



## Request for Repetition of Public Consultation on the Local Development Plan

---

Dear Planning Department,

I am writing to formally request a repetition of the public consultation process on the Local Development Plan (LDP) for East Hampshire. This request is grounded in several substantial concerns and newly identified issues that impact the integrity and comprehensiveness of the consultation process.

### 1. Inaccurate Housing Land Supply Calculations

The council's housing land supply calculations, as detailed in the Pegasus report for Bargate Homes (Planning Application Number 55318/001), were proven incorrect.

This fundamental inaccuracy undermines the reliability of the data used during the consultation process. Furthermore, these calculations are still under question, necessitating a re-evaluation to ensure accurate and reliable data presentation.

Specifically, the appeal decision at Four Marks (Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/23/3329928) highlighted errors that led to the council's deliverable supply being overestimated. An Inspector confirmed that 204 dwellings should be deleted from the supply as the Council's assumptions lacked evidence from housebuilders themselves.

The implications of these findings directly affect the Local Development Plan, which relies on these calculations to justify new developments under paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

Therefore, ensuring the accuracy and reliability of these calculations is critical for maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of the Local Development Plan.

### 2. Incorrect Parish Classification

It has come to our attention that a plot of land included in the consulted version of the document was incorrectly classified to Four Marks Parish instead of Medstead. This misclassification could have significantly influenced the outcomes of the consultation process and the public's ability to provide informed feedback.



---

### 3. Inadequate Public Awareness

---

Many residents were unaware of the initial consultation process. This lack of awareness likely limited the extent of public participation and the diversity of opinions considered. An inclusive consultation process is critical for ensuring that the Local Development Plan reflects the needs and concerns of all community members.

---

### 4. Lack of Comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

---

It is our understanding that the population increase in Medstead, resulting from past developments, did not undergo a single comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). This oversight could have significant implications for current and future developments. Additionally, we stipulate that the population growth was not adequately taken into consideration in the planning process. This new fact is critical and should be considered in the consultation process.

Given these substantial concerns, we respectfully request that East Hampshire District Council repeat the public consultation process for the Local Development Plan. This repetition should ensure that all residents are adequately informed and able to participate, and that all data and classifications are accurate and up-to-date.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. We look forward to your prompt response and to participating in a more comprehensive and accurate consultation process.



## KEY CONCERNS

### Accuracy and Transparency of Housing Supply Data

#### **Discrepancies in Housing Supply Estimates:**

The Housing Land Supply Assessment prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Bargate Homes identifies significant errors in the Council's calculation of the deliverable housing supply. The assessment for the recent Four Marks appeal demonstrated that the Council's figures were inaccurate, showing a supply of 1,994 homes instead of the 2,198 claimed. Pegasus Group's further review suggests even more substantial discrepancies, reducing the deliverable supply to 1,608 homes, equating to only a 3.47-year supply. These errors question the reliability of the Council's data and the transparency of the process.

### Procedural Integrity and Public Trust

#### **Draft Local Development Plan Classification Error:**

The version of the draft local development plan shared with us on 1st May 2024, after the consultation was completed, incorrectly classified a plot of land as being in Four Marks instead of Medstead. This error could misguide planning considerations and demonstrates a lack of accuracy in the planning process.

### Misleading Housing Supply Figures:

The failure to provide actual and relevant figures regarding the current and estimated population increase due to recent developments (which have increased the village population by over 40% in recent decades) suggests a lack of transparency and accuracy.

### Cumulative Environmental Impact

#### **Absence of Full Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA):**

Despite the significant population growth and development in Medstead, there has been no comprehensive EIA to assess the cumulative impacts. The lack of such assessments fails to address the cumulative significance of multiple developments.



---

### Impact on Local Infrastructure and Services:

The continuous development without comprehensive EIAs or consideration of cumulative impacts puts significant strain on local infrastructure and services, adversely affecting the community's quality of life and sustainability.

---

### Need for Independent Audit

#### Independent Audit of EHDC Planning Procedures:

Given the significant procedural deficiencies identified, there is a need for an independent audit of the EHDC's planning application procedures. This audit should assess data accuracy, transparency, procedural integrity, and the impartiality of assessments provided by developers.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized monogram or initials.

Yours sincerely,

Note: For privacy reasons, all personal information including a signature has been attached as a separate document.

---

### References

- [HOUSING LAND SUPPLY ASSESSMENT-1335961.PDF](#)
- [FOI – REF-191888-D3L9 – EHDC SPREADSHEET “DWELLINGS COMPLETIONS IN FOUR MARKS AND MEDSTEAD BETWEEN 2011 AND 2023 \(APR-MAR\) BY PARISH](#) – contains a potential error for 2018-2019, as it includes Alton CP in a report regarding Four Marks and Medstead Parish.
- [OBJECTION – 20240623 – 01 – CORE.PDF – on page 2](#), there is a screenshot illustrating the incorrect classification of a plot of land that is part of Medstead as Four Marks.
- [FOI – REF-191888-D3L9 – LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN](#)