

MID SUSSEX LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

SHLAA COMPARISON

HILL PLACE FARM, EAST GRINSTEAD

| | MSDC SHLAA | Section 78 Appeal (Oct/Nov 2016) Outline proposal 200 dwellings |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Site Reference | 562 | |
| Site Name | Land at Hill Place Farm to the south west of East Grinstead, west and east of the Bluebell Railway Line | |
| Suitable | <p>No:</p> <p>Highways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Not clear how site will be accessed by vehicles and pedestrians and cycles; o Capacity of the site is likely to be determined by transport constraints. Current ceiling estimated to be 190 homes for the whole town; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Site does not represent a natural or incremental extension to the built-up area; o Majority of site low landscape suitability for development; | <p>Yes/No:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways (Yes): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o MSDC withdrew objection at 11th hour (5-weeks before opening of Inquiry); o West Sussex County Council & Surrey County Council “no objection” to application; o West Sussex & Surrey Highway Authorities support package of off-site mitigation measures (circa £500k). • Landscape (No): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDC maintained Objection, however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Site not subject to any landscape designations (unlike land to north and east of built-up area); o More sensitive land (in AONB) released elsewhere. |
| Available | <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability has been demonstrated via a submission to the SHLAA. | <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site available and deliverable immediately. |
| Achievable | <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential transport infrastructure improvements, community facilities & SPA mitigation measures “<i>may add substantially to the cost of development</i>”. | <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 completed (addressing): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transport infrastructure; - community facilities; and - 14 ha on-site SANG. |

| | MSDC SHLAA | Section 78 Appeal (Oct/Nov 2016) Outline proposal 200 dwellings |
|---|--|--|
| Constraints/Action required | <p>6 constraints identified in SHLAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Listed viaduct structure – mitigation required; • Impact on Ancient Woodland – mitigation required; • Transport – infrastructure improvements required; • Access – poor pedestrian and cycle connections; • Landscape & AONB – sensitive development required; • Ashdown Forest SPA – mitigation required; | <p>1 constraint maintained during Section 78 Appeal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSDC - no conservation objection (impact upon Listed viaduct “less than substantial”); • No ecology/arboriculture objection (set back from Ancient Woodland); • Transport objection withdrawn (see above) – off-site improvements supported; • No access objection - pedestrian and cycle connections provided; • Landscape objection maintained (see above), albeit Site <u>not</u> situated in AONB; • No SPA objection (14ha SANG provided and funded) |
| Proposed density | Lower – 30dph | Lower – 30dph |
| Deliverable (1-5), Developable (6-10), Developable (11-15) | 0 units 0 units 0 units | 200 units - - |
| Overall Conclusion | Development of this site in isolation as a 'standalone' site does not represent a natural or incremental extension to the built-up area and it is considered unsuitable for development. | Site is undesignated land, which immediately adjoins existing settlement. MSDC did not object on any other ground except “landscape impact”. All other matters were agreed. |

Barton Willmore LLP
26 January 2017