

DM/26/0073 – Note on Newly Uploaded Affordable Housing Documents

Date: 29/04/2026

I wish to comment on the recently uploaded affordable-housing documents associated with application DM/26/0073, specifically the files titled “*West Hoathly – RP Feedback 24.04.26*” and the accompanying covering email from the applicant. These documents have been added to the planning portal after the close of the public consultation period, and I therefore hope it is acceptable to provide a short representation in response.

The Registered Provider (RP) feedback spreadsheet indicates that the applicant contacted a wide range of RPs regarding the affordable housing units proposed for this development. It is clear from the responses that none of the providers approached are willing or able to take on the units under the tenure mix required by Mid Sussex District Council’s policies. Reasons cited include the site being too small, the location not aligning with organisational strategies, and providers not seeking opportunities in this area. In several cases, no response was received despite repeated attempts.

The applicant’s covering email confirms this position and goes on to request flexibility to depart from the policy-compliant tenure mix. This includes a proposal for 100% shared ownership/shared equity and, if that is not achievable, a further request to consider a discounted open-market tenure. These suggested alternatives appear to represent a significant departure from the affordable-housing policies that apply to this site.

Taken together, the newly uploaded documents raise important questions regarding both the **deliverability** of the affordable housing provision and the **policy compliance** of the proposal. If no RP is prepared to take on the units as required by policy, and the applicant is now seeking a relaxation of those requirements, it suggests that the scheme may not be capable of delivering the affordable housing contribution that forms a key part of its justification.

I would also note that these concerns arise in addition to the issues set out in my two earlier submissions relating to HNWL matters, as well as the formal objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). When considered collectively, these points indicate a number of unresolved matters across several technical areas, which may be relevant to the overall assessment of the suitability of the proposed development.

I hope these observations are helpful.

1 Streatfield Place, RH19 4RQ