



Wesley House, Bull Hill,
Leatherhead KT22 7AH

01372 365064
07748 842025
adrian@qedplanning.co.uk
www.qedplanning.co.uk

SENT BY EMAIL

David Huckfield
Planning & Environment
Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh,
SO50 9YN

Our Ref 18323/7

4 September 2026

Dear David,

4 Oakwood Road, Chandlers Ford, SO53 1LU

Planning Application F/26/101367

Planning Statement Addendum

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Further to our recent correspondence, I write on behalf of Liaise Group Limited to provide further information in support of the above planning application.
- 1.2 As you will recall, the application seeks permission for the change of use / conversion of the existing dwelling and associated garage to provide residential accommodation for up to six adults with learning disabilities and support needs, together with associated communal facilities, staff room/office and parking (Use Class C2).
- 1.3 The application was originally submitted in May 2026 and was accompanied by a Planning Statement, Operational Management Plan, Transport Note, Travel Plan Statement and associated plans. As set out in the original Planning Statement, the intention is to provide small-scale specialist residential accommodation within an ordinary domestic environment, enabling up to six adults with learning disabilities and support needs to live as independently as possible whilst having access to the care and support they require.
- 1.4 Following your email of 17 August 2026, further consideration has been given to the operational characteristics of the proposed use and, in particular, the concerns raised regarding staffing, vehicle movements and the potential consequential effects upon the character of the area and amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 1.5 In response, the following additional information is submitted alongside this Planning Statement Addendum:

- Addendum Transport Note, Paul Basham Associates, September 2026.
- Site-Specific Operational Information – Addendum to Liaise Operational Management Plan, September 2026.

- 1.6 This Planning Statement Addendum provides an overarching planning assessment of that additional information. The PBA Addendum Transport Note and Liaise Operational Addendum should therefore be read as supporting documents to this letter and alongside the original application documentation. They do not alter the nature of the proposed development but provide greater detail and clarification as to how 4 Oakwood Road would operate in practice.
- 1.7 In addition, since submission of the application the Government has published a revised National Planning Policy Framework in August 2026. The revised Framework is an important material consideration and introduces a strengthened national policy context in relation to meeting identified accommodation needs, including the needs of disabled people. This provides a further reason for reassessing the proposal in light of the updated information now before the Council. The August 2026 Framework expressly replaces the December 2024 version and its national decision-making policies apply to decisions on development proposals.

2.0 Matters Raised by the Council

- 2.1 It is useful at the outset to identify the relatively narrow nature of the outstanding concerns.
- 2.2 Your email accepts that there is a general need for accommodation of the type proposed. It also acknowledges that the existing substantial dwelling could accommodate a large or potentially multi-generational household with several vehicles and different patterns of movement and that the property could alternatively be occupied as a House in Multiple Occupation for up to six residents without requiring express planning permission.
- 2.3 Furthermore, Hampshire County Council, as Local Highway Authority, raises no objection to the application. In its consultation response HCC describes the existing access as suitable for the proposed low-level trip-generating use, accepts the five-space parking provision and considers a 75% staff car mode share to represent a reasonable and robust assumption. It also accepts that limited short-term visitor parking could be accommodated on Oakwood Road without creating a justified highway safety concern.
- 2.4 The Council's Environmental Health team similarly raises no objection. Of particular relevance to the remaining concern regarding residential amenity, the Council's Environmental Health response concluded that, in noise terms, the proposed use would be similar to a normal household residential operation and is therefore acceptable.
- 2.5 Accordingly, the remaining concern is not understood to relate to highway safety, highway capacity, parking standards or an identified environmental health impact. Rather, it relates principally to whether the staffing arrangements and associated comings and goings would result in an intensity or character of use which would cause material disturbance to neighbouring occupiers or otherwise conflict with the prevailing residential character of the area.

- 2.6 The additional information has been prepared specifically to address that matter.

3.0 Clarified Operational Arrangements

- 3.1 The accompanying Site-Specific Operational Information prepared by Liaise should be referred to for the detailed operational position. Importantly, as requested, it relates specifically to 4 Oakwood Road rather than describing Liaise homes more generally.
- 3.2 The Operational Addendum confirms that the property would operate as a small-scale residential home for a maximum of six adults with learning disabilities and support needs. The residents would occupy the property as their permanent home. It would not operate as a clinic, day centre, hostel or facility to which members of the public routinely travel.
- 3.3 Each resident would have their own bedroom and en-suite bathroom together with access to shared kitchen, dining, lounge and garden areas. Care would be provided on a person-centred basis according to each resident's assessed needs. The essential character of the occupation would therefore remain residential, albeit with the additional care and support required to enable the residents to live safely and successfully within the community.
- 3.4 The Operational Addendum also clarifies the staffing arrangements and, importantly, how staff handovers would occur. Incoming and outgoing staff would not arrive and depart as two complete groups simultaneously. Changeovers would instead be staggered, allowing appropriate handover between staff whilst avoiding a concentrated arrival or departure event.
- 3.5 This is relevant when considering the perceived intensity of the use. The maximum staffing figure should not therefore be interpreted as meaning that a complete group of staff would arrive together and subsequently be replaced simultaneously by another group. The operational arrangements are structured specifically to avoid that occurring.
- 3.6 For clarity, some of the shift times and changeover arrangements referred to in the original application documents were indicative and were not expressed consistently across the submission. The site-specific arrangements now set out in the Liaise Operational Addendum and assessed within the Addendum Transport Note supersede those earlier assumptions and provide the definitive basis upon which the proposed operation should be assessed. In particular, they confirm continuous 24-hour staffing with managed and staggered changeovers and no gap in care provision between shifts.
- 3.7 The Operational Addendum also provides further information regarding family visitors, professional visits and servicing. Family and friends would visit residents in the same manner as visitors to ordinary residential accommodation. There would be no public visiting hours or organised group visiting sessions. Professional visits would be occasional and generally pre-arranged, whilst deliveries would be domestic in nature and comprise ordinary grocery, household and parcel deliveries and occasional maintenance attendance. Moreover, the home is not a nursing facility and is not expected to generate significant routine clinical waste, with ordinary household waste and recycling continuing to be managed through normal domestic collection arrangements.
- 3.8 The home would be overseen by an identified Registered Manager, supported by Liaise's wider operational management structure. The Registered Manager would have responsibility for staffing, travel and parking arrangements and neighbour liaison. A specific local contact and

formal complaints route would be available and operational arrangements would be monitored following occupation.

- 3.9 The presence of trained staff therefore provides a degree of active management which would not ordinarily exist within an unrestricted residential use. The Operational Addendum explains that this enables any concerns to be identified and addressed promptly and provides an additional mechanism through which neighbouring amenity can be protected.

4.0 Updated Transport Assessment

- 4.1 The accompanying Addendum Transport Note prepared by Paul Basham Associates should similarly be referred to for the detailed transport assessment of the scheme.
- 4.2 The Addendum does not revisit matters which have already been accepted by the Local Highway Authority. Instead, it provides further context concerning the actual timing and distribution of movements associated with the proposed use and responds directly to the matters subsequently raised.
- 4.3 The assessment demonstrates that staff arrivals and departures would be staggered rather than concentrated. A 24-hour staffing and movement profile has now been provided, allowing the actual likely pattern of activity throughout the day to be understood rather than simply considering an overall daily trip total.
- 4.4 On the assumptions assessed by PBA, no more than four vehicle movements would occur within any single hourly period. This is important not merely from a highway perspective but also in assessing the separate concern regarding residential amenity. It demonstrates that the development would not involve substantial groups of staff arriving or departing simultaneously but rather a dispersed pattern of relatively low-level movements.
- 4.5 The Addendum Transport Note also provides further context to the original TRICS comparison. The original assessment adopted an average trip rate for an individual dwelling. As PBA now explains, this is an average across a broad sample of dwellings and does not necessarily represent the potential occupation of the substantial six-bedroom property at 4 Oakwood Road. The existing dwelling could reasonably accommodate a number of independently mobile adults whose individual employment, leisure and visiting patterns could generate materially greater movements than the average TRICS figure.
- 4.6 Similarly, the Council has itself acknowledged that occupation by up to six people as a C4 HMO could lawfully occur without express planning permission. Such an occupation could involve six independently mobile adults with individual employment patterns, visitors, deliveries and associated movements, none of which would ordinarily be subject to planning control.
- 4.7 The relevance of these comparisons is not to suggest that either a large family dwelling or six-person HMO would necessarily generate any particular number of movements. Rather, they demonstrate that there is a reasonable range of activity which could already occur lawfully at this substantial residential property. The proposed C2 use should not therefore be compared solely against an assumed quiet or low-intensity pattern of family occupation.

- 4.8 Against this background and having regard to the absence of any objection from HCC Highways, there is no technical transport evidence indicating that the proposal would represent an unacceptable intensification of vehicular activity.

5.0 Residential Amenity and Character

- 5.1 As noted, the remaining objection appears principally to concern the potential for noise and disturbance associated with staff and vehicle movements.
- 5.2 It is accepted that the proposed use would not generate precisely the same pattern of activity as every possible occupation of a conventional dwelling. Different residential occupancies inevitably generate different patterns of activity. The appropriate planning question is whether the degree and character of the difference would be material and harmful.
- 5.3 In this case, the evidence identifies a small-scale residential use accommodating six permanent residents, with professionally managed and staggered staffing arrangements, modest and dispersed visitor activity and domestic servicing requirements. This assessment has been undertaken having regard to the residential context of the site and the proximity of neighbouring dwellings, which reinforces the importance of the managed and dispersed operational arrangements now proposed.
- 5.4 Staff movements are a direct consequence of providing the support which allows adults with learning disabilities and complex support needs to live within an ordinary residential environment. The attendance of those staff should not, in itself, be equated with the activity associated with a conventional commercial workplace or larger institutional facility.
- 5.5 Indeed, the Council's specialist Environmental Health consultee has specifically considered the use in a residential context and raises no objection, concluding that the proposed operation would be comparable to normal household residential occupation in noise terms.
- 5.6 Concerns have also been raised in representations regarding potential overlooking of neighbouring properties. No external alterations are proposed which would alter the existing physical relationship between the dwelling and neighbouring properties, including the position of existing windows. The proposed use would therefore not create any new overlooking relationship. The bedrooms would continue to be occupied on a residential basis and there is no reason to consider that their occupation by the future residents would, in itself, give rise to any materially greater effect upon neighbouring privacy than could arise from the lawful residential occupation of the existing dwelling.
- 5.7 In our view, the additional evidence now provides a sufficiently clear basis to conclude that the actual pattern of activity would remain compatible with the residential character of Oakwood Road and would not result in an unacceptable effect upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

6.0 Relevant Appeal Decision – Hilltop, Pinewood Park

- 6.1 Further context is provided by the appeal decision at Hilltop, Pinewood Park, Southampton (APP/W1715/W/23/3324730), dated 8 March 2024 (see **Appendix 1**).
- 6.2 Whilst every application must be determined on its individual merits, this decision is of particular relevance because it relates to Eastleigh Borough Council and concerned a change

to a Class C2 residential care home for six adults with learning disabilities and autistic spectrum disorder.

- 6.3 Although the circumstances are not identical, the key similarities with the current application site are that it relates to a former dwellinghouse within a residential cul-de-sac. Nonetheless in determining the appeal the Inspector considered a number of issues which are directly relevant to the concerns raised in this application, including an alleged significant intensification in staffing, noise and disturbance, vehicle movements and on-street parking.
- 6.4 In considering these matters, the Inspector recognised that a residential use involving people receiving care can itself involve staff comings and goings and that a large family house can similarly generate significant or equivalent activity, noise and disturbance.
- 6.5 Most significantly, the Inspector concluded that even when compared with conventional dwellinghouse occupation there was “*no compelling objective evidence of material increased adverse effect*” upon neighbouring living conditions. It is important to note that, the current application site is, by comparison, in a materially more accessible location, with a greater range of realistic alternatives to travel by private car.
- 6.6 Furthermore, in the current case, the Council now has considerably more detailed evidence regarding the potential amenity effects, including a site-specific operational statement, defined handover procedure, hourly vehicle movement assessment and active management arrangements. This sits alongside the absence of objections from both the Local Highway Authority and Environmental Health.

7.0 Comparable Liaise Development – Brill Place, Milton Keynes

- 7.1 We also draw attention to the recent decision at 16 Brill Place, Bradwell Common, Milton Keynes (PLN/2026/0815) as determined on 9 June 2026 under delegated powers.
- 7.2 Again, we recognise that this relates to a different Local Planning Authority and policy context and it is not suggested that the decision establishes the planning merits of the current application. It does, however, provide useful recent evidence concerning the operation of a closely comparable scheme by the same care provider and operational team.
- 7.3 The Brill Place scheme involved the conversion of a substantial detached dwelling in a tight-knit residential setting to provide specialist C2 accommodation for four adults, with up to four care staff providing one-to-one support.
- 7.4 In assessing residential amenity, the officer specifically identified carer vehicle movements at shift-change times as a potential noise source. Having considered that activity, the Council nevertheless concluded that the noise generated would not be above and beyond that which could reasonably be expected from a dwellinghouse in a residential neighbourhood.
- 7.5 The officer also concluded that the property would retain its residential appearance and that the proposal would not adversely affect the character of the area.
- 7.6 Brill Place therefore provides a useful recent example of the same small-scale care model being assessed within a conventional residential setting, including explicit consideration of the effects of staff movements upon residential amenity.

8.0 Updated National Planning Policy

- 8.1 Since the original application was submitted, the Government published a new National Planning Policy Framework on 17 August 2026. The revised Framework replaces the December 2024 version referred to in the original Planning Statement. The updated document explicitly defines itself as a material consideration of "critical importance" in both plan-making and decision-taking across England and is particularly relevant to the current proposal.
- 8.2 Policy HO1 identifies the need for plan-making authorities to understand the accommodation requirements of different groups, expressly including disabled people. The Framework definition of disabled people includes those with learning difficulties and autism.
- 8.3 More importantly for decision-making, Policy HO7 – Meeting the need for homes states that *"substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community..."* This expressly includes the needs of the different groups identified under HO1.
- 8.4 This represents a material strengthening of the national policy context which applied when the application was submitted. The Council has already accepted that there is a general need for the accommodation proposed. That accepted need must now be considered against a national decision-making policy which expressly requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of providing accommodation contributing towards evidenced local needs.
- 8.5 Policy HO9 is also relevant. It specifically addresses specialist forms of accommodation and requires specialist housing for disabled people to provide appropriate living conditions and access to services. It also recognises specialist community-based accommodation and the role of management plans or other supporting evidence in demonstrating how a safe and secure environment will be provided.
- 8.6 The proposal responds positively to these objectives. 4 Oakwood Road is situated within an established residential area, within the defined settlement boundary and accessible to local facilities and services. The Site-Specific Operational Addendum provides detailed evidence regarding management, safeguarding and the safe operation of the home.
- 8.7 The updated national policy position therefore reinforces the importance of looking beyond the simple land-use classification of the proposal and properly recognising the considerable social benefit associated with delivering appropriate accommodation for disabled adults within an ordinary community setting.

9.0 Local Need and Hampshire County Council Strategy

- 9.1 The local need for specialist accommodation was addressed within the original Planning Statement and is reinforced by Hampshire County Council's Adults' Health and Care Strategy 2023.
- 9.2 The Strategy identifies increasing numbers of young people with learning and physical disabilities moving from Children's Social Care into Adult Social Care, often requiring high levels of support. It also identifies as a strategic objective the facilitation of accommodation models which allow people to live as independently as possible within their local communities.

- 9.3 Of particular significance, Hampshire confirms that it will continue to pursue supported living opportunities and explains that supported living enables people with complex and high levels of need to receive support within a domestic setting. Having developed approximately 200 new supported-living beds since 2015, the County Council intends to develop further provision.
- 9.4 The Strategy goes considerably further in relation to the particular future residents relevant to this application. It identifies supported living as the default provision for people with autism and learning disabilities, allowing individuals greater independence, choice and control over their lives.
- 9.5 Elsewhere, the Strategy states that Hampshire intends to continue shifting the focus of support for people with learning disabilities away from residential care towards supported living and to extend the availability of community-based services which allow people to live in their own home.
- 9.6 The County Council also records an increasing demand for social care and identifies younger adults with learning disabilities, autism and other complex needs as placing significant demands upon its services. It recognises its Care Act duty to shape the local care market and to work with providers to understand supply and meet demand.
- 9.7 This provides clear strategic support for increasing appropriately located community-based specialist accommodation. The proposed development represents precisely the type of small-scale domestic provision which enables people requiring substantial care and support to remain part of an ordinary residential community.
- 9.8 Our own analysis suggests a very limited supply of recent permissions for new accommodation to meet this need. If, as appears to be the case, there is limited delivery of comparable accommodation within the Borough, this should add further weight to the benefits of the proposal. There is little benefit in identifying and accepting a need for specialist community-based accommodation unless appropriate schemes capable of responding to that need are positively considered when they come forward.

10.0 Public Sector Equality Duty

- 10.1 The proposal also engages the Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
- 10.2 The future residents are people with disabilities and the development would provide accommodation specifically designed to enable them to live with greater independence within an ordinary residential community.
- 10.3 It is noteworthy that the recent Brill Place officer report expressly considered this issue. Milton Keynes concluded that providing specialist care within a supportive residential environment would advance equality of opportunity between people sharing a protected characteristic and those who do not, and that due weight should therefore be afforded to the equal opportunities provided by the development.
- 10.4 The same principle is relevant at Oakwood Road. The proposed accommodation would allow six adults requiring specialist support to enjoy a permanent home within an ordinary

residential neighbourhood, whilst receiving the support necessary to participate in community life.

11.0 Planning Balance and Conclusions

- 11.1 The additional information submitted has been prepared specifically to address the concerns raised regarding the intensity and operation of the proposed use.
- 11.2 Taken together, this letter, the PBA Addendum Transport Note and Liaise Site-Specific Operational Addendum demonstrate that:
- the development is a small-scale residential care use for six permanent residents;
 - staff handovers and movements will be staggered and managed;
 - visitor/professional movements will be modest and dispersed;
 - servicing will remain domestic in character;
 - five on-site spaces are available; and
 - an identified Registered Manager will oversee travel, parking and neighbour liaison.
- 11.3 Hampshire County Council Highways raises no objection to the development. The Council's Environmental Health team similarly raises no objection and specifically considers the proposed operation acceptable in residential noise terms.
- 11.4 There is therefore no objection from either of the specialist technical consultees responsible for the matters which most directly underpin the outstanding concern regarding vehicle movements, noise and disturbance.
- 11.5 The lawful baseline is also relevant. The property is a substantial six-bedroom dwelling capable of accommodating a large household and the Council accepts that occupation by up to six persons as a C4 HMO could occur without express planning permission. Both scenarios could generate individual vehicle movements, visitors and domestic activity without the degree of management proposed as part of the current development.
- 11.6 The Eastleigh appeal decision at Hilltop provides particularly relevant local decision-making context. The Inspector expressly considered allegations of increased staffing, vehicle movements and disturbance associated with a comparable six-person C2 care use and found no compelling objective evidence of a materially increased adverse effect on neighbouring living conditions.
- 11.7 In our view, the additional evidence demonstrates that the proposed development would remain compatible with the residential character of Oakwood Road and would not give rise to an unacceptable effect upon neighbouring residential amenity.
- 11.8 Against any perceived difference in the pattern of activity associated with the proposed use, the newly published National Planning Policy Framework now requires substantial weight to be afforded to the benefits of accommodation which contributes towards meeting evidenced community needs. In this case there is an accepted need for the proposed accommodation and Hampshire County Council's strategic direction is expressly towards increasing supported and community-based accommodation for adults with learning disabilities and autism, providing greater independence, choice and control.

- 11.9 Having regard to the Development Plan as a whole, the additional information now submitted and the updated national planning policy position, it is respectfully considered that planning permission should be granted.
- 11.10 We would be grateful if the Council could take this letter and the accompanying supporting documents into account prior to determination of the application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adrian Kearley', with a long horizontal flourish underneath.

Adrian Kearley
Director