

Re: Case Details

Appeal Reference: [APP/D1265/W/25/3372602](#)

Appeal by: Churchill Living Ltd

Appeal Site Address: Land to the rear of 156-172, Bridport

I am against the appeal proposals for the same reasons given in my objection dated 3/11/24 and in the Dorset Council Officer's report dated December 2024.

I would like to submit further comments based on new information.

NPPF Dec 2024

The Statement of Case asserts that the appellant wishes to use a change in the NPPF rules of December 2024, together with the expiry of the current 5-year local plan to have their appeal granted.

I do not believe they have demonstrated sufficient grounds to rely on paragraph 11 to use this argument given that a new Local Plan that is in development and the proposed 73 units do not address the housing needs of Bridport or its wider community.

Paragraph 11(d)(ii) makes it clear that granting permission can be refused where adverse impacts of allowing the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. The appellant has not met this threshold.

This is demonstrated by the case of Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/23/3317173 17 & 19 Holly Road South, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 1NQ where it was ruled:

“The proposal would be acceptable in terms of drainage and flood risk and the living conditions of nearby occupiers. However, neither these matters, nor the benefits of the proposal set out above, would outweigh the harm I have found in relation to affordable housing provision and local health services, to parking provision, highway capacity and safety, and, to the character and appearance of the area”.

Affordable housing, local health services, parking provision, highway capacity and safety and character and appearance of the area are also relevant to this application and have not been satisfied to prevent an adverse impact on the community.

New Relevant Information

Housing Supply

This site as proposed does not fulfil the housing requirements of Bridport residents in respect of either the need for affordable housing or open market down-sizing retirees.

Affordable Housing

- There is no provision for affordable housing on this site despite a demand and need for affordable housing in Bridport.
- Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan shows that local people need housing that they can afford, whether to buy or securely rent.
- Mosaic Demographic Data from the 2021 Census shows that there is a specific need in Bridport for rental properties for younger people which this application does not meet.
- Currently there are 187 active Housing Register applications where the primary applicant is aged 60 or over and have stated Bridport as their preferred area or one of their preferred areas (Source: Dorset Council 27 Oct 25).
- Had 35% (26 units) of the site been allocated to affordable housing for this demographic it would have made a small but significant difference to the waiting list.

Open Market Down-Sizing Retirees

- Churchill state that these properties suit retirees downsizing and therefore free up larger properties for families to move into.
- This contradicts the data and demographics that Mosaic (Census 2021) identified for Bridport / West Dorset and the latest commentary from McCarthy & Stone (UK market leader in retirement living), Home Owners Alliance and NHBC (source 13 Oct 2025 www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/markets/article-15185441/Build-bungalows-free-market-says-McCarthy-Stone-boss.html)
- Mosaic Data from the Census 2021 shows that Bridport (and West Dorset) retired homeowners are not the demographic to want retirement flats / complexes. They fall into groups who want to remain in their own homes or move to a bungalow, enjoying retirement with their grandchildren and gardening. Many like to remain in village communities. The 35% of residents who are over 65 fall into the demographic that enjoy their outside space.
<https://gi.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/insights/areaprofiles/Town/bridport>
- This is still the case in 2025:
 - o McCarthy & Stone Chief Executive has called for a return to building bungalows – going as far to say the revival of bungalows is at the heart of his solution to ‘unlock’ the stagnant housing market.
 - o HomeOwners Alliance stated 1.2m over 55s have abandoned plans to move in the last 2 years, with a third stating lack of suitable properties as the reason
 - o NHBC report that 5m older people want to move to a bungalow – 9m pensioners want more built.
 - o Source: www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/markets/article-15185441/Build-bungalows-free-market-says-McCarthy-Stone-boss.html)

As demonstrated above the proposed 73 units of retirement flats and 2 storey homes do not meet the demands of Bridport / West Dorset retirees, be it those (of any age) who need affordable rental homes, or those who may consider down-sizing and freeing up family homes. For this reason, the appeal should be rejected.

Local Health Services

Given the age demographic of the residents, and the fact that already evidenced they are unlikely to be existing Bridport residents there will be added strain on the GP service, and an increase disproportionately to the rest of the population due to the age. More GP / Pharmacy / Dental / Hospital appointments/ District Nurse or Carer appointments will be needed.

- Every week there are health workers seeking help finding accommodation on social media for themselves or employees.
- Many are priced out of the market and recent further reductions to public transport and running costs of own vehicles mean that they have to live in Bridport to be able to work in Bridport.
- Typically health workers aren't paid well and need the supply of affordable housing (which already established isn't being provided).
- Bridport has already suffered the closure of one pharmacy - JHoots – reducing the ability of the Pharmacy First advice service and placing a huge strain on the remaining 2 pharmacies
- The nearest acute hospital for A&E and most outpatient appointments are in Dorchester or Weymouth, each some 15 miles away.
- Public transport is not reliable enough for medical appointments. Each year the timetable and number of buses are trimmed due to cost constraints.
- The elderly often require a care package to live independently. This is not a service provided by Churchill and so residents will have to provide their own.
- Four locally based care agencies already have vacancies based on needs for the current population.
- The ability to recruit staff revolves around the shortage of suitable housing and high costs of such accommodation.
- This has even affected Dentist recruitment in town, where appeals have been put out for accommodation for dentists wishing to accept job offers in Bridport. It should be noted that Bridport has no open lists for NHS dentists.

Due to the impact on Local Health Services and the struggles it will have to accommodate the specific needs of this demographic this appeal should be rejected.

Parking Provisions

There are insufficient parking spaces available for this development, especially when taken into consideration the proximity of other residents and businesses who already struggle with parking limitations. Outside of the estate there is no “overflow” parking facility.

- There are no identifiable disabled parking spaces on the site at all (houses or flats). There should be a minimum of 5% and given the age range of the expected residents it could be argued that there should be more than 5%. Looking at the site plan it does not appear to be easy to increase the size of spaces to meet

disabled sizing requirements without reducing the number of spaces which is already too low.

- Despite commentary by the Urban Design Officer there appears to be no provision for EV charging spaces.
- Whilst note has been taken of the Urban Design Officer's concern re lack of parking, there is still insufficient parking, and green spaces have been removed to either provide more parking spaces or widen the pavement.
- Widening the pavement does not address the concerns that cars will park indiscriminately over curbs / straddling pavements.
- There are only 17 spaces for the 48 flats – and yet 81.3% of households in Bridport own a vehicle (2021 census).
- It is also below Dorset Council recommended level of parking spaces which recommends 32 unallocated spaces and 5 visitor spaces for 48 flats. (Source: www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/car-and-cycle-parking-standards)
- 2021 Census shows that 77% of households aged 65-74, and 54% of households over the age of 75 owned one or more cars.
- This demonstrates that 17 spaces for 48 flats is inadequate
- Given the geographical locations of hospitals already highlighted and without access to regular reliable public transport residents are likely to want to remain car owners as long as possible.
- In the Public Inquiry Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/23/3317173 - it was noted by the planning inspector that:
 - o Whilst clear that fewer households over 75 own a car – more than half still do, and that would be in excess of the parking spaces to flats ration proposed.
 - o The units can be occupied by over 60s, (and over 55 where one party is over 60) and it is likely that car ownership in this cohort would be significantly higher than over 75s.

Due to the lack of parking provision and not addressing the issues that have been raised adequately, together with allowing for no disabled spaces or EV spaces, or room to accommodate these this appeal should be rejected.

Character and Appearance

In my original objection I commented on how this development does not complement or respect the character of the area. My views on this have not altered. However, I am concerned that in addition to this the site itself lacks cohesion.

- The revised design doesn't really satisfy any demographic or demonstrate why affordable housing has not been included.

- The original application stated it was for sheltered accommodation, however both the new site plan, and the Churchill-Living website make it clear the houses are stand-alone and state:
 - o You have the option to be part of the main Lodge community if you wish via a small club membership fee which allows you to benefit from the community activities and events, but this is completely optional. (Source: www.churchill-living.co.uk/retirement-apartments-for-sale/dorset/bridport-cottages/?_gl=1*4crpcn*_up*MQ..&gclid=EAlalQobChMI1uSlzNrBkAMVII tQBh3loyGWEAAYASAAEgl3WfD_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds&gbraid=0AAAAADE3 WWK6o3d0tLyBO5bMuAcKngNB2)
- Whilst there is a fee for communal gardens, window cleaning and an alarm system, these fees are not unique to the over 60+ market, lots of new estates include them. Many householders of all ages subscribe to services such as Verisure Alarms, which include medical emergency call out.
- As mentioned earlier green spaces have been removed to make way for wider pavements and extra parking for cottages and visitors
- With all these changes the development is starting to look like any road made up of individual houses, with some apartments, too many cars for the spaces and a lot of concrete floor space, not providing the community Churchill promote.

Since first submitting an objection, not only does it not have a harmonious fit with neighbouring properties, but there also isn't a harmonious fit between the cottages and the apartments. Nothing that makes it warrant a development for retirement living especially when the properties do not meet the design requirements (e.g. bungalows) of Bridport retirees. For these reasons the appeal should be refused.

Joanne McGhee
 24 Manor Fields
 DT6 4DB