

[REDACTED]
Subject: Comments on the Ashurst Hospital Proposed Development

Date: 2 March 2019 at 12:07:28 GMT

To: "bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com" <bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com>

Dear Chris Banks,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ashurst Hospital proposed development.

Accordingly please see below my comments made against each of your key questions:

1. It seems to me that the specific types of housing proposed are just a means to an end. That is to enable the site to be developed, Class C2 and Class C3 have been selected as having the best chance of getting planning approval.
2. The NFNPA affordable housing examination statement makes a brief reference to the provision of extra care housing at the former Lyndhurst Park Hotel site. I don't remember reading that the National Park specifically mentions provision of Class C2 or for that matter Class C3. With regard specifically to Class C2 in Ashurst helping to meet the overall housing need, there is I believe a case to be made. If say you move someone out of their home into a care home, this brings their former home back to the market. That said I personally don't think its that simple and other factors come into play, which in practice delay the release of the property.
3. Yes there is a case to be made for specifically including Class C3 in the policy. But since the Lyndhurst Park Hotel proposal has recently been withdrawn, I don't think attempting to make a comparison of Class C3 between the two sites is any longer meaningful.
4. Obviously the mere fact that more people will be brought into the area will have an adverse effect. But in this instance in the case of the Class C2 development, if they are, how shall I put this, not in the first flush of youth, they are less likely to be out walking across the SPA's. I'm not sure the same can be said of the proposed Class C3 development, as the some of the occupiers could well be much younger and therefore more mobile. Also as on other sites a Section 106 preventing them owning pets may go some way to mitigating the effect of extra predation stemming from the development. How effective this will be remains to be seen!
5. It seems that Policy XX attempts to minimise the effects of development on the site, whilst trying to ensure it meet local affordable housing needs. I'm not sure if it goes far enough in stressing the need for the affordable housing to remain in perpetuity.
6. In my view any housing development in a National Park will always have an adverse effect. So my preference would be to return the site to green field. That said a case could probably be made for affordable housing especially if the site were to be included within the Ashurst settlement boundary and therefore could count towards its contribution to meeting local housing needs.

Your sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]