



Jonathan Bore MRTPI
Pauline Butcher
Programme Officer

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

5th November 2016

Dear Mr Bore,

Representor: 20257 : Mid Sussex District Plan Examination

Further to the letter from Pauline Butcher dated 2nd November regarding the 'Inspectors Questions', I wish to respond as follows:

4. Unmet Need

I consider that Mid Sussex has more than accommodated the 'unmet' needs of other authorities. Not least because recently permitted approval for several large housing estates (Greenhill Way, Hurstwood Lane and Gamblemead to mention just 3 very recent cases) which, whilst falling under the jurisdiction of Lewes District Council and NOT MSDC, such residents' needs will have to be met in Mid Sussex - the major administrative town of Lewes being *over 13 miles away*.

S106 contributions are simply inadequate and in no way compensate for the overwhelming and ongoing burden that such massive housing estates and a virtual overnight increase in population, have imposed on relatively small towns in Mid Sussex, especially as the required infrastructure is not in place and in very many cases, is incapable of being met.

Presumably other nearby authorities are likewise required to accommodate any unmet needs of Mid Sussex.

The severe lack of infrastructure is a major factor. The 'hub' of Haywards Heath for example is an already highly congested bottleneck with no means of expansion, not least due to old, substandard narrow country roads not capable of being widened (most of which are nothing more than un-numbered country lanes). Add to this incoming traffic from Lindfield, Cuckfield, Ardingly etc all of whom have seen their villages expand (and still seeing) from ongoing developments, it is not difficult to see the problem.

We now find a constant flow of very large lorries coming into towns which have to cross the central white line into oncoming traffic, due to the narrow winding roads which were not constructed for this purpose.

Further, my own doctors' practice, Newtons Surgery, on its website states:

WE CURRENTLY DO NOT ACCEPT NEW PATIENTS

Newtons Practice list size has increased over the last few years due to new housing in the area. We have introduced the daily **Urgent Care Clinic** to try and meet this demand, and have subsequently found this has also increased the amount of people wanting to register at the practice. This additional work means that we are finding it difficult to sustain a workload that is safe and manageable.

5. Affordable Housing

5.1: Yes

6. The ability of the market to deliver

Firstly, I would like to refer you to the statement in red, above. The key words being *safe* and *manageable*.

The implications of a higher housing requirement would, I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever, raise a quality of life issue not only for current residents who are still reeling from and trying to deal with several years' constant onslaught of 'unplanned' and 'un-co-ordinated' major housing developments, but also new residents being shoe-horned into ill-fitting and ill conceived developments, with wholly inadequate infrastructure provision in place.

Thanks to the NPPF and lack of a District Plan, major housing developments in Mid Sussex have been *purely* developer-led, such developers having been given virtual 'Town Planner' status but without any moral obligation. Residents and local leaders have been rendered powerless. Communities had no voice.

7. Past Under-Delivery

No. The constraints in 2014 are the constraints in 2016.

8. Site Selection & Housing Distribution

8.1: Yes

8.2 – 8.3

Exploiting the 'numbers game', developers are building more and more apartment blocks, which again have a highly negative impact on our towns not only in terms of character but also an unrealistic, unsustainable and quite frankly unhealthy density.

The environmental implications of raising the housing requirement would be nothing short of short-sighted and shameful – can you really mitigate against loss of ancient and natural woodland and a healthy inclusive *natural* environment? Small, sad, tacked-on, sterile, intermittent, stubby green patches on housing estates are no substitute.

The district of Mid Sussex is approximately 50% AONB, which is why I agree that the preferred option is to focus development on (1) brownfield sites (2) land adjacent to and within Burgess Hill and (3) *South* of Haywards Heath where the by-pass is located. This is the most sustainable solution coupled with small, manageable integrated pockets of developments in nearby villages and larger developments in East Grinstead, for example, which is well served by rail and transport links.

My desire is for a planned, co-ordinated, safe, manageable and healthy environment which can only be achieved by swiftly formalising our District Plan and not leaving us exposed to yet even more years at the mercy of those whose only desire, and goal, is to exploit our communities.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Loewy (Mrs)