

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ERECTION OF 44 NO. APARTMENTS FOR OLDER PEOPLE

SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE

SITE OF THE RISE AND THREE NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES, STANFORD HILL, LYMINGTON

ON BEHALF OF RENAISSANCE RETIREMENT LIMITED

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

Prepared by: Chris Cox

Pegasus Group

First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL
T 01454 625945 | **F** 01454 618074 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | Dublin | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Newcastle | Peterborough

DESIGN | **ENVIRONMENT** | **PLANNING** | **ECONOMICS** | **HERITAGE**

1. PROFESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT

- 1.1 I am Chris Cox BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI and I am an Associate Planner at Pegasus Group, Bristol.
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Science in Geography and Planning from the University of Birmingham, and a Masters of Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Central England. I have been a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute since 2008. I have over 15 years of planning experience, mostly in the private sector. I specialise in the residential development sector, including care and older person's accommodation.
- 1.3 The evidence which I have prepared and provided in this proof of evidence is true and is given in accordance with the guidance of the Royal Town Planning Institute. The opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.
- 1.4 My Proof of Evidence deals with the appeal against the decision of the New Forest District Council to refuse planning permission (reference 20/10481) at the site of The Rise and three neighbouring properties, Stanford Hill, Lymington.
- 1.5 My evidence is concerned with planning policy therefore touches on all refusal reasons but has a particular emphasis on reason for refusal 1, concerning sustainable development. It deals with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and how the various considerations are to be weighed into the 'planning balance'. Detailed evidence on the other matters is provided by the following specialists:
- Mr Laurie Marlow – Design;
 - Mr Andy Williams – Design and Townscape;
 - Mr Jason Clemons – Heritage;
 - Mr Nigel Appleton- Specialist Housing for Older People; and
 - Mr Tim Goodwin - Ecology

- 1.6 It is the appellant's case that the appeal Proposal represents sustainable development within a location which is both accessible and appropriate for development, in accordance with Policy STR1.
- 1.7 My evidence also demonstrates that the proposal accords with the relevant design related planning policy and guidance, including policy ENV3 of the New Forest Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy (July 2020), the Lymington Local Distinctiveness SPD and paragraph 127 and 130 of the NPPF.
- 1.8 Mr Clemons concludes that the proposed development causes no harm to designated heritage assets, but notwithstanding this, my evidence demonstrates that the Proposal will deliver a range of public benefits. If the Inspector were to find that there is less than substantial harm, a proper application of the test at paragraph 196 of the NPPF will lead to a conclusion that the public benefits of the Proposal far outweigh any less than substantial harm.
- 1.9 For clarity, the public benefits of the Proposal include:
- The provision of housing where the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land;
 - Providing specialist housing for older people where there is an identified "significant need" for such accommodation;
 - Reducing demands on healthcare and savings to the NHS;
 - Promoting the physical and mental health of future residents, including reducing loneliness;
 - Freeing up family housing;
 - Economic benefits, including increased spending in local shops;
 - Economic benefits through construction and throughout the lifetime of the development;
 - Making efficient use of land to provide housing close to services and facilities; and

- An on-site biodiversity net gain.

1.10 One of the fundamental objectives of the NPPF is to boost the supply of housing. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and the 'tilted balance' is engaged. In these circumstances, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and planning permission should be granted without delay unless any adverse impacts of doing so would "significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits", when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole".

1.11 In addition to the sustainability related merits of the site's location that demonstrate accordance with Policy STR1, I consider that the proposal will create the following impacts, which are relevant to assessing the proposal under the 'tilted balance':

Social

Net increase of new homes to address a deficit in the Council's **Very Significant**

HLS

Benefit

Provision of new housing in a sustainable location

Significant Benefit

Provision of specialist housing to meet an identified

Significant Benefit

'significant' need

Promoting physical and mental wellbeing of residents

Moderate Benefit

Economic

Increased local spending

Moderate Benefit

Employment generated by construction

Moderate Benefit

Employment generated during operational phase

Moderate Benefit

Economic benefits to NHS and government services

Moderate Benefit

arising from improved health of residents

Boosting the housing market & freeing up family homes **Moderate Benefit**

Environmental

Re-use of a (part) brownfield site **Moderate Benefit**

Focusing development at a sustainable location **Moderate Benefit**

Accessible location reducing reliance on the car **Minor Benefit**

On-Site landscaping and open space **Minor Benefit**

On-Site Biodiversity net gain **Minor Benefit**

Achieving High Quality Design **Minor Benefit**

Impact on Solent SPA **Neutral**

Heritage Impact **Neutral**

Other environmental impacts **Neutral**

Additional transport movements **Minor Adverse Impact**

1.12 The three dimensions of sustainable development have been assessed and it is concluded that not only do the adverse impacts not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole, but very limited adverse impacts are identified at all, and the benefits clearly outweigh any harm.

1.13 I consider that the Proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan. The 'straight' planning balance exercise is that even if there is found to be limited conflict with the Development Plan, the benefits and other material considerations far outweigh this limited harm.