

From: Town Clerk <clerk@midhurst-tc.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 February 2025 17:18
To: Greg Burt <parishclerk@cocking.org>
Subject: FW: CH165, Land at Pitsham Farm

Good afternoon, Greg,

I read your email to Councillors at our Planning & Infrastructure Committee regarding the above.

Councillors raised concerns regarding the number of houses, which would potentially be too many for an affordable housing development, but considered the site generally suitable for development.

Kind Regards,

Sharon Hurr

Town Clerk and Finance Officer

Midhurst Town Council

From: Bob Gadsden <
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:19
To: Frances Russell <frances.russell@cocking.org>
Subject: Appeal against proposed development CH165- Land east of Pitsham Lane

Dear Frances I have been talking to Tim Carter who has suggested that I contact you directly, in relation to another development proposed within the SDNPA plan that is within the CPC area, the Pitsham Lane development in Bepton above.

This proposal is on the edge of Midhurst and would create a wider footprint for the town and cause deterioration in all the delicate infrastructure which is well balanced currently. Deterioration of infrastructure, and quality of life through new development and in-fill is the one thing that caused us to move from our previous area around Copthorne in Surrey to within the protection of the SDNP.

In Midhurst currently it is possible without stress to do all the things one might expect it is possible to park, get a GP appointment, get into the shops and restaurants, and generally to enjoy its historic and stable small town atmosphere. Its shops are not large and there is no out of town shopping which creates a very attractive small town atmosphere. In short the capacity fits the current town population. Traffic however has increased significantly through the town in the ten years we have lived here and is now a become a problem at rush hour twice a day and major issue when things go wrong as we have seen recently with the bridge and the Angel Hotel.

Midhurst is an attractive town surrounded by beautiful country - "The Jewel in the Park" and in my view well worth protecting and left as is, for residents and visitors alike to enjoy. On the latter, Midhurst represents a destination for thousands of people throughout summer- be it a Sunday drive out of London or holidays of longer duration- all of this is fragile and capable of being lost if its current size and attractiveness is not protected.

I hope that the CPC can consider an appeal against this as they are doing for the proposed development in Cocking- many of the same reasons for appeal apply in both locations. I believe the CPC would carry greater weight with the planning authority over and above individual residents' appeals.

Just to summarise, I think overall the feeling of my wife Rose and I is one of disappointment- we moved to Midhurst fundamentally to get away from this erosion of quality of life caused by constant infill and green field development with the resulting pressure on local infrastructure and had hoped that living in a park protected by a body such as the SDNPA would give us protection and stability to allow us to relax and enjoy our retirement. We are now finding we have to fight against the same thing happening here.

I do hope you can form an appeal as the CPC against this proposal.

Kindest regards

Bob and Rose Gadsden