

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

# **Statement of Consultation**

Regulation 22(1)(c)

**Appendix 10**

**Summary of Responses (Regulation 19) – Evidence Base  
and Policies Map**

December 2020

# Contents

Sustainability Appraisal.....	2
Habitats Regulations Assessment – General Comments.....	5
Policies Maps .....	6
Infrastructure/ Infrastructure Delivery Plan.....	7
Community Involvement Plan .....	8
Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA).....	10
Viability Assessment.....	10
Transport Evidence .....	11

# Sustainability Appraisal

## Number of Comments received

**Total: 33** | **Support: 2** | **Object: 30** | **Neutral: 1**

## Comments

## MSDC Response

### General comments

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally support the approach taken in the sustainability appraisal (691 – Pegasus, 738 – DMH Stallard)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment process is considered robust and it is considered that it demonstrates that the sites selected are the most appropriate for development (701 - Sunleys)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment process has been robust, and it is considered that this demonstrate that the sites selected are the most appropriate for development (2218 - Hargreaves Management)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA is silent on elderly accommodation. It failed to identify the need for specialist accommodation as a sustainability issue and therefore does not consider reasonable alternatives to address the need. (709 - Barton Willmore)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach to specialist accommodation for older people is detailed within Provision of specialist accommodation for the Elderly (TP4). The District Plan sets out the strategy in this respect and it is not for the Site Allocations DPD to revisit this approach.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delivery of the eastern part of the SA37 network, linking Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill, will be a likely significant effect of a beneficial nature within Lewes District and therefore should be considered as a cross-boundary impact likely to arise from the plan. (1715 - Parker Dann)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed that the proposed eastern route under policy SA37 will immediately benefit a small number of Lewes District residents living on the edge of Burgess Hill.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA is unduly reliant upon, and constrained by, indicative and untested settlement figures, which has led to the allocation of unsustainable sites having regard to alternatives that exist in the District. (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Strategy for the DPD is set out the District Plan which provides the overarching development alternatives for the SA. It is not the role of the Sites DPD to re-assess the Council's housing need or establish options for it. This will be carried out within the District Plan Review.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of traffic is overlooked within the DPD which is reflected in the SA which includes a lot of uncertainty in the site assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sites DPD is supported by robust Transport evidence that also informed conclusions of the SA.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sustainability Appraisal reports that the Council currently lacks data to distinguish Grade 3 from 3a agricultural land and assumes a default classification of 3 without evidence (2383 - Infrastructure First)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of ecological information available makes it hard to assess the potential impact of any site allocations or the assessment of their suitability against the SA Objectives (748 – Sussex Wildlife Trust)</li> </ul>	
<h3>Context and baseline</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA that accompanies the Regulation 19 consultation does not refer to the latest evidence and data and is therefore not a sound basis to develop the Site Allocations against. (1987 &amp; 2031 Wates)</li> </ul>	<h3>Context and baseline</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As described in the SA, the most up-to-date data has been used. Older data has been used where the most up-to-date information has not yet been released.</li> </ul>
<h3>Sustainability framework</h3>	<h3>Sustainability framework</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives and indicators identified for the purpose of the</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The framework should be reviewed to reflect the current COVID-19 context (684, 757 - Strutt and Parker)</li> </ul>	<p>sustainability appraisal are considered to remain relevant in the current COVID-19 context.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The framework should include a landscape objective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape is included under objective 9 of the SA.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Housing – reasonable alternatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA/SEA has not considered/assessed all reasonable alternatives which suggests that the Draft SA DPD has not been positively prepared as it does not meet the objectively assessed needs of the Category 3 Settlements or is justified by not having the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives (684, 757 - Strutt and Parker)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Housing – reasonable alternatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process followed to arrive at the preferred housing site options is detailed in section 6 of the SA and flows from the spatial distribution set out in the District Plan which was itself subject to Sustainability Appraisal. It is not the role of the Sites DPD to re-establish the strategy.</li> <li>The SA is clear about the logical approach to establish reasonable alternatives.</li> <li>It is not the role of the Sites DPD to re-assess the Council's housing need or establish options for it. This will be carried out within the District Plan Review.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA fails to identify a reasonable alternative of no further growth at East Grinstead based on the Habitats Directive and potential impacts upon the Ashdown Forest SAC. (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA fails to identify reasonable alternatives at Haywards Heath. (705 - Nexus)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Options presented were not sufficiently different in terms of addressing the approved spatial strategy. (708 - K LW)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA does not assess the alternative to direct growth outside the AONB (708 - K LW)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the Council have not rigorously considered the reasonable alternative of allocating more of, or all of, the remaining 47 sites (that meet the Council's own suitability criteria) (753 &amp; 1443 - Lewis &amp; Co Planning)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unclear in the SA how the alternative options for housing supply were arrived at. No consideration was given to providing for anything over and above the residual housing requirement. (791 - Wates)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA fails to assess to reasonable alternatives. All suitable options have not been appropriately identified . (1987 &amp; 2031 - Wates)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA focusses solely on the sustainability of sites rather the considering the benefits of providing housing in different locations. (1987 &amp; 2031 - Wates)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not considered that the assessment of the housing options is a sufficient enough assessment of reasonable alternatives as required by guidance and legislation. (2065, 2067, 2079 &amp; 2080 - Denton)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Housing – site specific comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA13 is incorrectly categorised 'marginal' when assessed against the sustainability framework - the respondent provided a scoring system to show that the proposed allocated site scored better than some other site categorised as performing well (691 - Pegasus)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Housing – site specific comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site appraisals are kept under review should any updates to site assessment in the Site Selection Paper 3: Housing arise (<b>SSP3</b>). However, the Council applied the same methodology to assess each site against the sustainability framework and is therefore confident that the sustainability appraisal provides a consistent assessment of reasonable housing site options.</li> <li>Alternative scorings submitted by alternative site proponents and</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA includes errors, omissions and inconsistencies for sites south of Folders Lane</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site land West of Sayers Common (SHELAA ref. 857) should be considered to be a reasonable alternative (708 - K LW)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of Land opposite Stanford Avenue, London Road, Hassocks (SHELAA ref. 221) has</li> </ul>	

<p>been excluded through the SA based on a flawed assessment in comparison to other sites. (753 - Lewis &amp; Co Planning)</p>	<p>objectors would not be consistent with the approach used within the SA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are inconsistencies in the SA in the assessment of sites in Horsted Keynes (in particular, SHELAA sites #68, #69, #184 (SA29), #216 (SA28), #807, #971). The assessments have been flawed due to incorrect assumptions being made, or wrong data being used for different aspects of the sustainability assessment. This has had a direct impact on which sites have been selected.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The findings of the SA are supported, however the assessment of the HH Golf Course (SHELAA ref. 503) site contains inaccuracies which need to be rectified.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA fails to identify measures to mitigate the impact of the proposed sites in East Grinstead and Felbridge, either alone or in combination with sites already committed in the Local Development Plan (738 – DMH Stallard)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site at Clearwater Farm Site (SHELAA ref. 841) was incorrectly discounted at the Stage 2 assessment leading to all reasonable alternatives not being considered within the SA and failure to assess a reasonable alternative the delivery of the modal shift aspiration of policy SA37. (1715 - Parker Dann)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sustainability Appraisal is superficial, inaccurate in places and fails to consider all reasonable potential sites, in particular closer to Crawley – the respondent has provided suggestion to correct the SA. (2383 - Infrastructure First)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA is inadequately evidenced in respect of transport and biodiversity in respect of policies SA12 and 13</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are errors within the SA with regard to SA32, there is no GP surgery in the village (597 - Turners Hill Parish Council)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An additional alternative should be considered for employment to allocate over and above the identified need to adopt a flexible approach given the various factors which impacts on uncertainty. (789 - Dukesfield)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Employment</b></p> <p>The reasonable alternatives for sites to meet the District Plan employment need are identified within the Site Selection paper 4: Employment (<b>SSP4</b>). Within the SA, sites were grouped in three categories to be assessed against the sustainability framework and were all considered for allocation at this stage. Sites were subsequently discounted due to their likely impacts on the social, environmental and economic objectives.</p>

## Habitats Regulations Assessment – General Comments

### Number of comments received

<b>Total: 3</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concur with the findings of the HRA report for both air quality and recreational pressure, providing that all required mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any future planning permissions given (710 - Natural England).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SDNPA and MSDC are members of the Ashdown Forest Working Group which is chaired by the SDNPA. No concerns raised regarding the proposals in the Regulation 19 consultation document and air quality impacts on the Ashdown Forest SAC. Look forward to continue working together alongside other partners of the Working Group (777 - South Downs National Park Authority).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural area developed (Individual).</li> </ul>	<p>HRA is a process to ensure that a plan or project being undertaken or permitted by a public body will not adversely affect the ecological integrity of a European wildlife site, in this case the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC. Ashdown Forest is within Wealden District. None of the proposed site allocations will result in development on Ashdown Forest. Mitigation for recreational pressure in the form of SANG and SAMM will be required for the proposed housing site allocations within the 7km zone of influence.</p>

## Policies Maps

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 13**   **Support: 2**   **Object: 11**   **Neutral: 0**

### Comments

### MSDC comments

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 11a East Grinstead – principle of including site (land south of 61 Crawley Down Road, Felbridge in built up area is supported (ABC, 2080)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 8a Copthorne – support amendments to include extent of development site (Terence O'Rourke, 654)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 19 Turners Hill – objection to continued designation of the Crawley – East Grinstead Strategic gap. There is no justified policy basis (Chilmark, 1458) (Jackson Planning, 1781)</li> <li>'Key' diagram on page 13 does not contain the strategic gap so is inconsistent with the Inset map. (Jackson Planning, 1781)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan, policy THP8 provides the policy justification for the strategic gap indicated on inset maps 19 and 19a</li> <li>The purpose of the key diagram is to provide an overview of the allocations and not to replicate the detail of the policies map and there is no inconsistency between the two documents.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 12a Hassocks – built up area should be amended to include Byanda, (Nexus Planning, 2001)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan was made in April 2020. Some amendments to BUA were made at this time in accordance with DP6. As there has been opportunity for the parish Council to alter BUA at this location relatively recently, it is not considered appropriate to amend as part of the Site Allocations DPD.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 2 – Ansty and Staplefield (Haywards Heath incorrectly referred to in rep. The proposals map should be amended to include the allocation to the East of Borde Hill Lane. (Woolf Bond Planning, 1454)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council does not agree that the omission site should be allocated and therefore no change to the policies map is required.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 17a Scaynes Hill – built up area should be amended (DMH, 762) (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 7/8 (TP2)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 7 Burgess Hill – Seven residential properties to the east of SA12 should be included in built up area (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 6 (TP2).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 10 Cuckfield – Area to the east of SA23 should be included within built up area. (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 7. (TP2)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 3a Ardingly – Area to the east of Selsfield Road (south Cobb Lane) should be included within the built-up area. (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 6 (TP2).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 4 Ashurst Wood – Land at Yewhurst, adjacent to SA26 should be included in the built-up area. (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 6 (TP2).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inset 19 Turners Hill – Withypitts Farm house building to the south of SA32 should be included in the built-up area (DMH, 761)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change. See Built up Area boundary Topic Paper, page 6 (TP2).</li> </ul>

## Infrastructure/ Infrastructure Delivery Plan

### Number of comments received

**Total: 7**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 5**    **Neutral: 2**

### Comments

### MSDC Response

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns were raised in relation to the capacity of the sewerage network in the north of the District, as well as water supply in Mid Sussex. (625 - Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure provision and improvements to support the delivery of the Site Allocations DPD have been identified within the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IV1), which includes reinforcement of the sewerage network at various locations across the District. It is acknowledged that some items may not be included for each site such as digital infrastructure, however such provision is required under policy DP23 and is expected to be delivered as part of the development as opposed to being considered as a developer contribution.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Local Plan should contribute to ensuring that appropriate digital infrastructure is delivered alongside new development to ensure that the local and national economy is appropriately supported. (625 - Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further development should not be proposed in areas where the water demand cannot be coped with, such as Handcross (1423 – resident; 2420 resident).</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is missing information in relation to the estimated cost of police, bus infrastructure and other infrastructure within the IDP (1430 - resident)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IDP contains the latest information available and will be updated as and when more information becomes available from infrastructure providers</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure should be improved ahead of new development being allocated to remediate current issues (1722 - Lindfield Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The timing of infrastructure delivery will be discussed on a case by case basis with infrastructure providers to ensure that capacity is available to accommodate future development so that new development is appropriately served by infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing essential services inadequate, nothing implemented from previous development (2209 - resident)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan fails to acknowledge the need to provide for specialist accommodation, such as extra care accommodation (709 - Barton Willmore)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach to specialist accommodation for older people is detailed within the Topic Paper: Housing for Older People (TP4).</li> </ul>



## Community Involvement Plan

### Number of Comments Received

**Total: 5**    **Support: 0**    **Object: 1**    **Neutral: 4**

### Comments

### MSDC Response

#### Felbridge form

- MSDC has failed to deliver on its Statement of Community Involvement.

- As statutory consultees all Town and Parish Councils and adjacent local planning authorities were alerted to both the Regulation 18 and 19 consultations.
- A summary of responses to the Regulation 18 consultation was published in the Council's Statement of Consultation (August 2020) (C3). This includes Actions to Address Objections.
- Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Regulations.

- Ineffective methods of communication used to alert residents and hard to reach groups of consultation.

- Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Regulations.

- Only a single press release in Mid Sussex Times; not distributed to Felbridge or East Grinstead.

- Press release issued but Council has no control over which publications choose to include the article

- No mention of consultation of Council's landing page, Planning and Building' or dedicated 'Consultations' webpages.

- All consultation documents and supporting evidence were available on the council website.

- No alerts in Mid Sussex Matters magazine.

- Due to timing of publication and approval of documents for consultation.

#### General

- Felbridge Parish Council was not contacted at any point during the development of the DPD. (534 – Felbridge Parish Council).

- Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Regulations

- Tandridge District Council were not informed of Regulation 19 consultation (534 – Felbridge Parish Council)

- As statutory consultees all Town and Parish Councils and adjacent local planning authorities were alerted to both the Regulation 18 and 19 consultations. Tandridge District Council have been fully involved in the preparation of the DPD, as set out in the SoCG (DC13).

- Consultation form too complicated

- Planning regulations govern the content of response for the Regulation 19 consultation.

- Community engagement virtually impossible to achieve given the knowledge needed and jargon used.

- Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Regulations

- No feedback or explanation on why detailed objections have been ignored.

- Comments received during regulation 18 stage were fully reported to Members, via Scrutiny and Council meetings.

- Limited number of people that buy the local newspaper to see press release.

- Noted

- Email alert only effective for those that have signed up

- Noted

- Was there any promotion of consultation at libraries during Covid-19 (i.e. posters on doors)?

- No due to limited operation of libraries during the consultation period.

- Local Development Scheme out of date (dated June 2019).

- Website has been kept up to date with changes to timetable due to Covid-19 to keep residents up to date.
- Revised LDS December 2020 however the Council's website has been kept up-to-date with timetable information

## Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)

### Number of comments received

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

### Comments

- SHLAA assessment undertaken on the blanket basis that it is C3 housing. This should be revisited (786 – Strutt and Parker)
- SHELAA assessments have not been corrected when notified of errors (1243 – K Griffiths, landowner)

### MSDC Response

- Whilst not distinction between C2 or C3 housing is made in the SHELAA assessment. As set out in DP30: Housing Mix sites that are considered suitable for housing development would be positively suitable for older person accommodation. Therefore no need to draw a distinction in the SHELAA.
- SHELAA has been undertaken in a robust manner, all sites have been assessed in a consistent way. SHELAA has been prepared using best practice methodology and in accordance with planning guidance.

## Viability Assessment

### Number of comments received

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

### Comments

- No updated viability appraisal has been carried out, it cannot be concluded that the DPD is effective or consistent with National Policy (705 – Nexus\_Miller Homes).

### MSDC Response

- A viability assessment of the sites was prepared in 2019 (IV2) prepared. It is informed by the Community Infrastructure Levy and district Plan Viability Study (2016) (IV3).
- As advised by the council's viability consultant: The sites DPD does not seek to introduce any new policies or a notably different range of sites to those in the District plan – therefore a more detail viability assessment is not required.

Transport Evidence			
Number of comments received			
Total: 5	Support: 0	Object:4	Neutral:2
Comments		MSDC Response	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Parish believes that the Plan has not adequately addressed the cumulative impact on local roads of the proposed developments around in East Grinstead, Crawley Down and Ardingly. (206 - West Hoathly Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Strategic Transport model (2020) has been prepared to inform plan preparation and ensure transport impacts are mitigated. This takes into account existing and proposed development in Mid Sussex and adjacent local authority areas</li> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) assessed the cumulative impacts and identified no remaining 'severe' impacts at any of the junctions in the vicinity of these areas.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Necessary to consider the increased traffic and the subsequent impacts on the character and tranquillity for the village of Ditchling (777 - South Downs National Park Authority)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council has worked with East Sussex as highway authority to understand any impacts on East Sussex highway network including Ditchling. This work is ongoing as set out in the SoCG with the South Downs National Park (DC11).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity studies should take place on all major junctions from M23 J10 eastbound until its junction with A22 (625 - Worth Parish Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Set out in the supporting text to SA35 the A262/A22 is subject to a separate piece of work in partnership with West Sussex County Council, Surrey County Council and Tandridge District Council.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Junction capacity on the local road network at the Turners Hill crossroads and the Sandy Lane, Vicarage Road and Wallage lane junctions with the Turners Hill Road through Crawley down needs to be considered (625 - Worth Parish Council).</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) does identify junctions on the highway network that will be impacted by the Sites DPD and mitigation is required where necessary.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has concerns as to the soundness of the plan having considered the transport studies. Specifically the capacity of A262/A22 junctions as indicated in the Systra report and the WSP report published on Tandridge Council Web Site (666_ - East Grinstead Town Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (Systra) Strategic Transport Assessment (T7) has been prepared to inform plan preparation and ensure transport impacts are mitigated. The WSP report is a separate piece of work exploring strategic/ cross boundary transport matters.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(At time of regulation 19) Transport Evidence has not been completed we are therefore submitting a 'holding objection'. These relate to the migration of the Science and Technology Park and Safety Audit. (792 – West Sussex County Council)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the publication of the Submission plan officers have continued to work with West Sussex County Council and Highways England in relation to the outstanding highways matters. Further information can be found in TP3 Introduction to Site Allocations DPD.</li> </ul>	