

Mid Sussex District Plan Examination

Site allocations and non-housing policies Hearing, 28 February 2017

Important note

I should like to thank all those who have responded to my comments and questions about specific policies, set out in Documents ID8 and ID9.

Having considered the responses, and all the other evidence, I am satisfied that no change is required to many policies. Submitted policies DP2, DP4, DP10, DP12, DP13, DP14, DP16, DP17, DP25, DP28, DP31, DP32, DP34, DP41 and DP42 all appear sound. In addition, I am content with the Council's proposed changes¹ (in MSDC8) to the wording of Policies DP7, DP8, DP9a, DP20, DP21, DP22, DP23, DP24, DP30, DP33, DP36 and DP37, and the deletion of policies DP1, DP24A, DP35 and DP38. I do not intend to ask any further questions about any of these policies.

In some instances the Council's proposed changes in MSDC8 are on the right lines but further minor adjustments are required to make them sound. These include the proposed new paragraph 2.13 regarding sustainable development, and Policies DP18, DP19, DP20 and DP40. I will set out necessary changes in a separate letter to the Council and they can be dealt with through an exchange of correspondence.

Policies DP5 and DP6 have already been considered in detail and are the subject of a separate letter to the Council concerning the District's housing requirement.

The Council's proposed changes to Chapter 5, Monitoring need to be altered to take into account the contents of my letter on the housing requirement, in particular the need to bring forward the coastal sub-regional study and to incorporate its findings in the next plan review.

As regards Policy DP29: Affordable Housing, the Council has reverted to the version in the pre-submission document, which appears sound. On the evidence I do not consider it necessary for that policy to change in response to the housing requirement set out in my interim letter. Any such change would in any case need to

¹ Note that substantive changes, in the form of main modifications, will be the subject of further consultation in due course.

be supported by evidence and consultation so I do not now propose to discuss the subject in the hearing on 28 February.

In respect of Policy DP15: Ashdown Forest, it seems to me that it would not be a good use of hearing time to discuss the matter now. That is partly because the Court's judgment is awaited in respect of a legal challenge by Wealden Council, and partly because Mid Sussex District Council will have to produce an addendum to the HRA in respect of the housing requirement set out in my separate letter. The further work on the HRA and the outcome of the legal challenge will provide a better basis for discussion later, if by then discussion is still required.

That leaves a small group of policies about which I require further information; DP3: Town Centre Development; DP9: North and North West of Burgess Hill; DP11: Preventing Coalescence; DP26: Accessibility; DP27: Noise, Air and Light Pollution; and DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction. These form the basis for the hearing topics set out in the agenda on the following page.

Mid Sussex District Plan Examination

Site allocations and non-housing policies Hearing, 28 February 2017

(Important: please read accompanying notes)

AGENDA

Matter 1. Strategic Allocation to the North and North West of Burgess Hill

- (a) In the light of evidence regarding the employment land requirement and supply, and my letter regarding the housing requirement, should the business park allocation be deleted from Policy DP9?
- (b) How should the plan address the multi-functional route between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath and the green circle and the structural landscaping of the site?
- (c) What should Policy DP3 and DP9 say about the status of any neighbourhood centre in this allocation and how should the sequential approach be applied in large new housing allocations?

Matter 2: Accessibility and sustainable design

- (a) Should Building Regulations requirement M4(2) be required for all new residential dwellings as proposed by Policy DP26 and, having regard to the evidence, should the requirement for M4(3) be set at 5%?
- (b) Are the sustainable construction requirements in Policy DP39 necessary to put in a policy and are they adequately covered by other legislation? How necessary and relevant is it in Mid Sussex to refer to communal heating networks and biomass boilers?

Matter 3: Preventing Coalescence

- (a) What is meant by coalescence? Should it be defined? Where are the settlements considered vulnerable to coalescence?
- (b) Why is Policy DP10 on the countryside considered inadequate to protect undeveloped gaps?

(c) Will Policy DP11 prove an impediment to meeting the housing requirement, by (for example) preventing the development of lower landscape or agricultural quality that might otherwise be appropriate for housing?

Matter 4: Noise

(a) Does Policy DP27 do enough to guide development away from noise sources? Should it be more specific (either in the policy or supporting text) about what is, and is not, an acceptable noise environment for noise-sensitive development (including metrics)?

Jonathan Bore
20 February 2017