

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

# **Statement of Consultation**

Regulation 22(1)(c)

**Appendix 9**

**Summary of Responses (Regulation 19) – Policies**

December 2020

# Contents

Policy: SA GEN – General Principles for Site Allocations .....	3
Policy: SA1 – Sustainable Economic Development – Additional Site Allocations .....	5
Site: SA2 – Burnside Centre, Burgess Hill .....	6
Site: SA3 – Former KDG, Burgess Hill.....	7
Site: SA4 – Land north of A264, Copthorne .....	8
Site: SA5 – Bolney Grange Business Park .....	9
Site: SA6 – Marylands Nursery, Bolney .....	10
Site: SA7 – Cedars, Brighton Road, Pease Pottage .....	11
Site: SA8 – Pease Pottage Nurseries .....	12
Site: SA9 – Science and Technology Park.....	13
Policy: SA10 – Housing .....	15
Policy: SA11 – Additional Housing Allocations.....	21
Policy: SA11 – Additional Housing Allocations – Omission Sites .....	26
Site: SA12 – 96 Folders Lane, Burgess Hill .....	29
Site: SA13 – South of Folders Lane, East of Keymer Road, Burgess Hill .....	31
Site: SA12 – 96 Folders Lane, Burgess Hill and SA13 – South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill .....	33
Site: SA14 – Land South of Selby Close, Burgess Hill .....	36
Site: SA15 – Land South of Southway, Burgess Hill .....	37
Site: SA16 – The Brow and St. Wilfrid's Catholic Primary School, School Close, Burgess Hill .....	39
Site: SA17 – Woodfield House, Isaacs Lane, Burgess Hill .....	40
Site: SA18 – East Grinstead Police Station, East Grinstead .....	41
Site: SA19 – Crawley Down Road, East Grinstead .....	43
Site: SA20 – Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead .....	46
Site: SA19 – Crawley Down Road, East Grinstead and SA20 – Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead .....	50
Site: SA21 – Rogers Farm, Fox Hill, Haywards Heath .....	55
Site: SA22 – Land north of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down .....	56
Site: SA23 – Land at Hanlye Lane to the east of Ardingly Road, Cuckfield.....	58
Site: SA24 – Land to the north of Shepherd's Walk, Hassocks .....	60
Site: SA25 – Selsfield Road, Ardingly .....	61
Site: SA26 – Hammerwood Road, Ashurst Wood.....	63
Site: SA27 – Land at St Martin Close, Handcross.....	65
Site: SA28 – Land South of The Old Police House, Birchgrove Road, Horsted Keynes .....	67
Site: SA29 – Land south of St Stephens Church, Hamsland, Horsted Keynes.....	69
Site: SA30 – Land to the north of Lyndon, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common .....	71
Site: SA31 – Land to the rear Firlands, Church Road, Scaynes Hill.....	73
Site: SA32 – Withypitts Farm, Turners Hill.....	74
Site: SA33 – Ansty Cross Garage, Ansty .....	75

Policy: SA34 – Existing Employment Sites .....	76
Policy: SA35 – Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements.....	77
Policy: SA36 – Wivelsfield Railway Station .....	78
Policy: SA37 – Burgess Hill / Haywards Heath Multifunctional Network.....	79
Policy: SA38 – Air Quality .....	81

Policy: SA GEN – General Principles for Site Allocations			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 10	Support: 2	Object: 5	Neutral: 3
Key Issues Raised			MSDC comments
<b>General</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under 'Landscape considerations', we welcome the third bullet point which sets out requirements with regard to the SDNP (777, South Downs National Park Authority)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes policy wording regarding biodiversity net gains (748, Sussex Wildlife Trust)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes addition of 'Historic environment and cultural heritage' section to reinforce relationship between SA policies and DP requirements (668, Historic England)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly support the requirements of all allocations to ensure there is net gain to biodiversity (710, Natural England)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should include requirements to monitor biodiversity net gain. Recommends water efficiency policy with a water consumption rate of 100 litres per person per day by 2040, in line with Southern Water's "Target 100". DPD should recognise soil as a finite resource and include mitigation (710, Natural England)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New strategic policies and monitoring framework will be considered further through District Plan review.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New suggested policy on Water Supply/ Wastewater Infrastructure (622, Thames Water)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New strategic policies will be considered further through District Plan review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of climate change policy (689, CPRE)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New strategic policies will be considered further through District Plan review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SGN requests early engagement to co-ordinate necessary works on gas infrastructure (624, Southern Gas Networks)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second bullet point under Landscape consideration set a very high bar, exceeds DP16 but consider this a sound approach given paragraph 172 of the NPPF. However, currently in conflict with SA25. (705, Nexus, Miller Homes)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. No conflict with SA25. See SA25 for response relating to principle of development in the AONB.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments in relation to Access and Highways, given acceleration of home working, use of electric vehicles and reduced work for (1005, resident)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Longer term impacts of current shift to working from home and increased use of electric vehicles will be considered further through District Plan review</li> </ul>
<b>Policy wording</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend changes to wording under 'Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure' heading regarding ecological information required for validation/ determination of planning applications: "Carry out <b>and submit</b> habitat and species surveys at the earliest opportunity in order <b>to inform the design and</b> to conserve important ecological assets from negative direct and indirect effects." (748 – Sussex Wildlife Trust)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – MO9)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term 'Special qualities' is not applicable to High Weald AONB. Amended wording suggested:  Under 'Landscape considerations' first two bullet points</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – MO5, MO6, MO7)</li> </ul>

<p>Bullet point 1 “Undertake Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or Appraisal (LVIA) on any rural and edge of settlement sites. <b>In the AONB the LVIA will utilise AONB MP components as landscape receptors.</b> The LVIA will need to inform the site design, layout, capacity and any mitigation requirements.”</p> <p>Bullet point 2 “Development in the High Weald AONB or within its setting will need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty <del>and special qualities</del> of the High Weald, as set out in the High Weald Management Plan 2019-2024 and District Plan Policy DP16: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”.</p> <p>Bullet point 5 “Where development is required to adopt a landscape led approach, <b>including all developments within the AONB or its setting</b>; this includes respecting the local character of the area in built form be utilising appropriate architectural design, site layout and density which complements and contributes to the overall character and appearance of the area.” (642, High Weald AONB Unit).</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under ‘Historic environment and cultural heritage’ we suggest reference is also made to historic landscape. Reference should also be made to the wider strategic green infrastructure opportunities (777, South Down National Park Authority).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – MO8).</li> </ul>

**Policy: SA1 – Sustainable Economic Development – Additional Site Allocations**

**Number of Comments Received**

**Total: 4**    **Support: 1**    **Object: 3**    **Neutral:**

Comments Received	MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support proposed site allocation SA4 (654 - St Modwen).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the policy is sound and support proposed site allocation SA5 (1656 - London Town Property Holdings).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Omission of site 999 (3.47Ha) – access is achievable without loss of ancient woodland. Suitable for B1/B8 uses. Consider good market conditions. Opportunity to provide more employment sites taking into account the wider sub-regional context of the Gatwick Diamond – site 999 will help to meet the employment land need of Crawley (654 - St Modwen).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection Paper 4 (<b>SSP4</b>) sets out the site selection process for employment sites.</li> <li>Enough employment sites have been allocated to sufficiently meet the need not further sites area required.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the need for B8 use could be met through the existing Hub site – minimise the need to develop greenfield land elsewhere (706 - Glenbeigh).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site has planning consent. Changes to the uses consented can be made through planning application. Current planning application (DM/20/3614) at The Hub to vary a condition to provide more B8 use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Omission of part of site 604/ 993 – see SA34 (2444 - Crawley Garden Centre).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enough employment sites have been allocated to sufficiently meet the need; no further sites areas required.</li> </ul>

## Site: SA2 – Burnside Centre, Burgess Hill

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 4**    **Support: 2**    **Object: 1**    **Neutral: 1**

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Burgess Hill Shed” is located at this site; this is a valuable community resource and they should be found alternative accommodation. There should be a comprehensive study of what is required in the town before the Burnside Centre is removed (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy requires replacement facilities to be provided or demonstrated that the current use is no longer viable. This should apply to all existing organisations/groups that use the building.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landowner (West Sussex County Council) supports the proposed site allocation (1431 - West Sussex County Council).</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased to see that additional criteria have been added to the policy since the Regulation 18 consultation to ensure that any development is supported by a robust Flood Risk Assessment and that no development will take place within 8m of the watercourse (713 - Environment Agency)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>   |

## Site: SA3 – Former KDG, Burgess Hill

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 3**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 1**    **Neutral: 2**

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site has planning permission for industrial use, the Council requests it is used for housing as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood Plan allocation relates to a mixed-use development at this location, this will not be possible when the existing planning permission is implemented.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic issue around the bend of Victoria Road; request a link road (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A link road is not currently being considered.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not an additional employment site allocation as it already has planning permission (1482 - Hargreaves).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed site allocation will still count towards employment need as it was not previously counted as a 'commitment'.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intending to deliver flexible business accommodation on site including B8 Storage and Distribution, as per the extant planning permissions (1482 - Hargreaves).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M11).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy wording does not recognise the extant planning permission for B8 use; suggest amending the policy wording (1482 - Hargreaves).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M11).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not appropriate for policy wording to require a justification for the quantum of development proposed for each use (1482 - Hargreaves).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider this is required to ensure a mix of uses to meet employment/business need and demand.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to Use Class B1 should be replaced by Use Class E; suggest amending the policy wording (1482 - Hargreaves).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M01).</li> </ul>



## Site: SA4 – Land north of A264, Copthorne

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 8	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 6	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposed site allocation – will help to contribute towards meeting employment need (654 - St Modwen Developments).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to consider the implications of Use Class E. Consider that the site isn't large enough for a mix of E(g) (former B1) and B8 – the site is more likely to be used as B8 given its location and demand in the area. Suggest amending policy wording (654 - St Modwen Developments).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M01).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area was intended to be retained as a landscape screen between the A264 and the residential development permitted to the north. This use would contradict its purpose (625 - Worth Parish Council) (1457 - Copthorne Village Association).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site was appraised favourably in Site Selection Paper 4 (SSP4) and the Sustainability Appraisal therefore is a suitable site for allocation, its location is supported by the NPPF.</li> <li>The policy wording requires the provision of a comprehensive landscaping scheme and a landscape screen.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is not required to meet the residual employment need (625 - Worth Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites DPD seeking to meet the residual employment need identified in the District Plan. This site helps to provide a spread of employment land across the District.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No demand for such units in the area, particularly in the current economic climate (932 – resident) (1421 – resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites DPD seeking to meet a need for employment land over a longer term to 2031. The provision of additional employment land ensures that land supply is resilient to go with both peaks and troughs in the economy over the longer term.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the proposed site allocation is only for B1 use and not B8 use (625 - Worth Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the information available to date infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development are not envisaged (622 - Thames Water).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site was intended for landscaping as part of the St Modwen scheme to retain the 'strategic gap' between Crawley and Copthorne and shielding the development to the north from any view from the A264, when planning permission for the rest of the site was granted and key factor in granting approval. A reversal of previous assurances (769 - Resident) (932 – Resident) (1457 – Copthorne Village Association)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site was appraised favourably in Site Selection Paper 4 (SSP4) and the Sustainability Appraisal therefore is a suitable site for allocation, its location is supported by the NPPF.</li> <li>The policy wording requires the provision of a comprehensive landscaping scheme and a landscape screen.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development already seems to be underway (1005 – resident).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning permission on another part of site is currently under construction.</li> </ul>

## Site: SA5 – Bolney Grange Business Park

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 7</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider this proposed site allocation sound; the location is well-related to the strategic road network. The land is available, suitable and deliverable in the short-term (1656 - London Town Property Holdings).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested a landscaping scheme is included in the policy wording to minimise the impact on views from the South Downs, this hasn't been added (784 - Bolney Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy SA GEN – sets out the landscape considerations that will be applicable to all allocations therefore no need to repeat in this policy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stairbridge Lane is unsuitable for HGVs (706 - Glenbeigh).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAGEN requires transport assessment and sustainable transport strategy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not considered necessary to allocate due to the availability of land at the Hub site (706 - Glenbeigh).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hub site has planning consent. Changes to the uses consented can be made through planning application. Current planning application (DM/20/3614) at The Hub to vary a condition to provide more B8 use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider in conflict with the District Plan's sustainability objectives and the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan which commits to a small expansion (1681 - resident) (2186 – resident).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site was appraised favourably in Site Selection Paper 4 (<b>SSP4</b>) and the Sustainability Appraisal therefore is a suitable site for allocation, its location is supported by the NPPF.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The southern parcel of land: impacts on wildlife, health and wellbeing (access along Jobs Lane), traffic; no economic justification; climate change concerns from traffic; need to limit the impact of development on the countryside. (1681 – resident) (2163 – resident) (2186 – resident).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development boundary of Burgess Hill will move further east and change the character of the area (696 - Amtico Group)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will negatively affect residents and a local employer, the Hickstead Hotel through an adverse impact on views and amenities (696 - Amtico Group)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excessive amount of employment development in this location and will have a significant adverse impact on the visual characteristics, air quality, tranquillity and biodiversity of the area. (696 - Amtico Group)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site selection has been based on the availability of sites as set out in Site Selection Paper 4 (<b>SSP4</b>).</li> </ul>

## Site: SA6 – Marylands Nursery, Bolney

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 2**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 2**    **Neutral: 0**

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the need for a site-specific lighting plan to reduce light pollution is included in the policy wording (784 - Bolney Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendments to policy wording – Policy SA GEN refers to light pollution impacts. Lighting can also be addressed at the planning application stage.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although offered by the current developer, would like to secure the land required to create a second lane for traffic queuing to access the A272 (784 - Bolney Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguarding of land for highways to be addressed through SA35.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site not considered large enough for B8 uses (706 - Glenbeigh).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not considered necessary to allocate due to the availability of land at the Hub site (706 - Glenbeigh).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hub site has planning consent. Changes to the uses consented can be made through planning application. Current planning application (DM/20/3614) at The Hub to vary a condition to provide more B8 use.</li> </ul>

**Site: SA7 – Cedars, Brighton Road, Pease Pottage**

**Number of Comments Received**

**Total: 3    Support: 0    Object: 1    Neutral: 2**

**Comments Received**

**MSDC Response**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M12).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the information available to date infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development are not envisaged (622 - Thames Water).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise and welcome the conclusion that this proposed site allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the requirement to undertake a LVIA to consider the potential impacts on the special qualities of the High Weald AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA8 – Pease Pottage Nurseries

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 4**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 2**    **Neutral: 2**

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (<b>DPD2 – M13</b>)</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the information available to date infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development are not envisaged (622 - Thames Water).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about proximity to ancient semi-natural woodland at Bensonhill Wood; recommend a minimum 50m buffer between the development and the ancient woodland, unless the applicant can demonstrate very clearly how a smaller buffer would suffice – suggested amended policy wording (2360 - Woodland Trust).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendments to the policy wording in relation to ancient woodland – Natural England supports the current policy wording with regards to ancient woodland and District Plan Policy DP37 refers to 15m.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise and welcome the conclusion that this proposed site allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the requirement to undertake a LVIA to consider the potential impacts on the special qualities of the High Weald AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the requirements regarding ancient woodland in line with Natural England's standing advice (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>   |

## Site: SA9 – Science and Technology Park

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 5</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An extensive evidence base has been developed to support the allocation (688 - Vail Williams)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive partnership working with Mid Sussex District Council, West Sussex County Council and Highways England on highways matters (688 - Vail Williams)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement to develop an allocation wide masterplan and phasing strategy (which includes transport mitigation) in the Regulation 19 policy drafted is understood and accepted. Proposals indicate later phases may come forward outside the plan period (688 - Vail Williams).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will lead to increased traffic using the A23 northbound off slip and junction with the A272 and diversions along rural routes to avoid delays leading to a safety concern. Amendment to 'Highways and Access' policy requirements suggested (784 - Bolney Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at this junction.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support inclusion of flood risk and drainage in the site-specific requirements along with requirement not to develop in areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3, approach to green infrastructure and biodiversity to manage surface water (713 - Environment Agency).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excessive amount of employment development would be created in one location – adversely impacting visual characteristics, air quality, tranquillity and biodiversity (696 - Ampito Group).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad allocation for SA9 was secured under District Plan Policy DP1.</li> <li>Extensive evidence has been compiled in support of the allocation available at <a href="#">SA9.1-SA9.8</a>.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmful impact on existing local businesses and residential properties (696 - Ampito Group).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency support the approach to flood risk.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood risk issues – part of site is a functional floodplain and not suitable and is therefore unlikely to provide the quantum of development proposed (696 - Ampito Group).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency support the approach to flood risk.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable located leading to heavy car dependency (696 - Ampito Group).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximising sustainable transport interventions is a policy requirement. In addition provision of new bus routes and pedestrian and cycle links to Burgess Hill are also a policy requirement</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of demand for employment space in this location as evidenced by the resubmission of The Hub outline application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad allocation for SA9 was secured under District Plan Policy DP1.</li> </ul>

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Extensive evidence has been compiled in support of the allocation available at <b>SA9.1-SA9.8</b>.</li><li>• Allocation is for specific use within definition of Science park, which are different to The Hub site.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

## Policy: SA10 – Housing

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 58**    **Support: 4**    **Object: 53**    **Neutral: 1**

### Broken down into following topics<sup>1</sup>:

<b>Total : 3</b>	General
<b>Total: 13</b>	Windfall Allowance
<b>Total: 3</b>	Residual amount calculation
<b>Total: 27</b>	Under/over supply
<b>Total: 4</b>	Trajectory
<b>Total: 6</b>	C2 provision

## GENERAL

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 3**    **Support: 2**    **Object: 0**    **Neutral: 1**

Comments	MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reference to the potential for additional allocations through reviewed Neighbourhood Plans (625 - Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there is opportunity for adopted Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed, there are no Neighbourhood Plans currently at a 'review' stage. In addition, there is no certainty that any reviewed Neighbourhood Plans will allocate additional housing sites. The District Council must ensure sufficient sites are allocated to enable the housing requirement is met in full and it is doing this through the Site Allocations Document.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed DPD, spatial strategy and housing numbers strongly supported. The Council has a five year housing land supply (1373 - Stop Haywards Heath Golf Club)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution of housing across the settlement categories is felt to be proportionate (1821 - Savills)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Windfall Allowance

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 13**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 13**    **Neutral: 0**

Comments	MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ansty and Staplefield Parish, Worth Parish, Bolney Parish, Lindfield Parish lend its support to objections raised by Cuckfield Parish Council and the possible underestimate of the number of windfall homes (Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council - 617) (Worth Parish Council - 625) (Bolney Parish Council - 784) (Lindfield Parish Council - 1722)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Windfall Study (July 2020) (H1)</li> <li>District Plan housing supply included a 45 dpa allowance for windfall. 450 units in total over 10 years from year 6 to the end of the plan period.</li> <li>Council reviewed supply from windfalls to understand if adoption of Plan, in particular DP6 impacted on windfall supply.</li> <li>Revised windfall allowance to 84 dpa. 504 units in total over 6 years from year 6 to the end of the plan period.</li> <li>The allowance has not just been increased by 54, it is just that the remaining plan period is now shorter.</li> <li>Objections fall into two categories, Parish Councils who say allowance is too low and an increase would mean less/no allocations</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD proposes to increase windfall allowance. Proportionately there are more windfall units to be provided for than are now proposed to be allocated in cat 2 and cat 3 combined. MSDC still very reliant on delivery of homes from windfalls. Could impact on supply of affordable housing (684 – Strutt and Parker) (757 – Strutt and Parker)</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> Note: numbers do not total 57 comments as comments separated into themes



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allowance for windfall sites within the plan period has been underestimated by 168 dwellings (through the use of inconsistent methodology); 128 dwellings from small windfall sites (up to 9 dwellings) and 480 windfall sites over 9 dwellings. Results in overstate residual requirement by 608 units (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<p>within their Parish and the developers who say allowance is too high and a reduction could result in more allocations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As set out in Windfall Study, the Council believes that housing need should primarily be met through Plan led system and not place an over reliance on windfalls, whilst acknowledging that windfalls do make an important contribution to overall land supply.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent methodology, 6 years rather than 8 applied. Underestimate from greenfield sites. Exclusion of sites over 9 units. Changes to permitted development (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Windfall allowance should be reduced back to the figure agreed in the District Plan (450 dwellings). Table 2.3 represents an increase of 54 dwellings. Such change could only be justified through the availability of new evidence; however no such information exists (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over reliance on windfalls with an increase from 45 to 85 dwellings per annum. A more proactive approach to site allocations should be adopted to reduce the reliance and revert back to 45 dwellings per year (697 – Star Planning) (1791 – Planning Potential).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear how proper planning of sustainable development can be achieved by postponing further amendment to the windfall allowance until District Plan review. Windfall trends continue to perform strongly as should be reflected in a more accurate residual housing requirement figure (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase of 54 units in windfall allowance, based on 2 years monitoring only. DP figure should be used (730 - Genesis) (2059 - Miller Homes)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would question what evidence MSDC have to justify a windfall allowance of 504 dwellings over the remaining plan period (to 2031). On this basis there can be no guarantees that past rates will return, especially in the current climate, such that we do not believe there is compelling evidence to increase the windfall rate from what would be 450 to 504 dwellings (791 – Judith Ashton)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Windfall allowance has increased from District Plan level. There has been an under estimate of the extent of housing provision on windfall sites accommodating 1 - 9 units (789 – Tim North)</li> </ul>	

<b>Residual Amount</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Neutral: 0</b>

Comments	MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over-provision of 37.8% which could be deemed excessive. The Parish Council considers that the methodology used by MSDC to calculate Minimum residual requirements penalises those settlements who have already met their DP6 minimum requirement targets by ignoring the completions and commitments in excess of the DP6 figure for each settlement (625 - Worth Parish Council, 625)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish OAN Distribution Methodology (H3)</li> <li>SSP2 – Site Selection Paper 2: Methodology for Site Selection (SSP2)</li> <li>Introduction to Site Allocations DPD (TP3)</li> <li>The overall housing requirement and the spatial distribution requirement are minimum figures as set out in DP4: Housing and DP:6 Settlement Hierarchy.</li> <li>The methodology for updating the spatial distribution of housing requirement, (as set out in SA10 and updated from DP6) is the same as that used to inform the District Plan (H3).</li> <li>Completions during the Plan period and commitments are taken into account, as explained in the methodology. This has resulted in a reduction in the residual amount that the Site Allocation Document is seeking to deliver from 2,429 units to 1,280 units (explained further in Introduction to Site Allocations DPD TP3)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not consider settlements that have already taken sufficient housing numbers to meet District Plan Requirement as set out in DP6, such as Burgess Hill (615 - SOFLAG, 615)</li> </ul>	
<p>Table 2.4 of Policy SA10 of the Reg 19 Plan looks to update the spatial distribution of the housing requirements given completions and consents. In doing so it indicates that the minimum residual requirements in the category 1 and 2 settlements has reduced and that within the category 3 settlements has increased, as is clear from table 4 below. Unfortunately, no evidence is contained within the Reg 19 Plan to demonstrate how MSDC have come to these figures (791 – Judith Ashton)</p>	
<p>DPD is inconsistent with the spatial strategy set out in Policies DP4 and DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan because it allocates sites in settlements that have already met and exceeded their minimum requirement housing 'target' without demonstrating that settlements that have not met their 'target' do not have sufficient sustainable sites to meet the Residual Housing Requirement (765 – Councillor Gibson)</p>	

## Oversupply/Undersupply

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 27**   **Support: 0**   **Object: 27**   **Neutral: 0**

Comments	MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should be revised to aid the significantly increased housing number to meet housing need/ 5 year supply/ HDT. In order to provide resilience, the DPD does not go far enough with over-supply. Standard method will increase. (652 - Rodway) (753 – Lewis and Co Planning) (1791 – Planning Potential) (1842 - Lichfields) (2005 - Savills) (2031 - JLL) (2065 - ABC) (2067 - ABC) (2079 - ABC) (2080 - ABC) (2118 - Gladman) (2468 – Boyer Planning)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commitment of the Council to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to ensure the District Plan housing requirement is met in full is set out in DP4.</li> <li>The Site Allocations DPD is a 'daughter' document of the District Plan and therefore not required to revisit the housing need in Mid Sussex.</li> <li>The District Plan is less than 5 years old and therefore does not require review.</li> <li>DP4 and DP5 commit the Council to commence a review of the District Plan starting in 2021.</li> <li>The Site Allocations DPD provides an additional 484 units over the housing requirement and equates to an over provision of 37.8% of the residual housing requirement and 2.95% of the total District Plan housing requirement. This will allow sufficient flexibility in housing supply.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The buffer in para 73 of NPPF relates to the buffer applied to the 5-year housing land supply and not to a buffer requirement applied to the total housing requirement. Reference to the buffer applied in the 'Position Statement' is taken from the Annual Position Statement, again for the purpose of calculating the 5-year supply and not a requirement applied to the housing requirement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would encourage the Council to allocate additional sites to deliver what will be a much higher residual need (657 – DHA Planning)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing buffer has been incorrectly applied, far more than required by law (615 - SOFLAG)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversupply of land which would help to offset any future fall in the council housing land supply. This may not be a sufficient buffer. Allocation of additional land in DPD would ensure future changes to how housing figures are calculated has been planned for (664 - Whaleback) (684 – Strutt and Parker) (757 – Strutt and Parker) (1987 - JLL)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MSDC have applied the housing buffer incorrectly, far beyond that required by law, as set out NPPF para 73. The Position Statement goes on to say “For the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test Mid Sussex is a 5% authority” but will be applied a 10% buffer in accordance with the NPPF (615 - SOFLAG)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council should seek to safeguard supply of housing sites to ensure future needs are met (700 - Hallam)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan does not comply with housing policies in NPPF and will not boost supply of housing or meet affordable need. Not all allocated site will be fully development in plan period and the is insufficient margin to account for this. The plan does not provide sufficient housing in villages to meet requirements (1389 - Resident)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should assess merits of delivering more housing to address future needs (791 – J Ashton) (1443 - Lewis co Planning)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question if more sites should be allocated due to unviable sites, stepped trajectory and oversupply on windfalls (789 – Tim North)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-implementation buffer should be applied. This should be of at least 10% (705 - Nexus) (2059 – Miller Homes) (2140 - Sigma)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over supply of 434 is welcomed (700 - Hallam)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there is an oversupply from the allocated sites. Should allocate more sites to ensure a continuous supply (697 - Star Planning ) (743 - Rodway) (1454 – Wolf Bond)</li> </ul>	
<b>Trajectory</b>	
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>	

Total: 4	Support: 0	Object: 4	Neutral: 0	
<b>Comments</b>				<b>MSDC Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have some concerns regarding the balance between strategic and non-strategic scale allocations and the anticipated delivery trajectory. We would urge the Council to prioritise medium sized sites that can deliver quickly and require minimal intervention to supporting infrastructure (657 – DHA Planning) (1847 - Savills)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H2 – Housing Land Supply Note (H2)</li> <li>The Site Allocations Document allocates a range of sized sites, from 550 to 12 units, to ensure a good mix of sites that can come forward quickly in the shorter term to more longer-term schemes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan relies too much on limited number of sites. (697 - Star Planning)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council have applied an unrealistic trajectory for the delivery of development associated with Burgess Hill (657 – DHA Planning) (697 - Star Planning) (1454 – Woolf Bond)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding the delivery of the Strategic site at Burgess Hill have been informed by the landowner Homes England.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already cumulative shortfall of 470 in delivery since start of Plan (697 – Star Planning)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adoption of the Sites DPD will ensure a continues supply of sites over the plan period to ensure the District Plan requirement is met in full.</li> </ul>

## Provision of elderly persons accommodation (C2)

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 6**   **Support: 0**   **Object: 6**   **Neutral: 0**

<b>Comments</b>				<b>MSDC Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There does not appear to be any detailed or robust consideration given during the DPD process to the need for specific allocations of care homes within Mid Sussex pursuant to the available evidence base and Local Plan Policy DP30 (697 – Star Planning)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of specialist accommodation for elderly (TP4)</li> <li>HEDNA -</li> <li>SSP1 – Assessment of Housing Sites against District Plan Strategy (SSP1)</li> <li>SSP2 – Methodology for Site Selection (SSP2)</li> <li>SSP3 – Housing (SSP3)</li> <li>The HEDNA, prepared to support the District Plan, sets out the need for specialist accommodation for the elderly.</li> <li>In the same way the housing requirement of the District Plan is not being revisited during the Site Allocations Document, the specialist accommodation requirement is not being reviewed at this time. This will be for the District Plan Review to consider.</li> <li>The Inspector considering the s78 Albourne Appeal did not conclude that the District Plan was out of date and stated that the evidence presented by the Council was robust. In addition whilst the Inspector, on this occasion, preferred an alternative provision rate she did not go so far as to state that the rate used in the HEDNA was incorrect, in fact she acknowledged that the alternative provision rate was aspirational and not evidence based.</li> <li>The NPPF is clear, at paragraph 33 that local plans should be reviewed to assess</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not been able to identify in the DPD's evidence base any more up-to date analysis that obviates the need for care homes to be provided during the plan period (697 – Star Planning)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only Policy SA20 allocates a Class C2 care home as part of the 550 dwellings scheme at Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead (697- Star Planning)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is self-evident that the current Local Plan policy provisions in DP25 and DP30 are inadequate and the unmet need for elderly person accommodation must be further addressed in the SA DPD (709 – Barton Willmore)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new policy that expressly identifies the need for extra care accommodation and provides a positive policy basis against future applications can be assessed, supporting and promoting their provision and therefore providing greater certainty of delivery (709 - Barton Willmore)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient allocations to deal with the arising need so far as it has been identified in the evidence base for the District Plan (781 - Freeths) (786 – Strutt and Parker)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the policy decision to not allocate land for specialist accommodation is not justified as no evidence has been provided to explain the rationale or alternatives behind this decision. It is clear therefore that the plan cannot be considered effective in delivering</li> </ul>				

<p>development to meet elderly needs across the plan period (781 - Freeths) (2092 - Turley)</p>	<p>whether they need updating at least once every five years. It would be illogical for the requirement for special elderly person accommodation to be reviewed ahead of the District Plan Review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One single allocation for a Class C2 care home across the plan period in the authority area does not suitably meet the identified requirements within Mid Sussex, particularly in light of the uncertainty of the deliverability of the site including wider land ownership issues (2001 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The District Plan provides a policy framework that allows such accommodation to be delivered on suitable sites, if a need is demonstrated. As set out in DP30:Housing mix and the District Plan when read as a whole.</li> <li>• There were no sites suitable for allocations put forward for C2 uses during the call for sites/ plan making process.</li> </ul>

## Policy: SA11 – Additional Housing Allocations

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 135</b>	<b>Support: 5</b>	<b>Object: 118</b>	<b>Neutral: 12</b>
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------

### Broken down into following topics<sup>2</sup>:

<b>Total: 10</b>	General comment about site allocations
<b>Total: 9</b>	Selection of sites in AONB
<b>Total: 44</b>	Site Selection process and outcomes
<b>Total: 4</b>	Site Selection paper specific
<b>Total: 10</b>	Supporting non-allocation of 2 omission sites
<b>Total: 6</b>	6 new omission sites submitted
<b>Total: 56</b>	56 previously assessed omission sites

## GENERAL

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 10</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 8</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation of the number of sites in SA11 is appropriate given the number of dwellings provided, the settlement categories into which they have been allocated (1821)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.34 - 2.41 - specific reference should be made to the detailed policies contained within 'made' Neighbourhood Plans (690)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M19)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non site specific issues – merge Hassocks and BH, roads gridlocked, too much housebuilding, stop all development, use brownfield sites instead, redevelop high street, hospitals and schools (1533, 1546, 1547, 1616, 1837)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in site specific matters.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield allocations are likely to experience delay, 6 brownfield sites are allocated. Unexpected physical constraints and remediation work may lead to delay (2118)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing trajectory indicates that will come forward across Plan period to ensure constant housing supply. Some will be later in plan period.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of allocations lack appropriate justification and may not be deliverable (697)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information from site promoters that site would not be deliverable within plan period. MSDC working closely with site promoters to ensure timely delivery of sites.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate level of smaller sites to feed small to medium housebuilders (657)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan contains a mixture of site sizes with 14 of the 22 sites allocated for 50 units or less, giving opportunity for small and medium housebuilders.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very concerned about proportion of greenfield sites being allocated particularly given that no site-specific ecological data appears to be provided or considered (Sussex Wildlife Trust - 748)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecological data was requested following response from SWT at Reg18 – Site library includes where submitted.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appears primary purpose of DPD is to meet unmet need of Crawley, it would have been logical to provide for that unmet need as close as possible to Crawley Borough (2164)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst the housing requirement includes an element of Crawley's unmet need, the DPD isn't solely for this purpose. Travel to work patterns indicate the Crawley's need can be met anywhere in the District (Evidence)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site selection process was unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC guidance (1779)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site selection methodology set out in SSP2</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Note: numbers do not total 122 comments as comments separated into themes

## Development in AONB

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 9**    **Support: 1**    **Object: 8**    **Neutral: 0**

### Comments

- Welcome and recognise that a conclusion has been reached that none of the proposed site allocations constitutes major development within the AONB (710 – Natural England)
- Sites outside AONB which could have been used to meet the residual need have not been considered. Sites selected due to conformity with spatial strategy and hierarchy without the proper application of the 'great weight' required to protect AONB (2079 - ABC) (2080 - ABC) (708 – Kember LW)
- Should consider pallet of non AONB sites first to ensure the protection, the most appropriate sites should be considered first (762 - DMH) (764 - DMH) (737 - DMH)
- Sites should only be released in AONB settlements that have a residual requirement to meet, where target already met council should not release further AONB sites before exhausting non AONB sites (2140 - Sigma) (657 – DHA Planning)
- Conclusions of Major development in the AONB Topic Paper are wrong, exceptional circumstance cannot be demonstrated (657– DHA Planning)

### MSDC Response

- District Plan strategy was adopted on basis that development within AONB would be required.
- District Plan Inspectors Report noted at paragraph 53 “Some settlements lie within the AONB and may be appropriate for modest housing schemes, but there is no evidence that meeting the housing requirement will necessitate major development in the AONB other than that already permitted by the Council at Pease Pottage, or that it would harm the National Park.”
- Exceptional circumstance does not need to be demonstrated as District Plan established strategy for development in AONB.
- See Site Selection Paper 2 (**SSP2** and ANOB Topic Paper **TP1**) for further information.

## Site Selection process and outcomes

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 44**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 44**    **Neutral: 0**

### Comments

- Not in conformity with DP4, not allocating sufficient sites in Cat 3 settlements (1842 - Lichfields) (757 – Strutt and Parker) (762 - DMH) (730 - Genesis) (697 – Star Planning) (1791 – Planning Potential)
- Need exceeded in Burgess Hill but further sites allocated, whilst further sites in Hassocks not included as need exceeded. (753 – Lewis and co Planning)
- No direct comparison of marginal sites (753 – Lewis and co Planning)
- Only identified 238 dwellings at Category 3 settlements when residual need is 371 and residual need at Category 2 is also not being meet. There should be provision of additional units down the settlement hierarchy as well as up (1847 - Savills) (737 - DMH) (684 – Strutt and Parker) (697 – Star Planning)
- Wrong to regard additional provision at Cat 1 more sustainable than provision in accordance with spatial strategy (684 – Strutt and Parker) (730 - Genesis)
- Allocation of 80% (1,409 of 1,764) across Cat 1 is not an even distribution. Vast imbalance with only 105 units allocated at Cat 2 settlements. Disproportionate level of growth directed to 3

### MSDC Response

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (**SSP1, 2 and 3**)
- District Council is satisfied that it has followed the methodology for site selection as set out in SSSP 2. The SA demonstrated that the most sustainable sites, in accordance with the District Plan strategy have been allocated.
- There is no consensus amongst reps that sites have been wrongly/correctly allocated to one particular settlement over another. Representation made purely on basis of site promotion.
- Methodology was subject to consultation, and changes made.
- No objection from South Downs National Park to the principle of the allocation of sites near National Park boundary.

<p>main towns which could be spread more evenly to cat 2 settlements (657 – DHA Planning) (2005 -Savills)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of additional development at Cat 1 where significant development already prejudices the long term vitality and viability of lower order settlements (791- Judith Ashton)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of more home in Cat 2 should be supported to maintain vitality and viability (791- Judith Ashton) (2140 - Sigma) (657 – DHA Planning) (2031 - JLL)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 2 sites allocated at Cat 2 despite cat 2 settlements being among the more sustainable settlements in the District. (764 - DMH)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 25 dwellings allocated at Haywards Heath which cannot be justified in context of sustainability merits at Haywards Heath. Failing short of that required to meet settlement demographic needs (1454 – Woolf Bond) (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution of majority of new homes to 3 main towns/Cat 1 should be maintained to conform with DP (2140 – Sigma) (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New homes at Cat 2 and 3 should be supported to enhance vitality and viability of the rural settlements (1987 - JLL)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD does not allocate sufficient housing to meet need at Horsted Keynes (775 - Batchelor Monkhouse)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not consistent with DP as allocates more to Cat 3 than Cat 2 (657- DHA Planning)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No proposed allocations in Bolney. Over half the employment land is allocated in Bolney, clearly additional housing will be required to meet DP4 and demand created by increased employment land (694 - JLL)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection process is inconsistent, as demonstrated when comparing outcomes of SA12 and SA13 with assessment of Haywards Heath Golf Course (site 503) and with Batchelors Farm (site 573) (615 - SOFLAG)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council should place great weight to protection of nationally designated sites including South Downs National Park which would have directed more development to Cat 2 settlements/ Cat 3 settlements (764, 762, 737 – DMH Stallard)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much growth focused at Burgess Hill in DP with a further 612 to be allocated in the DPD, difficult to understand justification (2059 – miller Homes)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council should make use of sites in more sustainable locations, in lower tier settlements such as Pease Pottage, which has clear spatial advantages in comparison to other settlements in the District to assist with meeting the needs of Crawley. (747 – A2 Dominion)</li> </ul>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fail to explore opportunities closer to Crawley for housing development (584, 1487, 1808, 1809, 1811, 1813 - residents)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation of sites in the town to address the housing need arising from Crawley impacts on the market town heritage (584 - resident)</li> </ul>				
Site Selection Papers				
Number of Comments Received				
<b>Total: 4</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Neutral: 0</b>	
Comments				MSDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSP1 – 150m proximity to developed areas is arbitrary, taking no account of general balance of advantage/disadvantage of site (2164 – Lord Lytton)</li> <li>SSP1 – ignores fact that broad locations are not necessarily meant to be considered for allocation in their entirety. Excluded without further assessment of individual sites/areas within that broad location (1443 – Lewis co Planning)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection Paper 1 (<b>SSP1</b>) explains the approach taken to excluding sites that do not comply with District Plan strategy as the first stage in the site selection process. Section 2 explains that the process is based on planning judgement to enable consistent approach. No other way of doing this suggested.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSSP3 – did not display a balancing exercise covering all planning constraints, ruling out on low score in one area means potential higher scores and other planning merits are not considered (775 – Batchelor Monkhouse)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection Paper 2 (<b>SSP2</b>) explains the site selection methodology. Greater weight afforded to some assets in accordance with NPPF. A low score in one area cannot be balanced out by high score in another as this will not take into account assets of particular importance. Criteria not assumed to have equal weight and therefore is a matter of professional judgement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSP3 – appreciates site selection methodology led to exclusion of sites that were likely to impact on locally designated sites, this approach is in line with the NPPF (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSP3 - The SA notes this shortfall but outlines at paragraph 6.43 that this can be addressed by additional growth at Category 1 settlements commenting that “As Category 1 is the most sustainable settlement category, and under-supply should be met at categories higher-up in the settlement hierarchy, this approach is acceptable.” Whilst this is an approach we wholly support, it at odds with paragraph 2.4.5 of the Site Selection Paper 3 which states “Where the results of the site assessment exercise were found to leave a shortfall in capacity at one settlement hierarchy category the aim is that this shortfall would be met in the category above. For example, in the absence of sufficient suitable, available and developable sites in Category 3 the residual need is passed up to the settlements within Category 2, and so on.” (705 – Nexus Planning)</li> <li>SSP2 refers to unmet residual need being passed down i.e. unmet need to be passed from Category 2 to Category 3 (para 2.10 refers). However, SSP3 refers to unmet need to be passed up (para 2.4.5 refers) -This should be clarified. (625 - Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unmet need from cat 1 cannot be passed up. SSP1 written on basis that start at top tier/cat 1 so have to go down. In practice, as set out in SSP2, sensible in sustainability terms for need to be met at the higher tier.</li> <li>In practice cat 1 has oversupply perhaps not surprising given most sustainable/ size of sites available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failed to apply DP polices to site selection criteria which are therefore unsound. Conflicts with policies</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the exception of DP4/DP6 a policy off approach has been taken to site selection.</li> </ul>

<p>DP6, DP37, DP12, DP13, DP15, DP18, DP17 and DP38. (615 - SOFLAG) (2378 – Wellhouse Lane Residents)</p>	<p>This is to ensure an unconstrained assessment of sites. If this approach was not taken then most of the sites would have an immediate conflict with DP12.</p>		
<p><b>Support for not allocating sites</b></p>			
<p><b>Number of Comments Received</b></p>			
<p><b>Total: 10</b></p>	<p><b>Support: 3</b></p>	<p><b>Object: 1</b></p>	<p><b>Neutral: 6</b></p>
<p><b>Comments</b></p>		<p><b>MSDC Response</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Council not allocating Haywards Heath Golf Club (site # 503) (1373 – Stop Haywards Heat Golf Course;1432 - resident)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Council not allocating Land at Huntsland, Crawley - Down (site # 688) (718,735,771,813,1853,2400,2404,2445 - residents)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>	

## Policy: SA11 – Additional Housing Allocations – Omission Sites

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 6</b>	New omission sites submitted
<b>Total:56</b>	Previously assessed omission sites

Rep ID	New sites submitted (6 sites)	SHELAA ref	Parish	Settlement	Not previously considered
694	Land north of Bolney (smaller part of existing site)	541 (part)	Bolney	Bolney	Not subject to detailed assessment
588	Market Place Shopping Centre, BH	N/A	Burgess Hill	Burgess Hill	Not subject to detailed assessment
2001	Byanda Hassocks	N/A	Hassocks	Hassocks	Not subject to detailed assessment
1443	Maltings Farm, Burgess Hill	740 (part)	Hurstpierpoint	Burgess Hill	Not subject to detailed assessment
1454	Sugworth Farm Haywards Heath	N/A	Lindfield Rural	Haywards Heath	Not subject to detailed assessment
2059	Land at Berrylands Pookbourne Lane Burgess Hill	N/A	Twineham	Burgess Hill	Stage 1 – not compliant with District Plan Strategy
Rep ID	Existing considered through site selection (56 sites)	SHELAA ref	Parish	Settlement	
709	Hazelden Nursery Albourne	52	Albourne	Albourne	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
1842	Swallow yard Albourne	789	Albourne	Albourne	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
757	Land south of Henfield Road Albourne	986	Albourne	Albourne	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
708	Land west of Meadow View, Sayers Common	857	Albourne	Sayers Common	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
1847	Land at Ansty Farm, Site A	576	Ansty and Staplefield	Ansty	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
1847	Land at Ansty Farm, Site B	791	Ansty and Staplefield	Ansty	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
1715	Clearwaters Farm Haywards Heath	841	Ansty and Staplefield)	Haywards Heath	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
743	Land at Hazeldene Farm Orchard Way Warninglid	839	Ansty and Staplefield	Warninglid	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
743	Butchers Field, Ardingly	495	Ardingly	Ardingly	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
743	Middle Lodge Ardingly	568	Ardingly	Ardingly	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
743	Land at Dirty Lane, Ashurst Wood	207	Ashurst Wood	Ashurst Wood	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
743	Land west of Dirty Lane Ashurst Wood	634	Ashurst Wood	Wood	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment

1987	Foxhole Farm Bolney	617	Bolney	Bolney	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
1987	Foxhole Farm (buildings) Bolney	802	Bolney	Bolney	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
664	Land east of Paynesfield, Bolney	526	Bolney	Bolney	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
743	Batchelors Farm Burgess Hill	573	Burgess Hill	Burgess Hill	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2005	North A272 Cuckfield	1001	Cuckfield	Cuckfield	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
743	Land north of Riseholme, Cuckfield	63	Cuckfield	Cuckfield	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2140	Land south of Edinburgh Way East Grinstead	598	East Grinstead	East Grinstead	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2080	Land south 61 Crawley Down Road Felbridge	676	East Grinstead	Felbridge	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
672	Land adjacent Great Harwoods Farm East Grinstead	17	East Grinstead	East Grinstead	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
753	2 Hurst Road Hassocks	210	Hassocks	Hassocks	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
2079	Land at Junction Hurstwood Lane and Colwell Road Haywards Heath	508	Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2067	Land north of Butlers Green Road HH	673	Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
746	Land north of Old Wickham Lane, Haywards Heath	988	Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
705	Land South of Lewes Road Haywards Heath	844	Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
585/775/1025	Jefferys Farm Horsted Keynes	971	Horsted Keynes	Horsted Keynes	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
585/775/1025	Jefferys Farm Horsted Keynes	68	Horsted Keynes	Horsted Keynes	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
585/775/1025	Jefferys Farm Horsted Keynes	69	Horsted Keynes	Horsted Keynes	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
743	Land to the south of Robyns Barn Horted Keynes	781	Horsted Keynes		Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2140	Land south of Chalkers Lane Hurstpierpoint	575	Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
1791	Coombe Farm Sayers Common	601	Hurstpierpoint	Sayers Common	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
737	Land west of Kings Business Centre Reeds Lane Sayers Common	830	Hurstpierpoint	Sayers Common	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
675	Land west of Kemps Hurstpierpoint	13	Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
674	Land east of College Lane Hurstpierpoint	19	Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
652	Land at Benfell, Albourne Road Hurstpierpoint	794	Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2118	Land at Walsted Grange, off Scamps Hill Lindfield	983	Lindfield Rural	Lindfield	Stage 3 - rejected following further evidence testing
2031	Land north of Oldfield Drive, Snowdrop lane Lindfield	836	Lindfield Rural	Lindfield	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2031	Land north of Lyoth Lane, Snowdrop lane Lindfield	1006	Lindfield Rural	Lindfield	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
762	Nash Farm Scaynes Hill	985	Lindfield Rural	Scaynes Hill	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
697	Land west of London Road Handcross	823	Slaugham	Handcross	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment

2065	Land North of Horsham Road Pease Pottage	818	Slaugham	Pease Pottage	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2065	Land North of Horsham Road Pease Pottage	219	Slaugham	Pease Pottage	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
747	Land north of Horsham Road Pease Pottage	674	Slaugham	Pease Pottage	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
730	West of Park Road Handcross	987	Slaugham	Handcross	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
700	Warren Cottage Fields (west of Truggers) Handcross	181	Slaugham	Handcross	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
676	Land west of Old Brighton Road (Woodhurst Farmhouse) Pease Pottage	581	Slaugham	Pease Pottage	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
684	Land north of Old Vicarage Field Turners Hill	852	Turners Hill	Turners Hill	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2092	Land south of Chapel Lane Copthorne	269	Worth	Crawley Down	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
786	Woodpeckers, Copthorne	810	Worth	Crawley Down	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
657	Courthouse Farm Copthorne	990	Worth	Copthorne	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
2164	Crabett Park Copthorne	18	Worth	Copthorne	Stage 1 - not compliant with District Plan Strategy
791	Land West of Turners Hill Road Crawley Down	1002	Worth	Crawley Down	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
764	Land at Hurst Farm Crawley Down	743	Worth	Crawley Down	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
685	Land east of the Martins Crawley Down	686	Worth	Crawley Down	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment
654	Land north of A264, Copthorne	1000	Worth	Copthorne	Stage 3 - rejected following detailed site assessment

Site: SA12 – 96 Folders Lane, Burgess Hill			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 14	Support: 2	Object: 12	Neutral: 0
Comments received		MSDC Response	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract with Metrobus needed for sustainable transport between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath. Haywards Heath to Burgess Hill cycle path must be delivered and highway mitigation provided to address impact of this development on Haywards Heath (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> <li>Query deliverability - application withdrawn in 2019 over highway concerns.</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of the site.</li> <li>Matters resolved - Highway Authority raised no objection to the proposed development (DM/19/0276) of 43 houses on this site, with the provision of suggested conditions (SA12.5).</li> </ul>	
<b>Landscape / Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will erode the rural buffer between Burgess Hill and the SDNP. Welcome new addition referring to the setting of the SDNP. To respond to context, characteristic layouts, materials and avoiding severance of green infrastructure is required. Policy requirements appear to increase density towards the SDNP in conflict with the objective. Query capacity for 40 dwellings whilst meeting the policy objectives including landscape. Reference to protection of dark skies is welcomed. Seek policy requirement to protect and enhance the public footpath to the west (777 - SDNP Authority).</li> <li>40 dwellings is out of keeping with Folders Lane and the density of the adjacent new development – should be reduced to 8 dwellings.</li> <li>Area of unimproved grassland, with hedges and mature trees, with a TPO area north and east. Development on the site could be visible from the South Downs National Park.</li> <li>Site is within a strategic gap and countryside - protected by national policy.</li> <li>Impact on the national park must be measured prior to allocation and if mitigation would not minimise the harm it should be withdrawn from the plan.</li> </ul>		<b>Landscape/biodiversity &amp; Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11 in this paper.</li> <li>The promoter has carried out a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which has informed the amended draft layout at reduced capacity (SA12.4).</li> <li>The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement.</li> <li>A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate a different quantum is more appropriate to meet all policy objectives.</li> <li>'Landscape considerations' - includes requirement to protect and enhance the public footpath.</li> <li>The site is not within a designate Strategic Gap within the Development Plan</li> </ul>	
<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation not justified – not required to meet minimum residual housing requirement and is not sustainable. Noted that dwellings reduced by 3 but not evidence to determine the ecological value of the site has been provided – site contains hedgerows and trees and is connected to wider network by linear habitats – does not comply with para 171 of the NPPF (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust).</li> <li>This contravenes various development plan policies, Neighbourhood Plan Core Objective 5 and Policy H3 (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> <li>Site is remote from services in Burgess Hill – acknowledged by the SA</li> </ul>		<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for the site is available in the Site Allocations Library (SA12.6).</li> <li>Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2015, prior to the adoption of the District Plan in 2018 which identifies a minimum residual housing requirement.</li> <li>The town is defined as a Category 1 settlement capable of accommodating sustainable growth.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully support the Sites DPD which meets the soundness test. Jones Homes have worked extensively to ensure development meets the Council's overall objectives for the draft allocation. This is supported by extensive technical assessments and reports (1805_Jones Homes)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building more houses in Burgess Hill is needed and supported and will bring more infrastructure and investment into the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA13 – South of Folders Lane, East of Keymer Road, Burgess Hill

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 19	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 16	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments received

#### Transport

- Contract with Metrobus needed for sustainable transport between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath. Haywards Heath to Burgess Hill cycle path must be delivered and highway mitigation provided to address impact of this development on Haywards Heath (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).
- Cumulative impact of 300 dwellings plus 500 north of Clayton Mills will overload numerous junctions along Ockley Lane exacerbating existing highway safety issues harming amenity of residents. Allocation is unjustified and contrary to para 102 of the NPPF as transport and environmental impacts have not been addressed, avoided or mitigated (600 - Hassocks Parish Council).
- Highway safety concerns regarding access along Broadlands during construction and operational phases – insufficient visibility splays – contrary to para 108 of the NPPF.
- Highway safety concern for Ockley Lane and cumulative affect with Allocation DP11 for 500 units to the south.
- Concern raised over impacts of increased traffic on character and tranquillity – particularly Ditchling (777 - SDNP Authority).

#### Landscape / Biodiversity

- Site is approx. 100m from the SDNP – part of larger landscape whose character survives from the medieval period and contributes positively to the SDNP and is sensitive to change. Development will erode the rural buffer between Burgess Hill and the SDNP. Welcome new additions to the policy since Reg18 - referring to the setting of the SDNP; lower density to the south, which is the most sensitive area in landscape and ecological terms; therefore, suggest open space moved to south area of site. (777 - SDNP Authority).
- Landscape evidence required to inform capacity, layout design – query capacity for 300. Reference to protection of dark skies is welcomed. Watercourses should be referenced in 'landscape considerations'. (777 - SDNP Authority).
- Site is historic field system which contains important biodiversity and protected species that would be harmed by development. Will cause coalescence to village to the south. (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).
- Development on the site could be visible from and will harm the setting of the South Downs National Park.
- Area of ancient meadow with significant wildlife
- Impact on the national park must be measured prior to allocation and if mitigation would not minimise the harm it should be withdrawn from the plan

### MSDC Response

#### Transport

- The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (**T7**) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of the site.
- The site promoters are carrying out a site-specific Transport Assessment and have entered pre-application discussions with West Sussex County Council Highway Authority to assess the more detailed highway impacts and safety issues and identify any required mitigation.
- As referred to in the signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG); work with the SDNP Authority will continue to address the matter with reference to other relevant examples in and around the SDNP (**DC11**).

#### Landscape / biodiversity and evidence

- Site promoter has carried out a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which provides evidence on yield which can be achieved and will inform additional elements to consider including where open space should be located (**SA13.1**).
- Policy does not require only one central area of open space and encourages higher density to the north of the site in response to SDNP.
- The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.
- The site is contained by existing development to the north, east and south.
- The South Downs National Park Authority have been involved in the site selection process and wording of Sites DPD policies. Signed SoCG sets out



	the joint work undertaken. No objection in principle to the allocation of this site. (DC11)
<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation not justified – not required to meet minimum residual housing requirement and is not sustainable. No site-specific ecological information has been provided – site appears to contain rough grasslands hedgerows and trees and is connected to wider network by linear habitats and ponds with potential priority species – does not comply with para 171 of the NPPF (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust).</li> </ul>	<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11 in this paper.</li> <li>An ecological delivery report (SA13.2) has been undertaken by the promoter which assesses the ecological suitability of the site for development based on the sites preliminary ecological baseline, wildlife legislation and relevant national and development plan policies.</li> <li>The findings of each report have informed the concept masterplan and latest draft of the policy (SA13.1).</li> </ul>
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient infrastructure – schools, doctors.</li> </ul>	<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation (IV1)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on listed building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site selection process in consultation with the Council’s Heritage Officer, acknowledged potential for Less than substantial harm (medium).</li> <li>A Heritage Statement (SA13.3) has been prepared to inform the emerging master planning of the site and has informed the draft policy</li> <li>No comment/objection has been raised by Historic England at Reg19.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building more houses in Burgess Hill is needed and supported and will bring more infrastructure and investment into the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<b>Site promoter</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yield: The number of units should state ‘approximately 300’ as detailed site assessment is yet to be completed (692 - Thakeham and Persimmon Homes).</li> </ul>	<b>Site promoter</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives and Urban design principles: reference to ‘a central open space’ is not necessary or justified and should be replaced with ‘creating a purposeful open space’ (692 - Thakeham and Persimmon Homes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy does not restrict the design to only one area of open space but encourages a central area for good urban design and landscape reasons to create a strong focus for the development and encourage higher density adjacent and away from the southern portion of the site</li> </ul>

<b>Site: SA12 – 96 Folders Lane, Burgess Hill and SA13 – South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b> <i>Note: The follow comments have been made with reference to both sites</i>			
<b>Total:</b> 673	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 670	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC Response</b>	
<b>Transport</b>		<b>Transport</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic issues will be compounded by the extent of additional development proposed in this area (678 - Ditchling Parish Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) sets out some broad proposals for boosting sustainable travel – the detail will be negotiated as part of a detailed planning application.</li> <li>Impacts on the highway network within East Sussex, including Ditchling have be assessed. SoCG with East Sussex and Lewes District Council provides further information (DC8).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding traffic impacts on village of Ditchling and wider SDNP – Reg18 (777 - SDNP Authority).</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract with Metrobus needed for sustainable transport between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath. Haywards Heath to Burgess Hill cycle path must be delivered and highway mitigation provided to address impact of this development on Haywards Heath (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IDP (IV1) identifies potential schemes for improvement along with the Burgess Hill Place and Connectivity Programme will deliver more sustainable transport measures, improve connectivity and improve Burgess Hill and Wivelsfield train stations.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport assessment flawed. Does not include any appropriate mitigation in the vicinity of the site.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Strategic Transport Assessment (Systra) (T7) has been validated by WSCC Highway Authority and Highways England to ensure it is fit for purpose.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous transport reports have found the site unsuitable.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Transport Safety Review was not complete at Regulation 19 stage and forms part of the evidence base for submission.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety concern for all users of surrounding roads and junctions, particularly in combination with other housing allocations/developments.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy SA GEN: Access and Highways.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport report commissioned by SOFLAG demonstrates failures in the Council's transport work – non-compliance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased air pollution could impact local business (Ridgeview Vineyard)</li> </ul>			
<b>Landscape / Biodiversity</b>		<b>Landscape / biodiversity &amp; Evidence</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erosion of the rural buffer – Reg18. We welcome a number of changes which have been made since Reg18 which go some way to addressing matters raised – some outstanding concerns remain (777 - SDNP Authority).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will harm the setting of the SDNP and biodiversity. They will erode the gap between the settlements (678 - Ditchling Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Landscape and biodiversity impacts have been fully taken into account during the site selection process as explained in SSP1, SSP1 and SSP3.</li> <li>An ecological delivery report (SA13.2) has been undertaken by the promoter which assesses the ecological suitability of the site for development based on the sites preliminary ecological baseline, wildlife legislation and relevant national and development plan polices.</li> <li>Liaised with South Down National Park Authority during the site selection process and policy writing (DC11).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site contains significant ecological value and biodiversity including ancient hedgerows and indigenous wildlife – this is being ignored.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban sprawl resulting in coalescence/ loss of strategic gap</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverse impact on fishing lakes</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topography is not suitable to have further development at this location</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current COVID-19 crisis has shown the need for green space</li> </ul>			
<b>Evidence</b>		<b>Evidence</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of existing major development are not yet fully understood, and a more strategic and cumulative assessment should be taken for future</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burgess Hill is a Category 1 settlement with a comprehensive range of services and employment opportunities, capable of</li> </ul>	

housing sites. Allocation is contrary to various Development Plan Policies. Loss of trees will impact on the aim of being carbon neutral by 2050. (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).	supporting addition growth beyond the <i>minimum</i> residual figure in the District Plan (DP4).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites contravene various development plan policies are unsustainable. (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2015) prior to the adoption of the district plan (2018) the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (SSP1-3).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation goes beyond the level of housing required in the plan period for Burgess Hill and is contrary to the Neighbourhood plan. Lack of consultation with neighbouring authorities (678 - Ditchling Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A close working relationship has been maintained between the neighbouring authorities, including East Sussex and Lewes District Council as evidenced by signed SoCG (DC8).</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>	<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient infrastructure to sustain future development within the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (IV1) sets out broad infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed allocation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No planned infrastructure to support future development– schools, doctor's surgeries, water, sewerage systems, roads.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage and flood risk will be exacerbated – Ockley Lane and Wellhouse Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Risk and SuDS Appraisal Technical Note has been undertaken and has informed the policy drafting and concept masterplan.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing these sites from the plan will still maintain a sufficient housing buffer/ 5 year land supply.</li> <li>Burgess Hill has met/identified its housing need</li> <li>No justification for choosing to allocate the site when these sites have been rejected numerous times in the past.</li> <li>Unsustainable location remote from services in Burgess Hill.</li> <li>Cumulative impact of both developments has not been assessed.</li> <li>Coalescence between Burgess Hill and Hassocks/ Keymer.</li> <li>Opposition from local authorities and statutory bodies makes the sites undeliverable.</li> <li>Housing need should be spread fairly across the district based on planning decisions – Burgess Hill has taken a disproportionate amount of housing.</li> <li>The site selection criteria was inconsistently applied and is unsound and the Member's working group was unrepresentative following the May 2019 elections.</li> <li>Haywards Golf Club scored higher than Folders Lane sites in the Site Selection Paper and Sustainability Appraisal yet was not allocated.</li> <li>Haywards Heath Golf Club is a more suitable alternative than the Folders Lane sites</li> <li>Allocating these sites goes against the Neighbourhood Plan, District Plan and national planning policy/guidance.</li> <li>A drafting error in the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan regarding the 'settlement boundary' has been exploited by the Council – these sites are outside the settlement boundary and should not be built on.</li> </ul>	<b>Site Selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11.</li> <li>Site was assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in the past, however the reasons for rejecting the site in the past have been addressed by the more up-to-date and site specific evidence base for the Sites DPD – particularly the Strategic Transport Assessment (T7).</li> <li>The decision to publish the Sites DPD for consultation was made by Council which consists of Members from across the district.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequacy of both sites shown in official reports (2005 Atkins study)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representations from the Regulation 18 consultation were lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As soon as practicably possible after being made aware of error the missing information was made available on the web site. A full printed copy of all the representations were available to Council Members in the Members Room. The key issues raised in all representations were reported in Appendix 1 of the 22.01.20 Scrutiny report.</li> </ul>

<b>Site: SA14 – Land South of Selby Close, Burgess Hill</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 10</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Neutral: 2</b>
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC RESPONSE</b>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic issues between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath will be compounded and therefore additional infrastructure improvements/ financial support is needed to mitigate the adverse effects on the town (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Transport Assessment (T7).</li> <li>Policy SA GEN: Access and Highways.</li> <li>The Burgess Hill Place and Connectivity Programme will deliver more sustainable transport measures, improve connectivity and improve Burgess Hill and Wivelsfield train stations.</li> <li>Site promoter is required to carry out a site-specific transport assessment and obtain pre-application advice from West Sussex County Council on the suitability of detailed highways arrangements. Site promoter is required to carry out a site-specific transport assessment and obtain pre-application advice from West Sussex County Council on the suitability of detailed highways arrangements.</li> </ul>	
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>		<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Southern Water infrastructure crosses the site so uncertain if there is adequate space to develop the site (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Southern Water confirmed at the Regulation 18 stage that their records do not show a need to protect their infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
<b>Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence provided that access from Edwin Street is agreed or available (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).</li> </ul>		<b>Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy wording provides the option of access from Hammonds Ridge or Edwin Street.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objections (667 – Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree there is a need for more housing in Burgess Hill which will bring improved infrastructure (general comment not site specific) (Individual)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	

<b>Site: SA15 – Land South of Southway, Burgess Hill</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 26</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 22</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC RESPONSE</b>	
<b>Neighbourhood Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Neighbourhood Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2016) prior to the adoption of the District Plan (2018); the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (SSP1-3).</li> </ul>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic issues will be compounded between Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill and therefore additional financial support/infrastructure improvements are needed to mitigate the adverse effects on the Town (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Transport Assessment (T7).</li> <li>Policy SA GEN: Access and Highways.</li> <li>The Burgess Hill Place and Connectivity Programme will deliver more sustainable transport measures, improve connectivity and improve Burgess Hill and Wivelsfield train stations.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed access from Linnet Lane is not suitable as it would be located between 2 blind bends and directly opposite existing resident drives.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter has provided a Transport Technical Note (SA15.2) and a Pre-App Response from WSCC Highways (SA15.3).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding pedestrian safety, lack of provision of sufficient vehicle parking, congestion and inappropriate access roads width.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site appears too narrow to build houses and meet road safety guidelines.</li> </ul>			
<b>Local Green Space</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation is on a Local Green Space (LGS) which is not compliant with NPPF policies. The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan designated this area as part of an important “green lung” for the west of Burgess Hill, a function which does not require accessibility (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust).</li> </ul>		<b>Local Green Space</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NPPF allows for an LGS designation to be subsequently allocated for a different purpose in a subsequent Development Plan Document if this is evidenced and justified.</li> </ul>	
<b>Ecology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is an important wildlife site including for nightingales, a species on the red list and in danger of extinction (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Ecology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (SA15.4).</li> <li>The policy wording and Policy SA GEN will ensure a net gain in biodiversity.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflicts with District Plan Policy DP38, which refers to enhancing biodiversity. There are numerous species on this site which are afforded statutory protection, e.g. great crested newts, nightingales. Site is a wildlife corridor between the Pookbourne Stream and the wood adjacent to the rugby club.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no ancient woodland on the site, adjacent to the site or in close proximity to the site. There are TPOs on the eastern boundary of the site which is recognised in the policy wording.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of this site is ancient woodland (667 - Burgess Hill Town Council). Impact on mature trees – climate change and carbon impacts.</li> </ul>			
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>		<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water utilities issues.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific water utilities issues identified by the water companies.</li> <li>Statement of Common Ground with South East Water (DC21). Southern Water do not normally use SoCG) and (DC22)</li> </ul>	
<b>Site Selection</b>		<b>Site Selection</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about due process for site selection regarding geographical and political balance of the sites Member Working Group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to the Site Allocations DPD Topic Paper (TP2).</li> <li>Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (SSP1, 2 and 3).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burgess Hill is carrying a disproportionate share of the burden for Mid Sussex's expansion plans in relation to its infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre redevelopment means that sites outside of the town centre are not required</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Land Ownership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site boundary encroaches onto Croudace Homes land and a more precise land ownership plan is required.</li> <li>There is a covenant on the land which means this land cannot be built on/ developed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Land Ownership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site promoter has confirmed there are no covenants relating to this site that restrict development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development would block rear access from the properties on Southway to the public footpath.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proposed Indicative Layout (SA15.1) shows a proposed PROW running to the rear of the properties on Southway so access would still be possible.</li> </ul>
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposed site allocation and supporting technical reports have been provided. Site is well-located for new housing and is deliverable (Sunley Estates Ltd and Hargreaves – site promoter).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree there is a need for more housing in Burgess Hill which will bring improved infrastructure (general comment not site specific) (Individual).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

<b>Site: SA16 – The Brow and St. Wilfrid's Catholic Primary School, School Close, Burgess Hill</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total:</b> 11	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 7	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC Response</b>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic issues between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath will be compounded and therefore additional financial support is needed to mitigate the adverse effects on the Town, by provision of financial or infrastructure improvements (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IDP identifies potential infrastructure improvements (IV1), detailed requirements will be negotiated and secured through the pre-application and planning application process with WSCC HA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's Playing pitch strategy (PPS) indicates a projected shortfall in junior pitches – planning field and pitches lost need to be compensated for. Suggest additional policy wording to reference under 'Social and Community' NPPF and Sport England's Playing Field Policy (1792 - Sport England).</li> </ul>		<b>Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M20).</li> </ul>	
<b>Site Selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to further understand the impact on primary education in this area. Site allocations should be considered in a more strategic manner. Question the deliverability and timeframe as the site involves numerous stakeholders – Reg18 (667- Burgess Hill Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Site Selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue ongoing consultation with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) regarding pupil places.</li> </ul>	
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burgess Hill is close to capacity and the gas infrastructure is likely to require reinforcement in the future to ensure security of supply (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>		<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>	
<b>Deliverability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites often complex and subject to delay, deliverability and viability issues leading to less contributions/community benefits.</li> <li>Policy is unclear whether school relocation is a requirement or at what stage – cost not reflected in the IDP leading to significant uncertainty.</li> <li>Delivery with re-provision of all community facilities, with the school prior to commencement has not been justified/evidenced.</li> </ul>		<b>Deliverability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Viability and masterplanning work is ongoing to demonstrate deliverability commissioned as part of the One Public Estate bid.</li> <li>SA16 is a facilitative policy to support future funding bids on the site.</li> <li>'<i>Social and Community</i>' requirements are clear and delivery is not prescriptive in the policy to ensure suitable flexibility to the satisfaction of the Council and relevant key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building more houses in Burgess Hill is needed and supported and will bring more infrastructure and investment into the town.</li> <li>Allocation is supported from a landowner perspective (792 - WSCC).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	



<b>Site: SA17 – Woodfield House, Isaacs Lane, Burgess Hill</b>			
<b>Number of Representations Received</b>			
<b>Total:</b> 10	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 5	<b>Neutral:</b> 3
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC RESPONSE</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question whether 30 dwellings can be delivered on this site given the landscape requirements and the uncertainty of the deliverability of the Northern Arc (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline planning permission has been granted for 30 dwellings (DM/19/3769).</li> </ul>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract with Metrobus needed for sustainable transport between BH and HH. HH to BH cycle path must be delivered and highway mitigation provided to address impact on Haywards Heath. Direct provision of infrastructure improvements may be more practical than s106 (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> <li>Concerns of safety and the impact for residents using Isaacs Lane and the Bolnore roundabouts. (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Transport Assessment (T7).</li> <li>Policy SA GEN: Access and Highways.</li> <li>The Northern Arc Strategic Development will deliver all supporting transport infrastructure.</li> <li>The Burgess Hill Place and Connectivity Programme will deliver more sustainable transport measures, improve connectivity and improve Burgess Hill and Wivelsfield train stations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).</li> </ul>		<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.</li> </ul>	
<b>Northern Arc</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of the Northern Arc Design Guide and Street Design and Adoption Manual will be key to ensure integration of the proposed site allocation with the Northern Arc. Will need to consider the regional surface water drainage masterplan and fluvial flood modelling (1988 - Homes England).</li> <li>Careful design required for frontages to meet policy objectives and principles including the proximity to the new secondary school; suggest landowner engages with WSCC. Secondary access suggested; Homes England willing to engage with landowner (1988 - Homes England).</li> <li>Consider it premature to consider the Reserved Matters applications in advance on the Plot 1.6 Northern Arc Reserved Matters application (1988 - Homes England).</li> </ul>		<b>Northern Arc</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter is encouraged liaise with Homes England and WSCC to ensure the site is integrated with the Northern Arc Strategic Development.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the objective to integrate the proposed site allocation with the Northern Arc (1988 - Homes England).</li> <li>Agree there is a need for more housing in Burgess Hill which will bring improved infrastructure (general comment not site specific) (Individual).</li> <li>Support the proposed site allocation – outline planning permission has been granted (743 - Fairfax – site promoter).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	

<b>Site: SA18 – East Grinstead Police Station, East Grinstead</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total:</b> 25	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 24	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC Response</b>	
<b>Principle of development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be preserved for the use of the town for recreational and educational purposes</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query whether land stability studies have been done (602 - East Grinstead Society)</li> </ul>		<b>Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Site promoter is required to carry out a preliminary assessment of ground instability which will inform the yield/layout. The policy wording includes the requirement for a slope/ land stability risk assessment report to ensure that adequate and environmentally acceptable mitigation measures are in place/provided.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for including the Old Court House to the scheme (602 - East Grinstead Society), other respondents noted the lack of clarity in this respect</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although there may be potential to include the Old Court House to the proposed scheme, insufficient information was available to allow a formal allocation at this point in time.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation will set a precedent for more development in the town and result in the loss of green spaces and impacts on the local wildlife</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal directs development to previously developed land and contributes to minimise the loss of green spaces in the town</li> </ul>	
<b>Traffic &amp; Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the impacts of further development on traffic</li> </ul>		<b>Traffic &amp; Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues have been identified in the Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) however a detailed transport assessment will be secured at the planning application stage to ensure highway safety is maintained and safe access is achieved.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing access road to the proposed allocation is not suitable for significant extra traffic (602 - East Grinstead Society)</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access on to A264 will exacerbate congestion. Through East Court; traffic will increase risk to public using the park.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is likely to increase commuting between Crawley and East Grinstead</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy fails to address the questions of the East Court through road ownership, maintenance and access, including restrictions through covenants</li> </ul>			
<b>Parking</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts of parking of the proposed allocation (602 - East Grinstead Society)</li> </ul>		<b>Parking</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The level of parking expected to be delivered alongside the proposed development is detailed within the policy. Parking standards will be applied, and details assessed through the submission of a Transport Assessment in support for the planning application</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the number of proposed parking spaces for the proposed allocation</li> </ul>			
<b>Conservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to protect the assets of East Grinstead</li> </ul>		<b>Conservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy will ensure that assets within the vicinity of the proposed development are protected.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inclusion of a built-up area boundary on East Court is likely to set a precedent and generate further development of the estate</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage assets will be affected, and apartments are not in character with the local area (2140 - Sigma Rydon)</li> </ul>			

<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of suitable infrastructure to support further development</li> <li>• The proposed policy fails to identify measures for sustainable transport infrastructure and services to appropriately support the development</li> <li>• Need for EG Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) with purpose-built cycle routes along with wider sustainable transport measures to reduce car use (582 - East Grinstead and District Cycle Forum)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributions to infrastructure provision have been identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Planning (IV1) accompanying the DPD in line with the requirements established by infrastructure providers. These include a contribution towards sustainable transport. The IDP will remain under review to ensure that appropriate contributions are secured at the point of planning permission being granted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fail to explore opportunities closer to Crawley for housing development (584, 1487, 1808, 1809, 1811, 1813)</li> <li>• The allocation of sites in the town to address the housing need arising from Crawley impacts on the market town heritage (584)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site Selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to response SA11 in this paper.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy wording</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the requirement for financial contributions in relation to the Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC (710 – Natural England)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy wording</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA GEN of the Sites DPD includes General Principles for development, this refers to Ashdown Forest.</li> </ul>
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No housing shortfall in East Grinstead</li> </ul>	<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site allocated to meet District Plan housing requirement. It will be for District Plan Review to determine an updated housing requirement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No recent assessment of housing need</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to account for the change to the economic climate following COVID-19</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No clear timetable for delivery (2140 – Sigma Rydon)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence to suggest site is not deliverable within plan period.</li> </ul>

<b>Site: SA19 – Crawley Down Road, East Grinstead</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 46</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 39</b>	<b>Neutral: 4</b>
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC comments</b>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverable improvement to Felbridge junction queried and details are incomplete. Incorrect interpretation of para 109 of the NPPF regarding 'residual cumulative' test (534 – Felbridge Parish Council).</li> <li>Existing issues will be exacerbated and no attempts are being made to resolve them.</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of the site.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport assessment is unsound and does not tie up with the study undertaken in support of the Tandridge Local plan (534 – Felbridge Parish Council and 666 – East Grinstead Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoters are carrying out a site-specific Transport Assessment and have entered pre-application discussions with Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities (HAs) to assess the more detailed highway impacts and safety issues and identify any required mitigation. Their approach has been validated by the Has.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied with the policy refers to joint working with Surrey and that sustainable transport enhancements will be sought wherever possible (913 – Surrey County Council).</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus priority will cause more issues.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air quality impacts.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inaccurate transport data – does not accord with findings of other recent studies – WSP jointly commissioned study.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor sustainable transport connections.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No suitable access – insufficient width causing harm to amenity.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited infrastructure means residents would look to East Grinstead for most services increasing pressure on the already congested roads.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Junction at Crawley Down Road and A264 needs upgrading.</li> </ul>			
<b>Built-up area boundary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed built-up boundary widening to include development within settlement of East Grinstead – note District policy DP13 seeks to prevent coalescence (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>			
<b>Site selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Felbridge is a Tier 3 settlement with basic services – relaying upon East Grinstead – growth determined as unsustainable by Tandridge in evidence base for Tandridge emerging plan (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>		<b>Site selection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.</li> <li>Settlement hierarchy was established in the adopted District Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of consultation. Site is extension to Felbridge which is a rural village (Tier 3 not Category 1 East Grinstead) with insufficient infrastructure and oversubscribed school – contributions will go to West Sussex instead of Surrey. Housing is not needed and will cause coalescence with East Grinstead. Unsustainable (534 - Felbridge Parish Council).</li> <li>No additional infrastructure proposed in Felbridge (666 - East Grinstead Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close working relationship has been maintained between Tandridge and Surrey County Council evidenced by the SoCG (DC13) and (DC12).</li> <li>Whilst the site is close to the County boundary financial contributions towards Education will be made to WSCC. No request from Surrey CC for financial contribution towards education arising from development.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding coalescence. (666 - East Grinstead Town Council).</li> <li>No internal roads should be provided to avoid coalescence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation site is fully contained by the Felbridge Water to the south, the SANG associated with SA20 exists to the south of the western half of SA19 and the land south of the eastern half remains open fields and does not form part of the proposed SA20 allocation, thus ensuring the two settlements remain physically separate.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites closer to Crawley should be considered to reduce the need for travel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inappropriate for development - Outside the BUAB – unsustainable location – contravenes the EG NP.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Felbridge is within the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not required - NP allocations meet East Grinstead housing need. Lack of public consultation – not legally compliant - no public exhibition.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation is contrary to DP6; Felbridge is a Tier 3 settlement with basic level of facilities; being treated as extension of East Grinstead; site is outside built-up area; SA19 would increase number of houses by 30%; would result in coalescence (DP13); Loss of agricultural land (Grade 3a).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of employment opportunities in East Grinstead.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed main modification - to ensure mitigation option to be agreed between all parties before development commences. Support detailed policy requirements for transport (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M23).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surface of the Public Right of Way (PRoW) should be upgraded and permeability for non-car users is key to delivering sustainable travel objectives (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M24).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures to protect and improve the PROW with linkages between SA19 and SA20 along with policy requirements relating to flood risk are welcome and supported (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy requirements to address issues of flood risk and ensure environmental enhancements (713 - Environment Agency).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for continued liaison between the parties to ensure cross-boundary impacts on Felbridge Primary School is mitigated (913 – Surrey County Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement to included contribute to the existing strategic solution in accordance with District Plan Policy DP17: Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC Support requirement for SuDS and greenspace to address impact on Hedgecourt Lake SSSI (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA GEN – Ashdown Forest</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No ecological surveys have been provided, without which assessment cannot be made on suitability to site for development – concern not consistent with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology Note available in sites library which includes a Phase 1 Habitat survey (SA19.2).</li> </ul>

<p>paras 171 and 175 of the NPPF (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust).Loss of ecology/ biodiversity.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access will result in loss of TPO tree (GR/5/TPO/04) within no.71 Crawley Down Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information from site promoter indicates that there is sufficient room for access without loss of tree. In addition building methods can be applied that safe guard tree.</li> <li>• Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (<b>DPD2 – M21</b>).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evidence base</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has large areas within Flood Zone 3 reducing developable area and increasing density to 31dph which is out of character (534 - Felbridge Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence base</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The yield takes account of the developable area and seeks to optimise development (<b>SA19.3 – Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal</b>) and has informed the concept layout plan (<b>SA19.1</b>).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of evidence to assess real demand for housing taking account of office to residential conversion, impact of Covid19 and Gatwick Airport economy/growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site allocated to meet District Plan housing requirement. It will be for District Plan Review to determine an updated housing requirement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site promoter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant amount of work and evidence has been gathered by the council and site promoter in support of the allocation – ecology, flood risk, transport – all contained in the evidence base. Engagement has taken place with the relevant highway authorities to agree the assessment methodology. Based on the agreed approach, the site will have a negligible impact on the operation of the highway network and will offer opportunities to improve public transport services in the local area (695 – Site promoter – Boyer Barratt).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site promoter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of public consultation – not legally compliant - no public exhibition.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council’s Community Involvement Plan (<b>C2</b>).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British Geological Survey findings note ‘locally uncharted mine workings may be present on site’.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site promoter is advised of potential risk.</li> </ul>

Site: SA20 – Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 73	Support: 4	Object: 62	Neutral: 7
Comments Received		MSDC Comments	
<b>Transport</b>		<b>Transport</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy wording as a main modification recommended to ensure mitigation option to be agreed between all parities is agreed before development commences. Support detailed policy requirements for transport (910 - Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Highways and Access' – requires a collaborative approach with each of the Highway Authorities (HA) to agree transport mitigation and minor modifications have been suggested to include wording to ensure this is secured <i>to the satisfaction of both HA</i>.</li> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M26).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied the policy refers to joint working with Surrey and that sustainable transport enhancements will be sought wherever possible (913 – Surrey County Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will exacerbate existing traffic congestions issues with no clear mitigation or infrastructure improvements identified.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of the site – the model has been validated by the HA.</li> <li>Each of the site promoters have also engaged in pre-application discussions with each of the HA, who have validated their approach and associated transport evidence.</li> <li>The IDP (IV1) identifies broad contributions each site would make towards strategic improvements along the A22/A264 corridor.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions of the transport study are unreliable.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport assessment contradicts the findings of the (WSP) report published by Tandridge DC and jointly commissioned by each of the four councils.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant impacts on traffic and community facilities – infrastructure should therefore be completed in tandem with phase 1 of the development – as per the Northern Arc (666 - East Grinstead Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Social and community' – requires agreement from key stakeholders of a detailed phasing plan for the other infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More sustainable than SA19 as capable of delivering significant infrastructure that will further reduce the need to travel by car (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity improvements have already been exhausted – 3<sup>rd</sup> party land would be required.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good quality cycle network needed</li> </ul>			
<b>Evidence base</b>		<b>Evidence base</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soundness of the Transport evidence is queried – conclusions differ to recent report published in support of the Tandridge Local Plan (WSP) (666 - East Grinstead Town Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WSCC HA have validated both the Sites DPD Strategic Transport Study and the jointly commissioned WSP report as fit for purpose.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage impact – Historic England concerns are supported – likely significant impact – no evidence to support allocation (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter has undertaken a heritage assessment (SA20.5) and engaged in pre-application discussions with Historic England – each have influenced the draft concept masterplan (SA20.1).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites DPD Strategic Transport Assessment confirms 'rat running' will increase as a result of SA20 (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Strategic Transport Assessment acknowledges that although junctions nearby are not identified as having a 'severe' as a result the Sites DPD development, further work and significant mitigation is</li> </ul>	

	recommended to reduce congestion (T7 – paras 6.1.1 to 6.1.7 p.22)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of evidence to assess real demand for housing taking account of office to residential conversion, impact of Covid19 and Gatwick Airport economy/growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site allocated to meet District Plan housing requirement. It will be for District Plan Review to determine an updated housing requirement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence to support allocation of C2 – quantum unknown/too vague. Unclear what needs would be met and whether it would fall within the C2 designation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to SA10 response in the paper to reps regarding C2 provision.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (EGNP) which seeks to retain site as open space (666 - East Grinstead Town Council).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11 in this paper.</li> <li>East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (EGNP) was adopted (2016) prior to the District Plan (2018).</li> <li>EGNP Policy SS8 relates to SA20 area and the allocation delivers on a number of the objectives.</li> <li>EGNP Policy SS3 housing allocation at Imberhorne Lower School could be facilitated by SA20.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density is too low – only 8.5dph – unsustainable – increase to 750 and remove SA19 (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation includes many other land uses are proposed within the site boundary - 8.5dph does not take account of these uses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11 in this paper.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to take account of existing transport congestion issues.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of infrastructure – existing traffic issues will be exacerbated.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of employment opportunities in East Grinstead.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of houses allocated in East Grinstead is disproportionate.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative sites in Crawley should be found to address their demand and reduce the need to travel/commute.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to the development plan national policy.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to provide adequate housing in East Grinstead but this is the wrong location</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic England are encouraged by the amendments to lessen the impact on the setting of heritage assets. Whilst some issues remain, Historic England are content that the site can be allocated and the significance of the assets protected (668 - Historic England).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harm to Grade II* listed Gullege – building in the field west of the property should be removed.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for continued liaison between the parties to ensure cross-boundary impacts on Felbridge Primary School is mitigated (913 – Surrey County Council).</li> <li>Support approach for either on-site or contributions to off-site expansion of GP surgeries and provision of strategic SANG – with potential to mitigate Tandridge development on the boarder. Support educational provision and improved PROW for non-car access.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>



<p>Support policy approach to flood risk requirements (910 - Tandridge DC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for continued liaison between the parties to ensure cross-boundary impacts on Felbridge Primary School is mitigated (913 – Surrey County Council).</li> <li>• Support requirements relating to flood risk management and identification of the area of historic landfill (713 - Environment Agency).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recommended precautionary principle is to include a minimum of 50m buffer between development and the ancient woodland – unless clear demonstration of how smaller buffer would suffice. No objection to well-managed access to ancient woodland as part of a wider woodland management plan (2360 - Woodland Trust).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England supports the current policy wording with regards to ancient woodland.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SANG is not in a convenient location for East Grinstead residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing for school provision and land swap not clear – would the allocation be acceptable without them given various identified sensitives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>'Social and Community'</i> – sets out requirement for a detailed phasing plan to be agreed by key stakeholders.</li> <li>• Liaison between the parties is ongoing to ensure neither options prejudices the other ensuring the allocation can be developed irrespective of the school's aspiration to expand.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has a long history of non-delivery. Phasing of 6-10 years should be revised to take account of constraints to delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing has been determined based on liaison with site promoter and key stakeholders and the trajectory is set out in the Housing Land Supply Note (H3).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site promoter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the inclusion of provision of land for gypsies, travellers, and travelling showpeople through policy SA20 (738 - DMH Site promoter).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site promoter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for gypsies, travellers, and travelling showpeople on 'strategic' scale sites (defined as over 500 dwellings) is a requirement of District Plan Policy DP33.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the allocation in a Category 1 settlement – policy criteria will deliver a sustainable community with a range of different land uses and community facilities and will enable consolidation of Imberhorne School and the release of the land identified as housing allocation policy SS3 in the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan. Extensive evidence base has been assembled to support the allocation (SA20.1 – SA20.7) (738 - DMH Site promoter).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p><b>Landscape / biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support provision of strategic Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to mitigate impact on Ashdown Forest and requirement to address impacts on nearby SSSI and ancient woodland (710 - Natural England).</li> <li>• Loss of valuable recreational open space, historic Grade 3a arable land and valued landscape – will encourage greater use of the Ashdown Forest accessed by car.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Landscape / biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA GEN – Ashdown Forest</li> <li>• On-site SANG provision is being made</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loss of biodiversity / ecology / habitat – ancient woodland.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Site specific requirements, SA GEN, relevant district plan policies and national policy requirements will apply to any application.</li><li>• Site promoter has undertaken a ecology report (SA20.7) which has informed the indicative masterplan (SA20.1)</li></ul>
--	--

Site: SA19 – Crawley Down Road, East Grinstead and SA20 – Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead				
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>				
<b>Total: 632</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 631</b>	<b>Neutral: 3</b>	
<b>Of which:</b>				
<b>Total Standard forms received:</b>	596, of which 68 had additional comments			
<b>Total of non-standard responses:</b>	36			
Standard Form Comments			MSDC Response	
<b>Summary of issues from standard form:</b> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites DPD evidence predicts that most major junctions in East Grinstead and surrounding area will be over capacity by 2031; before allocations factored in.</li> <li>Sites would lead to unsustainable traffic congestion; local junctions already over capacity.</li> </ul>			<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mid Sussex Strategic Transport Study (MSTS) concludes there are no additional 'severe' impacts at any junctions within East Grinstead associate with the proposed development within Site Allocations DPD.</li> <li>The transport work undertaken by Mid Sussex DC has been validated by WSCC HA in consultation with Surrey CC HA.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No deliverable mitigation to impact on highways.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each of the site promoters have also engaged in pre-application discussions with each of the HA, who have validated their approach and associated transport evidence.</li> <li>The IDP (IV1) identifies broad contributions each site would make towards strategic improvements along the A22/A264 corridor.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jointly commissioned transport study which supports the Tandridge Local Plan (WSP Report) shows A264/A22 junction already over capacity; requires third party for improvements. Full report not public</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WSP report is a separate jointly commissioned study of the Felbridge junction to aim to improve existing capacity and pedestrian safety issues.</li> <li>The report was primarily commissioned to support the emerging Tandridge Local Plan allocation south of Godstone. The executive summary report was published as part of the Tandridge evidence base and in support of their Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid. It does not form part of the Mid Sussex evidence base and is not required to support the Site Allocations DPD as demonstrated by the Mid Sussex Transport Study (T7).</li> <li>The WSP report and the MSTS have both been validated by</li> </ul>	

	<p>WSSC HA to ensure they are fit for purpose. They are not however comparable transport models and serve different purposes with differing baseline information resulting therefore in different outputs.</p>
<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative sustainable sites, better placed to meet Crawley's unmet need, were discarded without due consideration; Crabbett Park (SHEELA ref. 18) and Mayfields Market Town.</li> <li>Site assessments lacked evidence on highways issues and consideration of neighbourhood plan policies</li> <li>Lack of employment opportunities in Felbridge and East Grinstead; proposed housing is not where houses are needed (Crawley) and will increase out commuting.</li> <li>Contrary to development plan policies.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site Selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response to SA10/11 in this paper.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Procedure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MSDC failed to consult properly with the wider public.</li> <li>Consultation alerts were ineffective: Mid Sussex Times with press release not distributed to Felbridge or East Grinstead; no alert on landing page or 'Consultations' page of Council's website; and not featured in Mid Sussex Matters magazine.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Procedure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Community Involvement Plan (C2).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Additional comments for both sites combined</b></p>	
<p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sites should be assessed as a single development in context with committed development nearby. Capacity concerns of Surrey CC are shared along the A22/A264, along with other junctions in the associated road network – e.g. Turners Hill (625 - Worth Parish Council).</li> <li>Cumulative impact with committed schemes will exacerbate existing severe problems (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of the site.</li> <li>The site promoters are carrying out a site-specific Transport Assessment and have entered pre-application discussions with Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities (HAs) to assess the more detailed highway impacts and safety issues and identify any required mitigation.</li> <li>The strategic model and the approach taken by the site promoters have each been validated by the HAs.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigation for the A22/A264 corridor should be agreed by all parties before development commences on these sites – wording should be amended as part of the main modifications (910 – Tandridge DC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M26).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No proposed mitigation / infrastructure proposed – query deliverability on A22/A264 junction due to failed bid by Tandridge DC. 3<sup>rd</sup> party land required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IDP has been informed by WSSC HA (IV1) and identifies broad contributions each site would make towards strategic improvements along</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of detail on the 'A22/A264 corridor improvements' – no viable or deliverable scheme has been identified (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>	<p>the A22/A264 corridor – measures are required to be agreed by each of the HA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocations must be contingent on delivery highway and junction improvements set out in Atkins and WSP studies.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Grinstead needs a by-pass</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport and highway safety concerns especially for school children.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upgrades to PROW required to provide suitable routes for commuting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M24).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate sustainable transport measures – 2 or 3% in Strategic Transport Study. Lack of detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport model included relatively low percentage model shift to ensure the outputs are robust (T7).</li> <li>Policy requirements for SA19 and SA20 under 'Highways and Access' requires development impacts to be mitigated by maximising sustainable transport enhancements as a priority; and where additional impacts remain, highway mitigation measures will be considered.</li> <li>The forthcoming planning applications are therefore anticipated and expected to be more ambitious than has been modelled at a strategic level.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully funded Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) needed for East Grinstead to achieve model shift to sustainable modes.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable transport measures should be explicit and evidenced. Bus improvement and investment needed.</li> <li>Poor public transport links and expensive to use – remote from services in town centre.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WSP report into the Felbridge junction should be published in full – only available on Tandridge DC website as a summary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report does not form part of the evidence base for the Sites DPD and is not relevant.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of SA19 and SA20 is unsound; they rely on unsound transport assessments and lack of proportionate data to justify them (534 - Felbridge PC).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site selection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recent evidence to support suggested housing need – does not take full account of the extensive office to residential conversion in the town.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of Covid19 unknown and needs to be fully understood.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispute sites being defined as 'high performing'.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to take account of reasonable alternatives and failure to effectively engage with neighbouring authority Horsham.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocations are to address Crawley's unmet need some 13k away accessed via a congested road network – more appropriate and sustainable sites are available closer to Crawley.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no business growth / employment opportunities in the town – leading to more travel.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not justified in context of highway issues - Category 2 and 3 settlements are currently underproviding – unsound.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coalescence - contrary to development plan and national policy</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High car dependency – need to commute – unsustainable.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harm to amenity / well-being.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Grinstead is on the Gatwick flight path.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites in the area ignored.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long history of these sites being undeliverable</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Landscape / biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of outdoor space, countryside, agricultural land.</li> <li>Should remain as agricultural land</li> </ul>	<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Grinstead not currently listed as a potential site for Gypsy and Travellers, has this changed</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation falls within the definition of 'strategic site', as defined in the District Plan Appendix D Glossary – the requirements of policy DP33: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are relevant.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk to Ashdown Forest SAC and SPA - no monitoring of the effectiveness of SAMM and SANG strategy/policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA GEN – Ashdown Forest</li> <li>The approach is supported by Natural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be an additional requirement for smaller and more affordable homes.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA GEN, relevant Development Plan policies and national policy requirements will apply to any planning application.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of playing field – query consultation with Sport England.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be a net increase in the amount of playing field provision associated with the land swap with Imberhorne School.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No opportunity for further expansion on site allocations proposed and no flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not</li> </ul>

	a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200 dwellings equates to 60% expansion to Felbridge – a small rural village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to consult affectively – contrary to community involvement plan.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Community Involvement Plan (C2)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water capacity concern – query need to increase reservoir.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Cycle Study in support of the District Plan took account of the Site Allocations DPD requirement (O1).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate traffic infrastructure and environmental factors.</li> <li>• Felbridge is not part of East Grinstead – lack of infrastructure available in the village - unsustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (IV1) sets out broad infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed allocation.</li> </ul>

## Site: SA21 – Rogers Farm, Fox Hill, Haywards Heath

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 12    **Support:** 1    **Object:** 9    **Neutral:** 2

### Comments Received

- Support the proposed site allocation; it is based on a sound evidence base. A suite of technical evidence has been provided (1658 - Sigma Homes – site promoter).

### MSDC RESPONSE

- Noted.

### Planning History

- Planning application in for this site previously refused and upheld at appeal (639 – Haywards Heath Town Council).

### Planning History

- DM/16/3998 and AP/17/0057 – the appeal decision was a matter of planning judgement by the Inspector at that time.

### Neighbourhood Plan

- In principle Haywards Heath Town Council objects to the inclusion of this site. This site conflicts with the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan as it is not within the approved built line (639 – Haywards Heath Town Council).

### Neighbourhood Plan

- The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2016) prior to the adoption of the District Plan (2018); the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (**SSP1-3**).

### Site Selection

- Poor connectivity and sustainability (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).

### Site Selection

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (**SSP1-3**).

- Inconsistent with District Plan Policies DP4 and DP6.

### Transport

- Allocation would require the provision of traffic lights at the junction of Fox Hill/ Hurstwood Lane, combined with a speed limit reduction to 30mph (639 – Haywards Heath Town Council).

### Transport

- Site promoter is required to carry out a detailed site-specific Transport Assessment and enter pre-application discussions with West Sussex County Council to assess the more detailed highways impacts and safety issues and identify mitigation.

### Infrastructure

- Reinforcement of the gas network is required (624 - SGN).

### Infrastructure

- The site promoter is encouraged to contact SGN regarding connection to the gas network.

### Flood Risk

- Flood risk issues (639 - Haywards Heath Town Council).

### Flood Risk

- The site promoter has provided a Flood Risk and Drainage Technical Summary Note (**SA21.4**).

### Heritage

- A Heritage Assessment has been provided to assess the level of harm on the heritage assets (1658 - Sigma Homes).
- Impact on the Grade II listed building opposite.

### Heritage

- The site promoter has provided a Heritage Impact Assessment (**SA21.3**).

### Air Quality

- Air quality concerns.

### Air Quality

- Policy SA38: Air Quality.



## Site: SA22 – Land north of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 41    **Support:** 0    **Object:** 39    **Neutral:** 2

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Ashdown Forest

- Appropriate mitigation necessary to address impacts on Ashdown Forest (710 - Natural England).

#### Ashdown Forest

- District Plan Policy DP17 and Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations are considered sufficient. A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be undertaken at the time of the planning application and the proposed development will be subject to the approach at that time.

#### Access

- No suitable access to the site (625 - Worth Parish Council).
- No transport evidence provided. Burleigh Lane and Sycamore Lane are unadopted roads, and access from Woodlands Close would require demolition of dwellings.
- Access from Sycamore Lane not approved by the Burleigh Woods Management Company Ltd.

#### Access

- The policy wording refers to access from Sycamore Lane or Woodlands Close.
- The site promoter has identified Sycamore Lane as the preferred access (SA22.3).
- WSCC has confirmed that the proposed access arrangements form a suitable means of access into the proposed development (SA22.4).

#### Site Selection

- Copthorne and Crawley Down have exceeded their housing targets while other villages have not.
- The proposed site allocation is the only one in Crawley Down so need certainty of delivery.
- Would lead to coalescence with Felbridge and East Grinstead.

#### Site Selection

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (SSP1-3).
- Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- Not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan.

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2016) prior to the adoption of the District Plan (2018); the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (SSP1-3).

#### Transport

- Impact on traffic.

#### Transport

- The site promoter has provided a Transport Technical Note (SA22.2).

#### Landscape

- Landscape impact – open boundaries to the south of the site and impact on views.
- Loss of rural land and greenspace.

#### Landscape

- Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations – a LVIA is required.
- The policy wording seeks to protect the rural character of Burleigh Lane and views from the south by minimising the loss of trees and hedgerows along the southern boundary and reinforcing any gaps with locally native planting.

#### Wildlife

- Impact on wildlife.

#### Wildlife

- Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations – ecology work is required.
- Biodiversity net gain is required.

#### Heritage

- Impact on listed building.

#### Heritage

- The site promoter has provided a Heritage Impact Assessment (SA22.5).

#### Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impact on schools and health centre.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Insufficient existing drainage and sewerage.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Upgrades to the sewerage infrastructure network are required.</li></ul>

## Site: SA23 – Land at Hanlye Lane to the east of Ardingly Road, Cuckfield

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 12    **Support:** 1    **Object:** 12    **Neutral:** 0

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- Potential conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2014) prior to the adoption of the District Plan (2018); the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (**SSP1-3**).

#### Landscape and Ecology

- The landscape, ecology and other features on this site are particularly sensitive to change.
- Development will spoil the rural nature of the area – views from the site.
- Site is in close proximity to the AONB (Vanderbilt Homes).
- HRA only looks at Ashdown Forest, all green spaces need to be taken into account.

#### Landscape and Ecology

- The site promoter has provided a Landscape Statement (**SA23.2**).
- The site promoter has provided an Ecological Assessment (**SA23.4**).

- The site should not be expected to accommodate 55 dwellings – the capacity of the site should be amended to 20-30 dwellings (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).

- The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.

- Row of trees separating northern and southern fields – only some have TPOs. Try to preserve all these trees and need a tree expert. Need to monitor site clearance work.

- The site promoter has provided an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (**SA23.3**).

- Impact on biodiversity, loss of greenspace.

- The site promoter has provided an Ecological Assessment (**SA23.4**).
- Biodiversity net gain is required.

#### Policy Wording

- Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).
- Suggest transferring the southern field to the Parish Council and include wording to this effect (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).
- Suggest adding wording in relation to the northern field – landscape, low density development, vegetation screening, additional trees, narrow and hedge-lined access drives (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).
- Suggest amending policy wording in relation to highways and flood risk and drainage requirements (663 – Glenbeigh Site Promoter).

#### Policy Wording

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (**DPD2 – M28**).
- Any potential transfer of the southern field can be addressed at the planning application stage.
- The suggested policy wording changes will be reviewed and amendments made as appropriate.
- Retain the existing highways and flood risk and drainage requirements in case circumstances change by the time of a planning application. Current policy wording says 'consider drainage works'. Advice provided by MSDC Drainage.

#### Yield

- A smaller number of houses on the site would be more appropriate.

#### Yield

- The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning

	application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion and road safety – no cycle lanes, limited public transport.</li> </ul>	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site promoter is required to carry out a detailed site-specific Transport Assessment and enter pre-application discussions with West Sussex County Council to assess the more detailed highways impacts and safety issues, and identify mitigation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heavy traffic – Hanlye Lane, Ardingly Road, London Road, London Lane.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking at capacity at Haywards Heath railway station.</li> </ul>	
<b>Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hazardous access on Hanlye Lane – access should be from Stocklands Close.</li> </ul>	<b>Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy wording refers to access being provided from Hanlye Lane.</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development at the northern end of Cuckfield puts pressure on the centre of Cuckfield – insufficient parking, removal of village amenities (e.g. Ship Inn, Wealden Stores) – retain historic shop units and pubs</li> </ul>	<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li> <li>Details of any drainage works to the culverted pipe will be considered in more detail at the time of a planning application. Current policy wording says 'consider drainage works'. Advice provided by MSDC Drainage.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local infrastructure not sufficient.</li> <li>Recent water supply problems (August 2020).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Culverted pipe (outflow from pond) – policy suggests making an open watercourse to reduce future blockage and capacity issues. Resident has not been aware of any pond blockages or overflow in last four and a half years – residents take pre-emptive measures as necessary. Refurbishment of outflow would be worthwhile if required but an open watercourse would be a hazard and attract fly tipping.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the creation of a well-connected area of open space on the southern field, suitable for informal and formal recreation, which enhances and sensitively integrates the existing rights of way (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).</li> <li>Support the proposed site allocation subject to a couple of suggested amendments to policy wording (663 - Glenbeigh – site promoter).</li> </ul>	<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA24 – Land to the north of Shepherd’s Walk, Hassocks

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 7	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 5	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Connectivity

- Support the provision of a tunnel as it would complement non-motorised user connectivity to the SDNP; concerned that a footbridge would limit access. Suggest amended wording and recommend careful design that supports the transition into the countryside and makes a contribution to green infrastructure (777 - South Downs National Park).

#### Connectivity

- Planning permission has been granted for 130 dwellings (DM/19/1897) – includes the provision of a tunnel.
- The policy wording refers to safe inclusive access in relation to a tunnel or footbridge.
- The policy wording refers to green infrastructure is requirements.

#### Policy Wording

- Suggest amended policy wording in relation to biodiversity, minerals, archaeology, trees and drainage (2140 - Rydon Homes – site promoter).

#### Policy Wording

- The suggested policy wording changes will be reviewed and amendments made as appropriate.
- The suggested amendments from the site promoter can be addressed at the planning application stage (site already has planning permission).
- Biodiversity – Mandatory biodiversity net gain is included within the Environment Bill. The Defra Biodiversity Metric is the applicable metric. Further detail is set out in Policy SA GEN.
- Minerals – This wording is consistent with other policies and is the recommended wording from West Sussex County Council (Regulation 18).

#### Access

- Access to the site is through an adjacent parcel of land with a ransom strip. Deliverability is questioned unless a right of access can be confirmed (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).

#### Access

- Planning permission has been granted for 130 dwellings (DM/19/1897).

#### General

- Support the creation of a well-connected area of open space on the southern field, suitable for informal and formal recreation, which enhances and sensitively integrates the existing rights of way (726 - Cuckfield Parish Council).
- Support the proposed site allocation subject to a couple of suggested amendments to policy wording (663 - Glenbeigh – site promoter).

#### General

- Noted

<b>Site: SA25 – Selsfield Road, Ardingly</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 74</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 71</b>	<b>Neutral: 2</b>
<b>Comments Received</b>			<b>MSDC response</b>
<b>Scale of development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is too large for the village, will increase the size of the village by 13% (built up area by 18%). This level of development is not required (re DP6). Within an AONB. Ardingly lacks services, site is not sustainable. Likely to be Grade 3a agricultural land (714 - Ardingly Parish Council).</li> <li>Numbers exceed local need (May 2015 Settlement Sustainability Review; future development should be to primarily meet local needs). Several empty properties and other slow to sell.</li> </ul>			<b>Scale of development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of dwellings should be increased to 100 to help meet the 133 shortfall for Category 3 settlements. Object to boundary of developable area and designation of western end as open space. (1821 – Savills).</li> </ul>			
<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is adjacent to a cricket pitch, risk from ‘ball strike’ (1792 - Sport England).</li> </ul>			<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk from ball strike is considered to be resolvable through final design and layout of development. Illustrative layouts show public open space between recreation ground and houses, acting as a buffer.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation is ‘major’ development and does not meet exceptional circumstances and public interest tests (689 – CPRE).</li> <li>Plan fails to direct development to least constrained and least sensitive landscapes. No evidence of AONB Unit’s conclusions of ‘moderate impact’.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to NPPF (incl. para.172), District Plan (Strategic Objectives and Policies DP12, DP15, DP16, DP20, DP21, DP29, DP37) and HWAONB Management Plan.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England support MSDC in concluding the allocation is not ‘major’ development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would conflict with the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure in DtC and CIP – Ardingly Village Club has not been consulted.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection Paper 3: Housing and the Sustainability Appraisal contain the justification for selecting and rejecting individual sites and site options.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of site – covenant on land</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2015) prior to the adoption of the district plan (2018), the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (SSP1-3).</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation undertaken in accordance with the CIP</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Covenants do not prohibit the ability to allocate the site or approve planning permission. Site promoter states that covenant does not impact on deliverability of the site.</li> </ul>			
<b>Landscape/ Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate mitigation will be necessary to protect the Ashdown Forest. Support requirement for LVIA to consider potential impacts on special qualities of AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>			<b>Landscape/ Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Plan Policy DP17. A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be undertaken at the time of the planning application and the proposed development will be subject to the approach at that time.</li> <li>Policy SA GEN contains general principles for site allocations including</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within the Ashdown Forest 7km buffer zone</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly visible in landscape due to its elevated position and impact on dark skies</li> </ul>			

	requirements against Landscape and Ashdown Forest considerations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site designated as a National Habitat Network Enhancement zone 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site promoter has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (SA25.2) and Landscape and Visual Appraisal (SA25.4).</li> <li>• LVIA required to inform final details, including mitigation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study of the environmental impact needed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LVIA flawed and inaccurate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school is not large enough to support this development. Little capacity at local secondary school</li> <li>• Health services are too distant- and already under pressure</li> <li>• Impacts on water supply, sewage capacity and drainage</li> <li>• Poor telecommunication infrastructure in village</li> <li>• Popular recreation area – used by scout group and primary school.</li> </ul>	<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SA GEN Education and Utilities.</li> <li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport in the village is not sufficient, unsafe for cycling.</li> <li>• Traffic issues within the village (single lane and pinch points).</li> </ul>	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA GEN Access and Highways.</li> <li>• Policy requires Sustainable Transport Strategy to maximise sustainable transport measures and identify necessary mitigation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Showground Car Park which may have implications in the village during large-scale events – parking already an issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development will be required to meet the relevant parking standards.</li> <li>• Alternative parking areas in grounds available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and pollution levels are significant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies in place to mitigate noise and air quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Historic environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on listed buildings and conservation areas</li> </ul>	<b>Historic environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation has been informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment which concluded no material impact to any designated heritage asset, including their immediate setting (SA25.3).</li> </ul>
<b>Policy wording</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove part of sentence “AONB, and minimise impacts on its special qualities, as”; ‘special qualities’ is not applicable to HWAONB (624 - HWAONB Unit).</li> </ul>	<b>Policy wording</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M29).</li> </ul>

## Site: SA26 – Hammerwood Road, Ashurst Wood

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 13**   **Support: 1**   **Object: 12**   **Neutral: 0**

### Comments Received

### MSDC response

#### Evidence

- No residual requirement for Ashurst Wood (773 - Ashurst Wood, 2140 - Sigma Rydon)

#### Evidence

- Housing requirements for each settlement are expressed as minimums and should not be used as a cap to prevent development. The allocation of the site contributes to delivering the Council's spatial strategy at settlement within Category 3.

#### Access

- Access through Yewhurst Close is not considered suitable and therefore Hammerwood Road should be used (773 - Ashurst Wood Village Council)

#### Access

- Access through Yewhurst Close is preferred on landscape grounds

#### Principle of development

- Inconsistent with the Ashurst Wood Neighbourhood Plan

#### Principle of development

- The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2016) prior to the adoption of the District Plan (2018) the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (**SSP1-3**).

- Extends the build-up area resulting in overdevelopment of the area

- Noted

- The proposal would not result in an efficient use of land (789 - Dukesfield Properties)

- There are other, better sites in Ashurst Wood

- All sites put forward were considered and consistently assessed.

#### Natural and built environment

- The proposal will result in the loss of natural environment

#### Natural and built environment

- The proposed policy sets criteria to minimise the impact of the proposed development on the natural and built environment. The policy is also subject to policies contained in the District Plan and in particular DP38.

- Should not be including sites that are within the AONE

- Development of site will have impacts on view at a distance towards the village (789 - Dukesfield Properties)

- LVIA is unlikely to result in finding suitable areas in Ashurst Wood

- Noted

#### Policy wording

- The size of the site needs to be correct (773 - Ashurst Wood Village Council)

#### Policy wording

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (**DPD2 – M30**).

- Suggestions were made to improve the policy wording (642 - High Weald AONB)

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (**DPD2 – M31, M32**).

- Include the requirement for contributions towards mitigation schemes for the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA within the policy (710 - Natural England)

- SA GEN of the Sites DPD includes General Principles for development, this refers to Ashdown Forest.

#### Infrastructure

- The proposal will result in pressures on infrastructure

#### Infrastructure

- The level of contributions to infrastructure provision expected from the proposed development is detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanying the DPD (**IV1**). It was prepared in collaboration with infrastructure providers and will remain under review to ensure that appropriate



	contributions are secured at the point of planning permission being granted.
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the inclusion for the requirement to undertake a LVIA (710 - Natural England)</li> </ul>	<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased to see requirements related to contamination are fully considered, as the site is located on a secondary aquifer (713 - Environment Agency)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA27 – Land at St Martin Close, Handcross

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 15    **Support:** 0    **Object:** 13    **Neutral:** 0

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Delivery

- Increased pressure to deliver the St. Martin Close (East) site given access to the proposed site allocation is from this site (690 - Slaugham Parish Council).

#### Delivery

- The policy wording recognises that the delivery of SA27 will follow the delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan allocation.

#### Policy Wording

- Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).
- Suggested amended policy wording to align with the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan (690 - Slaugham Parish Council).

#### Policy Wording

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M33, M34).
- It is considered that the current policy wording is adequate in relation to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan.

- Suggested amended policy wording – character, open space, trees and hedgerows (690 - Slaugham Parish Council).

- It is considered that the other suggested policy wording amendments are included within Policy SA GEN or already included in SA27.

#### Site Selection

- Inconsistent with District Plan Policies DP4, DP6 and DP16.

#### Site Selection

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (SSP1, 2 and 3).

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan Examiner said that evidence justifies the need to release this site for housing.
- The proposed site allocation is a reserve site in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan and the opportunity should be taken to review the planning circumstances and strategy (697 - Welbeck Strategic Land).

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- The Neighbourhood Plan identifies that the release of the Reserve site is to be triggered by a number of potential events, including the adopted Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD and the need to allocate the site to meet the residual District housing requirement.

#### Housing Need

- The Mid Sussex District Plan has identified that there is no need for additional development in Handcross.
- Slaugham Parish Council's evidence of housing need is out of date.

#### Housing Need

- Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.
- Noted

#### Transport

- Impact of volume of additional traffic on local access roads.
- Parking issues on West Park Road and St Martin Close and traffic calming measures required.

#### Transport

- Site promoter is required to carry out a detailed site-specific Transport Assessment and enter pre-application discussions with West Sussex County Council to assess the more detailed highways impacts and safety issues, and identify mitigation.

- The site is not close to public transport or local facilities (697 - Welbeck Strategic Land).

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (SSP1, 2 and 3).

#### Landscape

- The Coos Lane edge to the site has a rural character of the landscape associated with the AONB (697 - Welbeck Strategic Land).

#### Landscape

- The proposed development will need to be landscape-led in order to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB.

#### Infrastructure

- Current infrastructure and utilities are not adequate.

#### Infrastructure

- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought

	from developments to help deliver projects.
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise and welcome the conclusion that this proposed site allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the requirement to undertake a LVIA to consider the potential impacts on the special qualities of the High Weald AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed site allocation is supported and considered sound (690 - Slaugham Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA28 – Land South of The Old Police House, Birchgrove Road, Horsted Keynes

### Number of Representations Received

**Total: 13** | **Support: 2** | **Object:10** | **Neutral: 1**

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Heritage

- The retention of the existing planting is considered to be sufficient to protect the heritage asset; a landscape buffer is not considered necessary (779 - Sunley Estates).

#### Heritage

- The site promoter has provided an Initial Heritage Impact Assessment (SA28.3).
- Further work may be required on heritage in consultation with the Conservation Officer.
- To be considered further at the planning application stage.

#### Ashdown Forest

- Recommend a requirement to be included for this proposed site allocation to contribute to the existing strategic solution for the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC in accordance with District Plan Policy DP17 (710 - Natural England).

#### Ashdown Forest

- District Plan Policy DP17 and Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations are considered sufficient. A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be undertaken at the time of the planning application and the proposed development will be subject to the approach at that time.

#### High Weald AONB

- Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).

#### High Weald AONB

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M35, M36).

#### Yield

- Unclear why the yield of the site is 25 and not 30 dwellings – suggest amending to 'approximately 25 units' or 'circa 25 units' to provide flexibility (779 - Sunley Estates).

#### Yield

- The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.

#### Policy Wording

- Suggest amended policy wording in relation to cycle route and the existing footpath (779 - Sunley Estates).

#### Policy Wording

- Even if the cycle links are on the highway, the site design and layout should provide a safe cycling experience.
- The footpath is a historic routeway and it should be integrated into the green infrastructure proposals for the site to protect its character. To be addressed in more detail at the planning application stage with the design and layout of the site.

#### Other

- No evidence that Horsted Keynes needs more homes.

#### Other

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (SSP1, 2 and 3)
- Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.
- Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations

- Excessive size of development, loss of agricultural land, poorly drained land.

- The proposed design and layout are out of character.

- Impact on medieval field system, AONB, habitats, wildlife, hedgerow, mature trees, rural public footpath, listed building, highways and access, infrastructure, utilities and amenities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest improving public transport, highways measures, conserve mature trees, improve utilities, and enforce construction operations.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistencies in the Sustainability Assessment.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inaccuracies in the documents provided by the site promoter.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased to see that the policy has been updated in line with advice on groundwater source protection zones. Support the requirements to ensure groundwater is protected (713 - Environment Agency).</li> </ul>	<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise and welcome the conclusion that this proposed site allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the requirement to undertake a LVIA to consider the potential impacts on the special qualities of the High Weald AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support SA28 – it is on the edge of the village with good site access although most traffic will need to go through the village to access amenities (Individual).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA29 – Land south of St Stephens Church, Hamsland, Horsted Keynes

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 27    **Support:** 1    **Object:** 26    **Neutral:** 0

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Policy Wording

- Suggested amended policy wording in relation to the need to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB (642 - High Weald AONB Unit).

#### Policy Wording

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M37, M38).

- Recommend a requirement to be included for this proposed site allocation to contribute to the existing strategic solution for the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC in accordance with District Plan Policy DP17 (710 - Natural England).

- District Plan Policy DP17 and Policy SA GEN: General Principles for Site Allocations are considered sufficient. A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be undertaken at the time of the planning application and the proposed development will be subject to the approach at that time.

- Suggest amended policy wording in relation to biodiversity and drainage (2140 - Rydon Homes).

- Mandatory biodiversity net gain is included within the Environment Bill. The Defra Biodiversity Metric is the applicable metric. Further detail is set out in Policy SA GEN.
- Drainage can be addressed at the planning application stage once further work has been undertaken.
- The site promoter has provided a Design Review (SA29.1) which shows SuDS in the southern part of the site.

#### Site Selection

- Adjacent land owned by MSDC.

#### Site Selection

- No decision has been made for the adjacent land.

#### Transport

- Disruption in terms of increased traffic and congestion.

#### Transport

- The site promoter has provided a Transport Statement (SA29.4) and Pre-App Response from WSCC Highways (SA29.5).

- The road width of Hamsland is insufficient which already serves 125 dwellings, extensive work would be required to widen access, this is unrealistic because of the steep slope, impact on pavement width affecting pedestrian safety, difficulties for emergency vehicles.

- The Challoners/ Hamsland area already has long standing parking difficulties.

- The policy wording includes the requirement to improve local traffic conditions by setting back the existing on-street parking spaces in Hamsland into the verge opposite the site.

- Inaccurate parking stress survey.

- Noted

- Inaccurate Transport Statement – agricultural vehicle access required in SW of site.

- No access via Bonfire Lane.

#### Access

- The access would affect a large number of mature trees.

#### Access

- The site promoter has provided a Design Review (SA29.1). The concept masterplan shows the retention of all existing trees and hedgerows on the edges of the site.
- The policy wording includes the requirement to investigate opportunities

	to set the access away from the trees on the site boundary to protect the existing trees.
<b>Landscape and Ecology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within the High Weald AONB.</li> <li>• Site is part of a mediaeval field system.</li> <li>• Inconsistencies in the HWAONB Unit's assessment.</li> </ul>	<b>Landscape and Ecology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (<b>SSP1, 2 and 3</b>)</li> <li>• The site promoter has provided a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (<b>SA29.2</b>).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on wildlife.</li> </ul>	
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on existing utilities infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (<b>IV1</b>) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li> </ul>
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise and welcome the conclusion that this proposed site allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the requirement to undertake a LVIA to consider the potential impacts on the special qualities of the High Weald AONB (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the proposed site allocation (2140 - Rydon Homes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Site: SA30 – Land to the north of Lyndon, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 7**    **Support: 1**    **Object: 6**    **Neutral: 0**

### Comments Received

### MSDC RESPONSE

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- Contrary to Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan in terms of the number of homes to be delivered. Sayers Common lacks necessary infrastructure to support additional development. Transport impacts on Reeds Lane need to be assessed, as well as flood risk (1083 - Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council).

#### Neighbourhood Plan

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (**SSP1, 2 and 3**).
- Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.
- The site promoter has provided a Transport Statement (**SA30.8**), a Stage 1 Safety Audit (**SA30.9**) and a Transport Note (**SA30.10**).
- The site promoter has provided a Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Assessment (**SA30.6**).

#### Planning History

- The previous planning application was refused on the basis of prematurity before the District Plan (2107 - Reside Developments).

#### Planning History

- DM/17/4448 – at the time the planning application was refused (March 2018), the Council was able to demonstrate that it has a five year housing land supply, there is not a need at this stage in the plan for additional housing sites to come forward that conflicts with the Development Plan and emerging District Plan.

#### Evidence

- A suite of technical evidence has been provided to the Council (2107 - Reside Developments).

#### Evidence

- SA30.1 – SA30.10.**

#### Policy Wording

- Suggest amending the site yield to 'around 35' to provide flexibility (2107 - Reside Developments).

#### Policy Wording

- The yield for each of the sites is based on the evidence available, in consultation with the site promoters and is not a definitive requirement. A subsequent more detailed planning application may demonstrate higher or lower quantum is more appropriate.

- Suggesting amending the following policy wording: Enhance connectivity with Sayers Common village by providing pedestrian and/or cycle links to adjacent existing networks, where possible. (2107 - Reside Developments).

- No change to policy required, additional wording not necessary. Site should connect to existing pedestrian/ cycle networks.

#### Site Selection

- The site is not sustainable due to the distance from a school and GP (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).
- No evidence provided that the site is required for further mineral extraction (Denton Homes and Vanderbilt Homes).

#### Site selection

- Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (**SSP1, 2 and 3**).
- Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper.

#### General

- The proposed site allocation is supported; the site identification and assessment is considered to be sound and robust. Subject to minor changes to the policy wording, the proposed site allocation is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy (2107 - Reside Developments).

#### General

- Noted





## Site: SA31 – Land to the rear Firlands, Church Road, Scaynes Hill

Number of Representations Received				
<b>Total:</b> 31	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 25	<b>Neutral:</b> 5	
Comments Received				MSDC response
<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure from ribbon development pattern.</li> <li>Outside the built up area boundary.</li> </ul>				<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictive covenant with the owners of properties in Downs View Close which prevents any development of a significant part of the land the subject of SA31.</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictive covenant does not impact access; two small areas within site - not expected to be a constraint to deliverability.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No demand for new properties in area</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on open countryside and wildlife</li> </ul>				<b>Natural Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (SA31.5) and LVIA (SA31.6) provided by proponent.</li> </ul>
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor transport links, cycling is unsafe and no pavements between villages and towns.</li> </ul>				<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy SA GEN contains general principles for site allocations including Access and Highways.</li> <li>Access and Transport Statement provided by site proponent (SA31.7).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Junction of Church Road and A272 would be affected.</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site promoter is required to carry out a site-specific transport assessment and obtain pre-application advice from West Sussex County Council on the suitability of detailed highways arrangements.</li> <li>The site should meet the relevant parking standards.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Church Road/ Nash Lane already a dangerous short cut and used by large tankers and HGVs.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access and Transport Statement is lacking.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking already an issue</li> </ul>				
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scaynes Hill is an unsustainable location and lack of infrastructure.</li> </ul>				<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including education, transport, health and recreation. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Consultation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MSDC failed to alert residents to consultation</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Community Involvement Plan (C2).</li> </ul>

## Site: SA32 – Withypitts Farm, Turners Hill

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 9    **Support:** 1    **Object:** 8    **Neutral:** 0

### Comments Received

### MSDC response

#### Evidence

- Assessment work to further support the allocation is progressing (684 - Strutt and Parker)

- Noted

#### Principle of development

- Strongly object as it brings no benefits to the village, public transport is poor, no health provision in the village, walk to the primary school is unsafe, access is dangerous, visual impact, last working farm in the Parish, AONB (597 - Turners Hill Parish Council)

#### Principle of development

- Site selection Paper 3 sets out why this site is suitable for allocation (**SSP3**).

#### Natural and built environment

- Welcome the inclusion for the requirement to undertake a LVIA (710 - Natural England)

#### Natural and built environment

- Noted

- Development should not occur in the AONB

- No objection from Natural England or High Weald AONB unit to the allocation of the site.

- There are unique constructions currently on site that should not be lost.

- Site promoter will be required to carry out a Heritage assessment and engage in pre-application discussion with Historic England and undertake any work necessary.
- The policy wording ensures that where possible existing building will be retained. Initial plans show the intention to retain those buildings.

- The site is located within the Brick Clay (Weald) Mineral Safeguarding Area

- The policy was designed to ensure that mineral resources on site are best managed.

#### Infrastructure

- Lack of infrastructure within the village to support further development.

#### Infrastructure

- The level of contributions to infrastructure provision expected from the proposed development is detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1) accompanying the DPD. It was prepared in collaboration with infrastructure providers and will remain under review to ensure that appropriate contributions is secured at the point of planning permission being granted.

#### Policy wording

- Amendment to the policy wording have been suggested (642 - High Weald AONB)

#### Policy wording

- Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (**DPD2 – M39, M40, M41**).

- Include the requirement for contributions towards mitigation schemes for the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA within the policy (710 - Natural England).

- SA GEN of the Sites DPD includes General Principles for development, this refers to Ashdown Forest.

<b>Site: SA33 – Ansty Cross Garage, Ansty</b>			
<b>Number of Comments Received</b>			
<b>Total: 9</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Neutral: 0</b>
<b>Comments Received</b>		<b>MSDC comments</b>	
<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly object to the allocation as Ansty has already seen numerous developments in recent years. (617 - Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<b>Principle</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Selection Papers 1, 2 and 3 (<b>SSP1, 2 and 3</b>).</li> <li>Refer to response SA10/11 in this paper</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent with Spatial Strategy, DP4, DP6 and DP16; Ansty has met minimum housing target.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan (617 - Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan was made (2015) prior to the adoption of the district plan (2018) the reasons for allocation against existing development plan policies is fully evidenced and justified (<b>SSP1-3</b>).</li> </ul>	
<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic and access concerns (particularly regarding the roundabout) (617 - Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Technical Report (<b>SA33. 4</b>) provided by site proponent.</li> <li>Site promoter is required to carry out a site-specific transport assessment and obtain pre-application advice from West Sussex County Council on the suitability of detailed highways arrangements.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sustainability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No pub. Very limited public transport (617 - Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water supply issues.</li> </ul>		<b>Infrastructure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (<b>IV1</b>) sets out the broad infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including; utilities. Contributions will be sought from developments to help deliver projects.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support updates made to policy (713 – Environment Agency).</li> </ul>		<b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have provided additional information regarding the site prior to consultation (743 – Rodway – Site Promoter)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	

## Policy: SA34 – Existing Employment Sites

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 3**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 3**    **Neutral: 0**

### Key Issues Raised

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object – remove SA34. Employment sites unnecessarily restricted to those falling within Use Class B1, B2 and B8. Recent Use Class changes not taken into account – Use Class E. Suggested policy amendments (789, Tim North, Dukesfield Properties).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Economic Development Strategy aims to increase the amount of business floorspace in the District, as well as minimising the loss of floorspace. Policy SA34 supplements District Plan Policy DP1 by providing additional policy requirements to the protection of existing sites, whilst supporting their growth where appropriate.</li> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (<b>DPD2 – M01</b>).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the protection of the employment land at Crawley Garden Centre (Site 604) through SA34 and Appendix A. However not all the land within the ownership is included and consider it should be included; uses include storage and a residential dwelling. This would allow for further expansion and development (2444, DMH, CGC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA34 seeks to safeguard existing employment land within defined uses. It is not considered appropriate to safeguard a residential dwelling for employment use and the remainder of the site does not fall within the defined employment uses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the inclusion of the Box House Poultry Farm, Albourne Road, Hurstpierpoint (<b>Site 859</b>) as an existing employment site – promoting for residential development. No longer suitable for employment use (652, Rodway, Benfell Limited)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should remain safeguarded for employment uses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove Ivy Dene Industrial Estate, Ashurst Wood (<b>Site 182</b>) from Appendix A as the viability of continued use on this site is uncertain, and employment needs can be met without requiring this site (789, Tim North, Dukesfield)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should remain safeguarded for employment uses.</li> </ul>

## Policy: SA35 – Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 9**    **Support: 1**    **Object: 7**    **Neutral: 1**

### Key Issues Raised

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy in recognition of highway capacity issues at various locations, including A22/A264 junction – mitigation should be agreed by all parties prior to development commencing in the vicinity to ensure impact mitigated and contributions sought (910, Tandridge District Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that finance will be wasted on further studies – radical improvement has already been recognised – solutions should be implemented prior to further development in the area (1436, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A272/London Road junction should be added to the policy to ensure upgrades are made, including those requiring land take outside the highway boundary (784, Bolney Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport evidence (T7) available does not suggest it is necessary to include the A272/London Road junction.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should include the safeguarding of Dukes Head Roundabout with capacity studies into all major junctions from M23 J10 Eastbound on A264 to the junction with the A22. (625, Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Sussex County Council /Surrey/Tandridge have agreed to jointly commission further studies to explore highways improvements related to the A22/A264 corridor</li> <li>The transport evidence available does not suggest it is necessary to include the M23/A264 (T7)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should include biodiversity net gain as a requirement of future schemes (748, Sussex Wildlife Trust).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M44)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to safeguard land to provide new link road / ‘travel corridor’ between High Cross and Sayers Common, to provide access for a proposed allocation in Horsham district for a new settlement – published in Regulation 18 version of their Local Plan (2016, Quod, Mayfield)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence to support the need for the travel corridor / link road is required to support the Sites DPD. New settlement one of a number of options considered by Horsham District Council. This option is not supported by Mid Sussex District Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy and commend the council for identifying and seeking to deliver improvements to existing infrastructure – SA identifies positive outcomes as well. A range of possible highway improvement projects which could be secured through SA35 have been considered by the promoters and provided sufficient evidence to the highway authority to demonstrate betterment to future journey times along the corridor – all development coming forward in the area would be required to contribute towards the improvements (738, DMH Stallard, site promoter for SA20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguarding policy concedes that development proposed in the DPD will cause unacceptable road congestion without major road improvement (602, East Grinstead Society)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy required to support delivery of strategic highway and sustainable transport infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Junction at Crawley Down Road and the A264 is a major omission (602, East Grinstead Society)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport evidence available does not suggest it is necessary to include this junction (T7)</li> </ul>

## Policy: SA36 – Wivelsfield Railway Station

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 1**   **Support: 0**   **Object: 1**   **Neutral: 0**

### Key Issues Raised

- Support the integrated use of sustainable transport however disappointing that an area allocated as Local Green Space in the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan will be developed. Not clear of biodiversity value of the allocated area. Considerations of the compensation required would be welcomed (748, Sussex Wildlife Trust)

### MSDC Response

- The NPPF allows for an LGS designation to be subsequently allocated for a different purpose in a subsequent Development Plan Document if this is evidenced and justified.

## Policy: SA37 – Burgess Hill / Haywards Heath Multifunctional Network

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 8**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 7**    **Neutral:1**

### Key Issues Raised

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for non-vehicular links between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath has long been obvious and should be extended south to Hassocks (689 - CPRE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An additional pedestrian/ cycle route is proposed to be completed between Burgess Hill and Hassocks as part of the land north of Clayton Mill, Hassocks strategic development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern route - The evaluation work had not been done properly. Should be removed from plan until all work done to avoid something that is undeliverable and illegal (630 - Theobalds Road Residents' Association)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safeguarded areas shown in the map accompanying SA37 are indicative and a number of options are being investigated. The final route option is still to be determined; detailed designed work will be carried out to inform this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of need from cyclists for this route (630 - Theobalds Road Residents' Association)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme part of an ambitious programme of sustainable transport infrastructure improvement to support development, particularly at Burgess Hill</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at the level of uncertainty from this policy, including how the route was selected and the ecological information considered. We would welcome acknowledgement that multifunctional networks would have the benefits to deliver benefits to biodiversity. The creation of a network could aid or hinder connection and function in the natural environment. (748 - Sussex Wildlife Trust)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safeguarded areas shown in the map accompanying SA37 are indicative and a number of options are being investigated. The final route option is still to be determined; detailed designed work will be carried out to inform this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern route - Theobalds Road is a public ancient bridleway with priorities for pedestrians, metalled as an equestrian pathway. It is a private road. The route will be a commuter route, pavements on Valebridge Road will be too narrow. The route would need to conform with design requirements. How would the route be managed and maintained during construction and onwards? (630 - Theobalds Road Residents' Association)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safeguarded areas shown in the map accompanying SA37 are indicative and a number of options are being investigated. The final route option is still to be determined; detailed designed work will be carried out to inform this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the objections cited by the Theobalds Road Residents' Association, the proposed route is (707, Wivelsfield Parish Council; 1002, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with the route chosen, particularly the eastern route. Alternative, more direct routes should have been looked at such as land adjacent to railway line. (630 - Theobalds Road Residents' Association)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safeguarded areas shown in the map accompanying SA37 are indicative and a number of options are being investigated. The final route option is still to be determined; detailed designed work will be carried out to inform this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern route is undeliverable and illegal. Bridleway already available for cyclists use. Changing to route where cyclists have priority as illegal as under the 1968 Countryside Act cycle users must give way to equestrian and pedestrian users (630 - Theobalds Road Residents' Association; 1036, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst the final route option is still to be determined, there is no intention of changing the legal status of the bridleway.</li> <li>Key on map and Appendix B should say multifunctional network rather than cycleway. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M46, M51)</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy could be improved by including a more precise timeframe for the delivery of the scheme, include a requirement for consultation and restrictions to avoid ribbon development along the network (689 - CPRE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safeguarded areas shown in the map accompanying SA37 are indicative and a number of options are being investigated. The final route option is still to be determined; detailed designed work will be carried out to inform this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would lead to the loss of private land (frontage of properties, front gardens) and possible blight (989, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council does not consider the use of Compulsory Purchase of private properties (land frontage/gardens) appropriate to facilitate any route.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should contain pledge not to allow network to become a focus for allowing future ribbon development along this route (689 - CPRE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. District Plan policies will apply to land along the safeguarded route, no additional wording required.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Western route gives much more control of creating a cycle way through new development sites rather than existing and established properties (989, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement to existing bridle way vicinity of Fox Hill) should not discriminate against any existing users. Upgrade should rectify poor surface and not detract from existing tranquillity. Segregated and shared cycle/pedestrian options could create more dangerous situations (1036, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Policy: SA38 – Air Quality

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 5**   **Support: 1**   **Object: 3**   **Neutral: 0**

### Key Issues Raised

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the requirement for applicants to demonstrate there is not an unacceptable impact on air quality resulting from their proposals. Recommend change to policy wording to strengthen the protection of designated sites (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M50)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air quality assessments and modelling should take place to analyse the impact of increased traffic along the A264 corridor to ensure compliance with SA38 (625 - Worth Parish Council).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence to suggest specific policy reference to air quality on A264 required. General air quality monitored by Environmental Health outside planning process.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA38 should have higher standards. Should consider particulate matter. Should assess air quality across the District. Call for a policy that is clear, comprehensive, objective, fair, flexible and legally compliant – changes to SA38 are needed (689 - CPRE Sussex).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New strategic policies will be considered further through District Plan review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should refer to 2020 Sussex guidance (689 - CPRE Sussex).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Suggest change to policy wording. See modifications schedule (DPD2 – M47, M48, M49)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should be in accordance with NPPF; include a reference to NPPF (1036, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not considered necessary to duplicate the NPPF.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about air quality generally. Query modelling and data used (1036, resident)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The air quality modelling has used the latest data available.</li> <li>Air quality reports: AQ1-AQ7.</li> </ul>