ends of the town, due to all of the new housing having priority over the school closest to them, despite one of my children attending that school.

Now, with the never ending road closures, roadworks and diversions, it takes over 20 minutes to complete a simple school run.

Talking of the school's - no school in Bordon and Whitehill have a car park. Dropping children off and picking children up is dangerous now as there is absolutely no provision to safely drop our children to school.

Now whilst I appreciate how much more beneficial it would be for everyone to walk/cycle: when school places are allocated on the opposite side of the town and then parents need to go to work after, there is no alternative to driving.

The new secondary school, Oakmoor, had replaced Mill Chase. It has been moved from one end of Bordon to the other. Children who would have walked from Lindford or Headley to school now have a much further walk. No provision has been made for a school bus.

I believe that provision has been made for a Morisons in Bordon, yet from looking at the footprint, it is no bigger than the tesco we currently have. With the amount of people now residing in Bordon and Whitehill, and the amount of people yet to arrive in Bordon and Whitehill, we need a superstore here. Not only will that cater for the population, it will also create jobs within the store, create jobs for delivery drivers and would give the current tesco site an opportunity to be developed into something else needed in the community.

At the moment, we have a national shortage of doctors. The NHS is under an enormous amount of pressure and there is nothing that anyone singularly can do about that. However, as a local authority, I would expect you to be putting public health a major consideration. The roadworks constantly in bordon add to everyone's life stresses. The lack of jobs in bordon adds to everyone's life stresses. The cost of living crisis adds to everyone's life stresses. By adding to everyone's life stresses, the need for GP appointments goes up. By not having jobs created, the crime rates are likely to go up.

I really hope that EDHC take these comments into consideration when planning for furniture developments of the area.

We object to the proposal to allow housing development on Stanford grange farm. Bordon should not extend into Headley. Headley is rural Bordon is urban. Bordon is already too big. The area is inappropriate for housing. There is inadequate roads and other infrastructure. The farm is a county and national asset and should be protected.

I have not engaged through the headings in the Digital Engagement Plan form as there was nothing there regarding employment land. However, it may be worthy of mention that I have been searching for almost 5 years for a 5 acre commercial site for my clients Pickerings Hire in this locality & along the M3 corridor and between Winchester and Hook. This is for the storage and distribution of accommodation cabins and generators, mainly to the construction industry. Pickerings Hire supply an important service to the infrastructure and construction engineering sectors, they do their own transport of cabins to and from site. They do not need frontage or main road exposure. They can be 'back of site' and are prepared to landscape boundaries as necessary but do need good lorry access, mains water and electricity and preferably mains drainage.

Perhaps you would like to consider some further emphasis on employment land in the Local Plan.

I am completely opposed to and sick to the teeth of hearing about the number of potential housing developments earmarked for South Medstead and Fourmarks especially along Lymington bottom road. The local facilities, road infrastructure and drainage cannot sustain this on top of those that have already appeared in the last four years since I moved here.

I live in Four Marks and am writing to express my views on future development in my area.

A few years ago we had a local vote on development in our area and there was overwhelming support to curtail it. This vote seems to be ignored again and again as big developments keep having to be fought off.

While Four Marks is not an old village it is a very rural village and the continuous nibbling away at the green fields it causing it harm.

Please do not spoil our village further, limit planning and look for brown field sites.

As usual, it appears that EHDC resort to verbal smothering. It seems that the whole exercise is a waste of public money, whilst ultimately local people will have little say as to what actually occurs. The local plan may be well intentioned but it will now have little impact on planning decisions because as a result of recent about turns by EHDC planning, any local plan, current or future, will not be able to use the Settlement Policy Boundary as a reason to refuse applications; a precedent has been set.

REASON'S FOR NOT BUILDING MORE HOMES IN MEDSTEAD AND FOUR MARKS

1. Every new home in Medstead will increase even more the amount of traffic, including extra vans and lorry deliveries to those home and businesses which will cause even more increased danger.

The increase in new buildings over the last ten years has made the Medstead High Street a nightmare particularly when the local school has children delivered and collected. Also more builds will create even more dangerous traffic travelling through Boyneswood Road, Five Ash Road, Lymington Bottom Road, Roe Downs Road, South Town Road and Trinity Hill by people driving to Basingstoke, Alton and Lasham and other local villages. The extra traffic will also delay the access through the train tunnel in Lymington Bottom Road, access to the A31 and also access over the train tunnel on Boyneswood Road.

2. All the extra traffic in these areas will increase harmful chemicals that pollute and create environmental problems.
3. Medstead and Four Marks have had hundreds of new home built in the area over the last 10 years or more. That's enough!

I am shocked and dismayed at the proposal to elevate our locality in this way. This will allow more building in an area already struggling with the excessive development of the last 10 or so years

The concept of a walkable neighbourhood fails here due to the linear development along the single carriageway A31 and the hilly terrain. There is already a major deficient in infrastructure with only an overcrowded primary school, few shops, no pub, few workplace opportunities, very limited options for public transport and an existing traffic problem exacerbated by the narrow tunnels and bridges under and over the Watercress Line. This centre is not sustainable! The majority of transport is by car! within and without the villages

I have read your documents and doubt that many will be determined enough to fill out the questionnaire and while I know this is not the time to discuss possible large sites for development would point out the unsuitability of any of the four sites previously suggested in this area due to the above points

The site that does make sense along the A31 corridor is Neatham Down which has ready access to the dual carriageway A31 on a large roundabout, pedestrian access to Alton via a foot bridge (s j and it's workplaces, shops, pubs, schools and excellent public transport on the mainline railway

Four Marks / Medstead is not suitable as a level 2 centre

I understand that EHDC are currently consulting the public on its new Local Plan (LP), and that one proposal within it would be to change the Tier within the Settlement Hierarchy Policy (SHP) for the villages of Four Marks and Medstead (FM&M) from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

I believe that this is unjustified given that nothing has materially changed in recent years with regard to the services and amenities available within our villages. I would urge you to reject this proposal.

In the EHDC Local Plan consultation material e.g. in development option 1, it is proposed that Four Marks and Medstead moves from a tier 3 in the settlement policy to a tier 2.

We object to this proposal:

1. To change a location from tier 3 to tier 2 when there has been no material improvement in facilities and services is just a means of facilitating large scale housing development. There has been no increase in sustainability.
2. The resulting large scale housing development will overwhelm Four Marks and Medstead wrecking the character and amenity of the villages.
3. Four Marks and Medstead are geographically spread out. The distance from areas available for development to services and facilities can easily be 1km. Consequently, most journeys including local journeys from any new development will be by car rather than by cycle or foot because of the distance involved. Most people will not walk or cycle even modest distances (0.5km) because of the time involved, the difficulty carrying shopping or other items, safety issues (children walking to school – abduction and traffic risk), and lack of mobility (very young and elderly).

4. Four Marks and Medstead have nothing like the facilities that tier 2 Horndean has. Horndean has for example a large supermarket, several primary schools, a secondary school, and many more medical and dental service providers.

I am amazed that the EHDC believes it is realistic to upgrade this area to service centre 2. The infrastructure is inadequate for current needs let alone an almost certain imposition of 1 or even God forbid 2 of the large sites proposed for the initial consultation which this promotion would allow

I strongly agree with the submission by SMASH and also <>.

The FM/ South Medstead area is not a sustainable site, does not meet the criteria for the 20 minute neighbourhood and any addition residents would be commuters mostly by motor car to places of work in Alton, Basingstoke or Winchester and even Southampton and Portsmouth and by train from Alton to Farnham and London

If as seems to be EHDC policy sites will be along the A31 corridor the only feasible one left apparently would be Neatham Down with a ready access to the A 31 via a roundabout to dual carriageway It would not inconvenience current residents and with foot bridges over the A 31 would be part of a 20 minute neighbourhood with Alton where there are work places, several schools, a college, numerous shops and supermarkets and pubs which are conspicuously absent from FM / SM and also benefits from the mainline train station. There would not be access problems for building traffic as there are no narrow bridges or tunnels to negotiate and ready access to the sewage treatment plant

The other site proposed which has good communications and facilities would be Horndean with access to the A 3 and the Portsmouth area

There are environmental reasons for not selecting East Hants such as water supply and sewage and agricultural run off. The Government is supposed to be improving the North where there is a need to improve housing and jobs and both could be effected much more cheaply than in the South East

The letter from Mr Gove to councils suggests more local control and less central dictat and this should be seized to build appropriate , quality homes for the right age groups and not allow developers to build large, expensive but shoddy homes which generate more profit! There is an intent for more democratic and local resident input

FM / SM must not be gratuitously elevated to tier 2 the area and cannot cope with further influxes of homes and people and cars!

There are rumours around that EHDC are seeking to amend the tier in which FM & M sits from tier 3 to tier 2 which all of a sudden makes it a "more sustainable" (what does that mean?) location for sticking lots more houses in.

Since nothing in the village has changed since the last time we went around this analysis, then you should not re-categorise the village to suit the desires of avaricious developers. That is what is otherwise called gerrymandering the rules and is disreputable (if not illegal). It should be evident to anyone who has visited FM&M that is as rural village, spread out geographically with no foot-ways along its connecting lanes and just does not have the facilities, infrastructure, highways capacity or any other features justifying calling it a tier 2 village. It is just not suitable for additional major development and we residents wish you would cease playing statistics with it and leave it as it is. We do not want another several hundred houses crammed into a tiny tier 3 rural village.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to a proposed change in the existing Settlement Hierarchy Policy which would move the settlements of Four Marks and Medstead from Tier 3 to Tier 2 despite no evident improvements in access, facilities or infrastructure to justify this. These settlements are bursting at the seams and cannot take any further large scale development on top of that already endured in the recent past. My wife and I have lived in Medstead for some 45 years and remain totally dependent on our motor vehicles to access any of the local facilities. Nothing can be reached conveniently by foot or bicycle, especially for people of our age (nearing 80).

I am very concerned that EHDC is proposing to upgrade Four Marks and Medstead Settlement Hierarchy to Tier 2 in line with Horndean.

This is the most ridiculous proposition to be considered by the council, considering we in Four Marks have very limited facilities, for a start, to try and park at the shops is often not possible, to get an appointment at the Doctors is nigh on impossible. There is only one small village school, the road infrastructure is overloaded and continually floods in heavy rain. Where is all run off water from all these housing going to go, but straight down the road!

I believe the Council has one aim in mind and that is to destroy what little countryside we have left in Four Marks and Medstead.

You have already ruined Alton from a little market town to a satalite town, Medstead has been downgraded in its appearance from being a select residential area to that of urban sprawl and Four Marks will just look like a suburb of Basingstoke if this plan goes through.

I beg you to tear up this proposal now.

I write to support SMASH's objections to the possible change to the 'hierarchy' of Four Marks and Medstead, from 3 to 2, and the consequent possibility that this change in hierarchy will result in unsustainable development in the area.

I hope you will take this email seriously, and turn away from the possibility of changing the hierarchy.

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed change in the settlement hierarchy, whereby Four Marks and South Medstead's designation would change from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

Four Marks and South Medstead only have a limited range of services and therefore should continue to be designated as Tier 3.

I strongly support SMASH's (Stand with Medstead Against Speculative Housing) objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

Your policy states that the more facilities the settlement has, which are accessible by foot or cycle, the more sustainable it is deemed to be. Then the higher up it is in the hierarchy the more likely it is to take considerably more housing.

Four Marks and Medstead are currently in Tier 3, which is defined as a small local service centre that is able to to accommodate modest development tomeet local needs.

In your new policy, EHDC are proposing that that Four Marks and Medstead move up the hierarchy which would suggest it is now a more sustainable location, although nothing has changed.

My fear is that EHDC will use this change to justify building even more houses in our area on top of the enormous number we have already taken over the past 9 years. There were three developments proposed in Medstead, very close to the Four Marks border last year. All of them were refused. I believe some of the reasons were there were a lack of facilities on the area

I wish to register my strong support for SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

Already there are far too many new houses in Four Marks and Medstead with inadequate supporting infrastructure. It is not correct to say that local facilities are accessible by foot or cycle, as for many of the older residents a car is essential to get to the already overloaded GP practices and shops

We strongly object to the raising of our two villages Medstead and Four Marks from 3 to 2 status. There are many reasons for this:

No new facilities have been built here during the 2 1/2 years we have lived here.

There is no mainline train station and only 2 buses per hour to Winchester and Alton.

The small supermarkets we have are not fit for an increased population

The school is also only fit for a small intake of pupils

The main road is very often congested and is most unsuitable for added traffic.

We strongly support SMASH's objection to the proposed hierarchy change.

As a postscript we would like to add the following:

With our camera trap, we have got evidence for deer and we nightly hear the owls in the field behind us. (Alton lane to BlackBerry lane) and we have frogs and dragonfly larvae in our new pond. To build upon such a lovely open green site where there are slow worms and rare orchids would go against the Government's own strategy.

I write to strongly object to the proposed change in the settlement hierarchy, whereby Four Marks and South Medstead's designation would change from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

Four Marks and South Medstead still only have a limited range of services and therefore should continue to be designated as Tier 3 (Small Service Centre). The great majority of residents use a car to get to work, shopping and school which underlines the rural nature of this community.

I would like to register my support for SMASH's stand regarding the change to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy .

Many of the recently built new estates are a good distance from the schools and shops. The Holland Drive estate has even built its bungalows as far from the road as possible- where is the logic in that for keeping the elderly in touch and socialised?

I notice that you have not included a reference to the West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, that covers parts of Four Marks and Medstead, in your background papers for the Settlement Hierarchy.

I strongly support the comments on the change of hierarchy made by SMASH in regards to Medstead. It should not be moved from tier 3 to tier 2.

The three single vehicle access points across the Watercress line mean larger scale developments to the north of the A31 are unsustainable.

I note in the documents and online materials relating the ongoing local plan consultation that one option being considered is the reclassification of Four Marks and Medstead in the settlement hierarchy with Four Marks moving to tier 2 and Medstead moving to tier 3.

In your own document titled Settlement Policy Boundary Review: Interim Methodology Paper dated Dec 2018 in section 1.10 these settlements were classified as tier 3 and 4 respectively.

I have lived in Medstead (village) for a considerable period and there has been no material improvement, and certainly not since 2018, in the local infrastructure nor facilities supporting sustainability to warrant either of these changes so I wish to lodge my **strong objection** to any alterations to the classifications of these settlements.

In addition I support the objections being raised by SMASH to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

I strongly support SMASH'S objections to the settlement hierarchy policy, we have had enough building in Four Marks and Medstead, the A31 is impossible to join as both ways there is constant traffic, houses that have been built have had a lot of trouble with Septic tank issues, roads on the new estates are too narrow, cars have trouble parking, so park on pavements, including lorries that are damaging the pavements, complete waste of public money, Boyneswood Road has been ruined with heavy vehicles, so many houses built around this area traffic is really busy, the bridge must be taking a lot more weight which can't be good, Doctors, schools are over burdened, will you build any more?

I wish to register, in the strongest possible terms, my objection to the reclassification of South Medstead & Four Marks as Tier 2 rather than Tier 3 under the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

It is clear that such a move would be a cynical attempt to manipulate the planning process to permit the development of hundreds more houses in an area which has already seen way more than its fair share of development in recent years.

There is absolutely no justification for such a reclassification: it is an area with little local employment and limited public transport thus requiring the use of private cars for commuting purposes. The greater proportion of the houses in the area are beyond reasonable walking distance of schools and local amenities once again requiring the use of private cars. These facts are the reason the area has been in Tier 3 and NOTHING has changed. Accordingly, any change from Tier 3 to Tier 2 is a naked attempt to undermine your own planning guidance to simplify the future sacrifice of yet more green fields in a community which has already seen significant over-development.

Surely, it makes more sense to build large numbers of houses close to existing facilities for public transport, employment, retail and education rather than in an area which lacks virtually all of these.

I have understood that in draft the new policy, EHDC are proposing that FM&M move UP the hierarchy (from Tier 3 to Tier 2), ***even though nothing materially has changed in the villages structure or services***

- This would place FM&M in the same tier as Horndean which has significantly more facilities, local employment hubs, a senior school and a large Morrison's supermarket.
- FM&M does not have significant services to justify classification as Tier 2
- Four marks & medstead are already overstretched due to the increase in housing seen in the last 5yrs

- services were not increased when housing numbers were (primary school is full – I was offered spaces in chawton school for my children, no large shop in the area, no secondary school, doctors are full etc).

- Infrastructure is also already over burdened

- Roads are overcapacity and dangerous driving at junctions can commonly be seen (as shown by multiple studies)

- the way to walk to the primary school for a very large portion of the village is unsuitable for children (road walking on 60mph country roads – no pavements!!) – see the campaign by school parents under Safe Active Travel Routes (SATR)

I do not agree with this change for Four marks & medstead into a Tier 2 area and feel it is flawed and incorrect.

I would like to record my strong support for SMASH and their rejection of the undemocratic changes to the settlement hierarchy of so called “South Medstead and Four Marks”. These have not been consulted on locally and seem designed to justify planning decisions that have already been made. The consultation for the local plan takes these hierarchy changes as gospel and they do not reflect the local reality in which we get in our cars for almost everything - driving to local shops, sports amenities, for work, school, GP surgery etc.

Furthermore I continue to object to the (again undemocratic) arbitrary creation of “South Medstead and Four Marks” as a planning area. What is the purpose of parish councils, planning committees, village/settlement boundaries, local plans etc if they can be rewritten arbitrarily by central planners to suit their needs.

I appreciate you have a difficult mandate to fulfill but making fundamental changes like these which affect local people without consulting (to my knowledge) or making them subject to a proper democratic process (ie vote) seems unfair and the wrong basis on which to make such important decisions.

I am writing to register my objection to the absurd proposal to change our status from Tier 3 to Tier 2. This is utterly ludicrous as the facilities around these areas have not improved and we cannot walk or cycle to all the necessary amenities including larger shops, a commutable train station, sports and wider recreation facilities.

You could not possibly live in our community without regular use of a car so the idea that we are more sustainable and could accommodate more housing is madness. The road network is already overstretched and the rail bridges means the restrictions to the A31 will always exist.

Why do we constantly have to put up with changing rules and criteria and see planning proposals that are rejected on so many grounds, coming back time after time in the hope that one time it might slip under the radar and be passed?

These are small community areas, with a strong, diverse wild life population that are simply not suitable for big planning proposals!

Please register this email as a very strong objection to the proposed changes to the Settlement Hierarchy.

I object to the proposed move of Four Marks and Medstead up the hierarchy from Tier 3 to Tier 2 and strongly support SMASH's objections to the proposed settlement hierarchy change. The change will encourage and falsely justify further large scale development.

Four Marks and Medstead is clearly a Tier 3 settlement with a limited range of services where modest development to meet local needs for housing, employment, community services and infrastructure will secure its continuing vitality.

As per the SMASH (<https://www.smashonline.co.uk/>) travel Survey:

- 63% of people work, 75% work outside the village at some time of which 78% drive >20 miles. Car+ train usage is 93%.
- The primary mode of transport whether visiting local FM's shops or travelling outside FM's for shopping or other activities is overwhelmingly the car.

Any move to Tier 2 will increase car usage on narrow roads with pinch points due to the historic railway that are already congested at peak times. These roads are heavily used by horse riders and it is impossible to give riders adequate passing distance based on the recommendations in the new highway code.

The area is not suitable for Tier 2 and resulting development leading to a worsening of an already dangerous and inconvenient situation.

I object to the proposed move of Four Marks and Medstead up the hierarchy from Tier 3 to Tier 2 for the following reasons:

Tier 3 is a settlement with a limited range of services where modest development to meet local needs for housing, employment, community services and infrastructure will secure their continuing vitality and ensures that the community thrives. This is the correct tier for Four Marks and Medstead.

As per the SMASH (<https://www.smashonline.co.uk/>) travel Survey:

- 63% of people work, 75% work outside the village at some time of which 78% % drive >20 miles. Car+ train usage is 93%.
- The primary mode of transport whether visiting local FM's shops or travelling outside FM's for shopping or other activities is overwhelmingly the car.

The goal posts have been changed first from an 800 to 1200m travel distance. From the Four Marks Map in Appendix E

(<https://www.easthants.gov.uk/media/7736/download?inline>). The 800m buffer clearly shows that there is very little more space for housing development, which means any new development will go out to 1200m.. The reality is that people on a regular basis are not going to take a 40 minute round trip to pick up a carton of milk (you can only do small shops in the local shops – a weekly shop requires a car trip to Alton). How can you possibly justify the movement of Four Marks and Medstead from Tier 3 to Tier 2? It will only increase car's usage, with further environmental impact (which goes against another of your policies). More car's already traveling on single track, poorly maintained rural roads with pinch points are all the railway line crossings. More houses with families traveling (by car) to the primary schools.

In addition to this there is the LEVELLING UP BILL. 7/12/22 the government conceded to pressure from parliamentarians and the public on a range of key planning issues:

- An abandoning of damaging, centralised mandatory housing targets that have led to needless, unaffordable and poorly designed greenfield developments, in favour of an advisory system that takes local character and need into account
- An end to landbanking – the practice developers use to sit on land they have acquired permission for while it accrues in value - a huge cause of the lack of housing being actually built
- Local authorities given greater powers to promote brownfield development, and a wider review into brownfield development

The movement for FM & M from Tier 3 to Tier 2 goes against the advice of the levelling up bill and the majority of residents in Four Marks and Medstead and will destroy the rural character and nature of Four Marks and Medstead, in addition to a negative environmental impact to Hampshire as a whole.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

I wish to register, in the strongest possible terms, my objection to the reclassification of South Medstead & Four Marks as Tier 2 rather than Tier 3 under the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

It is clear that such a move would be a cynical attempt to manipulate the planning process to permit the development of hundreds more houses in an area which has already seen way more than its fair share of development in recent years.

There is absolutely no justification for such a reclassification: it is an area with little local employment and limited public transport thus requiring the use of private cars for commuting purposes. The greater proportion of the houses in the area are beyond reasonable walking distance of schools and local amenities once again requiring the use of private cars. These facts are the reason the area has been in Tier 3 and NOTHING has changed. Accordingly, any change from Tier 3 to Tier 2 is a naked attempt to undermine your own planning guidance to simplify the future sacrifice of yet more green fields in a community which has already seen significant over-development.

Surely, it makes more sense to build large numbers of houses close to existing facilities for public transport, employment, retail and education rather than in an area which lacks virtually all of these.

I write to say that I strongly support SMASH's objections to revisions to the settlement hierarchy.

As a Professor of Urban Social Geography, I can see no additions to our facilities or services or improved accessibility to existing resources to justify this. Four Marks remains an under-provided ribbon development that houses people who use their cars for commuting, shopping or accessing entertainment.

Please read the below with the knowledge that I am a person in my early 20s with a concern of finding housing in my near future for myself, however this does not change how disgusted I am at the proposal to build yet more houses in my village. I actually question whether we can call this once quaint and peaceful place a village anymore, what with it's constant sprawling development and the suffocating number of bodies and cars that comes with it.

Our village has been a heart of a small community since the 11th century, let it not be bulldozed into a heaving, heartless town now.

I wish to register, in the strongest possible terms, my objection to the reclassification of South Medstead & Four Marks as Tier 2 rather than Tier 3 under the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

It is clear that such a move would be a cynical attempt to manipulate the planning process to permit the development of hundreds more houses in an area which has already seen way more than its fair share of development in recent years.

There is absolutely no justification for such a reclassification: it is an area with little local employment and limited public transport thus requiring the use of private cars for commuting purposes. The greater proportion of the houses in the area are beyond reasonable walking distance of schools and local amenities once again requiring the use of private cars. These facts are the reason the area has been in Tier 3 and NOTHING has changed. Accordingly, any change from Tier 3 to Tier 2 is a naked attempt to undermine your own planning guidance to simplify the future sacrifice of yet more green fields in a community which has already seen significant over-development.

Surely, it makes more sense to build large numbers of houses close to existing facilities for public transport, employment, retail and education rather than in an area which lacks virtually all of these.

I am emailing re the upcoming Local Plan, and particularly the Settlement Hierarchy Rules in relation to Four Marks & Medstead, with the reported potential for this area to be moved from Tier 3 to Tier 2 status. I am fundamentally opposed to any change in the area's status, as well as to the approval of any further housing developments.

We have lived in Medstead for almost 35 years, and in that time hundreds of new houses have been built in the two villages, in what is undeniably still a "rural area". Up until now, I believe many people have accepted the additional housing as it has to go somewhere, but we have reached the limit of justifiable development in Four Marks and Medstead. All future housing on anything other than a very small scale (i.e. ones and twos) must immediately be stopped.

Aside from the obvious environmental aspect and the global climate emergency, the road infrastructure is just not up to catering for further housing. Given the very limited public transport availability (and even then only if you're within striking distance of the A31) – and the fact that the vast majority of any incoming people's jobs will almost certainly be in Alton, Basingstoke, Farnham, Winchester, or even further afield – the reality of extra housing in this area is that each and every new house will result in at least one extra car on the local roads, and very likely two or even three – depending on the life requirements of the house occupants. For a new housing development comprising up to hundreds of houses, that would likely result in upwards of 1000 extra cars on the local roads compared with the current situation: that is clearly totally unsustainable and unacceptable.

The A31 through Four Marks is a single-carriageway road (with no possibility of a bypass ever happening for logistical reasons), with regular traffic hold-ups already widely occurring during busy periods. The significant majority of roads to the north of the A31 in Four Marks are country lanes, with (in most cases) no street lighting and no pavements. When (as since Christmas), we have a lot of heavy rain, in many places the roads are partially or completely covered in water with a lot of mud into the bargain, and it is impossible to be a pedestrian or cyclist in these conditions without getting soaked and/or filthy – I don't blame people for using their cars in these circumstances. On top of that, the roads are already badly pock-marked with potholes of varying severity, and the addition of so many extra cars will only make things much worse as road surfaces break up more quickly.

There are five ways off the northern side of the A31 towards Medstead: of these five, four of them are limited to single-track access either immediately off the A31 or within a short distance:

- Grosvenor Road off the A31 near the old Watercress Inn is impassable and currently closed (again) due to deep flooding just off the A31 (and even when not flooded, is still subject to the limitation of the narrow railway tunnel with single-track access on both sides)
- Gravel Lane (the immediate alternative) is such a small road as to make it a non-viable option except for occasional local traffic (and it is also subject to the restricted-width railway tunnel at its bottom end)
- Lymington Bottom Road is two-way to start with, but then goes down to single-track to negotiate the railway bridge
- Boyneswood Road has a single-track width restriction on the railway bridge within a very short distance of the A31 (queues often build up in both directions at this width restriction at busy times of the day, especially when traffic is trying to turn right out of Boyneswood Road on to the A31)
- The fifth access (Station Approach) is a quiet two-way residential road that would immediately become even more of a rat-run than it already is with drivers trying to avoid the other compromised access routes at busy times.

Given the very restricted of all of these access routes, any housing development resulting in more cars would just make an already-bad situation much worse.

As well as being a car driver and a cyclist, I am also a regular pedestrian on the lanes around Medstead and Four Marks, and even with the existing amount of vehicular traffic it can be very scary to walk along these unpaved lanes, as a significant percentage of drivers just do not slow down sufficiently or give you sufficient space – and I'm a very confident road user myself. It must be highly intimidating for older people or mothers with children to use these roads. Let's not kid ourselves: any further housing development on

any scale – with their associated cars – is only going to reduce the amount of walking and cycling that is practised, not increase it. People simply will not endanger themselves by trying to walk or cycle.

Aside from the environmental importance of preserving the green fields, pasture land and paddocks for wildlife and preventing the loss of any further countryside in this area, the harsh reality is that the majority of occupants of any new housing developments are unlikely to be able to afford the tens of thousands of pounds currently needed to buy an “environmentally friendly” electric car – so instead they will likely be driving internal-combustion-engined cars that will significantly increase air pollution, and degrade the local air quality for pedestrians, cyclists and nearby residents.

I urge you to stop any further consideration of Four Marks & Medstead as being suitable for additional housing development, in order to prevent a major increase in car movements on these narrow, unlit and unpaved local roads.

It has come to our attention that there is some discussion over the elevation of the settlement hierarchy of Medstead and Four Marks possibly being raised from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

I wish to register our strong objection to such a re-categorisation. We have lived in Paice Lane, Medstead since 2011 and have seen how much the increase in housing has put a strain on the highways in the local area. The volume of traffic on; trying to get onto and around the A31 is already significantly increased. The elevation of these villages to Tier 2 would no doubt increase the chances of more building in the area and therefore the strain on the highways, not to mention the local ecology and natural environment of these villages, including flooding.

I am responding to your local plan consultation by email, rather than the "easy to use online consultation" because it only allows comments / feedback on a small number of questions you have selected.

My response is on the proposal in the Settlement Hierarchy Background paper, then referenced in the Spatial Development Options Background paper, to redefine the settlement hierarchy.

The paper proposes that Four Marks and South Medstead (also Grayshott and Clanfield) should be classified in the same category as Horndean although they are considerably smaller. The claimed objective of this re-defining of the settlement hierarchy is to "enable the emerging Local Plan to support the regeneration of our existing built-up areas, enhance social cohesion, improve health outcomes and support the move towards net-zero carbon targets through reducing unsustainable travel". This will not be achieved, and in my opinion will be made less achievable by this redefinition.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy. The points I would particularly like to emphasise are:

1. It is not feasible to walk or cycle to shops from majority of housing in Four Marks and South Medstead (FM&M). Families with children wouldn't walk along roads into the villages because of lack of pavements and if walking on the main road would need to hold tightly onto any child's hand for obvious reasons, thus leaving them unable to carry much else. So to think that people would walk a mile to the shops and a mile home again with heavy shopping bags (plus children in tow) is simply insane. There is no pavement on the more rural lanes which are rat runs

during school and rush hour. Talk of building cycle paths is also ridiculous when most of the roads that go off the A31 are country roads and lanes.

2. It is ridiculous to compare the few small village shops in the centre of Four Marks to Horndean where there is a Morrison's supermarket, secondary education, large businesses and has easy access to facilities in Waterlooville. For the vast majority of shopping in FM/M you need to use a car or take a bus from the A31.

The only possible reason for EHDC to put FM&M in same category as Horndean (the two places have very different infrastructure as pointed out in SMASH objection) is obviously to push new housing into this area. We have taken a huge hit over the last 11 years with the amount of new development but no new school, Doctors surgery capacity, shops, supermarkets to support this housing. This whole area is extremely car dependent and so adding more people will make the area less sustainable. Just because we live on the edge of the SDNP doesn't mean to say we should bear the brunt of EHDC housing quota.

I believe Chawton Farm was chosen for development initially following a long consultation. This is a much better option. Alton has many amenities, good road access, a train station and local employment.

Developing FM/M villages will bring yet more pollution along the village roads and A31 along with a poorer quality of life for existing residents. For the council to say they want more people to cycle and walk is very noble, however this can only work in certain geographical areas and FM/M is not one of them.

I am very unhappy about the form of the online consultation as it is formulated as a series of very high level questions that don't give very much insight into what local people think but is easy to analyse, and write a report from, and also does not enable any challenge to some of the proposals for the Local Plan hidden within the background documents. It is an example, in my opinion, of creating a process that gives the appearance of consultation without achieving the outcome that is claimed to be the objective.

As a result, I am emailing my response which is to the Spatial Development Options paper and the Settlement Hierarchy Background paper.

The stated logic for the redefinition is to "enable the emerging Local Plan to support the regeneration of our existing built-up areas, enhance social cohesion, improve health outcomes and support the move towards net-zero carbon targets through reducing unsustainable travel".

Because of the lack of local facilities, e.g. higher education, supermarkets, anything other than convenience stores for shopping and businesses providing employment, most travel is in/out of the village along the A31 and by car. Due to the steep hill down into Alton, Four Marks is reputedly the highest village in Hampshire, it is not practical to cycle to the nearest town unless very fit and willing to brave the A31 dual carriageway. Increasing housing without addressing these realities will not support the move towards net-zero carbon targets through reducing unsustainable travel as it will increase car use.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy. I think that the methodology used is flawed - the comparison with Horndean is absurd as it is 2-3x the size of FM&M. But more significantly Horndean has Cowplain and Waterlooville as neighbours forming part of the South Hampshire conurbation. It therefore

has access to employment, a 13 minute bike ride into Waterlooville. However, it is outside of the EHDC boundary so presumably this would not be considered?

The analysis of employment hubs seems to be limited to the number of commercial developments in existence and not the number of local people employed. To my knowledge, the businesses in Four Marks are all small and employ low numbers of people who live in FM&M.

I challenge the concept of the "20 minute neighbourhood" on the basis that EHDC should seek to influence planning so that carbon emissions are minimised towards the outcome of net-zero. Consider why people use cars and then act to reduce the requirement by developing areas close to mainline railway stations (perhaps a new development "garden village" at Rowlands Castle or in Bentley); develop cycle paths between villages and local towns in flat areas of county to make commuting, or school travel for older children, by bike possible). The distance on a map is not an indicator of the practicality of sustainable travel.

The UK government and public services have failed to successfully develop strategy, policy and its implementation. A key failure is not to think in terms of outcomes and systems, but rather targets and process. A recent example is a planning decision in South Medstead to allow development outside of the settlement boundary and a part of the justification was that CIL money would be used to build cycle paths to make travel more sustainable. This addresses a target in terms of miles of cycle paths and ticks a box in terms of using process to justify development through using it to support investment in improving sustainability. But, because most people travel by car outside of the village and to take children to the local schools, which are not within walking distance and isn't practical by bike for small children, (whole system consideration) then developing local cycle paths will not have the desired outcome. It will benefit EHDC who deliver more miles of cycle pathway, the developer who can build additional houses, and the contractor who gets to build the cycle paths. It is not a good use of public money.

I have been trying to participate in this consultation online but am finding the design of the response options extremely frustrating in that it doesn't allow for a "Yes but" scenario. I am therefore providing my views here as briefly as possible and trust they will be taken into consideration and not excluded from the final analysis which I fear will result in misinterpretation of public opinion.

I strongly believe that we should strive for the following and that EHDC's philosophy is the same:

- More affordable housing in the right place
- Improved infrastructure
- Carbon-zero design
- Protection of the environment in response to the Climate Emergency

However for the following reasons I am not convinced that EHDC can fulfil these philosophies:

- Imposition of housing numbers by Central Government which bear no relation to local needs or constraints, which have as yet not been officially withdrawn from Government legislation despite overtures to that effect.
- The continued urbanization of areas of East Hampshire that sit outside of the SDNP which must (currently) satisfy the majority of the housing numbers demanded at the expense of farmland, green fields, ancient woodland and towns and villages that will cease to be nice places to live.

- Consequent inadequacy of infrastructure as a result of this continued polarized over-development.
- Potential stagnation of towns and villages inside the SDNP and adverse impact on house prices both inside and outside the SDNP.
- Increased traffic in and out of the SDNP due to unaffordable housing within it.
- Failure of Central Government to grasp the key driver of this over-development in the South of England ie executives being drawn out of London.

What is needed is greater vision and leadership from Central Government that focuses on urgent regeneration of our inner cities where there is genuine employment opportunity and genuine need, instead of the continued destruction of our countryside which has a vital role to play in the Climate Emergency solution.

Firstly- and this is a general comment- I can see that you have made efforts to simplify the issues for the public. But I do have to say that I have had many residents tell me that 'this is all over my head' ...' I have no idea what is really going on..' etc. I consider myself to be of average intelligence and I have found it difficult to penetrate and absorb all of the documents. Planning really does appear to be a dark art ! But you may find that there is a disappointingly low number of responses- it will not be apathy but a sense of powerlessness of not knowing how to respond.

Strategic Approach

Older people

I could not see as much evidence that I expected that there is an intention to take a strategic approach to addressing the housing needs for the population of EDHC. There needs to be a strong and direct connection to

The age of the catchment population - almost a quarter of which are aged 65 and over. This age group is expected to grow by a staggering 43% and yet I saw nothing to indicate that this group of the population and their particular needs are uppermost in your minds. I have not reached this age range yet- but I am concerned that so little appears to be in the plans to address their needs. I would expect to see more houses that are suitable for the 65 years and above. The types of dwellings that older people seek are usually single storey with almost immediate access to local amenities. Older people do spend a lot of time using healthcare resources and we should look to see what important healthcare facilities are available and where they are located. The Rt Hon Michael Gove MP has given a clear indication that he expects that our older population's housing needs should be met by independent living, care homes, residential Care and Nursing homes. I would like to know that EDHC will conduct a proper needs assessment and develop sufficient dwellings of the right kind and in the right location to meet the needs of this significant part of our population.

Younger People

With regards to the younger population, there is such compelling evidence that young people want to live in a place where their particular needs are met. The cafe culture is strong and young people look for an area which is vibrant, buzzing and full of the pursuits that they enjoy- cinema, pubs , cafes, sport centres and of course employment opportunities. They do not typically seek a rural village. I would like to know that EDHC can meet their needs- what they want and seek rather than what we think is the best place for young people to live (Location, Location, Location !!)

Taking into account the needs of the older population and the younger population, I believe that their needs to be best met by co-locating with an existing town such as Alton or Bordon. I note that parts of the Alton town centre are of a poor quality- could we not use the fringe of the town for housing and simultaneously develop the town centre to be a more vibrant place with plenty of the right facilities for older and younger people alike?

Rt Hon Michael Gove consultation

On 22nd December 22, the proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework was launched. My understanding is that the outcome will be known in the next 2 months (spring 23) . This document contains some vitally important proposals and the revisions will give EDHC a fantastic opportunity to reset the dial on the future housing needs.

Having taken a look at the consultation document , my assessment is as follows :

- The removal of LPAs to continually demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply,
- That uplifts to establishing housing requirements should be prioritised to brown field or underutilised urban sites (and not rural locations),
- Housing needs for older people should be widened to include retirement and housing with care and care homes,
- Past over delivery can be deducted from the housing requirements,
- Building at densities significantly out of character with a local area may be justification for not meeting full assessed housing needs. We believe that this would apply to FM and Medstead,
- The tilted balance test is removed and the new test of whether adverse impacts are likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of any development,

In addition the duty to cooperate and the duty to assist neighbouring councils to meet their housing targets is removed.

If I am right on the above, I would like to have some reassurance that EDHC is going to stop and pause and carefully consider the outcome of the consultation and the positive impact it may have on its LP.

Medstead- the place I call home

You will know that there are very strong feelings about any prospect of significant numbers of houses being built in Medstead and FM. The reasons for this are simple - it lies in the recent history of house building in these 2 villages. Your records should show that over 500 houses have been delivered in FM and Medstead in the last 9 years. In the southern part of Medstead alone, in 2017 and in 2018, 133 and 151 respectively were built. **This number is more than the entire number built in the SDNP.**

The residents of Medstead feel that they are the guardians of the village and want to protect its special qualities for the future. This does not mean no houses to be built- but anything more than minor will be vehemently objected to. The charm and the character of Medstead is important to us but more than that- we know that the small number of amenities that we have will be swamped by any further growth in houses.

Our fields and woodland and open spaces are so important to village life- we find it incomprehensible that EDHC would even contemplate pouring concrete and tarmac over our much valued green spaces.

We know that the Rt Hon MG has declared that building densities which are significantly out of character within an existing area may be justification for not meeting housing needs

in full. Surely you would have to agree that building significant numbers in a village such as Medstead would be out of character?

I cannot see any reason why you would want to continue with any housing strategy which contemplated large scale housing developments in any one area. I could accept that building in the immediate surrounds of an established town could be beneficial providing that there is a commensurate investment in that town. I can see no circumstances where it would be beneficial to build large scale housing estates in small / medium villages.

One of the issues that I had with your document was that it was impossible to gauge what was meant by " *some houses* ". I do not know if this was a deliberate omission? For me, " *some* " means not significant numbers. I have asked many people what EDHC might mean by the term " *Some Houses* " and the responses vary but most believe that it means " **a few** ". I would be grateful if you could clarify this for me.

Settlement Hierarchy

I had not heard the term settlement hierarchy, but it makes sense to have one. What would have been very helpful is that you provided a definition of the tiers. A number can feel meaningless. A description of the tier would have aided the reader. Can this be provided?

I think that I may have missed something but what is the overall objective behind your proposal to move Medstead and FM into a new tier? In the absence of any clear reason, I filled the gap with thinking about what you would be trying to gain and I did not like the answer.

It appears to me that you are trying to change our settlement hierarchy so that you can build far more houses ? If that is correct , I think that this is an appalling and if I may be frank, underhand thing to try to slip in. The vast majority of people that I have spoken to have no idea about settlement hierarchies and when it has been explained- all , without exception have seen this attempt to change the hierarchy as devious and sneaky. (these words are actually far more polite than I have had to listen to!)

Taking the emotion away from this and viewing it as objectively as I can- I sincerely believe that you have got this one wrong. Medstead and FM are most certainly not 20 minute neighbourhoods nor are they , for the most part, 30 minute neighbourhoods. If you want to come to my house and we walk to the shops with me, I would be very happy to do so- you can then see for yourself. Mind you, you will need to be pretty fit as there is quite a long hill to walk up. ANd you will be carrying my shopping so that you get the full experience ! Much of the route has no pavement so please wear a high viz jacket. And bring a torch as much of the road is not lit. Apart from that - we can walk. I can guarantee that we will only see 1 or 2 dog walkers so we will have the road to ourselves.....(at the moment you may need to also bring swimming trunks- the flooding by the pig farm is significant - it covers the entire road and is pretty deep - in fact it is impossible on foot so we may have to wait it out until the flood recedes)

I can foresee some serious disputes if you persist on M and FM being in tier 2. We are not. We live here. We know. I would like to have some reassurance that you are going to revisit this and place us back in tier 3.

Spatial Strategy

Thank you for asking for comments on this - but I do not feel I can be of much use as I had too many questions to be able to respond in a meaningful way. I did think the options were over simplistic. However I think that you should follow a sensible algorithm. But you must surely wait until the outcome of the MG consultation before you do anything ? But herewith my views.....

1. Brownfield sites - see my earlier comments about building out the town centres. Build where the older population will have amenities that they need on their doorstep. Build where young people get a sense of excitement, vibrancy and employment.
2. EDHC owned land - are there any creative ideas to utilise this ?
3. No large scale housing developments . Absolutely not necessary and will be the ruination of villages and the rural surroundings.
4. Do not build over our green spaces - they are a precious and rare commodity. Keep our country a green and pleasant land .

Meaningful consultation

In my career, I have led and driven many consultations. For a consultation to be meaningful, you need to provide those involved with sufficient information to make an informed decision. I find that I have too many questions.....For there to be meaningful consultation, my expectation is that you would review all comments and consider them carefully. Where you reject a notion or comment, you should be able to explain why and this should be made available in the public domain. Is this your approach? Will you be summarizing comments received? will you be feeding back to those comments, advising which is accepted and which is rejected? Will you explain how the outcome of the consultation will be fed into the LP?

Essentially we all want to know that the effort that we have put into responding to your consultation has been appreciated and valued and what might change as a result.

Whilst I know it is impossible to meet with each and every respondent. I am a member of SMASH and wonder if you would meet with us to go through the comments that we have raised. There is nothing inconsistent in this response than that sent to you by SMASH. I think it would be a good idea to keep the local community alongside you and SMASH can help by being that conduit.

Kind regards - and let me know if you would like to take me up on a shopping trip to test out your 20-30 minute neighbourhood.....!!

Calculation of Housing Need - not withstanding adjustments that may result from any government changes to the housing legislation, the affordability of decent housing for local people will remain an issue that cannot be solved by increase in supply alone. This is borne out by the stubborn higher prices of accommodation that has been unaffected by new building.

The mix and location of affordable homes in our communities is not being adequately met by developments that are predominantly three- and four-bedroom family homes, selling at market prices that attract new residents from other more expensive areas and do not address the existing need of local people trying to downsize or buy for the first time.

The Council can do much to remedy this by reviewing the mix and type of homes to be built, stipulating an increased number of one and two bed homes to allow people to downsize and buy for the first time.

The retirement accommodation option typical of McCarthy and Stone is exploitative as buy backs at a severely lower price after the death of the occupant are being reported in the national press. It is also an option people tend to choose right at the end of their retirement journey, whereas smaller homes near to facilities would encourage fit older people to downsize earlier, releasing family sized accommodation for sale. This sensible policy would create a healthier churn in the market.

Self-Build opportunities - The technology for producing well insulated homes to passive solar principles in kit form has come along in leaps and bounds over recent years and the self-build process is now in reach of many people at very competitive prices. This option should receive greater encouragement from the planning process as it is good for the environment and will add innovation in design, rather than the unimaginative red brick and render estates that are springing up all around Alton and other towns.

Environmental issues - On the subject of the new estates being built around Alton, the roads will remain unadopted because they are too narrow and do not meet the minimum standards required for adoption. This is ludicrously poor planning, leading to overparking on the pavements, neighbour disputes and blocked access for emergency vehicles. The hard landscaping and small gardens/courtyards that surround these tightly packed two and often three storey properties result in flash flooding that pours down onto the main roads. If you need a real-life illustration, please visit the estates being built opposite the Alton Leisure Centre on a wet Saturday, late morning.

This sort of poor design is storing up problems for the future. The properties are also a disaster for wildlife as the fenced in gardens and overbuilt landscape have no wildlife corridors, no sanctuary and are basically a man-made sterile environment without room for anything other than cars and people. Go take a look.

Overall, it all very well to argue with residents about whether or not local houses are needed but you need to win the battle through showing that the council is capable of responding to the needs of local people for decent affordable housing that is built with the respect to the natural environment.

Thankyou for making the Local Plan Consultation available.

I can't quite view it all on my phone but I have two issues which I think need to be flagged as urgent?

- One is the provision of more council housing for local populations because the lack of it is causing hardship in many areas which do not receive any publicity.
- Which leads to the problem of truly affordable rental developments for young working families and older residents.

And the burning question:

- What is the reasoning behind the gradual running down by funding cuts of our local Chase Community Hospital?

Can anyone at EHDC please explain if responsibility for the Chase Hospital has been bought by the CCG or donated to them or somehow removed from any hope of public consultation being possible to influence its future?

Does the land that it sits on belong to EHDC?

I do hope these questions can be answered.

Frustrated by the fact that the on-line consultation is not providing me the opportunity to get my points across.

The ONS forecast for East Hants population completed in 2014 were as follows.

2011

2027 ONS forecast Growth

Young people	20,000	20,000	0%
working age people	73,300	71,000	-3%
Retired people	22,200	34,000	53%
of which over 80	6,300	11,000	75%
Total	115,500	125,000	8%

At the time we had a low birth rate but the death rate amongst our elderly population was falling and so they were predicting spectacular growth.

Two significant things have changed during the pandemic.

The death rate has increased with deaths amongst the elderly running at 15% above pre-pandemic levels. The collapse of the NHS and social care means this will continue for five years at least.

The work from home trend has removed the fall in the working age population.

The ONS will update the forecasts next September and will reflect those changes, but starting with the 2021 census not the 2011

. I have done it for them (an expert at this). You can see that the 2021 census data was quite different to the ONS forecasts for that year as they did not expect the pandemic.

	2021	2027 forecast	Growth
Young people	20,500	20,000	-2%
working age people	76,300	75,100	-2%
Retired people	29,100	28,350	-3%
of which over 80	8,200	7,050	-14%
Total	125,900	123,450	-2%

For information we currently have 7, 220 single people living alone over the age of 66 and that is why the builders are focusing on retirement flats but we do not need any more of these in the next five years. We need to manage those who will give up their family home over the next five years and that will provide plenty of opportunities to re-develop our housing stock and provide the affordable family homes we need.

The plan is for too many houses by far!! The current infrastructure will not support such "wild" plans!

Please reconsider this - the numbers must be reduced!

We are writing desperately asking for you help to reduce to impact of more floods traffic lack of amenities ie Doctors , School teachers etc . All caused by too many houses and no plan's whatsoever to do anything about these issues .

When was the last reservoir planned ? le shortage of water in the summer which will get worse . We can't seem to attract GPs anymore, no hospital beds . No fields more flooding . Need I continue. This local area has done its bit . Please please listen to everyone. We are all hating whats been happening. Call a halt and be understanding and see what damage its causing .

Find my comments for the consultation process. I Live at the North End of Wooteys Estate and Adjacent to Greenfields Estate. The new extensive housing we have had to digest over the last three years has increased traffic in this area to an almost intolerable situation. Cars can't be parked and motorists can hardly negotiate Wooteys Way without having to pull in behind parked cars to allow oncoming vehicles, not to mention the smaller roads which are often worse than Wooteys Way. Gilbert White way is often used by motorists travelling too fast making coming out of any of the surrounding roads dangerous to exit and for children crossing for school. Anstey Lane is also now a dangerous area with additional traffic from newly built estates. Not to mention exit onto Old Odiham Road from Gilbert White Way, which I often hear screeching of tyres and see evidence of accidents. In short we need to digest current growth in housing at this end of the town for a number of years before even thinking of extending in this area.

please note:

- you are way behind in providing the necessary infrastructure to go with the thousands of houses you have built and are continuing to Build at Bordon.

All of Bordon still only has ONE Doctors Surgery. You are at least one down on schools provision, and where are the much heralded community buildings such as meeting and fitness places etc.

As far as i know it's still only the Forest Centre.

Very few new mixed commercial centres with a variety of shops and coffee /tea places. Meanwhile The historically useful up until a few years ago, Chase Hospital lies virtually unused and please don't blame the NHS, it's a quango contractor that's probably waiting for the go ahead for moreyes that's right, more houses.

The revised local Plan also needs to

provide REAL green spaces with trees and ground cover, not just tidy little twee places with large paths and dog poo bins. This not yet a huge dense urban area and we don't need another quango like Natural England to design green spaces (sang)either.

Let's have more meadows and woodlands with tracks please, and fewer houses round Bordon which has had plenty already, and more medical provision instead. You will have a lot of houses with young families all needing this kind of infrastructure provision!!

best wishes

It is my view an Anti-eco town is definitely this district does not need at all! Bordon urgently requires a railway station. In recent years, this town has seen several thousand hectares of tarmac laid. Including taxpayers' money being spent on moving the A325 to the west of Bordon High Street. The way new developments are happening at the moment will just add traffic to Farnham's already heavily congested Hinckley's Corner.

I phoned earlier today to ask if you could let me have a little more information on the location of the Tier 3 (small) settlement - some new development possible - small orange "blob" - at Bentley Station.

No one was available to help.

My comment - depending on the location - is that Station Road is already a busy road at peak Tims making it a dangerous road for pedestrians. I know this from first hand experience having been hit by a car door mirror. There is of course no footpath and no street lighting - and commuters race to catch their train. 40 mph seems a ridiculously high speed limit in the circumstances.

Cycleways: please provide safe segregated cycle ways between Horndean and Havant **and** from Clanfield to Horndean especially through Horndean centre which is the only route for school children to cycle on (currently on the road)

Plastic waste: why to EHDC not take a better range of plastic waste like other local councils do?

Flooding: please address regular flooding issues under the A3(M) at Horndean **and** at the bottom of WhiteDirt Lane, Clanfield.

The effects of Climate Change should dominate your plans and lead to their radical development. Please recognise the likelihood that our heavily-populated coastal areas will suffer permanent flooding in the near future, so please plan the extent to which Southern England will be progressively surrendered to the sea in the planning period. Please consider abandoning all plans for sea defences and instead plan successive new shorelines bordering higher ground. Behind the new shorelines, land use, infrastructure, population, economic activity and our means of survival, will require much larger-scale planning than at present.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PROPOSED CRICKET PITCH FOR HORNDEAN. AS PROMISED IN THE INITIAL PLAN FOR 700 HOUSES BY THE MOTORWAY. HOW CONVENIENT IT HAS DISAPPEARED.

Planning? What planning.?

We have already seen how clever planning is.

Four supermarkets within four blocks on the west side of Petersfield.

It's great! Residents from the east all travel in their cars sitting at closed train gates - engines running - carefully considering the pollution of course - Then if the jam down station road is too thick let's try town centre.

Oh no too difficult we will go via the Spain past the school no possible danger to children and then weave through the passing places to go via the hospital.

A green roof on Aldi is in lieu of all the car pollution and traffic which is generated. Very thoughtful for the environment indeed.

A thought for the over65s?

Yes they could very easily walk from the other side of town.

I don't see any planning here. It is all short termism!

Let's have proper consultation

Open meetings in halls where people can get together and discuss. Not everyone is tech.

I for one being over 65 find human interaction far more valuable than trying to get a machine to understand. Bring back proper meetings. Aldi planning got through during covid. How much real consultation was there?

Petersfield is a delightful market town and growing rapidly as are other towns. proper consideration

I agree and support the comments made by PeCan. Please May these come be recorded as my comments also.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

We strongly support the objections raised by SMASH regarding changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

I am writing to you today to object to any proposal to move Four Marks & Medstead up the local planning priority and I fully support the objections already lodged by the organisation known as SMASH.

I want to register my agreement and support for the objections and comments previously submitted by SMASH regarding the proposal to raise Four Marks and Medstead up the Settlement Hierarchy from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

Please be advised that I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

As with many of the residents of Medstead, I strongly agree with the views of the SMASH campaign of the changes to the local plan. Please register my objection to the changes to the local plan.

I strongly support SMASH'S objections of the changes to the settlement Hierachy Policy.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy. We can not keep taking more houses the environment will not cope with it.

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy.

Late in the day but my wife and I and many of my neighbours wish to endorse the comments of the above groups who are very concerned about the possible further destruction of Four Marks / South Medstead by excessive, unsustainable, unsuitable and unwanted further development despite the lack of any adequate infrastructure and certainly no 20 minute neighbourhood !

Mr Gove's letter and that of the Chairman of Council give us hope

I strongly support SMASH's objections to the changes to the Settlement Hierarchy Policy for Four Marks and Medstead.

Traffic lights in Liphook this week clearly demonstrated the need for access around the village not solely through the centre. It took me over 45mins to get from the A3 to the centre of the village .

In an emergency - fire, ambulance etc has no way to get round the jam without travelling miles even if they can get out to the A3 and maybe come in through Haslemere or Petersfield directions.

To consider building more houses here is absolutely irresponsible without making Liphook more easily accessible to services.

Why can'r EHDC get together with Highways and HCC to resolve this issue

On the funding page for local initiatives there is one entry for Liphook and multiple schemes for the other places, we are always at the end of the list

I am very unhappy that in 20 years of living here the council is maximising its revenue from Liphook from new housing but we are seeing little in return that would make a difference to living here

I am dismayed to hear that EHDC are considering changing its policy on the existing Settlement Hierarchy Policy (SHP) for our villages.

I understand that this policy states essentially that the more facilities a settlement has, which are accessible (on foot or cycle), the more sustainable it is deemed to be. The higher a settlement is up in the hierarchy the more likely it is to take considerably more housing.

I would point out that Four Marks is currently in Tier 3 which is defined as a small local service centre that is able to accommodate modest development to meet local needs. I remind you that the village has only a primary school (overcrowded), a modest collection of convenience shops, no pub, no upper school, and a half-hourly bus to either Winchester or Alton. The village is almost 3km long -spread along the A31 which is all single carriageway. So I would conclude that hardly anyone can walk to any of the village facilities, many are more likely to live more than 20 or even 30 minutes walk away, with steep inclines etc to boot. The result being a very high percentage of school-age children are driven to Four Marks school, and cars to the shops etc.. Finally, there is very poor access to parts of "south Medstead" the other side of the Watercress Railway due to the single-lane bridges over the line. I can thus agree that a Tier3 SHP rating is more appropriate, and that more housing in this village would be detrimental to the life here, with even more overcrowding, poor access to doctor, no NHS dentist, no social activities for youth etc.

In the new policy, I understand EHDC are proposing that Four Marks move UP the hierarchy (from Tier 3 to Tier 2), suggesting it is now a more sustainable location even though nothing materially has changed recently within the village, except more house building (recently 45 more houses were approved along Boyneswood Road).

As a comparison, EDHC is proposing to place Four Marks in the same tier as Horndean. I cannot see that this is fair or even remotely equivalent to equate Four Marks to the same Tier as Horndean, which has significantly more facilities, local employment hubs, a senior school and a large Morrison's supermarket, and the nearby junction to the A3(M). I cannot see how this comparison is fair or equitable, given the DE FACTO massive shortfall of infrastructure in Four Marks versus Horndean. Horndean has long been a fairly well-known place, while Four Marks is barely on the map, showing also that this Tier 2 selection would be unfair.

I have long suspected that the 2022-3 "local plan consultation" is just a circuitous way to re-examine the original "ten large sites" of the 2019 consultation, where several of the original preferred sites on that list have fallen by the wayside, to thereby raise the original four sites in and around Four Marks up the rankings and to therefore threaten the village with 600+ more homes. The fear I have is that EDHC will use this above proposed SHP change as part of the new Local Plan deliberations to justify building even more houses in Four Marks in the forthcoming Local Plan on top of the enormous number we have already taken over the last 9 years. This move, if it were to happen, would seem to therefore confirm my suspicions that EHDC are determined to find some way to land Four Marks with even more housing, when it has taken so many already and despite significant local opposition.

I feel that this SHP re-tiering proposal is wrong for Four Marks, wrong for Medstead, and I urge EGDC to drop this proposal. I would request that you acknowledge the receipt of this email and that due consideration of my letter will be undertaken. Thank you in anticipation.

I am writing to comment on the EHDC Local Plan.

In particular, I have reviewed the Local Plan consultation website, and 4 days to deadline, the responses have been paltry. 300 or so on some issues, 12 on one. This points to the abject FAILURE of EHDC to publicise and conduct their consultation. I hate to think of the expense of this process.

With such small responses across the 85,000 or so residents of East Hampshire District, any statistician would warn EHDC of the wisdom of relying on any of the responses to make pivotal critical decisions about the Local Plan (e.g. closing off one or other of the Development Options, adopting green policies etc).

I would like to point out some of the reasons from a resident's point of view why this consultation has failed.

Purpose of the consultation: First of all the notices and publicity was OK, but there were too few consultation sessions for people to attend, to even get to understand what EHDC are asking for and why. Where does this consultation lead? What are the concrete things residents can say that will influence the EHDC next steps? None of this was made clear. As time has gone on, my overriding feeling is this is just a pre-cursor to EHDC announcing what it wanted to do anyway. But somehow justifying that announcement by saying that people have had their say.

The website. I have spent considerable time to look through and respond to some of the "panels" on the consultation. This is the most obscured, complex and nearly useless consultation set-up I have ever come across. I regard myself as computer-literate, but found myself going round in circles and coming back to the same pages time and again. Most people would not have the patience to use this and give a response to all the issues (and those are only the issues EHDC think are important- there are many others). I fear this consultation will result in most people just clicking off and leaving no information for EHDC to use. This is a big factor why some "panels" in the consultation have had more responses than others. And mostly, why the overall numbers are so low. The whole consultation has been a waste of time and money, therefore. I fear EHDC have been "taken for a ride" by using commonplace engine. It is AWFUL. [What a barrier to getting residents involved!](#)

The responses allowed are "tick box" choices, and so people will pick the one that most fits their opinion, but they are not allowed to express that opinion discretely, there is no facility for that. The options given are all the choice people might have. It is a classic case, "ask the wrong question, get the wrong answer".

There is no mention of the intensely difficult choices that EHDC will have to make to meet the Government targets. It is vital to have people realise that this pits one settlement against another in where these houses are going to go. And so on. There is no attempt to explain this conundrum, to bring the residents along with you.

Whether these houses are "greener" than before, or somehow better planned, is almost irrelevant, it is the effect on local infrastructure that bothers most people- especially the residents moving into those new houses- they will have to get to work, local schools etc, and our roads are already reaching capacity. Existing residents see nothing but downsides, by more people coming in, swamping local infrastructure and facilities, adding to road congestion etc. That could explain why the response has been so low- you can only address existing residents, of course- but they are so fed up with the relentless tide of development, and their voices have been ignored so many times before, they have given

up trying to even bother telling EHDC, especially when the response process is lengthy, complex and far from easy. Turn off.

With the recent statement by Michael Gove to bring more flexible targets in place by legislation later this year, this should be welcomed by EHDC and allow a deliberate pause to the Local Plan preparation to allow the new targets to be put in place first, and that would radically change the outcome. It would ease these difficult choices, and mean that houses are not built unnecessarily or against local opinion etc.

The bottom line of the Consultation appears to be to decide how but not where development is going to be put in. Any development will have to be on green agricultural land, since we have so little brownfield sites in the district any more. This should be obvious to residents, but EHDC seem unable to state this bare fact to residents without dressing it up somehow. Don't insult our intelligence!

The Consultation was about generalities of local development, so the responses are only from people who understand planning, development and building things etc. I sincerely hope that once EHDC issues the draft Plan as a result, that the specific sites, plans or changes being proposed will galvanise locals to express their opinion. It is hard to generate critique, until there is something first. Surely this would have been obvious to EHDC when designing this Consultation.

I would say one thing: almost no one (bar developers) is excited about building more houses in rural East Hampshire.

A simple questionnaire with free-form answer boxes would be so much more effective and simpler to use. And then you might get a flavour of the local feelings, the anger, the passion, the worry, the concern, etc.

I have long held the opinion that the 2022-3 "Local Plan Consultation" is just a circuitous way to re-examine the original "ten large sites" of the 2019 Consultation, where several of the original preferred sites on that list have fallen by the wayside, perhaps due to access, flooding issues, local protests etc, to thereby raise the other sites in the list up the rankings. So where in 2019 a given site was low down due to critical planning factors etc, these will suddenly look OK, but yet NOTHING has changed with the site itself since then. Perhaps I am cynical, but I cannot see what else EHDC is trying to do, given the targets it must meet. But it will result in sub-standard housing (high density, poor access, low sustainability etc) in some of the least suitable sites in the District, building over some of the most beautiful land and Valued Landscapes, spoiling stunning vistas, adding nothing but downsides to locals and new residents alike, with poor infrastructure and transport access. Whereas there may be other Development Options like a full Garden Village idea with several 1000's of houses and planned built-early-on infrastructure, placed in a location close to local rail and trunk roads might be a better alternative. But this was not one of the Options in the "DEV" section.

I have never been more worried about the future of the environment of East Hampshire. I have lived here 37 years, and over that time, there has been a steady erosion in quality of rural life here, but this time, I see only a quantum drop in overall quality of life, especially close to any proposed larger sites, but even in smaller dispersed sites within outlying villages etc.

As you know we are still very unhappy about the revised settlement hierarchy document. The question I asked you about it in my last email, related not to a **name** for each tier but a **definition** of each tier. Obviously, at the moment the planners when looking at

applications for new house building in the Four Marks & Medstead area always refer to the villages being deemed as a "Small Local Service Centre" which as you know means, that *"they have a more limited range of services but are suitable locations to accommodate some new development. These centres will have different roles depending on their size, but they will all play an important part in the life of their communities. They will be maintained to ensure that they provide basic food and grocery shopping, supported by a limited choice and range of other shops plus a range of non-retail services and community uses. Modest development to meet local needs for housing, employment, community services and infrastructure will secure their continuing vitality and thriving communities"*. This designation is totally the right one for our 2 villages and helps the planners, with reference to CP2 & CP19 in their attempt to resist large and inappropriate developments here, all of which are outside the settlement policy boundary. By moving our villages up the hierarchy (incorrectly in our view) and then giving no definition of what the tiers mean, then we strongly believe that you are literally opening us up to mass urban style housing developments which will completely destroy the character of these 2 villages. This is what we are fighting for!

In addition, I take issue with your score boundaries. It looks like you've done the scoring for each settlement first and then gone on to decide where the boundaries for each tier will be, instead of deciding the tier boundaries first i.e. equal sized bands (up to a score of 40 as described in paragraph 4.4 of the Settlement Hierarchy paper) and then subsequently populating the results for each settlement.

I would suggest a more logical and appropriate boundary demarcation would be:

Tier 1: 31 - 40

Tier 2: 21 - 30

Tier 3: 11 - 20

Tier 4: 1 - 10

Tier 5: 0

This would then put Horndean in Tier 2 and Four Marks in Tier 3, which I would argue is much more appropriate. I say this because, looking at your 20-minute neighbourhood maps for each settlement, then yes, we could walk to our limited number of shops on the A31 and then on to our small employment hub on Station Approach, but not to either of the 2 primary schools. We recently visited Horndean ourselves to see what facilities they had and then looked at your 20-minute neighbourhood map for the location. From it you can see that the local centre, the big Morrisons Supermarket, the secondary school, 2 of the primary schools and several employment hubs, including Hazleton Industrial Estate which must employ hundreds of people are all within the 20-minute neighbourhood zone thus allowing for multiple linked journeys. There is NO comparison. Then when you also consider the additional written explanation in the document of why Four Marks doesn't actually "fit" the model anyway, this just feels like total manipulation of the data to deliberately move our villages up a tier and therefore "give the green light" for significantly more housing on top of the excessive amount we have seen here already! We are not arguing about the scores for each settlement, they are fact based, it is the arbitrary tier boundaries that we believe are wrong. If you amended them to the fairer and more logical ones that I have proposed, then the current definitions would still remain more or less correct. We will go on fighting our corner on this one as we know that this paper is wrong and unfair. As you have suggested, we will be adding all our concerns to the consultation in due course and sharing our views with the local residents and other interested parties.

Changing the subject now I should also like to comment about the standard method of calculation for the overall housing need as I know you have also looked at alternative methods to the standard one. I would appreciate your thoughts about it.

When the affordability ratio is calculated it uses the median house price of £415,000 in EH and an income of £28,603. However, why isn't a weighted average for income used. I say this because, all these new households being formed are not all made up of one person households; in fact I would suggest that 1 person households would be the minority, (although you may get some divorcees, of course) but I would suggest that the majority of new households would be made up of new working couples in their 20's or 30's renting or buying together for the first time. I'm sure there must be data on this.

So, for the income part of the calculation, shouldn't we be taking this more realistic scenario into account and thus using a combined household income depending on the make-up of these new households (1 person or 2 person). So, for 1 person, the earned income figure would be £28,603 and for 2 person households the household income figure would be £35,082 (The HEDNA states the combined household income of newly forming households is approximately 84% of the figure for all households (i.e £41,764 x 0.84 = £35,082) and then use these figures in a weighted average?

So, for example if 25% of new households were made up of 1 person and 75% were made up of 2 persons, then wouldn't it be more appropriate to use a household income figure (with reference to the HEDNA) of £33,464

ie $(£28,608 \times 0.25 \text{ [from 25\% single person household]}) + (£35,082 \times 0.75 \text{ [from 75\% 2 person households]}) = £33,464$

This would then make the affordability ratio not 14.51 but 12.4 and therefore giving an adjustment factor of 153% (not 166%) which then calculates to be an annual housing need of 583 (not 632), a reduction of 49 per year. See table below.

For the whole of EH District

INCOME	AFFORDABILITY RATIO	ANNUAL HOUSING NUMBER
£28,603 for 1 person new household	14.51	632
£35,082 EXISTING for 2 person new household		
£33,464 WEIGHTED (i.e.25% 1 person & 75% 2 person household)	12.40	583

I may just be crazy here and missing something obvious or interpreting the data incorrectly, but I would be interested in any comments you may have about the above.