

The Planning Bureau Limited

Bournemouth • Coventry • Hatfield • Manchester • Ringwood

Exeter Local Plan

Examination in Public

Hearing Statement

The Planning Bureau on behalf of

McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd and

Churchill Living Limited

April 2026

Matter 14 - Infrastructure, Facilities and Viability

Q7. How would the review mechanism under Policy IF2 work in practice? What is the justification for its inclusion in the Plan? Would it apply to all development?

Q8. In terms of this issue, are any of the suggested modifications in the Schedule of Suggested Modifications necessary for soundness?

Q7. How would the review mechanism under Policy IF2 work in practice? What is the justification for its inclusion in the Plan? Would it apply to all development?

- 1.1 We participated in the Matter 7 hearing session on 11th March 2026 specifically with respect to specialist housing for older people where the viability of specialist housing for older people was discussed.
- 1.2 The Inspectors and the Council will remember at that session it was agreed that the proposed modification SMM84 in Core Document CSD-03 '*Exeter Plan Schedule of suggestion modifications*' should be taken forward as a main modification to the plan. This was in order to provide flexibility in the application of review mechanisms to smaller single phased schemes that are built in one phase.
- 1.3 We believe such a change would make the plan consistent with national policy.
- 1.4 We would agree that for a large or multi-phase development which will be delivered over a long period it makes sense to check whether the scheme's viability has changed with market movements. However, for a small single phased site, such as an older persons housing scheme that is built in one phase, the Inspectorate have repeatedly noted that review mechanisms are unnecessary. For example, under Appeal decision reference APP/C4235/W/120/3256972 dated 1st April 2021, the Inspector noted in paragraph 17 that '*as the development would almost certainly be completed in a single phase with an estimated build time of 12-18 months, it is not the sort of large multi-phased scheme where stronger arguments for a review/clawback mechanism may otherwise exist*'.

Q8. In terms of this issue, are any of the suggested modifications in the Schedule of Suggested Modifications necessary for soundness?

- 1.5 Yes, the proposed modification SMM84 should be taken forward as agreed in the Matter 7 hearing session.
- 1.6 In addition to ensure the plan is not ambiguous the following text could be added to the end of SMM84 that reads:

'Single-phased development schemes will not be subject to a review mechanism'.