

## Appendix 5 – Response to Regulation 18 Omission Site comments

SHLAA ID	Site Name	Site Promoter Comment	MSDC Response
17	Land adjacent to Great Harwood Farm, Harwoods Lane, East Grinstead	<p>Comments By: Jonathan Ordridge (Thakeham Homes Limited)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within AONB but shouldn't preclude development.</li> <li>• Masterplan would place development in less sensitive areas and there would be c.30ha of open space thereby retaining and enhancing AONB landscape character.</li> <li>• Vision Document (12/22) submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is well served by local services.</li> <li>• Opportunity to improve connectivity between site and East Grinstead through new/ enhanced bus services and pedestrian/ cycle routes.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>No change – AONB Assessment concludes Major development in HWAONB, High impact. Not in line with strategy – protection of designated landscapes. Refers only to visual impact and not landscape impact.</p> <p>Noted. No change – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p>
19	Land east of College Lane, Hurstpierpoint	<p>Comments By: Rhett Flashman (Thakeham Homes Limited)</p> <p><u>Yield – 40 to 80</u></p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site rejected due to potential of coalescence –site adjacent to settlement boundary and does not extend further east than the existing settlement boundary.</li> <li>• 'Vision Document' submitted – proposes green infrastructure to screen the built-up form and a robust landscaped edge to the extent of the settlement</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Council's LUC Study shows Low Landscape Capacity. Existing development between College Road and London Road follows clear linear pattern, development would alter pattern. Substantial difference in proposed yield, initial concerns in higher yield and potential impacts on landscape.</p>

29	Land off Snowdrop Lane, Lindfield	<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access existing services and amenities in Hurstpierpoint within walking distance</li> <li>• Site in close proximity to public transport networks.</li> </ul> <p>Comments by: Judith Ashton Associates OBO Mr Jordan Van Laun (Wates Developments)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – reduced to 40 Site could also accommodate elderly care units</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Vision Document’ submitted</li> <li>• Amended boundary</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Transport Matters - Pro-Forma Review’ submitted</li> <li>• Disagrees with councils’ negative grade – the site is within 20 minutes of the centre of HH through public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Boyer Planning OBO Mr Joe Cheeseman (SDP)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - reduced from 72 to 40 homes.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is not visually prominent within the landscape setting; bounded on the North and South by woodland and vegetation</li> <li>• Views to the site restricted due to the topography of the land, hedgerows and small woodlands.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A phase 1 ecological survey concluded the site is of low ecological value</li> <li>• Arboricultural statement concluded all retained trees and vegetations retained would not prevent development.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No change – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted. Amended</p> <p>Wording within assessment amended to reflect sustainable transport strategy. No – TravelTime mapping checked and confirms over 20mins walk/ 30 mins via public transport to Main Service Centre</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>No change – LUC concludes Low/ Medium capacity</p> <p>Ecological and arboricultural work undertaken for adjacent developments, not SHELAA site 63.</p>
63	Land north of Riseholme, Broad Street, Cuckfield	<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Transport Matters - Pro-Forma Review’ submitted</li> <li>• Disagrees with councils’ negative grade – the site is within 20 minutes of the centre of HH through public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Boyer Planning OBO Mr Joe Cheeseman (SDP)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - reduced from 72 to 40 homes.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is not visually prominent within the landscape setting; bounded on the North and South by woodland and vegetation</li> <li>• Views to the site restricted due to the topography of the land, hedgerows and small woodlands.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A phase 1 ecological survey concluded the site is of low ecological value</li> <li>• Arboricultural statement concluded all retained trees and vegetations retained would not prevent development.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No change – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted. Amended</p> <p>Wording within assessment amended to reflect sustainable transport strategy. No – TravelTime mapping checked and confirms over 20mins walk/ 30 mins via public transport to Main Service Centre</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>No change – LUC concludes Low/ Medium capacity</p> <p>Ecological and arboricultural work undertaken for adjacent developments, not SHELAA site 63.</p>

		<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local services and facilities can be reached within 5-15 minutes.</li> <li>Nearest bus stop located approx. 250m to the north of the site</li> </ul> <p>No details submitted on site assessment.</p>	<p>No change to assessment – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p>
155	Aurora Ranch Caravan site, Bolney		
181	Land to the northwest of Handcross (Land West of Truggers)	<p>Comments By: LRM Planning OBO Hallam Land Management Limited</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Reduce yield to 105</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Vision Document' (Masterplan) Submitted</li> <li>Disagree that the development would have a high impact on AONB</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Not in line with strategy – protection of designated landscapes.</p> <p>No change – High impact of AONB</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p>
207	Land at Dirty Lane/ Hammerwood Road, Ashurst Wood	<p>Comments By: Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with AONB impact conclusions. Landscape consultants responded (Hyland Edgar Driver).</li> </ul>	<p>No change – AONB Assessment concludes High impact on AONB</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p>
219	Land at Former Driving Range, Horsham Road, Pease Pottage	<p>Comments by: Mr Steven Doel (Denton Homes)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Assessment of the Impact of the SHELAA Sites on the High Weald AONB" – states that cut and fill will be required; however, site is broadly flat</li> <li>Separation between development and countryside will be maintained by retained woodland and intervening infrastructure</li> </ul> <p><u>Trees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buffer to ancient woodland would be provided and tree coverage will be retained.</li> </ul>	<p>AONB assessment reviewed and amended.</p> <p>Site contains 0.38ha of Ancient Woodland</p>

261	Land east of High Street and Lindfield Road, Ardingly	<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within 20-minute from Main service centre via public transport</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement reached with A2Dominion to provide access from site 674.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Tim Rodway (Rodway Planning) OBO Trustees of the RNS Clarke Will Trust</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Proposing to reduce units from 314 to 40</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagrees with impact AONB</li> <li>• New planting proposed to the south, north boundaries.</li> <li>• Site will be visually contained within the landscape</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Arboricultural Briefing Note (Appendix B)' submitted</li> <li>• Opportunities to enhance the local landscape and biodiversity</li> <li>• Reduced scale and indicative layout enables protected trees to be unharmed.</li> <li>• Scope for new planting on a 1:1 basis to compensate for removal of early mature/ mature trees for access road.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage score should be 'neutral' site is separated from CA by existing development</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Motion – Technical Note for Lindfield Road (Appendix C)' submitted</li> </ul>	<p>No change - Accessibility scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 2b</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment reviewed – AONB impact assessment amended to may potentially be regarded as major development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment reflects presence of Ancient Woodland on site and need for removal of some trees for access.</p> <p>Site is close to Conservation Area, Less than substantial harm – consistent with criteria.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
-----	---	--	---

265	Land north of Shepherds Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down	<p>Comments By: John Costello (Landowner)</p> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage concerns addressed</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electricity, water, and foul sewer available. Gas is not available – Solar Panels and an EPC rating of A on design will meet the needs</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 2a</p> <p>No detailed evidence submitted – assessment unchanged.</p> <p>Noted</p>
386	West Hoathly (Ibstock) Brickworks, Hamsey Road, Sharpthorne	<p>Comments By: Montague Evans OBO Ashill Regen</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is characterised by buildings and hardstanding that are harmful to the local environment and visual appearance.</li> <li>Land designated as Ancient Woodland and SSSI do not form part of the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is currently vacant and serves no employment purpose or function – site has no prospect of being used for employment in the future.</li> <li>This site should be allocated for residential developments.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Rodway Planning OBO Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with conclusion of ‘High impact’ on AONB, should be ‘moderate impact’</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 2b</p> <p>Noted. Landscape conclusion remains unchanged; likely major development. Assessment reflects that a small part of site is within 15m buffer.</p> <p>Noted. For the purposes of assessment, continues to reflect that it is an employment site but vacant.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p>
495	Butchers Field, south of Street Lane, Ardingly	<p>Comments By: Mrs Emma Challenger (Millwood Designer Homes)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative score given to the site in term of landscape appears to be based on the 2007 Mid Sussex Landscape Study, where all land surrounding Bolney was identified as having a low landscape capacity including land to the west of</li> </ul>	<p>No - Conclusion of High impact unchanged.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Comments noted, no change to Landscape conclusion. Landscape assessments are based on the Capacity</p>
526	Land east of Paynesfield, Bolney	<p>Comments By: Mrs Emma Challenger (Millwood Designer Homes)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative score given to the site in term of landscape appears to be based on the 2007 Mid Sussex Landscape Study, where all land surrounding Bolney was identified as having a low landscape capacity including land to the west of</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Comments noted, no change to Landscape conclusion. Landscape assessments are based on the Capacity</p>

		<p>London Road and the allocated Foxhole Farm – site is more contained and influenced by existing development than these two sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for the northern side to include landscape buffer with the adjacent woodland. Site is largely enclosed by the defined built-up area, existing residential development and open space (LGS).</li> <li>• The site is separated from the road by a hedgerow boundary</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site lies outside but adjacent to Bolney Conservation Area and buffered by Glebe Cottage and Bolney Primary School proposed open space.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to connect the site with The Street to the south, this route is currently owned by a third party</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previously scored negative in terms of access to facilities and services – additional housing may help support a case for provision of facilities</li> <li>• It is not unusual for rural settlements to rely on neighbouring facilities for main service provision</li> </ul>	<p>of Mid Sussex District to accommodate development study (LUC, 2014). Proposed allocation aligned with Strategy.</p> <p>Noted – assessment reflects proximity to conservation area.</p> <p>Noted, would potentially improve sustainable movement.</p> <p>Noted; however only 30 dwellings. Proposed allocation to provide onsite infrastructure alongside the 200 units.</p>
527	Land north of Ryecroft Road, Bolney	<p>Commented on by individual</p> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Disagree with TPO Group’ – arboricultural report concluded little or nothing worth of preservation.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Dowsett Mayhew OBO Anstone Development Ltd and Spurpoint Ltd</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledges site is within AONB with significant number of trees</li> <li>• Work undertaken to identify constraints (<i>not included with rep</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Noted. Evidence of report not provided.</p>
541	Land adjacent to Packway House, (Parcel B), Bolney		<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Noted. Landscape assessment reflects site is within AONB (High impact)</p>

543	Land west of London Road (north), Bolney	<p>Comments By: White &amp; Sons OBO Sue and John Seward</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Feasibility Site Plan – (65 Dwellings) submitted</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited impact to landscape due to the topography of the site and A23 which serves as a barrier</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional screening from the A23 can be provided alongside the existing trees and planting to increase biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with SHLAA findings that access is not available. There is existing permanent access as approved under DM/17/0492</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure already in place to support development.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted. No change - LUC study low/medium landscape capacity.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment acknowledges that the site benefits from an existing access. Access score amended to 'Very Positive' to reflect that status of approach.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
555	Pollards Farm, Ditchling Common, Burgess Hill.	<p>Comments by: Mr Nick Stickland (Stickland Wright)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with negative grading; should be neutral</li> <li>No specific landscape characteristics worthy of note or protection. Ditchling Common and buffer mitigations create a landscape margin between ditching road and the site.</li> <li>Advice has been sought from Natural England</li> <li>Agreement 'in principal' has been reached with developers of 'east of Kingsway' to link proposed sites</li> <li>Boundaries between proposal and the Common can be reinforced</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>No change - 'Capacity of Mid Sussex District to accommodate development' study (LUC) concludes Low/ Medium landscape capacity.</p> <p>Natural England's purpose is to help conserve, enhance and manage the natural environment; therefore offers advice in relation to biodiversity rather than landscape matters.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed 60m buffer zone leaves the western boundary available for development; buffer can be altered based on specific site evidence and mitigation – this buffer will create opportunities for biodiversity enhancements</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent pre-application for a smaller number of dwellings did not rule out development at this location subject to mitigation</li> <li>Dense tree planting to form a buffer to mitigate impacts to the setting of the listed building</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Transport Report” submitted</li> </ul>	<p>No change – Score reflects proximity of SSSI and NE’s advice.</p> <p>The Conservation Officer’s advice for the purpose of this assessment considers the detail submitted via the SHELAA process. It focuses exclusively on the potential impact on surrounding listed buildings rather than a decision on the suitability of the site for development. The possibility for mitigation is acknowledged although impacts on the listed building would remain as the openness of the site contributes to its wider setting. The pre-application advice sought was for 6 units.</p>
575	<p>Little Park Farm, North-East of Hurstpierpoint</p>	<p>Comments By: Nexus Planning OBO Rydon Homes</p> <p>Site boundary amended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision Document Submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape response from DJA: Moderate landscape sensitivity and moderate landscape value, resulting in medium landscape capacity.</li> <li>Development can be achieved without harm to the landscape character</li> <li>Development to be located towards the southeast corner to align with existing development</li> </ul> <p><u>Trees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No ancient woodland adjacent or within 15m buffer</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Noted. No change to assessment – criterion uses LUC capacity study which concludes Low landscape capacity.</p> <p>Assessment amended to ‘Positive’ to reflect that revised site area no longer contain protected trees/ woodland. Assessment text amended to reflect revised site boundary change. No change</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be setback from site boundary and screened through significant landscaping from listed buildings</li> <li>Development 350m from boundary of Hurst Wickham conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development in line with 20-min neighbourhood concept. Walking distance from various facilities in Hurstpierpoint</li> </ul>	<p>to Heritage score – potential harm to Listed Buildings.</p> <p>No change - Scoring reflects TravelTime mapping.</p>
598	<p>Land to the south of Edinburgh Way, East Grinstead</p>	<p>Comments By: Sarah Conlan (Rydon Homes)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site has not been appropriately considered against the landscape criteria. – seems to have been assessed differently than DPH8</li> <li>A balance needs to be struck between locating development in the most suitable locations and those which have the least environmental constraints.</li> <li>The site is well contained within its surroundings – no adverse impact on landscape due to the topography of the site</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access is secured through the same land ownership, further options through adjoining promoted land.</li> <li>Issues regarding safe and acceptable access to the site through adjoining roads will be addressed through design</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Score reflects overall conclusion of AONB assessment; site 198 is Not likely major development but Moderate impact, whilst site 598 is Likely major development – High impact.</p> <p>Access conclusion reflects that improvements are needed. Access would be reliant on another site. No evidence submitted to show achievability.</p>
603	<p>Land south of Pease Pottage</p>	<p>Comments By: Thakeham Homes</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urbanisation of locality compromises AONB setting – weight attributed to AONB should therefore be downgraded proportionately.</li> <li>Vision document submitted.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>AONB assessment reviewed in light of comments. Downgrading the weight would not be consistent with the AONB designation and HWAONB Management Plan. Conclusion remains as Likely major development with no exceptional circumstances identified – High impact.</p>

634	Land west of Dirty Lane, Ashurst Wood	<p>Comments By: Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise that there may be issue with deliverability of the site due to the sloping nature of the site and access issues</li> </ul>	Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)  Noted – no change.
671	Land at Lywood Depot	<p>Comments By: Trustees of the RNS (Tim Rodway (Rodway Planning))</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Site could accommodate 30 dwellings</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Lywood Depot Design Report (Appendix E)' submitted</li> <li>Site is partially Brownfield and should not be described as 'isolated' in terms of the NPPF.</li> <li>Site currently used by WSCC as a storage facility. Existing structures and hard standing on-site will be replaced with new dwellings.</li> <li>Site located within High Weald AONB – views of the site are limited by mature trees, hedgerows and topography</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Arboricultural Briefing Note (Appendix F)</li> <li>Development will encourage ecology and wildlife within the site</li> <li>The ancient woodland and its 15m buffer will be protected</li> <li>2 oaks will be retained with appropriate mitigation for new dwellings if necessary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibility of a mixed-use development (residential/ community/ commercial) or fully commercial could be explored.</li> <li>'Motion – Technical Note for Lywood Depot (Appendix D)' submitted.</li> <li>Access through B2028 Linfield Road. Existing access road to Lywood Depot will be retained.</li> <li>Site would not create a severe impact on the local highway.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(a)</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted although this does not change the conclusion on this site. Methodology filters sites disconnected from existing settlements.</p> <p>Noted. No detailed assessment undertaken as site was filtered out at early stage. Would have reflect protected trees on site.</p> <p>Noted. No detailed assessment undertaken as site was filtered out at early stage. Would have reflected existing access.</p>

673	Land north of Butlers Green Road, Haywards Heath	<p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Right of Way that lies to the south of the site will be unaffected</li> </ul> <p>Comments by: Mr Steven Doel (Denton Homes)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Revised number of dwellings - 20</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to landscape would be neutral given the proposed buffer, screening and revised quantum of housing</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Site Assessment – Heritage – Appendix K” submitted</li> <li>Heritage Assessment outlines series of design criteria to prevent harm to heritage including retention of 45-50m buffer between proposal and Listed Building, screening and refurbishment of existing curtilage buildings and housing to a density and design that matched surroundings. Should be no more than LSH: Low.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Access Plan – Appendix J” Submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 20-minute walk from school and retail facilities</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses to assessment submitted “Appendix I”</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Turley OBO A2Dominion</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site directly contiguous with the existing built urban fabric</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>No change to score - based on LUC Capacity Study.</p> <p>An application for 4 dwellings on the site was refused on landscape grounds (DM/17/3672) and unless substantial evidence can be produced, the assessment is likely to remain unchanged.</p> <p>No change – assessment conclusion remains as LSH; Negative.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>No change – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Noted</p>
674	(Pease Field, Pease Pottage) Land north of Pease Pottage,	<p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Right of Way that lies to the south of the site will be unaffected</li> </ul> <p>Comments by: Mr Steven Doel (Denton Homes)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Revised number of dwellings - 20</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to landscape would be neutral given the proposed buffer, screening and revised quantum of housing</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Site Assessment – Heritage – Appendix K” submitted</li> <li>Heritage Assessment outlines series of design criteria to prevent harm to heritage including retention of 45-50m buffer between proposal and Listed Building, screening and refurbishment of existing curtilage buildings and housing to a density and design that matched surroundings. Should be no more than LSH: Low.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Access Plan – Appendix J” Submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 20-minute walk from school and retail facilities</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses to assessment submitted “Appendix I”</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Turley OBO A2Dominion</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site directly contiguous with the existing built urban fabric</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>No change to score - based on LUC Capacity Study.</p> <p>An application for 4 dwellings on the site was refused on landscape grounds (DM/17/3672) and unless substantial evidence can be produced, the assessment is likely to remain unchanged.</p> <p>No change – assessment conclusion remains as LSH; Negative.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>No change – scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Noted</p>

	west of Old Brighton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider that Council's assessment overstates significance of impacts on AONB against certain criteria</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'i-Transport' Technical Notes submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No national policy restrictions for developments within AONB</li> <li>Assessment process undertaken without regard for what the overall strategy for accommodating development might be</li> <li>Site rejected due to it being within the AONB yet the draft plan has allocated sites within the AONB</li> </ul>	<p>No change - AONB assessment concludes likely major development when considering individual components.</p> <p>Noted. Score reflects that access does not currently exist but can be achieved via 3<sup>rd</sup> party land (agreement in place).</p> <p>Conclusions of 'Likely major development with no identified exceptional circumstances' is not in line with Strategy. Other proposed allocations within AONB concluded to be 'Not likely major development'.</p>
677	Land south of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down	<p>Comments by: Lewis &amp; Co Planning OBO Mr Bernhard Eppert</p> <p>Proposal is for 10 to 15 Self-build units</p> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with reasoning for rejection - there are no barriers for delivering an upgraded site access</li> <li>'Technical Note' - submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities and services within 1.2km of the site</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan hasn't allocated sites for custom build housing.</li> <li>Pre-application advice has been sought</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Rodway planning OBO Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – reduce yield to 50 dwellings</p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 2b</p> <p>TN states that rights of way and permission to undertake construction works is assumed (1.7). Low traffic generation from 15 units (68 movements/day), highly unlikely to pass each other but are informal passing places.</p> <p>Accessibility to services based on TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Self- and Custom- build to be sought on allocations of 100+ dwellings.</p>
691	Land east of High Street, Ardingly		<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 2b</p> <p>Amended.</p>

736	Land at Ansty Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar sized site in village not considered major development in AONB; consistent approach needed</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree that there will be a harmful impact on setting of Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to deliver housing within first 5 years of the plan period</li> </ul>	<p>AONB assessment reviewed. Concluded to be 'May be regarded as major development' Moderate impact; amended to 'Negative'.</p> <p>No change – score reflects proximity to Conservation Area and potential harm.</p> <p>No change. No housebuilder on board and a suitable access has not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change to assessment – LUC concludes site is mostly within Low/Medium capacity. Text amended to reflect that small part of development area is medium.</p> <p>Noted. No change – conclusion acknowledges ancient woodland on and adjacent to site.</p>
		<p>Comments By: Savills OBO Will Adams (Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd) and Fairfax acquisitions</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – Reduced to 1,450 dwellings</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated vision document (fabrik) submitted</li> <li>Landscape and Urban Design review of alternative sites (fabrik) submitted</li> <li>Beechy Bottom Country Park Vision Document (DLA) submitted</li> <li>Site is outside the High Weald AONB, Ashdown Forest and South Downs</li> <li>Northern parcel is within the AONB and proposed as a Country Park providing public access and appreciation of the area – not currently possible due to private ownership. Development areas within AONB could support conservation practices and economic ties outside the AONB</li> <li>No significant harm will be caused to the key belts of woodlands</li> <li>Development has the opportunity to be nestle within the wider landscape.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ancient woodland will be largely untouched - with appropriate buffers, only intervention is a route informed by tree survey works</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Technical Note (Ardent Consulting Engineers) submitted</li> <li>• Highway concerns are capable of resolution. Limitations of the SYSTRA survey highlighted in the technical note.</li> <li>• Issues regarding transport concerns have outweighed the sustainability benefits of the overall scheme</li> <li>• Access can be delivered, and this is not being prevented by third party land ownership.</li> </ul> <p><i>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of new local centre and community facilities (Pub or library) - the negative score in terms of services should be amended to reflect this.</li> <li>• Prioritisation of sustainable travel within site – new walking and cycling routes providing links to bus stops, public right of way and rail services</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has been unfairly singled out, and no explanation has been given for this.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Submissions reviewed, however uncertainty around achievability to resolve capacity issues around junctions remain.</p> <p>Wording amended.</p> <p>Assessment conclusions reflect that onsite provision expected – creating a sustainable community.</p> <p>Appendix 4 of Site Selection Conclusions Paper summarises reason for exclusion.</p>
789	Phase 1 Swallows Yard, London Road, Albourne	<p>Comments By: Miss Seraphina Knowlden (Whitehall Homes LLP - Respondent)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>No Environmental designations on or near the site – Outside of the AONB</p> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade II LB: Goldsmiths, Potter’s Field, and Inholmes Cottage within 90-110m to the South and West of the site. – Unlikely to be of significant impact due to their distance and separation from the site by fields and existing development.</li> <li>• No Negative Impact on any Conservation Area or Area of Townscape Character.</li> <li>• The design would consider its impact on the nearby LBs, future applications will be supported by a Heritage Statement</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Available for development within the next five years</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected Stage 3 (Strategy)</p> <p>Noted. Assessment reflects LUC Study; Low/ Medium Landscape Capacity.</p> <p>Noted; however, no change to assessment in absence of evidence regarding potential impact on Heritage.</p> <p>Noted and reflected in assessment.</p>

818	Land north of the Former Golf House, Horsham Road, Pease Pottage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DP doesn't contain allocations within Albourne</li> </ul> <p><i>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is well connected to the road network. Bus stops located throughout the village; regular links between Crawley, Burgess Hill, Brighton and Pulborough</li> <li>Employment sites to the North (including Albourne Court)</li> <li>Primary school, church and recreational grounds within village</li> <li>Further amenities in nearby villages of Sayers Common and Hurstpierpoint, within 10-20-minute walk along continuous paved footpaths.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA considered the site to be a sustainable option for allocation.</li> </ul>	<p>Strategy: not in combination with Sayers Common significant site to the north.</p> <p>Noted. No change needed; assessment reflects accessibility to nearby services and public transport options.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
		<p>Comments by: Mr Steven Doel (Denton Homes)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Proposed Residential Development Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment" – Appendix H - Submitted</li> <li>Layout Plan submitted "Appendix – G"</li> <li>Contradicting information between "Site Selection Pro Forma" and Assessment of the Impact of the SHELAA Site on the HW AONB" – development would have low impact on AONB.</li> </ul> <p><i>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary School 20-min walk away</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing office will be retained within a new replacement building – there would be no conflict with policy SA34</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses to assessment submitted "Appendix F"</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>'New' evidence to be reviewed – dated 2018 but does not appear to have previously been submitted.</p> <p>Site Selection and Topic Paper assessments reviewed to check conclusion; remains Moderate.</p> <p>No change. TravelTime mapping indicates primary school is more than 20mins walk.</p>

839	Land at Hazeldene Farm, north of Orchard Way, Warninglid	<p>Comments By: Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to deliver housing within first 5 years of the plan period</li> </ul>	<p>Site sifted at 2(c) due to conflict with SA34 – site plan shows re-provision of commercial.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(a)</p> <p>Noted. No detailed assessment undertaken as site was filtered out at early stage.</p>
841	Clearwater Farm, Haywards Heath	<p>Comments By: Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relatively unconstrained.</li> <li>• Site within Green Corridor in the HH Neighbourhood Plan – development would not conflict with its aims.</li> <li>• Retain majority of hedgerows and wildlife corridors</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the Environment Agency's Flood Mapping Zone 1</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has potential to contribute towards the delivery of multifunctional network connecting HH and BH by foot and cycle.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of allotments.</li> <li>• Cross-boundary residential Development with Lewes District; could meet housing needs for Mid Sussex and Lewes District.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(a)</p> <p>Comments raised in representation are noted; however, no detailed assessment was undertaken for this site as it was filtered out at early stage, in line with the methodology, due to being considered disconnected from an existing settlement. Should an assessment be undertaken in future then comments could be considered.</p>
844	Land at north Colwell Farm, Haywards Heath	<p>Comments By: Nexus Planning OBO Miller Homes</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplan (by Richards) and Vision Document (miller homes) Submitted</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Reject at Stage 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Masterplan has been updated to be a logical and sensitive extension to HH, with low density on the edges.</li> <li>● The development would have a low impact on landscape, given its relationship with the existing settlement and contained nature of the site.</li> <li>● The site is not adjacent to any local or nationally designated landscape.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heritage Assessment (by rps) submitted</li> <li>● Colwell House is not within the setting of the proposed development.</li> <li>● Numerous sites have been proposed for allocation which have also scored 'neutral' on Heritage and impact to Conservation Area – neutral impact on heritage assets is not a reason to reject the site allocation.</li> <li>● Potential impact to the Conservation Area will be balanced against the significant public benefits.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Site is located 30-minute walk from the main service centre, or reached by other methods of sustainable travel, such as cycling</li> <li>● Site is very well connected, therefore a positive score is suggested</li> <li>● Development would also contribute towards improving the existing public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>No change to assessment score – LUC Capacity Study concludes Low/ Medium landscape capacity.</p> <p>Noted. No change – considered to be a LSH harm to heritage asset but with potential for mitigation; Neutral. Heritage alone is not the reason for the site being rejected rather it is the cumulative impact of the site.</p> <p>No change to score – data measured using TravelTime Mapping (from centre of site) Scores reflect site's accessibility to Primary School, Health and Retail.</p>
902	Land to the west of Rookwood, Tylers Green, Cuckfield	<p>Comments by: Mr Andrew Smith (Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 'Appendix 1 – Suggested built-up boundary extension' submitted</li> <li>● Site was rejected due to the separation from the existing defined settlement boundary – with boundary is out of date, further development has happened outside the boundary – a review of the boundary is therefore suggested.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Reject at Stage 2(a)</p> <p>BUA boundary amendments are limited to incorporating proposed allocations, a more comprehensive review of BUA boundaries is not proposed for this stage.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through the incorporation of standard mitigation measures, the development would not lead to an adverse ecological impact</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Appendix 6 – initial Traffic Analysis' submitted</li> <li>Initial traffic analysis suggests the access arrangement would not cause traffic queuing and would not have an adverse impact on traffic</li> <li>The proposed vehicular access would be broadly in the same location of the existing</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Appendix 4 - Bus Route Plan' submitted</li> <li>'Appendix 3 – Cycle isochrones Plan' submitted</li> <li>'Appendix 2 – Walking isochrones plan' submitted</li> <li>Site is accessible from Cuckfield by footways</li> <li>Cuckfield and HH are within a 10m cycle</li> <li>There are regular bus stops within 400m of the site</li> <li>Key services available within 20 minute walk from site</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further housing sites need to be allocated in Cuckfield</li> </ul>	<p>Comments raised in representation are noted; however, no detailed assessment was undertaken for this site as it was filtered out at early stage, in line with the methodology, due to being considered disconnected from an existing settlement. Should an assessment be undertaken in future then comments could be considered.</p>
920	Land at Silver Birches, Haywards Heath	<p>Comments by: Mr Steve Lawrence (ACHIEVE-Town Planning and Urban Design Ltd)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is within the defined urban area</li> <li>Proposed two open spaces and enhancement of existing green corridor and woodland</li> <li>Design layouts submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing access via parking court off Silver Birches and footpath provision</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p>	<p>Noted – the site was not considered for allocation in the District Plan Review process. The site is within the BUA where the principle of development is accepted and development proposal can be assessed against existing policy. Policy DPH1 includes a windfall allowance accounting for development coming forward within the BUA during the plan period.</p>

983	Land at Walstead Grange, Scamps Hill, Lindfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-application advice has been sought for 24 dwellings</li> <li>• Further pre-app is being prepared for 9 dwellings mixed use scheme</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Victoria Demetriou-Smith (Gladman)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – revised layout area removes development from eastern parcels and focuses development to the west to restrict impact on listed buildings.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed buffer could be used as part of a public open space or enhance biodiversity</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant buffer around Tythe Cottage to limit potential harm.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe vehicular access can be achieved through Scamps Hill</li> <li>• At the application stage a comprehensive access strategy will be developed.</li> <li>• Pedestrian and cycle accessibility will be designed on site, and provide access to existing highway and footpath network.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lindfield services and facilities will be accessible on foot (distances submitted)</li> <li>• Bus stops available in close proximity to the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Reduced estimated yield (90dwellings) applied based on revised development area.</p> <p>Noted. No change – assessment reflects no LWS/ SSSI designation constraints.</p> <p>No change – assessment conclusion reflects proximity of listed buildings and potential harm.</p> <p>Noted – Assessment wording amended to correctly reflect that an existing access does not exist but can be achieved.</p> <p>No change to assessment – scores based on TravelTime mapping (measured from centre of site)</p>
987	Land to the West of Park Road, Handcross	<p>Comments by: Genesis Town Planning OBO Mr Jordan Van Laun (Wates Developments)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision document submitted</li> <li>• Existing woodland to the northend will be retained</li> <li>• Any potential harm to the AONB can be suitably mitigated</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>No change – AONB assessment concludes ‘Likely major development with no identified exceptional circumstances’</p> <p>No evidence submitted, aside from vision document.</p>

988	Land to the north of Old Wickham Lane, Haywards Heath	<p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing trees along the western boundary will be retained and reinforced with planting.</li> <li>Additional planting to the eastern and southern boundaries</li> <li>The site will retain a high degree of biodiversity</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular access could be provided from Park Road</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New direct route for residents to the central part of Handcross</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative care village scheme for the site has been prepared (40-50 units)</li> <li>Additional 40 bungalows in the central and south part of the site</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Sarah Hockin (Turley) (Agent) OBO Crest Nicholson</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is screened in all directions and views into the site are limited by hedgerows and trees along the site's boundaries</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capable of being planned to preserve and enhance the setting of the listed buildings and heritage assets</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the site provided to the East (Gatesmead) – approved as per ref. DM/17/0839</li> <li>Neighbouring site is also controlled by Crest Nicholson, therefore suitable and safe access can be obtained.</li> </ul>	<p>No change – assessment conclusion reflects site is significantly treed which would be lost to development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Could test for exceptional circumstances if promoting for alternative use.</p>
			<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Noted. No change to assessment conclusion; reflects Medium Landscape Capacity.</p> <p>No additional evidence submitted. No change – assessment reflects presence of and potential harm to listed buildings.</p> <p>Achievability of access reflected in Neutral score; does not currently exist but achievable through same ownership.</p>

990	Land at Courthouse Farm, Copthorne	<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Train station within 12-minute walk, bus stop located 7-minute walk away</li> <li>• Site is adjacent to the Public Right of Way network</li> <li>• Services and facilities located within 1 mile</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Option Two Development Ltd (respondent)</p> <p><u>Yield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal 1: 100 dwellings</li> <li>• Proposal 2: two-storey residential care home in the front part of the site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Landscape and Visual Appraisal' submitted – should be taken into account.</li> <li>• 'Feasibility' Plan submitted</li> <li>• 'Option two Development' Plan and 'Alternative Feasibility' Plan submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent to the Copthorne Common Local Wildlife Site ("LWS"). Potential recreational impacts can be mitigated by providing informal open space and semi natural grassland within site</li> <li>• 'Ecology Report' and 'Ecology Further info' submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connected to the strategic road network via M23. 'Transport Overview' submitted - unlikely to result in severe impacts to the local highway network.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two bus stops nearby, closest bus stop 400m from the site. Bus stops serve eight bus routes</li> <li>• Copthorne Village served by schools and other services and amenities.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Accessibility scores confirmed by TravelTime mapping.</p> <p>Initial conclusions: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>Yield Amended.</p> <p>Landscape conclusion taken from LUC Study – concludes Low/ Medium landscape capacity.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment text amended to reflect that a new access is proposed to serve development – Transport consultant considers achievable.</p> <p>No change – data measured using TravelTime Mapping (from centre of site)</p>
-----	------------------------------------	--	---

995	Firs Farm, Copthorne	<p>Comments By: DHA Planning OBO Option Two Development Ltd</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside of Green belt or AONBs</li> <li>• Outside but close to the Built-Up Boundary</li> <li>• TPOs in the north boundary (Ref: WP/07/TPO/87)</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Firs (Grade II LB) located to the north-east side of the site</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to site via a private road from the northern boundary (Copthorne Common Road)</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services and facilities in Copthorne Village accessible from site</li> <li>• Bus Services available along the A264</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No detail proposal at this stage - site available for residential or specialist older persons' housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(a)</p> <p>Comments raised in representation are noted; however, no detailed assessment was undertaken for this site as it was filtered out at early stage, in line with the methodology, due to being considered disconnected from an existing settlement. Should an assessment be undertaken in future then comments could be considered.</p>
1006	Land to the north of Lyoth Lane, Lindfield	<p>Comments by: Mr Jordan Van Laun (Wates Developments)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Vision Document' submitted</li> <li>• Development in the site will be visually contained by topography, and existing vegetation</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited intervisibility of the listed building with the site, lack of functional association between the site and the building – should be 'neutral'</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>No change – LUC Capacity Study concludes Medium landscape capacity</p> <p>Revised layout reducing developable area noted. However – Heritage score remains as 'Negative', recognising potential for harm.</p>

	<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Transport Matters - Pro-Forma Review' submitted</li> <li>• Transport links with Snowdrop Lane</li> </ul>	<p>Wording within assessment amended to reflect sustainable transport strategy.</p>
1019	<p>Land at Grange Farm, East of Bullfinch Lane and West of Brighton Road, Hurstpierpoint</p> <p>Comments By: Woolf Bond OBO Fairfax Acquisitions</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No landscape or technical constraints. No statutory/non-statutory designations and not within valued landscape.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological Technical Note by The Ecology Co-op Submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHELAA Assessment contradicts Fact checking exercise (Nov. 21) in terms of impact to conservation area</li> <li>• No designated heritage assets will be affected</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual Technical Note by fabrik submitted; identifies the site as having great potential for development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHELAA Assessment contradicts fact checking exercise (Nov. 21) in terms of access</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking distance from local services and facilities, including bus services</li> <li>• Transport technical notes identifies the site as a sustainable location</li> <li>• Transport Appraisal technical Note by SDP submitted</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Victoria Demetriou-Smith (Gladman)</p> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>No change – LUC Capacity Study concludes Low/ Medium. Within setting of SDNP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment for heritage assets reviewed. Listed Building and Conservation Area conclusions remain at Negative – substantial development shown in important setting to heritage assets.</p> <p>No change. Proforma states 'Very Positive' for Access, no constraints.</p> <p>Noted</p>
1022	<p>Former Hassocks Golf</p>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p>

	Course, London Road, Hassocks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporation of green infrastructure, including enhancements to existing mature boundaries. Aim to delivers net gains in biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe vehicular access can be achieved through London Road</li> <li>• Opportunity for pedestrian and vehicular access into Bellway scheme</li> <li>• On site pedestrian and cycle access to existing highway and footpath networks will be designed</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services and facilities within Hassocks accessible on foot</li> <li>• Transport links to Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath Stations</li> <li>• Bus stops along London Road</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to potentially deliver retail store on site</li> <li>• The houses will be built with high standards of energy efficiency and EV charging points</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No change to assessment score – currently reflects no LWS/ SSSI designation constraints.</p> <p>Noted. No change to assessment score – currently reflects existence of access.</p> <p>No change – Assessment conclusions reflect that the site has good access to public transport, however walking distances to local services are 20 minutes or more.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
1023	Land at Badgers Brook	<p>Comments by: Resident</p> <p>Smaller sized sites should be allocated rather than one larger site to enable integration into the village.</p>	<p>Initial conclusions: Rejected at Stage 2(c).</p> <p>No change – Site does not need allocation; policy compliant (adjacent to BUAB and less than 10 units).</p>
1024	Land at Brook House Farm, East Grinstead	<p>Comments By: Dowsett Mayhew OBO LC Hobbs and Son Ltd</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – Reduce to 45 dwellings. Amend boundary.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development not considered ‘major development’ within the AONB.</li> <li>• Impacts on landscape could be mitigated through design, layout and landscaping.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Reject at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>AONB assessment of site reviewed and concludes ‘May potentially be regarded as major development’ and High impact; score remains as Very Negative.</p>

1031	Land at Pilgrims Farm, Stairbridge Lane, Bolney Grange	<p>Comments By: Landowner of Pilgrims Farm</p> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites should be allocated before green sites of Bolney Garage Business Park and Science and technology Park SA9</li> </ul>	The site is not suitable to achieve the proposed strategy
1040	Land rear of Daltons Farm and The Byre, Bolney	<p>Comments By: Rodway Planning OBO Rolo Developments</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be neutral not negative: Outside protected landscapes, Urbanised character to the north, providing physical containment.</li> <li>• Landscape Appraisal (by HED) Masterplan and location plan submitted</li> <li>• The site is not visually prominent within the wider landscape setting. Views are screened by the topography, woodlands and hedgerows.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Notes Rev1 submitted (by Cogent Heritage)</li> <li>• Conclusion in respect to impact on LBs – should be ‘Medium’</li> <li>• Impact to LBs and CA could be reduced through landscape buffers</li> <li>• Inconsistencies in how the site has been assessed in comparison to Foxhole Farm in regards to Listed Buildings, as the sites are adjacent</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of existing access drive with adjustments to site boundary wall to the south and reposition of some buildings – in consultation with Motion Transport.</li> <li>• No highway or transportation reasons why the site wouldn't be allocated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller sites should be allocated instead of foxhole farm, including 1040.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusions: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>No change – LUC Capacity Study concludes Low/ Medium</p> <p>Noted. No change. Several Grade II listed buildings, surrounding site to the east, north and north west, all concluded as LSH – High.</p> <p>Noted. Accompanying wording to assessment amended; remains Neutral.</p> <p>Selection of sites consistent with Strategy.</p>
1059	Land at Woodpeckers,	<p>Comments By: Airport Parking and Hotels Limited</p> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p>	Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(a)

	Snow Hill, Cophthorne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not in an unsustainable location given its proximity to the main access roads of Turners Hill and Cophthorne Road A264.</li> <li>• Potential for a new access road off the main Turners Hill Road to the West</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is well served by public transport</li> <li>• Small scale community facilities and retail in the site's vicinity</li> <li>• Good transport connectivity with the M23 and J10</li> <li>• There are 2 bus stops, nearest within approx. 105 metres.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments raised in representation are noted; however, no detailed assessment was undertaken for this site as it was filtered out at early stage, in line with the methodology, due to being considered disconnected from an existing settlement. Should an assessment be undertaken in future then comments could be considered.</p>
1066	Land North of Springfield Close (Parcel A) Bolney	<p>Comments By: Dowsett Mayhew OBO Anstone Development Ltd and Spurpoint Ltd</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is shielded by trees and is therefore visually contained</li> <li>• Impact on trees should be neutral not negative impact – trees can be incorporated (low density development)</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site would have less than substantial impact on LB due to the distance and significant screening.</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking distance from shops, services, schools and public transport</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Savills OBO Danworth Farm Ltd</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and Visual Assessment, Vision Document and Masterplan submitted</li> <li>• "Low/medium potential to change in landscape terms" – a far more positive assessment than DPH16</li> <li>• Development is contained within existing hedgerows</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c)</p> <p>No change – LUC Capacity Study concludes Low/ Medium</p> <p>No change – significant tree coverage, TPO Group designation across whole site.</p> <p>No heritage evidence to support change in assessment.</p> <p>Noted. No change – TravelTime mapping confirms accessibility scores</p>
1075	Land at Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint		<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Both sites score 'Negative' reflecting conclusions of the LUC Study - sites fall within 'Low' landscape capacity.</p>

1105	Land at Malthouse Lane, Burgess Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not agree that the development has the potential to contribute to coalescence.</li> <li>Only the eastern part of the site falls within a local gap. While the entire area of DPH16 falls within a local gap</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very positive score for LBs and CA – no impact – a higher score than DPH16</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection raised to the site not being allocated despite scoring positive at stage 1 and 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No change - Local Gap does not form part of assessment criteria.</p> <p>Noted. No change.</p> <p>Noted. However, assessment and further considerations concluded site not suitable for allocation.</p>
		<p>Comments By: Lewis &amp; Co Planning OBO Vistry Group</p> <p><u>Yield</u> - Reduced to 750 homes with the same onsite services</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Vision Document and Masterplan' submitted</li> <li>'Baseline Analysis Framework Document' submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity (Trees/ Biodiversity)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature improvements will be delivered, with parts of the site protected from development.</li> <li>Multifunctional green corridor will be created adj. to the Herrings Stream</li> <li>The proposal will deliver 20% BNG</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is designed as a 15-minute neighbourhood (primary school, mobility hub, neighbourhood centre Green Circle widening, connectivity routes. Good access to off-site employment and town centre.</li> <li>'Transport Note (16 Dec)' submitted - Further work has been undertaken in relation to transport and traffic impacts</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Noted. No change to Landscape score – LUA study concludes Low/ Medium landscape capacity.</p> <p>Noted. No change to assessment – currently reflects no LWS/ SSSI designation constraint.</p> <p>Noted. Accessibility scores based on TravelTime mapping data (using existing facilities). Provision of new onsite services and facilities reflected in text accompanying assessment.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed redirection of routes through the site to deliver highways upgrades</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable drainage system can be delivered that does not increase runoff.</li> </ul>	Noted.
1106	Land at Hyde Lodge, London Road	<p>Comments by: Welbeck Strategic Land</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topography of the land is a gentle slope; would not require significant cut and fill</li> <li>No particular geographical features. No springs, ponds or watercourses which downslope from the site. There are no banks, ditches or former building platforms</li> <li>Site is over 15 metres from the Ancient Woodlands</li> <li>The site is not separated from the main village of Handcross – existing built forms of development to the south of the site</li> <li>Score should be amended to ‘Neutral’</li> <li>Vision document submitted</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes factual errors have been incorporated into the evidence base for the Draft Local Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Draft allocation DPH28</p> <p>Noted. AONB assessment reviewed in light of comments; concluded ‘May potentially be regarded as major development’ – Moderate impact. Overall score for Landscape is Negative.</p>
1122	Sussex House and Commercial House and 54 to 56 Perrymount Road, Haywards Heath	<p>Comments By: Hornbeam Properties Limited</p> <p><u>Heritage (Listed building/ Conservation Area/ Archaeology)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No listed building on site, nor is it within a conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Developability (Availability/ Access)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should be allocated for a housing-led mixed-use development (30% affordable housing) within Built-Up Area opposed to be being considered an unidentified or windfall site.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 2(c) (within BUAB)</p> <p>Noted – the site was not considered for allocation in the District Plan Review process. The site is within the BUA where the principle of development is accepted and development proposal can be assessed against existing policy. Policy DPH1 includes a windfall allowance accounting for development</p>

		<p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site well located to amenities, services and public transport.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial contributions towards the provision of: Play space, sports facilities, community buildings, library, education, sustainable travel, healthcare and emergency services. With the provision of sustainable transport measures and car parking.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Built-up area boundary should not be a reason to reject the site. Site is brownfield and should therefore be prioritised</li> </ul>	<p>coming forward within the BUA during the plan period.</p>
<p>581 &amp; 574</p> <p>Land west of Old Brighton Road South (200) and Land west of Cedar Cottage Pease Pottage (88)</p>	<p>Comments By: Jonathan Ordridge (Thakeham Homes Limited)</p> <p><u>Yield</u> – combined yield of 200.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Vision Document’ submitted.</li> <li>• Site edge (within) High Weald AONB – compromised urbanised setting of the AONB in the immediate locality; weight of the AONB in this locality should be downgraded</li> <li>• Site is partially brownfield</li> <li>• Site is contained by dense vegetation</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is well connected to bus stops with services to Crawley and Brighton.</li> <li>• bridleway which extends through the Site in an east-west direction</li> </ul> <p><u>Other comment</u></p>	<p>Initial conclusions: 574 rejected at Stage (a), site 581 rejected at Stage 2(b)</p> <p>Yield amended. Boundary of 581 amended to incorporate 574.</p> <p>No change. AONB assessment concludes ‘Likely major development in the AONB with no identified exceptional circumstances. High impact.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Accessibility scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p>	

603	<p>Land to the West of Woodhurst Farm, Old Brighton Road South, Pease Pottage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This residential-led mixed use development would accord with the principles of the Draft District Plan and would enhance the sustainability of Pease Pottage.</li> </ul> <p>Comments By: Jonathan Ordidge (Thakeham Homes Limited)</p> <p><u>Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Vision Document' submitted.</li> <li>Site edge (within) High Weald AONB – compromised urbanised setting of the AONB in the immediate locality; weight of the AONB in this locality should be downgraded</li> <li>Site is partially brownfield</li> </ul> <p><u>Accessibility (Availability of Public Transport/ Access to main Service Centre/ Distances to services)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is well connected to bus stops with services to Crawley and Brighton.</li> <li>Bridleway which extends through the Site in an east-west direction</li> </ul>	<p>Not in line with strategy – protection of designated landscapes.</p> <p>Initial conclusion: Rejected at Stage 3</p> <p>Site incorporates sites 574 and 581.</p> <p>No change. AONB assessment concludes 'Likely major development in the AONB with no identified exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Accessibility scores based on outcomes of TravelTime mapping.</p>
-----	---	--	---