## Planning Comment submission on application 2024/1079 at 07/04/2025 10:53:42

Thank you for your comments on application 2024/1079, which have been received.

Please note that we do not send a separate acknowledgement.

CommentatorName	William Stevenson
Telephone No	
EMail Address	
Address	Oakleigh House, Town Hill, Lingfield, RH7 6AG
Planning App No	2024/1079
Comment Reason	Do not object to this application
Comment	

Planning Application 2024/1079 - Lingfield

My initial reaction to the Lingfield House development proposal was negative. I do not think that Lingfield needs another retirement complex given the Orchard House and St. Piers developments, which have already been given approval, and the large Charters Village complex that is nearby. It would seem that a better use for the space would be to build housing, including some social/affordable houses. In addition, I feel that this development could cause traffic problems, since traffic exiting the complex will do so onto a fast section of the East Grinstead Road.

I have since given the proposal further thought, particularly the proposal for a new Doctor's surgery. The present surgery is old, too small for the population it caters for and cannot be extended. The doctors cannot currently provide the range of services that the community requires because of the lack of space in the surgery. The developments at Orchard Court, St. Piers and other future developments will only make things worse. We desperately need a new surgery to cope with both the community's current needs and those that will be encountered over the next 20 or 30 years as the population grows. The problem is that the doctors cannot afford to fund the building of a new surgery, and the NHS will not provide funds for such a comparatively small medical complex. Therefore, the developer's proposal to fund a new surgery (in a land swap arrangement) is attractive.

The developer's proposal is to provide a building larger than the doctors current needs, but which will allow expansion for population growth and allow the introduction of new services that will benefit the local community. It should also be noted that, given the large car park, there is room to extend the building if the population growth from property developments over the next 20 or 30 years substantially increase demand for the doctor's services.

The problem that we face is that an alternative proposal for the site involving housing is will not be anywhere near as financially rewarding as a retirement complex. Therefore, the developers of such an alternative will not be willing to fund a new doctor's surgery. As a result, the doctors would get a large number of new patients but would be stuck with existing facilities, with the likelihood that the quality of services would inevitably deteriorate.

The question is how can we obtain a new surgery, some new social/affordable housing and overcome the potential traffic issue? As I have noted above the surgery is being bult as part of a land swap arrangement. The developers have yet to table a proposal for what is to be built on the current surgery's site. Is it not possible to tie the development on that site to that of the Lingfield House site? Perhaps a section 106 condition that requires them to build social/affordable housing on the current surgery site. As for the traffic issue, perhaps the solution is combination of pinch points and platform speeds bumps as seen in London Road, East Grinsted and the Crossways in Dormansland (my apologies I do not know the formal term for them) before and after the pinch points. These would make the traffic slow down and ensure that traffic can exit the development/surgery safely.

The bottom line is that we desperately need a new surgery. It would seem that the only way to get one is by developer's agreeing to build one as part of a development. Therefore I (reluctantly) feel that this proposal must be approved subject to the addition of the condition I suggest for housing on the current surgery site. If it is not approved than I fear that the quality of medical cover for the community will substantially deteriorate over the next 10 to 30 years.

0061582710
,