MID SUSSEX DISTRICT PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Jonathan Bore, MRTPI c/o 260 Collingwood Road Sutton Surrey, SM1 2NX Programme Officer: Pauline Butcher

Tel:07823 494353Email:ldfprogrammeofficer@tiscali.co.uk

24 March 2017

Chris Tunnell Acting Head of Planning Mid Sussex District Council Oaklands Road Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 1SS

Dear Mr Tunnell

Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031

Thank you for your letter of 23 March 2017. I appreciate the efforts you have made to address the housing issues raised in my interim letter of 20 February.

You are proposing that the annual requirement should be set at the OAN figure of 876 dpa until 2024/25 and then should step up by 150 dpa to 1,026 dpa until the end of the plan period to coincide with the emergence of unmet housing need from Crawley. That would result in a total housing requirement of 15,792 dwellings over the plan period, rather than the 17,442 indicated in my letters of 20 February and 17 March 2017. I note that on that basis, the Council anticipates that it can both achieve a 5 year housing land supply position without any further assessment and maintain the current policy position of 30% affordable housing, and that it may be possible to move forward with consultations on modifications.

The issue here is the rate of delivery in the later part of the plan period in relation to Crawley so, before commenting further, I need to understand the implications for Crawley's unmet housing needs. I would be grateful for a joint statement from Crawley Borough Council and Mid Sussex District Council which contains a clear and objective assessment of the effects of this proposal in that respect.

On another matter, I would be grateful for your comments on the note from Mayfield Market Towns dated 23 March 2017 in relation to unmet need in the coastal area and the issue of the timing of future studies and plans.

I am very pleased that work on the other policies has made good progress. I wrote yesterday (23 March) to Alice Henstock with my comments on the proposed modifications set out in MSDC8a, and they all appear acceptable except for Policy DP26, Accessibility, for which I have proposed a suitable modification. I also look forward to seeing the proposed modifications to Policy DP6 to provide a stronger strategic framework for the neighbourhood plans and for the Site Allocations Plan.

In due course it will also be necessary to consider the 5 year housing supply calculation on the basis of the finalised housing requirement.

Yours sincerely Jonathan Bore

INSPECTOR