

ENOUGH HOUSING LAND SUPPLY WITHOUT THE FIELDS

The Report to the July 22nd Full Council meeting refers to the need for an “oversupply” of housing numbers, but there is now an excessive oversupply and the fields south of Folders Lane are no longer needed. A standard buffer of 10% can be achieved without them.

The Minutes of 25 September 2019 Council state that housing allocation “Option 2” (including Sites SA 12 / 13) is recommended for the Site Selection DPD as a prudent approach to ensure a “buffer” of sufficient sites.

But the housing figures have changed since then, more houses have been built or granted planning permission, and the requirement has shrunk by more than 200:

Requirement = 1280

Site Selection DPD provides for 1764 (including SA12/13)

Buffer = **484** which is **38%** and is excessive to requirements

Remove SA 12/13 and buffer is still **141 = 11%**

In the latest housing Annual Position Statement in July 2019 MSDC stated:

“The five year housing land supply for the District was last confirmed through the Examination of the District Plan. The Council now wishes to confirm the five year supply through an Annual Position Statement. Therefore, a **10% buffer** will be applied to the five year requirement in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.”

Paragraph 73 of the NPPF also sets out buffer requirements:

5% to ensure competition **5% for the DPD is 28**

10% where the local planning authority wishes to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites through an annual position statement or recently adopted plan. **10% for the DPD is 128**

So they can take out SA12/13 and still exceed the NPPF recommended buffer.

We cannot understand why MSDC are suggesting that a suitable buffer for this DPD is now 37%?

There is no good reason to include this unsuitable site, when the real risk is from bringing the whole of Burgess Hill grinding to a halt due to the traffic chaos that will result.

(NB Option 3, Haywards Heath Golf Course, was of course excluded because it provided unnecessary numbers of housing, so it would be inconsistent and unsound to include SA12/13 when they are also now unnecessary).