

Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement – 13th January 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Mid Sussex District Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the Examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Hassocks Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan can proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Hassocks Neighbourhood Development Plan relates to the area that was designated by Mid Sussex District Council as a neighbourhood area in July 2012. This area corresponds with the Hassocks Parish boundary that lies within Mid Sussex District and South Downs National Park Local Planning Authority Areas.

2.2 Following the submission of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Development Plan to the District Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The formal publicity period ended on Monday 16th September 2019 with a focused extended consultation until 14th October 2019.

2.3 Mr Andrew Ashcroft BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI was appointed by Mid Sussex District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority with the consent of Hassocks Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Development Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The Examiner's report concludes that subject to making the recommended modifications recommended, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the recommendations made by the Examiner's report, and the reasons for them, Mid Sussex District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority in consultation with Hassocks Parish Council have decided to accept the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations. The reasons set out have in some cases been paraphrased from the Examiners report for conciseness. This statement should be read alongside the Examiner's Report.

3.3 If a Local Planning Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications being made, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the legal requirements and basic conditions then it can proceed to Referendum.

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Policy 1: Local Gaps</p>		
<p>In criterion 1 replace 'or some other.... countryside' with 'or other uses which accord with national and local policies for the use of land and buildings in the countryside.'</p> <p>In criterion 2 - add 'or Policy SD25 of the South Downs Local Plan as appropriate to the location of the proposed development' delete 'and...Local Gap'</p> <p>The amended part of the policy will read as follows:</p> <p>Development will be supported within the Local Gap where:</p> <p>1. It is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, or some other use which has to be located in the countryside <u>or other uses which accord with national and local policies for the use of land and buildings in the countryside</u>; or</p> <p>2. It is a scheme for housing that is in accordance with MSDP Policy DP6 (1-3) or Policy SD25 of the South Downs Local Plan as appropriate to the location of the proposed development; and includes an appropriate landscape buffer to strengthen the purposes of the Local Gap; <u>and it would not compromise individually or cumulatively the objectives and fundamental integrity of the gaps between Hassocks and the settlements of Ditchling, Hurstpierpoint, and Burgess Hill.</u></p>	<p>The first criterion as submitted does not have the clarity required by the NPPF. The second part of this criterion relates to the requirement for a landscape buffer to be associated with any proposed housing schemes. In this regard the need or otherwise for landscaping of whatever type would be a matter of judgement for the Local Planning Authority. The change to the second criterion incorporates reference to the appropriate policy in the South Downs Local Plan in so far as that policy would apply within elements of the various Local Gaps which fall within the National Park.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 1: Local Gaps – Supporting Text		
<p>In paragraph 4.14 (second sentence) replace 'keep these areas.... Local Gap' with 'ensure that development in these areas is restricted to that which would be appropriate to safeguard the separation of the settlements concerned whilst ensuring that sustainable development takes place within the Plan period.</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 4.14 add: <u>The policy identifies specific types of development which would be supported within the identified Local Gaps. It seeks to balance the need for policy clarity on the one hand with facilitating the sustainable use of land and buildings in the countryside. This is particularly reflected in the two criteria in the policy. The boundaries of the Local Gaps where they adjoin Hassocks/Keymer are mostly common with the built-up area boundary of the village. Development proposals which may arise in a Local Gap immediately adjacent to built-up area boundary will be determined against both Policy DP6 of the adopted District Plan, Policy DP25 of the South Downs Local Plan and Policy 1 of the HNP. Whilst these policies overlap, Policy 1 of this Plan would have a particular focus on ensuring that the proposal would not compromise the integrity of the Local Gap concerned.</u></p>	<p>For clarity purposes. The phrasing 'keep these areas free from development in the longer term' is at odds with the specific support to development in the policy itself. In addition, it fails to take account of the 'Plan period' in its rather loose use of 'the longer term.'</p> <p>For clarity purposes.</p>	Accept modification
Policy 1: Hassocks-Burgess Hill Local Gap Boundary		
<p>Add at after the above paragraph: <u>Remove the parcel of land within the application sites of planning applications DM/19/1897 and DM/18/2342 from the Hassocks – Burgess Hill Local Gap and as shown in Appendix 1 to the Examiner's report.</u></p>	<p>Planning permission has been granted on this area of land and therefore should be excluded from the Local Gap boundary designation.</p>	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 2: Local Green Spaces		
<p>In the first part of the policy delete LGS1, LGS2 and LGS4. Replace the final part of the policy with: <u>'Proposals for development within designated Local Green Spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances'</u></p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>The Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan designates the following locations as Local Green Spaces (as shown on the Proposals Map):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the north of Shepherds Walk (LGS1). 2. Land at the Ham (LGS2). 3. Land to the south of Clayton Mills (LGS3). 4. Land to the east of Ockley Lane (LGS4). 5. Land at south of Downlands (LGS5). 6. Land to the west of the railway line (LGS6). 7. Land at Pheasant Field (LGS7). 8. Land at Clayton Mills (LGS8). <p>Development proposals, which conflict with the purpose of this designation, will be resisted in these areas. <u>Proposals for development within designated Local Green Spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances.</u></p> <p>Modify the Proposals Map accordingly to remove LGS1, 2 and 4 designations</p>	<p>LGS1, 2 and 4 do not meet the NPPF criteria as being demonstrably special and in addition planning permission has been granted for development on land which includes LGS 1. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that LGS designation will rarely be appropriate where land has planning permission for development.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 2: Local Green Spaces – supporting text		
<p>In paragraph 4.19 after the second sentence insert: <u>'Three of the sites included in the submitted Plan were removed as an outcome of the independent examination.'</u></p> <p>In the third sentence of paragraph 4.19 replace 'These areas' with <u>'The remaining five local green spaces'</u></p>	<p>To ensure that there is an audit trail in terms of those proposed LGSs which were included in the background paper but which have now been recommended for removal and therefore do not translate into any Made neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Policy 3: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Replace the opening element of the second part of the policy with: <u>'Development proposals which include the provision of additional green infrastructure will be supported. Particular support will be given to proposals which'</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1 and 2 delete 'They' • In 3 replace 'Planting contributes' with <u>'includes planting which would contribute'</u> • In 4 delete 'Proposals' • At the end of criteria 1/2/3 add: 'and/or' • In the third part of the policy replace 'be resisted' with <u>'not be supported'</u> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Where proposals include the provision of additional green infrastructure these will be supported where <u>Development proposals which include the provision of additional green infrastructure will be supported.</u> <u>Particular support will be given to proposals which:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They seek to link to the existing path and open space networks; 2. They provide off road access for walking, cycling and horse-riding; 3. <u>Includes</u> Pplanting <u>which would</u> contributes to wildlife and links to existing woodland, hedges and streams; and 4. Proposals include the planting of native species. <p>Proposals, which would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure, will be resisted <u>not be supported</u> unless it can be demonstrated that the development proposals brings new opportunities which mitigates or compensates any loss whilst ensuring the protection of the existing ecosystem.</p>	<p>The policy as drafted suggests that any development proposal would need to comply with all the four criteria listed. In many cases this will be impracticable. Other changes to wording are recommended for clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 4: Managing Surface Water		
<p>In the first part of the policy replace 'Development proposals' with 'Technical proposals'</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows: Development <u>Technical</u> proposals which seek to reduce the risk of surface water flooding will be supported. Development proposals should seek to reduce existing run-off rates in the first instance.</p>	<p>The first part of the policy is intended to give support to specific technical measures to reduce the risk of flooding e.g. attenuation ponds.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 5: Enabling Zero carbon		
<p>In the first part of the proposal replace 'Support ... development proposals' with '<u>Development proposals will be supported</u>' In the second part of the policy delete 'All' Delete the third and fourth components of the policy.</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows: Support will be offered for <u>Development proposals will be supported</u> that maximise the opportunity to include sustainable design features, providing any adverse local impacts can be made acceptable. All Residential development proposals that modify existing buildings (including extensions) should seek to maximise the inclusion of energy-saving measures and renewable energy generation. Planning applications for developments of new dwellings must be accompanied by an Energy Assessment using the standard assessment procedure* (SAP) to demonstrate how carbon dioxide emissions are to be minimised onsite. All new residential development will be required to demonstrate that the net maximum heat energy requirement of the dwelling calculated using the SAP is 15 kWh/m2/year or less**/**. Proposals which make provision for charging electric vehicles at each dwelling (where feasible) and on-street; and making parking areas charging ready will be supported.</p>	<p>The third component is a process matter rather than a land use policy. The fourth component does not comply with the Government's Written Ministerial Statement (2015) which makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not set out any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. In addition, this element of the policy has not been tested for the potential impact on the viability of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 6: South Downs National Park		
<p>In criterion 4 replace 'no significantly' with '<u>not unacceptably</u>' Replace 1/2/3/4 with bullet points.</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals within the South Downs National Park will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Have regard to the purposes and duty of the Park Authority; and • 2. Conserve and enhance the landscape character, scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park. <p>Development proposals on land outside of, but contributing to, the setting of the South Downs National Park will be supported where proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3. Do not detract from, or cause detriment to, the special qualities and tranquillity of the South Downs National Park; and • 4. Do no significantly <u>not unacceptably</u> harm the South Downs National Park or its setting. 	<p>For clarity and to correct a spelling mistake. As with other policies it is recommend that the numbers used for the different criteria are replaced with bullet points. In this case it removes the confusion of the use of 3 and 4 for the first and second criteria of the second part of the policy.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 7: Development in Conservation Areas		
<p>At the beginning of the policy add: <u>'Development proposals in the Keymer Conservation Area and in the Clayton Conservation Area will be assessed against Policy DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy SD 15 in the South Downs Local Plan.'</u></p> <p>In particular development proposals should have regard to the following special features:'</p> <p>Delete the first part of the policy. Delete the two sets of sentences which begin with 'The following special features' and 'Any development'</p>	<p>To ensure that the relationship between the District Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan policy approaches is clear as in several respects the policy is a hybrid policy. Other consequential and layout modifications to the policy are also needed.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 7: Development in Conservation Areas continued		
<p>At the start of the schedule 1-8 add a heading to read '<u>Keymer Conservation Area</u>.</p> <p>At the start of the schedule 9-18 add a heading to read '<u>Clayton Conservation Area</u>.</p> <p>Replace numbers 1-18 with bullet points.</p> <p>The relevant parts of the Policy will read as follows:</p> <p><u>Development proposals which seek to preserve or enhance in the Keymer Conservation Area and Clayton Conservation Area will be supported assessed against Policy DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy SD15: in the South Downs Local Plan.</u></p> <p>The following special features have been identified in the Keymer Conservation Area:</p> <p>The following special features have been identified in the Clayton Conservation Area:</p> <p><u>In particular development proposals should have regard to the following special features:</u></p>	See above.	See above.
Policy 9: Character and Design		
<p>Replace the opening part of the policy with:</p> <p><u>'Development proposals will be supported where they have regard to the Hassocks Townscape Appraisal, and where their character and design takes account of the following design principles as appropriate to the nature, scale and location of the particular proposal:</u></p> <p>In the sixth criterion replace 'significant' with '<u>unacceptable</u>'.</p>	For clarity as required by the NPPF.	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 9: Character and Design continued		
<p>The relevant parts of the Policy will read as follows: Development proposals will be supported where they <u>have regard to the Hassocks Townscape Appraisal, and where their character and design takes account of the following design principles as appropriate to the nature, scale and location of the particular proposal are in line with the Townscape Appraisal, and where the character and design:</u></p> <p>Does not cause significant <u>unacceptable</u> harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight and security;</p>	See above.	See above
Policy 10: Protection of Open Space		
<p>Replace 1/2/3/4/5 with bullet points.</p> <p>In the first part of the policy (second sentence) replace 'is to be of' with <u>'should be'</u></p> <p>In the second component of the policy replace the opening part with: <u>'The neighbourhood plan identifies the following areas of public space. They are shown on the Proposals Map.'</u></p> <p>The relevant parts of the Policy will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals, which provide a mix of formal and informal open space to meet local need, will be supported. Open space is to be of <u>should be</u> high quality and serve local need.</p> <p>The Proposals Map identifies the following areas of public open space: <u>The neighbourhood plan identifies the following areas of public space. They are shown on the Proposals Map:</u></p>	For clarity as required by the NPPF.	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 11: Outdoor Play Space		
<p>Replace 'will be required to' with '<u>should</u>'.</p> <p>At the end of the first sentence add: '<u>on the site concerned</u>'.</p> <p>In the second sentence replace 'This should...site, or' with '<u>Where on site provision is not practicable</u>' and '<u>community facilities</u>' with '<u>play areas and associated equipment</u>'.</p> <p>The relevant parts of the Policy as amended will read as follows: Development proposals of 5 or more homes will be required to <u>should</u> provide play areas and associated equipment. This should be preferably provided on site or alternatively <u>Where on site provision is not practicable</u> financial contributions should be provided towards both the provision and long term maintenance of off site community facilities <u>play areas and associated equipment</u>.</p>	<p>This is to take account of the flexibility that may exist for new developments to contribute towards more substantial facilities off site but within close proximity to the development concerned and to comply with Paragraph A 2.9 of Appendix 2 of MSDC's Infrastructure, Development and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 13: Education Provision		
<p>In the first part of the policy delete 'two-form entry'.</p> <p>Delete the second part of the policy.</p> <p>Reposition the second part of the policy so that it sits as a second part of Aim 2.</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows: The provision of a two-form entry primary school within the Parish will be supported.</p> <p>The Parish Council will work with the Local Education Authority, Mid Sussex District Council, and developers to ensure a school is provided to meet growing demand in the Parish and in accordance with other policies in the HNP.</p> <p>Aim 2: Education Facilities Support will be offered for the delivery of adequate education facilities to meet the needs of all ages of the local resident population. <u>The Parish Council will work with the Local Education Authority, Mid Sussex District Council, and developers to ensure a school is provided to meet growing demand in the Parish and in accordance with other policies in the HNP.</u></p>	<p>The mention of a two form entry is already satisfactorily addressed in the supporting text. In any event the organisation and the intake policy of a new school is not a land use matter. The second part of the policy would be better repositioned into Aim 2.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 14: Residential Development		
<p>Replace points 3-7 inclusive with <u>'they are in accordance with Policy DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy SD25 of the South Downs Local Plan and Policy 1 of this Plan.'</u></p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals for residential development outside of the built-up area of Hassocks will be supported where <u>they are in accordance with Policy DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy SD25 of the South Downs Local Plan and Policy 1 of this Plan:</u></p> <p>3. The proposed development is for fewer than 10 dwellings; and</p> <p>4. The site is contiguous with an existing built-up area of the settlement; and</p> <p>5. The site is outside of the South Downs National Park; and</p> <p>6. The development is demonstrated to be sustainable, including by reference to Hassock's position in the settlement category hierarchy of MSDP Policy DP6; and</p> <p>7. The development is located within the Local Gap, it complies with the criteria of Policy 1: Local Gap.</p>	<p>The second part of the policy is over-complicated and largely repeats other policies in either the District Plan (fewer than 10 dwellings, contiguous with the built-up area), policies in the South Downs Local Plan, and within the neighbourhood plan (the Local Gap policy).</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 15: Hassocks Golf Club		
<p>Delete criteria 1 and 8.</p> <p>In criterion 3 replace 'Allow for the retention of' with <u>'Retain'</u></p> <p>In criterion 5 replace 'suitable' with <u>'appropriate'</u></p> <p>In criterion 6 replace 'Protect' with <u>'Safeguard'</u></p>	<p>For clarity as required by the NPPF. The first criterion which relates to the Local Gap is unnecessary as the Golf Club, as identified on the Proposals Map, is outside the Local Gap. In any event any development which may be proposed adjacent to the Golf Course site in the Local Gap would be assessed against the contents of Policy DP13 of the District Plan and Policy 1 of this Plan. Criterion 8 which refers to the details of the maintenance of open space is not directly a land-use matter.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 15: Hassocks Golf Club continued		
<p>Policy as amended will read as follows: Residential development proposals on land at Hassocks Golf Club (as identified on the Proposals Map) will be supported where proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For residential development do not extend into the Local Gap (as identified on the Proposals Map); 2. Protect ancient woodland; 3. Allow for the retention of <u>Retain</u> existing mature trees and hedges; 4. Protect and do not adversely affect heritage assets, including Friars Oak House and its rural setting; 5. Provide an <u>suitable appropriate</u> mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs for current and future households; 6. Protect <u>Safeguard</u> the amenity of existing residential properties bordering the site; 7. Provide a mix of high quality formal and informal open space; 8. Include details for the maintenance of public open space; 9. Provide land to the west of Belmont Recreation Ground for formal/informal open space; 10. Provide suitable access and parking; and 11. Maximise opportunities to facilitate and provide the increased use of alternative means of transport to private non-carbon fuelled vehicles. 	See above	See above
Policy 16: Land to the North of Clayton Mills and Mackie Avenue		
Delete criteria 1/3/8.	For clarity as required by the NPPF. The first criterion which relates to the Local Gap is unnecessary as the strategic site, as identified on the Proposals Map, is outside the Local Gap. Criterion 3 (transfer of land to the Parish Council) is not directly a land-use matter. In terms of criterion 8 (reference to the South Downs National Park), the strategic allocation has already been assessed for its impact on the landscape in its allocation in the District Plan.	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 16: Land to the North of Clayton Mills and Mackie Avenue continued		
<p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Land to the north of Clayton Mills and Mackie Avenue is allocated as a Strategic Development in MSDP Policy DP 11. Development Proposals on this site will be supported where they accord with MSDP DP 11. To ensure the site is developed in line with the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the HNP, HPC will support proposals which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not extend into the Local Gap (as identified on the Proposals Map); 2. Provide a greenspace buffer on the northern periphery of the site to form a defensible boundary and to prevent coalescence with Burgess Hill; 3. Transfer land within the greenspace buffer to the Parish Council; 4. Protect the amenity of existing residential properties bordering the site; 5. Provide a suitable mix of dwelling type and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households; 6. Protect existing Public Rights of Way within, and adjacent to, the site and their open aspect through suitable landscaping; 7. Provide and enhance safe pedestrian and cycle routes from Hassocks village centre to Burgess Hill via the development site; 8. Do not detract from, or cause detriment to, the special qualities and tranquility of the South Downs National Park (in line with HNP Policy 6); 9. Protect the setting of the nearby heritage asset; 10. Protect existing open space to the south of the strategic allocation; 11. Provide a mix of high quality formal and informal open space; 12. Provide suitable access and parking arrangements; and 13. Maximise opportunities to facilitate and provide the increased use of alternative means of transport to private non-carbon fuelled vehicles. 	See above.	See above.

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Policy 17: Affordable Housing</p> <p>Delete the second and third components of the policy.</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Residential development proposals should provide a mix of affordable housing sizes, types and tenures aligned to meet the needs of the Parish.</p> <p>When allocating the first letting of a home within a new development of general needs housing, priority will be given to bids from applicants who have a local connection to the parish of Hassocks. In order to establish a local connection, the applicant(s) must meet one of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resides in the Parish of Hassocks as their only, or principal home, and has done so for the previous 2 years; or 2. Has resided in the Parish of Hassocks as their only, or principal home, for a period of at least 3 years in aggregate out of the preceding 5 years; or 3. Is in paid employment in the Parish of Hassocks (working 16 hours or more a week) and has been for the previous 2 years; or 4. Has close relatives who reside in the Parish of Hassocks as their only, or principal home, and have done so for at least the previous 5 years, or the previous 2 years if the Applicant is aged 65 or over. <p>Larger new developments containing 250 homes or more in total are intended to meet the housing needs of the whole District and are therefore exempt from the local connection criteria above.</p>	<p>The second and third parts of the policy do not meet the basic conditions tests. The second part is an expression of the MSDC Housing Allocation Scheme (April 2018). Whilst the provision of affordable housing is a land use matter its allocation is not land use matter. In any event paragraphs 6.42 to 6.44 of the supporting text properly describe the local circumstances which apply in Mid Sussex.</p> <p>The third part of the policy addresses a strategic matter and which overlaps with the Housing Allocation Scheme.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy 18: Village Centre		
<p>In the first part of the policy replace 'seek to' with '<u>would</u>'</p> <p>In the second part of the policy delete 'This will include...to'. At the end of this part of the policy add '<u>will be particularly supported</u>'</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals which seek to enhance the character and sense of place of the central retail and commercial area of Hassocks will be supported.</p> <p>This will include, but is not limited to, <u>Proposals to enhance parking facilities, traffic flow, pedestrian and cycling facilities, shop frontages, green spaces, public realm and signage will be particularly supported.</u></p>	<p>In the interests of clarity.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>
Policy 19: Tourism		
<p>Replace 'provided' with '<u>where</u>' and 'the' with '<u>their</u>'</p> <p>Include '<u>character and appearance of the</u>' before 'local area'</p> <p>Policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals, which promote tourism activities and include overnight accommodation, will be supported provided <u>where</u> the their siting, scale, and design has regard to, and reflects the <u>character and appearance</u> of <u>the</u> local area.</p>		<p>Accept modification</p>
Other Matters - General		
<p>Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.</p>	<p>It is considered appropriate for MSDC, the SDNPA and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text as a result of the recommended modifications</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
The Plan Period		
On the front cover of the Plan (after 'Plan') and in paragraph 1.1 identify that the Plan period is 2014 to 2031.	For clarity purposes and to ensure this matter should be more clearly expressed in the Plan	Accept modification
Proposals Map		
Replace the Proposals Map with a Policies Map produced to the same scale and clarity as Map 12/12a in the District Plan.	The submitted Plan has addressed a series of complex matters. Its various policies are shown on a single Proposals Map which is complicated to understand. This is reinforced as several of the proposed designations overlap. In addition, the map is of a scale which does not provide the clarity required for a development plan document.	Accept modification
Foreword		
Delete Foreword or update its contents so that it relates to the referendum stage of the plan-making process.	The Fore word includes several general statements about the role and purpose of neighbourhood plans. Some of its statements are factually correct. Others are potentially misleading. It has primarily been designed as an explanation of the role of the neighbourhood plan to local residents. It also seeks comments through what was the submission consultation process. In the event that the Plan proceeds to referendum and is made it will need to be substantially updated or deleted. In that context the Introduction provides an appropriate context for the Plan at that stage.	Accept modification
Introduction		
Replace paragraphs 1.12 and 1.13 with: 'The South Downs Local Plan was adopted in July 2019'	To update the plan as since the Neighbourhood Plan was prepared the South Downs Local Plan has been adopted.	Accept modification

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Monitoring and review of the Neighbourhood Plan		
<p>In paragraph 9.2 replace the second sentence with: 'It will be used to determine planning applications'</p> <p>In paragraph 9.3 insert 'part of the' between 'become' and 'Development Plan'</p> <p>Replace paragraph 9.4 with 'Once part of the development plan the Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness of the Plan's policies'</p> <p>Add a further paragraph (9.7) to read:</p> <p>Through its monitoring process the Parish Council will take a view of the effectiveness or otherwise of the policies in the Plan. It will also use this information to come to a view on the need or otherwise for a full or a partial review of the Plan to be undertaken. A key event for the consideration of a review process will be the outcome of the adoption of the Mid Sussex Sites Allocation Development Plan Document (and any implications which may arise from the potential allocation of additional sites in Hassocks), the review of the Mid Sussex District Plan starting in 2021 and any review of the South Downs Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan is silent on the need or otherwise for any review. Any made neighbourhood plan will need to take into account potential changes to the wider development plan. In this context MSDC is now consulting on its emerging Site Allocations DPD and the final version of the Site Allocations DPD may be different from the October 2019 consultation draft. In addition the District Council intends to begin a review of the District Plan in 2021 and there will be a future review of the South Downs Local Plan.</p> <p>Additional text is needed in this part of the Plan to draw attention to this matter.</p>	<p>Accept modification</p>