

Sample SHLAA Assessments – On behalf of the Developers Forum
MSDC Examination 2017, Prepared to inform the Examination Hearings on 8th / 9th February

Lane west of Truggers, Handcross (Slaugham) - SHLAA ID #181	
Identified error in SHLAA assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Factually incorrect in relation to availability (Para 20 of PPG) 2. Inconsistent approach to site assessment
SHLAA Assessment of constraint / Overall conclusion	<i>“Site is considered unsuitable as it would represent a large scale extension of the built up area boundary into attractive AONB landscape. It is unknown whether this site is available.”</i>
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is available for immediate development. This was submitted as part of the call for sites in 2014 and has actively been promoted since. • Site location within AONB has immediately rendered the site unsuitable – yet other sites including ref 748 (Horsted Keynes), 127 (Handcross) and Ref 215 (Pease Pottage Golf Course) are within the AONB but considered suitable The site was not therefore assessed in the landscape study. ‘Large scale extension’ is inaccurate. The site in a wooded setting immediately adjoining the existing settlement with very limited landscape and visual impacts.
Victoria Business Park (Burgess Hill) SHLAA ID #245	
Identified error in SHLAA assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rejected on the basis of constraints (Para 22 of PPG) 2. Inconsistent approach to site assessment
SHLAA Assessment of constraint	<i>“Contaminated land concerns. Coordinated approach from landowners and developers would be required to progress scheme... New and improved infrastructure, including the required upgrades to the sewage treatment infrastructure... Archaeological mitigation (targeted) and protection of the fabric and setting of the Grade II Listed buildings at Little Hammonds farm”. Not available or achievable.</i>
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contamination, archaeology and heritage listed as constraints to development but no consideration of how to mitigate. • Residential applications have already been approved within the site. • Site is allocated within the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan.
Western Arc, Burgess Hill (Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common) - SHLAA ID #740	
Identified error in SHLAA assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Factually incorrect 2. Rejected on the basis of constraints (Para 22 of PPG) 3. Rejected due to a claimed lack of evidence of delivery
SHLAA Assessment of constraint	<i>“No information has been provided... regarding the delivery of infrastructure that would be required to support the development. It is likely significant investment in road and sewage infrastructure would be required to enable this site to be brought forward for development.... There would need to be a period of time to allow the existing proposed development [Northern arc] to 'settle down' before further large scale development at Burgess Hill is considered. There is a lack of evidence to support the development in this area.”</i>
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations made to MSDC in July 2015 and Jan 2016 in relation to the site, SHLAA assessment was amended, but the site area was not updated to reflect this new evidence. • Road and sewage capacity cited as constraint to development, but no consideration given to whether they can be mitigated. • Site rejected due to emerging allocation of ‘Northern Arc’, this should not constrain SHLAA assessment of the sites suitability for development.
Land at Winch Well (Worth) SHLAA ID #213	
Identified error in SHLAA assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inconsistent approach to site assessment
SHLAA Assessment of constraint	<i>“Poorly located in relation to services and facilities. Development at this location would jump existent strong defensible boundary of the road and would represent an obtrusive and incongruous extension of the built up area boundary and lead to further pressure for development in this direction.”</i>
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is approximately 500m from village centre, but considered poorly located. But site Ref. 686, which is 900m from village centre is considered developable (11yrs+), also, pp granted for site #272 & ‘The Pheasantry’, which are further from village centre. Also inconsistent with the actual SHLAA methodology. • Development considered to ‘jump’ strong defensible boundary, yet planning permission granted for sites #272 and land at ‘The Pheasantry’, also on the west of Turners Hill Road, the supposed ‘defensible boundary’ has therefore already breached.
Gleblands Field (Bolney) SHLAA ID #749	
Identified error in SHLAA assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rejected on the basis of constraints (Para 11 of PPG) 2. Inconsistent approach to site assessment
SHLAA Assessment of constraint	<i>“The development of the site would represent a significant incursion into the countryside. Access to the site is via rural lanes which are unlikely to be able to accommodate large scale development”</i>
Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site disregarded due to incursion into the countryside, yet other site #617 is considered accepted with similar incursion • Site access is questioned, but no consideration to whether suitable access can be achieved through upgrading of lanes. This is not a showstopper and inconsistent with methodology.