

## **8Aii Housing and Infrastructure**

### **8Aii.1 Is housing provision set at the right level in the Sussex Coast, having regard to the assumptions about local employment, and does it “help meet wider regional needs” (Policy SCT7, para 2.3)?**

Paragraph 2.3 says that the housing provision should be to meet local needs and to help meet regional demand. The dilemma for the sub-region is that this is a continuation of the present situation which is heavily dependent on out-commuting, which will become increasingly unsustainable as fuel costs rise and as congestions gets worse at peak time. Building more houses in the coastal area for populations who will be commuting out of the area is not sustainable development. Policy SCT7 needs to be conditional not only on infrastructure but also on local employment being available. Without this link building these properties will simply increase the amount of commuting. New Greenfield developments outside the existing towns to satisfy a demand for more commuting households will do nothing to help the problems within the coastal towns, and will damage the environmental assets that should be used to help stimulate the much needed local employment.

The Sussex Coast has great potential, and if developed appropriately could become the focus of a South Coast renaissance in the future, part benefiting from global warming that brings warmer weather conditions for an English Riviera to the South Coast.

### **8Aii.2 Is a 40% affordable housing appropriate in the Sussex Coast (Policy SCT8)?**

We agree in principle with the provisions of Policy SCT 8. We also consider that 40% should be the minimum, because the real issue is the number of affordable homes needed. The % is the mechanism to fund them. In the Sussex coast context the proportion that is market housing will tend to be sold to people moving into the area in order to commute out of it. This will exacerbate rather than solve the problems of Sussex. There is a substantial need for affordable housing and this needs to be in mixed, well designed, well serviced communities. Funding mechanisms must be sought to enable developers to include a significantly higher proportion of affordable housing to be incorporated into new developments, to avoid exacerbating the out-commuting problems, until local employment starts to significantly increase.

### **8Aii.3 Has the potential for additional housing in the areas identified for development in structure plans been fully explored (Policy SCT7)?**

We believe in general it has, because it is essential that a viable mix is achieved between residential, business and light industrial so that employment is local or within public service transport routes.

## **8Aii Housing and Infrastructure (cont'd)**

### **8Aii.4 Have the water supply and waste water treatment, flood risk, and transport implications of the growth proposals been adequately considered (and is there a case for a more co-ordinated sub-regional approach to infrastructure) (Policies SCT6, SCT9, para11.1)?**

The whole of both East and West Sussex is currently in, and will increasingly in the future be in, a geographical area that is short of water. This is the reality of current environmental conditions. The Sussex coast area is crucially short of water during the summer period when rainfall is low and demand is high. It is surely incredible that large increases in the housing stock are being proposed when there is already inadequate water supply in the region. The subregional investment framework in the implementation plan cites raising Arlington and desalination at Newhaven as two water supply projects at the investigation stage. We strongly suggest that a much more integrated approach is necessary, in which all aspects of infrastructure are considered vis a vis their contribution towards a more sustainable pattern of development for the subregion. The water shortage for housing and businesses is just one indicator of the current environmental and infrastructure constraints.

There are also many areas in the coastal region which are currently subject to periodic flooding and so are unsuitable for development and this must be taken into consideration in any plan, but it is not mentioned anywhere in the Strategies.

We recognise that the structure of the water industry and its regulatory regime make it difficult to provide a region-wide strategy, but this is no reason to ignore this significant factor in any plan for economic regeneration on the south coast sub-region. The water companies are pursuing a strategy biased towards water resource development with inadequate provision for demand management and leakage reduction, which must be a prerequisite for any new public and private development in this sub-region.

CPRE gives high priority to the need to address the present and future water supply deficiencies before any developments can take place.

The provision of updated waste disposal schemes and sewage treatment need greater emphasis as provision of this essential infrastructure is at a premium in some sites in area. The consequential transport problems must also be addressed concurrently with these services, particularly in relation to waste disposal.

**8Aii.5 Are the proposals in the Implementation Plan<sup>1</sup> (including for social and green infrastructure) clear, justified and well related to the spatial strategy? What are the priorities?**

The priorities for the infrastructure are set out without a clear plan as to where the money for investment is to be found and what mix, if any, there needs to be of private and government funding. If there is reliance solely on private financing, then the piper may call the tune and a planned spatial strategy would be put in jeopardy.

CPRE Sussex 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2006  
Contacts Roy Haycock/Sarah Robinson CPRE Sussex

---