

COMMENTS ON PLANNING INSPECTOR'S COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ON SITE
ALLOCATIONS AND NON-HOUSING POLICIES DATED 26 JANUARY 2017

The following are my comments on those questions on which I have a view. All other questions are, in my view, matters for MSDC, and in some cases for The Forum to respond as well.

POLICY DP1 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN MID SUSSEX

I support the removal of this Policy.

POLICY DP7 GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AT
BURGESS HILL

Sub Paragraph (c). There have been reports in the local newspaper some while ago that the Burgess Hill Northern Arc would contribute funding of about £40m for the town centre and would provide better shops, larger shops and new leisure facilities in the town centre. In my view, this was always unlikely to be funded by the Northern Arc development because I cannot see how the developers could contribute £40m - or any extra funding - for the improvement of the town centre facilities, on top of their obligation to meet s106 agreements, without the viability of the strategic development being compromised. But, it is for the developers to comment on the likelihood of the additional direct investment in town centre facilities referred to in Policy DP7 bullet point 2

Sub paragraph (g) I agree that there is nothing over and above the affordable housing policy in DP29 that is required for the Northern Arc and this currently is 30% and not 40% shown in Policy DP7 bullet point 11.

POLICY DP11 PREVENTING COALESCENCE

This policy, as drafted, is vague and ill defined anyway. Already between some towns and their adjacent villages there is coalescence along one side of the highway but not on the other side of the same highway where there are still a couple of fields; do such existing situations count as there already being coalescence or, does coalescence mean that both sides of a highway must be developed before coalescence is deemed to have happened? Or, does this policy still bite where there are fields on one side of the highway only. In addition, what does coalescence mean: can two settlements be developed up to the point at which they are 500 yards apart, a mile etc or what before policy DP11 comes into play for any further development?

POLICY DP24A HOUSING DENSITY

I have already tabled a paper for the Housing Hearings on 5 January 2017 expressing my concerns about this policy and its impact on the setting and character of Mid Sussex where existing housing density is much lower than the very high densities proposed in this Policy. I also expressed concern about the potential adverse social consequences of such high densities. And, I also expressed my concern that MSDC did not use such high densities to assess additional sites, and minimise the

number of such additional sites, which might be needed if its total housing provision of 800dpa was found to be too low.

I fully support the removal of Policy DP24A.

POLICY DP27 NOISE, AIR AND LIGHT

I have had experience in our village of planning applications for individual properties where the useage would have been very noisy for nearby residents and it was difficult, without a clear noise level number/metric, to constrain the proposed useage planned on the property. In my view, without clear maximum numerical limits for noise, air and pollution there will be very real difficulty in the application of this Policy, as drafted, when dealing with noise etc in determining planning applications in the real world.

POLICY DP29 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

I have already set out my views on the possibility of MSDC increasing its affordable housing policy from 30% at present to 35% as MSDC have hinted at. My concerns are set out fully in paragraph 5 of my paper submitted to the Examination under cover of my letter to Pauline Butcher dated 11 January 2017. That paper was titled 'An analysis of MSDC's argument that committed supply should be spread over the full 17 year plan period rather than a 10 year period'.

References to 20% affordable provision for Starter Homes and to a total of 40% affordable housing policy should be removed anyway because there has been no Government Policy announced on Starter Homes and in the event of a Government Policy announcement, the whole question of the appropriate level of affordable housing for development sites would need to be revisited by MSDC and public consultation on MSDC's views would be necessary before a new policy could be implemented. Even the hinted at changes to 35% would need prior public consultation in my view.

POLICY DP33 CONSERVATION AREAS

Living in a Conservation Area as I do, I agree that it is not only the appearance of buildings, streets and spaces which need to be preserved or enhanced but Conservation Areas also need protection from harmful/detrimental activities which maybe proposed.

NEIL KERSLAKE

6 February 2017