

ONLINE CONSULTEE RESPONSE ON PLANING APPLICATION 20/10481
RELATING TO THE SITE OF THE RISE AND THREE NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES
ON STANFORD HILL, LYMINGTON SO41 8DE
COMMENTS OF LYMINGTON AND PENINGTON TOWN COUNCIL

I am Andy Ash-Vie, Chair of the Lymington and Pennington Town Council Planning Committee. I have been authorised to set out a summary of our objections to this Application.

1. It does not meet the housing needs of the town. We already have ample provision of upmarket retirement properties. (see Policy 18 of the Local Plan). The Town Council is acutely aware of the shortage of affordable housing (Policy 17) which targets 50% affordable housing and must take precedence. Any plan for this site must meet the requirements of Policy 17 but this application makes absolutely no contribution to affordable housing.
2. This is over-development calling for a very large building in dominating close proximity to the neighbouring properties, particularly Nos. 14 and 15 Bucklers Mews and Concorde, resulting in an unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy.
3. The scale and bulk of the proposed development is entirely out of character and utterly inappropriate to the nearby listed buildings and Conservation Area.
4. It impacts on the approach to Lymington as it is too imposing and bulky. The ridge heights are higher than the established ones making the building over-bearing and an unwelcoming approach to the town.
5. We attach considerable importance to the Local Distinctiveness SPD and its design guidance. The SPD notes that Stanford Hill comprises of large houses in good sized plots each with a garden setting proportionate to the mass of the building and advises that the spatial setting is most important. The scale of the proposed building fails to respect the SPD.
6. There are insufficient parking spaces for residents and visitors, resulting in extra parking pressure on streets where there are very few spaces. (From personal experience, I often had problems parking at Buckler's Court when visiting my father, people were parking on pavements then (2012))
7. We are extremely concerned about the safety of traffic entering the site from the eastbound carriageway of the A337 to cross the very busy westbound carriageway. There are often police speed cameras on that stretch so they recognise it as a danger.
8. The location of the electricity sub-station impinges on the resident's right to quiet living without background noise and emissions.
9. The Ecology Report recommends refusal of the package treatment plant as inappropriate for mitigating nitrate. It will not meet Environment Agency regulations.

10. The trees on the site are threatened and the application does not support Conservation Species and Habitat Regulation 2017.
11. There is no mitigation for existing flooding problems on Stanford Hill and Belmore Road.(Again from personal experience there is often rainwater flooding at the junction of Belmore Road, more hard standing is only make matters worse.)
12. Overall Lymington has a glut of these properties. As of yesterday, according to just one_property website there were 50 retirement properties on the market. Another example, Knights Close, a comparable development marketed since June 2018 is still only at 40% occupancy and had to apply for an extension of planning permission for their marketing material as they were not selling. Simply put, there are too many of these properties in this town.

Councillor Andrew Peter Ash-Vie

11th May 2021