

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 402

**Response Ref:** Reg19/402/1

**Respondent:** Ms K Beckwith

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Kirsty Beckwith
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	AN. OTHER
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the site allocations DPD because the huge amounts of traffic and the congestion caused by it in this area is already very bad and a massive issue. The traffic report produced for MSDC is flawed and there is no suitable solution for this.</p> <p>A huge concern of mine is the destruction of the land home to animals and plants in these fields. The development of this land will leave animals with smaller territories and no where to go, and flora and fauna in these fields lost forever.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 405

**Response Ref:** Reg19/405/1

**Respondent:** Mr R Donnelly

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Ronald Donnelly
<b>Job title</b>	Chartered Engineer
<b>Organisation</b>	Self
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	I understand that the process has been less than truthful about the traffic situation. Independent report validates what I have experienced myself with the growing traffic in Burgess Hill, in my own case at Folders Lane when on some mornings traffic is queuing back 500m from the top of the roundabout all the way to my own house. An there are more developments in progress in this area! Crossing the road at the top of Keymer Road/Folders Lane Junction is actually life threatening in busy situations - and that's in clear daylight, let alone dark wet winter evenings. Have you people who are proposing this actually stood at this junction and witnessed mothers trying to cross with pushchairs. This is just one pinch-point, and just applying traffic lights is not the solution. It's a holistic problem where the only solution is reducing traffic not increasing it.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	The developing this area should not be allowed to progress. There traffic infrastructure in the town is unsuitable.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes



**Please notify me when-The Site  
Allocations DPD is adopted**

yes

**Date**

13/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 411

**Response Ref:** Reg19/411/1

**Respondent:** Mrs S Pullen

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Sian Pullen
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	16/09/2020

**Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response****Policy:** SA12 - SA13**ID:** 416**Response Ref:** Reg19/416/1**Respondent:** Ms J Dallas**Organisation:****On Behalf Of:****Category:** Resident**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Jennifer DallS
<b>Job title</b>	Head of Digital
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Jennifer Dallas
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12-SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	The site selection was unsound as it didn't follow MSDCs own guidance. You list the representation made for the first consultation and the traffic report is flawed! I'm incredible worried about the biodiversity of the site and don't feel this has been properly reviewed. I think these plans go against the national planning guidance.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	I haven't seen anything that suggests infrastructure will be improved to substantiate the claims traffic won't cause further chaos in the town or that the added pollution won't have a dramatic impact on biodiversity of the site.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 422

**Response Ref:** Reg19/422/1

**Respondent:** Mr D Rudling

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	David Rudling
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because:</p> <p>The site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative, did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made to the first consultation were apparently 'lost'.</p> <p>The traffic report produced for MSDC is flawed as the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this. Increased traffic will add to local air pollution.</p> <p>Developing the important green gap between Burgess Hill and the Keymer and Hassocks villages to the south will result in coalescence.</p> <p>There is a lack of commitments to infrastructure (eg new resources for local schools, water supplies, health care, local transport, etc).</p> <p>These housing proposals go against both the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	25/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 425

**Response Ref:** Reg19/425/1

**Respondent:** Mr R Henley

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ian Henley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 September 2020 14:26  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Allocation of housing to sites SA12 & SA13

I am writing to object to the allocation of housing to the sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD. Over the last 10 years, those of us who live on the South side of Burgess Hill have observed multiple developments in and around our area: the East and West End of Folders Lane and the substantial development on the former brickworks spring to mind but there are of course many others. I quite accept that Burgess Hill must do its bit toward the provision of housing in our area and we have already demonstrated our clear commitment to this - and the major development in the Northern Arc is another powerful demonstration of the town's continuing commitment over the coming years.

However, I must say, enough is enough. Burgess Hill has accepted 36% of the number of homes required by government, a number which is more than Haywards Heath and East Grinstead put together; and the District Plan confirms that we have clearly met our obligations. Why must we do more now with these sites? They will further erode the green gap between Burgess Hill and Keymer/Hassocks and, moreover, they will compromise a highly biodiverse site.

And there are other arguments against the allocation of more housing provision to the South of BH: the existing recent developments have already stretched the infrastructure, in particular the road, water and sewer provision. Folders Lane is now busy beyond its original design capability (and the traffic report produced for these proposals by MSDC has many shortcomings); the intersection of Folders Lane and Keymer Road regularly floods; and water outages now seem to occur more frequently, particularly in the summer. As I understand it, there is nothing in the proposals for SA12 and 13 which addresses this vital planning consideration.

Finally, two process observations are also called for here: (1) the selection of these sites did not follow MSDC's own guidance and it appears that representations made on the first consultation were 'lost'. This really must be considered unacceptable from a good governance perspective and (2) allocation of these sites is not compliant with either the District Plan or National Planning Guidance.

For all of the above reasons, I would urge that these sites NOT be allocated for further housing.

KR

R.I.S. Henley  
[REDACTED]

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 428

**Response Ref:** Reg19/428/6

**Respondent:** Ms L Castleton

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>Building here will further close the strategic green field gap between Hassocks and Burgess Hill. I am against the closing of this gap.</p> <p>Surely the current pandemic has shown that green space and clean air is vital to our survival. We should be maintaining fields to allow nature to flourish. The individual and separate identity of the two towns should be maintained and the existing large green gap should stay as big as it is.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when the publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 and SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	As I understand things, selection of this site did not follow MSDC's own guidelines. How can you possibly continue to consider the site when you're not even following your own rules. It seems selection of this site cannot be considered a sound decision when guidelines have not been followed.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	Follow your own guidelines
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 and SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	More housing brings more traffic to the area particularly Folders Lane and Keymer Road/Ockley Lane. This means more pollution. The traffic report produced for MSDC is flawed. It does not sufficiently address how the increase in traffic will be managed
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	Throw out this site
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I understand that this site is unique in its biodiversity. Surely this should be celebrated and protected. In fact MSDC have a duty to maintain our rather unique countryside.</p> <p>I do not want another site lost to the might and heavy hand of the developer.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to this site being developed without any provision of infrastructure. Where will children go to school? How far will someone have to go to see a doctor? Can the drains and sewers cope?</p> <p>All necessary to be addressed before any housing is built.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when the publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Louise Castleton
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to this proposal as new build of 350 houses here is outside of the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</p> <p>Surely the District Plan should be adhered to, otherwise what was the point of drawing it up?</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	It is necessary to follow the District Plan, not introduce new sites outside of the plan.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 431

**Response Ref:** Reg19/431/1

**Respondent:** Mrs J Hayman

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

June V. Hayman

26.09.2020

Planning Policy  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands  
Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH15 1SS

MID SUSSEX DC

28 SEP 2020

Dear Sirs

SA12 & SA13 Planning Consultation

I write to object to the planned housing development on the land to the south of Folders Lane in Burgess Hill.

The proposed development would not only further extend the Burgess Hill boundary towards Hassocks but will also place a further burden on already unsustainable issues within the town. In addition:

- The current infrastructure in Burgess Hill is already stretched to its' limits and the proposals make no reference to how this issue might be addressed.
- The traffic report produced for MSDC is clearly flawed and doesn't properly reflect the real life traffic congestion and bottle necks which are already a regular situation within the town, particularly during the rush hour and school drop off and collection periods.
- The site selection process was conducted without complying with the protocols contained within MSDC's own guidance policy. I also understand that a number of representations made for the first consultation were lost by the council.
- MSDC have not properly taken into account the biodiversity of the site and the significant negative environmental impact of the proposed scheme.

The consideration of this site for residential development is in flagrant disregard of National Planning Guidance and the District Plan and would also result in further encroachment across the boundaries of Hassocks.

Yours faithfully

June V Hayman



# June V. Hayman



26.09.2020

Planning Policy  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands  
Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH15 1SS

Dear Sirs

SA12 & SA13 Planning Consultation

I write to object to the planned housing development on the land to the south of Folders Lane in Burgess Hill.

The proposed development would not only further extend the Burgess Hill boundary towards Hassocks but will also place a further burden on already unsustainable issues within the town. In addition:

- The current infrastructure in Burgess Hill is already stretched to its' limits and the proposals make no reference to how this issue might be addressed.
- The traffic report produced for MSDC is clearly flawed and doesn't properly reflect the real life traffic congestion and bottle necks which are already a regular situation within the town, particularly during the rush hour and school drop off and collection periods.
- The site selection process was conducted without complying with the protocols contained within MSDC's own guidance policy. I also understand that a number of representations made for the first consultation were lost by the council.
- MSDC have not properly taken into account the biodiversity of the site and the significant negative environmental impact of the proposed scheme.

The consideration of this site for residential development is in flagrant disregard of National Planning Guidance and the District Plan and would also result in further encroachment across the boundaries of Hassocks.

Yours faithfully



June V Hayman

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 434

**Response Ref:** Reg19/434/1

**Respondent:** Mr M Williams

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Mark Williams
<b>Job title</b>	Director
<b>Respondent ref. number</b>	SA12&SA13
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Mark Williams
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12&SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>OBJECT</p> <p>Site selection was unsound and did not follow MSDCs own guidance. There is a lack of infrastructure in the plans. It will encourage urban sprawl and joining of Hassocks and Burgess Hill. The planned site goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 435

**Response Ref:** Reg19/435/1

**Respondent:** Mrs V Williams

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** vanessa williams [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 September 2020 16:42  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Objection to housing on Sites SA12 and SA13

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** SiteDPD

Hi

I wish to object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because this is currently a lack of infrastructure structure to support any additional housing and this has not been addressed in any proposals.

It already takes an excessive amount of time to get a dentist and doctors appointment in Hassocks. The primary school and secondary school are already over subscribed.

Also the current traffic is already excessive.

Finally I believe the fields should be preserved, I often see deer in them and wish to preserve the unique ancient biodiversity for the future of everyone.

Kind regards  
Vanessa Williams  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 436

**Response Ref:** Reg19/436/1

**Respondent:** Mr S Willis

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Stephen Willis
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 - SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound

**Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD**

I write to object to the inclusion of the fields known as SA12 & SA13 in MSDC's site allocation DPD.

MSDC and its councillor representatives have a clear responsibility to put forward the most appropriate sites for development. This democratic process should include proposed sites being scrutinised by a suitable delegation or committee, formed from an appropriate geographical spread in terms of constituency representation.

The inclusion of Sites SA12 & SA13 have clearly not met these essential criteria and must therefore be rejected. This rejection is even more essential as there are more suitable sites that don't have the same restraints. Examples of the restraints that apply to SA12 & SA13 include:

- o The geographical location of SA12 & SA13, along with many other local locations to the north and south of these sites, have already been over-developed in recent years. The supply of homes needs to be spread equitably throughout Mid-Sussex, considering the local traffic infrastructure and its capability to carry the necessary associated vehicles. The local roads were just not designed to accommodate the subsequent traffic volumes, and the houses that have already been approved in the locality have not actually all been built yet (around 500 more to come from the south and many more on the old Keymer Tiles site to the north east), but the traffic flow at peak times is already unacceptable. If SA12 & SA13 are approved, this will make an already bad situation even worse.

- o If this development goes ahead it will bridge the vital green gap between Burgess Hill and Keymer/Hassocks. This development will actually go right up to the boundary line between Burgess Hill and Keymer/Hassocks, so the new garden boundaries/fences will abut the Keymer/Hassocks properties in Wellhouse Lane, this is unacceptable when more suitable sites are available in Mid-Sussex.

- o These green fields house unique and precious flora & fauna and irreplaceable biodiversity, which needs to be preserved.

- o Due to the layout and landscaping of these sites, there is no natural or sustainable drainage solution, which again make it unsuitable for development.

- o These field house a diverse range of wildlife, reptiles, amphibians and various species of bats that are unique to the given location due to the layout, size and condition of these sites.

- o Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance.

I sincerely hope that my faith in the planning selection process can be restored by the rejection of these unsuitable locations.

**Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.**

Select appropriate site(s) using the appropriate processes and democratic procedures, taking into account all of the items I have highlighted in my objection.

**If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here**

<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
--	--

<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
--	-----

<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
--	-----

<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
--	-----

<b>Date</b>	22/09/2020
-------------	------------

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 440

**Response Ref:** Reg19/440/7

**Respondent:** Mr R Cherry

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** ✓

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	The decision to include these green sites is totally inconsistent with Mid Sussex District Councils previous overviews (SHELAA 2007, 2012 and 20130) as well as the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan ( <a href="https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/2759/burgess-hill-neighbourhood-plan.pdf">https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/2759/burgess-hill-neighbourhood-plan.pdf</a> ) This is summarised by a single sentence on page 8.2 The residents of Burgess Hill are strongly opposed to the loss of existing green space.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	The one simple action which could resolve these inconsistencies would be a revision of The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and a local referendum to sanction the revised version. The original Plan was approved by local referendum in January 2016.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	Fundamentally I consider it my democratic right and duty to be engaged in discussions which will determine the future of my neighbourhood and the environment in an irreversible way.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	Yes
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	The traffic report hastily produced for MSDC is fatally flawed as it takes no account of future housing development, in excess of 500 new homes in Hassocks. The traffic situation is already serious with traffic flows at peak times severely restricting access to Burgess Hill. The roundabouts at Hoadley's Corner and adjacent to McDonalds, in Burgess Hill, becoming major bottlenecks. No substantive solutions have been offered to address these problems.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	A full independent traffic study, involving public consultation needs to be carried out in advance of any final decisions being taken on SA12 and SA13.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	With an important and irrevocable decision to be made on the future of my neighbourhood and its environment, I see it as my democratic right and civic duty to be engaged with the decision making process.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>Resulting traffic, with the air pollution it will create will have a detrimental effect on health in an area that includes several schools, kindergartens and care homes.</p> <p>To quote DEFRA: "Air pollution is a major public health risk, ranking alongside cancer, heart disease and obesity. It shortens lives and damages quality of life for many people".</p> <p>National and Local Government have a duty of care to ensure that chemical and particulate pollution are not consciously increased to levels which endanger public health</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	<p>An independent study into the current pollution levels at peak traffic times, which can be extrapolated to predict the levels to which they will move with increased traffic along the Keymer Road and at Hoadley's Corner needs to be urgently undertaken.</p> <p>It should be focused on the potential impact on pupils and students at local schools and nurseries, such as Burgess Hill Girls, Birchwood Grove, Woodlands Mead, Burgess Hill Academy and The MightySaurus and Burgess Hill Nurseries, as well as on residents of the many care homes in the area.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	Air pollution is a major public health risk, ranking alongside cancer, heart disease and obesity. It shortens lives and damages quality of life for many people.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes





<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	MSDC have ignored the rich biodiversity of this area and therefore its unsuitability, as a greenfield site, for development. The proposed sites are the habitats for many protected species and provide an important base for their food chain. Bats, adders, slow worms, great crested newts, cuckoos and barn owls are but a few of the creatures that would be adversely affected.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	Changes should be made only after a thorough, independent environmental impact assessment has been conducted and its advice adhered to. Once lost this precious environment will never be regained. The same is true of many of the living species which currently live and breed on these sites.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	Simply my democratic right as an interested local resident to be engaged with what will happen in my neighbourhood.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Development of these sites would fatally erode the rapidly decreasing gap between the town of Burgess Hill and the villages of Keymer and Hassocks. Longer term, if this erosion continues there is a real risk of the whole area becoming a major conurbation. Should this be allowed to happen, even the South Downs National Park, which would separate this conglomeration from the City of Brighton and Hove, would be under threat of development.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	A holt should be made to the consideration of these an alternatives in other parts of Mid Sussex which have already been considered, should be re-examined.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	I have lived in this area and have paid council tax-to MSDC for over 40 years. If this does not give me an interest and a right to engage with this process, I'm not sure what does.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance. From MSDC's own evidence, there are other more sustainable sites which are available. These can deliver the housing required with out breaking or straining the traffic, social and environmental constraints connected with SA12 and SA13.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	MSDA needs to urgently and constructively relook and the assessments already made on other sites in its area, rather than ram more developments to its southern boundary which is being forced to take ever more development and risks being seriously over developed.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	As a long term resident and tax payer, I feel it my civic duty to be as fully engaged in this process as possible.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Richard Cherry
<b>Organisation</b>	Mr
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	If developments on sites SA12/SA13 are to proceed a detailed infrastructure plan and project management system, comparable with the one established for Burgess Hill's Northern Arc, needs to be put in place and approved before these developments can go forward. Otherwise they will cause traffic chaos and an unacceptable deficit in education places and with medical and health care services. After recent chaotic breaks in water supply recently, caused by under capacity, water resources must be at the forefront of any such plan.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</b>	Not only do have an interest in this process as a longterm resident and tax payer in this area, I am a former Town and District Councillor who was very much involved in the development of the current District Plan and can therefore, I believe, engage sensibly and knowledgeably in this process.
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 442

**Response Ref:** Reg19/442/1

**Respondent:** Mr D Henden

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



<b>Name</b>	Derek Henden
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	The traffic report produced for MSDC does not reflect my experience. Traffic in this area has increased dramatically in recent years resulting in severe delays at many junctions. In particular Folders Lane and Keymer Road suffer long slow moving traffic queues at peak times and beyond. Inadequate roads are merely a symptom of a neglected infrastructure which is barely able to support existing local needs.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	25/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 443

**Response Ref:** Reg19/443/1

**Respondent:** Ms L Henden

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



<b>Name</b>	Linda Henden
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	These two green fields vitally represent the green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south. Using the fields for housing will be a significant loss of biodiversity and goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	28/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 445

**Response Ref:** Reg19/445/1

**Respondent:** Mr M Tyler-Smith

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Matthew Tyler-Smith
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12&SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I wish to object to the allocation of housing sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site selection process did not follow MSDC's own guidance.</li> <li>2. The traffic report produced for MSDC is flawed and does not address the current traffic situation and provide any mitigation answers that addresses these issues.</li> <li>3. The biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development.</li> <li>4. We cannot overlook the importance of closing the gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south. Keeping the green spaces is fundamentally in the environments sustainability.</li> <li>5. There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is shown in any of their proposals to address this fundamental issue.</li> <li>6. Allocating the sites for housing goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</li> </ol>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 446

**Response Ref:** Reg19/446/1

**Respondent:** Ms H Hepworth-James

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Heidi Hepworth-James
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Heidi Hepworth-James
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because Burgess Hill and the surrounding areas do not have the infrastructure and nothing is agreed in proposals to address this.</p> <p>It is disgraceful that the site selection did not follow MSDC's guidance.</p> <p>Traffic is already at breaking point (just look at the mess McDonald's has caused).</p> <p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the DP&amp;NP guidance.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	23/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 451

**Response Ref:** Reg19/451/2

**Respondent:** Mrs L Rose

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Lesley Rose [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 September 2020 07:35  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Site Allocations DPD Consultation

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF Sites SA12 & SA13

We fully support the SOFLAG objection submission and we urge the council to consider it fully.

Regards,

Philip & Lesley Rose

<b>Name</b>	Lesley Rose
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	AN OTHER
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>The site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC's own guidance.</p> <p>The traffic situation in this area is already at breaking point with roads congested and the report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed.</p> <p>This proposed site allocation goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</p> <p>Developing the vital green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south would mean the loss of a unique biodiversity site and the loss of green space which is vital to everyone for physical and mental health.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	18/09/2020



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 452

**Response Ref:** Reg19/452/1

**Respondent:** Mr B Rudling

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Benjamin Rudling
<b>Job title</b>	Civil Servant
<b>Organisation</b>	Civil Service
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	As a regular user of Folders Lane I consider the traffic already at dangerous levels and more houses would make this unsustainable. I also believe the building would reduce the green belt between Burgess Hill and Keymer and would destroy the uniqueness of these rural villages. The houses would also destroy key biodiversity in an area so close to the South Downs National Park.
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	I do not believe that additional housing in this area is sustainable. The green space must be protected.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 453

**Response Ref:** Reg19/453/2

**Respondent:** Mr P Rose

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Lesley Rose [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 September 2020 07:35  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Site Allocations DPD Consultation

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF Sites SA12 & SA13

We fully support the SOFLAG objection submission and we urge the council to consider it fully.

Regards,

Philip & Lesley Rose

<b>Name</b>	Philip Rose
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	AN OTHER
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the site allocations SA12/SA13 in the DPD for these reasons, the site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Allocating these sites also goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed, the traffic situation now is horrendous adding extra volume to the roads in this area will result in even more gridlock.</p> <p>The vital green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south must be kept for the well being of everyone and the unique biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development as once this is lost it will never come back and MSDC have ignored this.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	23/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 454

**Response Ref:** Reg19/454/1

**Respondent:** Mr P Jebb

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Phillip Jebb
<b>Job title</b>	retired
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Phillip Jebb
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</li> <li>2. the site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made to the first consultation were 'lost'.</li> <li>3. there is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.</li> <li>4. the traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.</li> <li>5. the unique biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC have ignored this.</li> <li>6. developing south of Folders Lane is inappropriate, not only from a traffic point of view, but impacts on the local wildlife and countryside approaching and adjacent to the South Downs National Park. Future housing development should be planned for north (and west) of Burgess Hill (as per the Northern Arc).</li> </ol>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete rejection of these Site Allocation DPDs and replace with further housing developments north (and west) of Burgess Hill (as per Northern Arc).</li> </ol>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes

**Please notify me when-**The publication of  
the recommendations from the  
Examination

yes

**Please notify me when-**The Site  
Allocations DPD is adopted

yes

**Date**

20/09/2020



**Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response****Policy:** SA12 - SA13**ID:** 456**Response Ref:** Reg19/456/1**Respondent:** Dr N Adams**Organisation:****On Behalf Of:****Category:** Resident**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	NIGEL ADAMS
<b>Job title</b>	DOCTOR
<b>Organisation</b>	NHS
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>The site selection process was dishonest, unrepresentative, did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made during the first consultation were 'lost'.</p> <p>The traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.</p> <p>The biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC have ignored this.</p> <p>This will coalesce - the green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south will be lost forever.</p> <p>There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.</p> <p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	NONE OTHER THAN SIGNIFICANT NEW ROADS BYPASSING THE VILLAGES OF KEYMER, DITCHLING AND HASSOCKS.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes

**Please notify me when-The Site  
Allocations DPD is adopted**

yes

**Date**

13/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 457

**Response Ref:** Reg19/457/1

**Respondent:** Mrs S Jebb

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Sheelagh Jebb
<b>Job title</b>	retired
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Sheelagh Jebb
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</li> <li>2. the site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made to the first consultation were 'lost'.</li> <li>3. there is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.</li> <li>4. the traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.</li> <li>5. the unique biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC have ignored this.</li> <li>6. developing south of Folders Lane is inappropriate, not only from a traffic point of view, but impacts on the local wildlife and countryside approaching and adjacent to the South Downs National Park. Future housing development should be planned for north (and west) of Burgess Hill (as per the Northern Arc).</li> </ol>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	Completely reject the Site Allocations DPDs and replace with housing developments north (and west) of Burgess Hill (as per the Northern Arc).
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	20/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 459

**Response Ref:** Reg19/459/1

**Respondent:** Mr D McBeth

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:** Ditchling Parish Council

**Category:** Town & Parish Council

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Donald McBeth
<b>Job title</b>	Chairman
<b>Organisation</b>	Ditchling Parsih Council
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Ditchling Parish Council
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>What must be made abundantly clear to you the inspector ,is If you look at page 8 of the Burgess hill neighbourhood plan it shows "map 1". You will see that it says, "Neighbourhood plan boundary", and it is not !! This should say "Neighbourhood plan Settlement Boundary" but the words were omitted in error at the time of its drafting. It shows the extent of the building development settlement that will be permitted in Burgess Hill during the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan. As a result MSDC Councillors have interpreted this error literally by saying that if it is not in the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan as defined by the red line on the map, therefore everything "outside" the line is fair game for development, and that is the last thing it was intended to show.</p> <p>The Burgess Hill neighbourhood plan covers the whole of the administrative boundary of Burgess hill, not just the containment line shown on the map, and as a result it means that anywhere "outside" the line shown is "forbidden" for development during the duration of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>May I remind you that the Burgess Hill neighbourhood plan has already been treated in contempt by MSDC when they permitted building of the Liddle Supermarket on land that had been specifically allocated for 58 houses. (Please see Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan page 14).</p> <p>I trust you the inspector will treat all neighbourhood plans with respect, which is more than MSDC are doing. We in Ditchling are choked with traffic and we do not want any more originating from unwanted, unwarranted and unnecessary traffic in Folders Lane. If this unintended development loophole goes ahead, it spells the death knell of all our neighbourhood plans.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	They cannot be made legally compliant as they are already outside of the legal boundary of the Burgess Hill neighborhood plan.

<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	<a href="https://forms.midsussex.gov.uk/upload_dld.php?fileid=66c882bbb3320c8e2da42b64edda6669">https://forms.midsussex.gov.uk/upload_dld.php?fileid=66c882bbb3320c8e2da42b64edda6669</a>
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 460

**Response Ref:** Reg19/460/1

**Respondent:** Mrs P Collins

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Poppy Collins
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>The site selection process was dishonest, unrepresentative, did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made during the first consultation were 'lost'.</p> <p>The traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.</p> <p>The biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC have ignored this.</p> <p>This will coalesce - the green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south will be lost forever.</p> <p>There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.</p> <p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	17/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 461

**Response Ref:** Reg19/461/1

**Respondent:** Mrs L Collins

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Lucy Collins
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>The site selection process was dishonest, unrepresentative, did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made during the first consultation were 'lost'.</p> <p>The traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.</p> <p>The biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC have ignored this.</p> <p>This will coalesce - the green gap between Burgess Hill and the villages to the south will be lost forever.</p> <p>There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.</p> <p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	17/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 462

**Response Ref:** Reg19/462/1

**Respondent:** Mrs J Kelly

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Jenny Kelly
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 and SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Lack of infrastructure Unique biodiversity of the site Traffic too much already in this area Erosion of the green gap between Hassocks and Burgess Hill
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	19/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 463

**Response Ref:** Reg19/463/1

**Respondent:** Ms H Valler

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Helen Valler
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to these fields (SA12 &amp; SA13) being included in MSDC Site Allocations for the following:</p> <p>The impact on traffic and roads in Burgess Hill. The developments at Kings Way and Keymer Tile Works have already had an impact on the traffic levels along Ockley Lane and Folders Lane. Ockley Lane is not currently fit for purpose, it is a Lane! WSCC already don't have the funds to maintain it to a safe level, more cars will only add to the problem. The is already planning permission for 500 homes on nearby land in Hassocks, building on these fields will further erode the green space and gap between Hassocks and Burgess Hill. The already mass building work going on has had a negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity in the area, certain areas need to to left alone to allow displaced wildlife to find new habitats.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	23/09/2020



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 464

**Response Ref:** Reg19/464/1

**Respondent:** Mrs A Kelly

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Anna Kelly
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 and SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Lack of infrastructure Unique biodiversity of the site Traffic too much already in this area
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	19/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 466

**Response Ref:** Reg19/466/1

**Respondent:** Mrs E Kelly

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Emily Kelly
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 and SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	Lack of infrastructure Unique biodiversity of the site Traffic too much already in this area
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	19/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 473

**Response Ref:** Reg19/473/1

**Respondent:** Mr G Carter

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Gerry Carter [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 September 2020 16:27  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** SA12 and SA13 South of Folders Lane

Dear Sir or Madam,

My wife and myself moved to Burgess Hill from Surrey in April 1972, and we are still here now albeit in our third property.

One serious experience has been the over development of Burgess Hill to the point that we now have thanks to that overdevelopment, more traffic than we would have ever imagined !!! Plus parking is now a NIGHTMARE...

So, the building of further houses needs to stop here and now.

We do not have the infrastructure to support any further building of residential homes in Burgess Hill, Plus we do not want to become part of Hassocks or Haywards Heath as we wish to protect our own Burgess Hill Town identity.

So I say NO to the proposed development of 350 homes on the site "Ancient Green Fields" south of Folders Lane.

Enough is enough.

Yours sincerely

Gerry Carter

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 475

**Response Ref:** Reg19/475/1

**Respondent:** Mrs J Beavis

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Janina Beavis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 September 2020 20:37  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Re: 343 more houses south of Folders Lane

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** SiteDPD

We strongly object to the allocation of yet more housing on field sites SA12 & SA13  
There are already too many new houses in this area. The services are at breaking point, water supply in particular is affected. Facilities in the town are poor. There are not enough doctors to cope & the traffic is too congested already. Leave the last bit of countryside for us to enjoy our flora & fauna. Janina Beavis & Olga Derriman  
On Mon, 11 Nov 2019 at 21:12, Janina Beavis [REDACTED] wrote:

I wish to object to site allocations DPD, building on the fields south of Folders lane Burgess Hill because the site is full of protected wildlife species, also there will be no gap between Burgess Hill & the villages, we have far too much non stop building work in the Croft Kingsway area & the old brickworks site, non stop traffic noise& road sweeper noise already in this part of the town causing pollution, congestion etc. There are other more suitable sites elsewhere. Janina Beavis & Olga Derriman ( residents since 1981)



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 478

**Response Ref:** Reg19/478/2

**Respondent:** Mr B Roberts

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Bryan Roberts
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I would like to object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because these are greenfield sites designated as "countryside areas of development restraint", they are not allocated for housing in the District Plan and the houses are not needed as Mid Sussex already has enough sites to meet its housing need.</p> <p>Existing developments taking place in the locality, e.g. Folders Lane and Kingsway are already having a detrimental effect on traffic congestion and local amenities such as car parking and medical facilities. In addition the developments taking place to the north of Hassocks will exacerbate these problems.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Bryan Roberts
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & Sa13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and failed to follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made to the first consultation were lost.</li> <li>- The National Planning Policy Framework demands that The District Plan is the primary guidance document in the decision making process and that these proposals would be a "major" developments in an area of countryside restraint that have not been allocated in that plan.</li> <li>- The development would cause harm to the setting of and views from the National Park contrary to the policies of the District Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	24/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 481

**Response Ref:** Reg19/481/1

**Respondent:** Mr & Mrs P Bates

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Peter Bates [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 September 2020 14:35  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** South of Folders Lane Action Group

I wish to object to the building of 350 homes to the south of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill.

If this plan is accepted, and I sincerely hope not, where will you build a new school for the extra 500 to 700 Children that will arrive in the area

350 houses will mean an increase between 700 and 1400 people arriving in the area so where will you put and find enough Doctors, their surgery's and Dentists.

The increase in traffic will cause serious jams so which roads will be widened and where will new roads be made. At the moment the Burgess Hill town can just about handle car parking by allowing many roads to be used by parked cars. Where are you going to put new car parks.

There are talks of having a big increase of Electric driven cars in the next 15 years, where are you going to put the hundreds and thousands of charging points.

Have you thought about where water, electricity and gas is coming from and by which route. Waste water will need a separate route and destination.

I have a feeling that the council cares very little for Burgess Hill and is only interested in Haywards Heath and developers. If that is so Haywards Heath will feel the affect that this set of new houses will make, more people seeking jobs and/or over filling car parks, crowding trains and buses.

PLEASE REJECT THIS PLAN

Peter Bates

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 487

**Response Ref:** Reg19/487/3

**Respondent:** Mr R Walker

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Robert Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Robert Walker
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because:</p> <p>The site selection process was unsound in that it was unrepresentative and did not follow MSDC guidance. Representations made during the first consultation appear to have been lost, not recovered and not considered.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	The above failures must be corrected.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Robert Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because:</p> <p>The traffic study produced for MSDC is badly flawed and unsound. It does not properly take into account the considerable number of homes currently being built or approved in the near locality and makes unrealistic assumptions of average traffic speeds in the area. The traffic situation between Folders Lane and Burgess Hill which now includes 3 mini roundabouts and 4 pedestrian crossings is already at breaking point at peak times.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	A credible traffic study correcting the oversights and assumptions is required, however it is unlikely that this would support the proposed allocation.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020



<b>Name</b>	Robert Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Robert Walker
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I object to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because:</p> <p>Allocating housing to these sites contravenes both the District Plan and National Guidance. It would be a 'major' development that has not been allocated in the Mid Sussex District Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) demands that the District Plan be the primary guidance document in the decision making process.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	22/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 491

**Response Ref:** Reg19/491/3

**Respondent:** Ms V Walker

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12, SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because allocating housing to these sites contravenes both the District Plan and National Guidance.</p> <p>It would be a 'major' development that has not been allocated in the Mid Sussex District Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the District Plan to be the primary guidance document in the decision making process.</p> <p>Furthermore, significant representations made during the first consultation appear to have been lost and were not considered.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	23/09/2020

**From:** eforms  
**Sent:** 23 September 2020 10:55  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Site Allocations DPD Consultation Response (Ref: DPDCon-1600854662)  
**Attachments:** Site Allocations DPD Consultation Repsonse Form.pdf

**Categories:** SiteDPD

<b>Name</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12, SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because the traffic study produced for MSDC is flawed and does not properly consider the large number of homes currently being built in the area and makes unrealistic assumptions of peak time traffic speeds in the area.</p> <p>The traffic situation between Folders Lane and Burgess Hill station is already problematic at peak times and more traffic on the existing roads will cause increasingly serious problems.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

and give evidence at the  
hearing part of the examination

Please notify me when-The  
Plan has been submitted for      yes  
Examination

Please notify me when-The  
publication of the      yes  
recommendations from the  
Examination

Please notify me when-The Site  
Allocations DPD is adopted      yes

Date      23/09/2020

<b>Name</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Vivienne Walker
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12, SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 & SA13 in the DPD because developing the green gap between Burgess Hill and Keymer will harm the semi-rural setting of the local area contrary to District plan policy.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	23/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 501

**Response Ref:** Reg19/501/1

**Respondent:** Mrs J Djamaluddin

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 September 2020 18:33  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Save our ancient green fields south of Folders Lane Burgess Hill, West Sussex

Dear Madam/Sir

Once again another email objecting to the allocation of housing on sites SA12 & SA13 in the DPD because these sites for housing goes against the District Plan & National Planning Guidance.

There is also a lack of infrastructure in your proposals - they show nothing to address this.

Also the unique biodiversity within this site makes it unsuitable for development & MSDC know this and once again have ignored it!

What about the traffic?? Too many houses and no infrastructure!!

Is it a case push it through We don't live here and don't care just want the money!!!

If this building is allowed I assume more developers would be grabbing the countryside south.

Please put a stop once and for all!

Burgess hill does not want to be joined to Keymer or Hassocks we need the green gap between us. They would say the same.

Regards

Mrs J Y Djamaluddin

Sent from my iPhone



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 509

**Response Ref:** Reg19/509/1

**Respondent:** Mr C Lake

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Chris Lake [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 September 2020 13:19  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** In support of proposed development SA12 and SA13

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** SiteDPD

Hello

I am writing in SUPPORT of the proposed development of housing on sites SA12 and SA13. Burgess Hill requires housing. Indeed, the country requires housing. There is proven link between housing and population health, between housing and healthy life expectancy, between housing and educational attainment. We have simply not built enough housing in this country, leading to inflated prices that serve the boomer generation and generation X (of which I am a member) but harm the life chances of the younger generation. Too many, generally middle-aged, NIMBY people oppose such developments for their own self-centred purposes. I had a flier through my door from such people. They talked of 'traffic chaos' - hilarious!! It's not exactly the Hanger Lane Gyratory System is it!!

This development will bring much needed housing, will grow the local economy, and will support (MUCH needed) town centre regeneration. Planning guidelines have been followed - so let the development progress.

Regards, C

Chris Lake

[REDACTED]

*A man told me that for a woman, I was very opinionated. I said, 'For a man you're kind of ignorant!' - Anne Hathaway, actress, human rights campaigner, LGBT rights activist, Step Up Women's Network*

---

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 513

**Response Ref:** Reg19/513/1

**Respondent:** Mr G Moss

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Graham Moss [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 September 2020 11:44  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Public Consultation re Sites SA12 & SA13

Dear Sirs

**RE: CONSULTATION RE ALLOCATION OF SITES SA12 & SA13**

I am a nearby resident in Folders Lane and write to object in the most serious possible terms to the further destruction of fields to the south of Folders Lane and east of Keymer Road, designated as SA12 and SA13, respectively, in a proposed allocation for sizeable housing development.

I, like many local residents, find it incredible that such a substantial change to the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31 (Adopted Version March 2018) – hereinafter “the Plan” – should even thought to be justified at this point of the Plan’s duration.

The Plan is well respected by the community containing many well considered and well-expressed policies. It provides a worthwhile attempt at a complete future picture and considers needs and issues for residential, commercial, support infrastructure, community facilities, transport, employment and leisure. In our view, the Plan is to be seen as a whole and the base plate for the development of our District.

My understanding of the Plan, relating to Burgess Hill, is that Folders Lane reflected the southern urban boundary and areas, especially green field and countryside stretching southwards towards the adjacent villages were respected with the policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of Countryside).

A change to the Plan has already, with questionable decision-making, succumbing to developer pressure, allowed a part of the green fields to the south of Folders Lane to become housing amidst what we see as a surreptitious movement of the Urban Boundary. It is my view that this does not mean there is acceptance of further spread in this location, rather, that there must be a return as soon as and as closely as possible to the maps and directions of the Adopted Plan. A return to the concepts of the Plan for the District as a whole at this time must, in my opinion, be correct.

The sites of SA12 and SA13 are an integral component of the local atmosphere and rural ambience which risks irrevocable destruction. The areas are wonderful countryside and a part of the nature around and between the conurbations and their loss is not envisaged in the Adopted Plan. As well as this rural aspect I have concerns that development at these places will exacerbate traffic and water issues.

Re traffic – until Burgess Hill infrastructure is improved, there is only a single “B” road through the centre that has to channel traffic from east via Folders Lane, from residential and new developments at Kingsway, also via Folders Lane and traffic from Keymer to the south, on Keymer Road. Dramatic growth in housing in these areas and the practical necessity of avoiding Ditchling has already pushed this route to peak capacity.

Re water – Southern Water and South East Water have told customers in our area that water supply cannot be guaranteed with a warning that infrastructure is weak in some areas. Investment and improvement is no doubt in planning and progress but until complete, approving more large-scale housebuilding is foolish. Similarly, drainage is problematic in our area and it is only logical to improve that infrastructure before more building and not the other way round.

In conclusion, the Adopted Plan is a sequence of development of many aspects of our District and should be regarded as the base plate and the timetable. It contains enough disruption to endure and enough change to digest. The Plan covered the forecast needs and Burgess Hills commitments within those. Bolting on new green fields is a disaster. If anything in the predictions need tweaking – it makes more sense to look first and fully at the brown field potential.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.  
Yours truly  
Graham Moss



## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 514

**Response Ref:** Reg19/514/1

**Respondent:** Mr D Barker

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** David Barker [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 September 2020 16:39  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** SA12 & SA13 Planning Objection

Dear Sir,

I am contacting you today to OBJECT to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 & SA13 in the DPD due to the following reasons.

1. The allocation of sites SA12 & SA13 for a housing development goes against the District plan and National Planning guidance.
2. The area has already experienced large housing development and the infrastructure has not been improved to accommodate this. I see nothing in the proposals to correct this.
3. Traffic through Burgess Hill is already at capacity and there is no plan to address this. Bottlenecks are a regular occurrence causing delays and inconvenience for local residents.
4. Further development will again reduce the Green gap between Burgess Hill and Hassocks and will result in coalescence.
5. The diversity within the site has been ignored by MSDC, if this had been considered the site would have been found unsuitable for this development.
6. Selection of the site did not follow MSDC,S own guidance and therefore unsound.

I hope the above points will be taken on board and the development of SA12 & SA13 is rejected.

Regards...David Barker

David Barker  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 516

**Response Ref:** Reg19/516/1

**Respondent:** Mr & Mrs M & B Moysen

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Mike Moysen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 September 2020 14:03  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Objections to site allocations SA12 & SA13 :Fields South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill

Dear Sir or Madam

My wife, Barbara Moysen and I, Michael Moysen of 9 Rosebarn Close, Burgess Hill are objecting to the building of houses on site allocations SA12 & SA 13, the fields south of Folders Lane on the following grounds :-

- \* Traffic congestion at the Folders Lane junctions with Ditchling Road, Sycamore Drive, Shearing Drive, Kings Way and particularly Keymer Road can be significant throughout the day but especially between 0700-0930 and 1600-1830, Monday to Friday. Delays will increase substantially if the site allocations referred to are approved.
- \* Folders Lane is a much used access and egress road to and from Burgess Hill Town Centre and Victoria Way Industrial Estate from Haywards Heath, East Sussex and the south. It is used by all types of vehicles including lorries and coaches and crosses an old and narrow bridge over the London to Eastbourne Railway Line. My wife and I have lived in our house which backs on to the junction of Folders Lane and Kings Way for 37 years and have seen very little of note done by the Councils responsible to ensure the road network is safe and can continue to cope with the very substantial increase in traffic on Folders Lane over that period of time.
- \* Traffic congestion on Folders Lane is already likely to increase even further once the residential properties being built on the Kings Way, Cants Lane Old Brickworks, and Jones Homes, Folders Meadows (off Folders Lane) sites have been completed and occupied.
- \* No relevant traffic study can have been made to take account of the situation that will evolve once these properties have been completed and occupied. Road safety on Folders Lane is already being compromised by the volume, type of vehicle, and excessive speeds of some vehicles using it. Crossing it on foot has become increasingly difficult and dangerous with Primary School pupils wishing to gain access to Birchwood Grove Primary School, as well as pensioners, particularly at risk.
- \* Traffic congestion on Folders Lane and other access roads to Burgess Hill Town Centre and Victoria Way Industrial Estate will become even more prevalent and hazardous if site allocations SA12 and SA13 on the fields south of Folders Lane are approved and more residential properties are built there.

My original emailed objection was sent to you on 25th September but was returned to me on 26th September and I did not unfortunately notice the returned email until today.

Michael and Barbara Moysen

[REDACTED]

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 528

**Response Ref:** Reg19/528/1

**Respondent:** Mr T Cooper

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Tim Cooper [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 September 2020 18:18  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** SA12 & SA13 South of Folders Lane

Dear Sirs

Another 350 houses planned what with all the others south of Burgess Hill and then the 4,000 planned for the north how will the town cope. The roads the parking the whole infrastructure can't cope anyway at the moment.

We came to a lovely little town 33 years ago and if we wanted to live in Crawley we would have done so.

Please stop this madness.

Yours faithfully

Tim Cooper [REDACTED]

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 545

**Response Ref:** Reg19/545/1

**Respondent:** Mr S Mooney

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	steven Mooney
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I have lived of Folders Lane for 31 years. It has changed from a leafy lane to a major busy road and it was never designed for that and is not capable of sustaining being a major link road.</p> <p>From the common end of Folders Lane to the A23, it can often take 40 minutes to travel by car and that is not always at peak times. The majority of that time is to get past the station. The area has already been over developed with housing estates popping up everywhere near by, starting with Folders Farm. Any further development in this area will cause major traffic problems that cannot be overcome apart from closing roads and encouraging traffic from East Sussex to go elsewhere to travel through or to Burgess Hill.</p> <p>It might already be time to consider turning Folders Lane into a residence only access road to relieve this problem.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	No further developments.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	17/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 546

**Response Ref:** Reg19/546/1

**Respondent:** Mr B Stevens

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Barrie Stevens
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because there is a lack of infrastructure with nothing in the proposal to correct this.</p> <p>It appears the water company is struggling to maintain supplies through demand during Covid and unpredictable weather conditions therefore any further pressure created through excessive housing development will only inflame the situation.</p> <p>The site selection process did not follow MSDC guidance.</p> <p>The traffic report produced by the MSDC is flawed . The traffic situation is terrible at the moment and being fuelled by developments already underway on Folders Lane and The Kingsway causing more pollution .</p> <p>More than ever we have recognised the need for green spaces, this development would destroy a vital green gap between Burgess Hill and Hassocks. This is a unique area and MSDC have ignored the studies submitted.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	I do not consider there are any changes that would make this a sound development.
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 555

**Response Ref:** Reg19/555/1

**Respondent:** Mr M Green

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



<b>Name</b>	Martin Green
<b>Address</b>	<div></div>
<b>Email</b>	<div></div>
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 / SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound

**Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD**

I am objecting to the selection of Sites SA12 & SA13 as allocations for housing. Their inclusion means the whole DPD is unsound as it does not comply with local or national planning law.

The selection of sites SA12 & SA13 contravenes the following District Plan policies:

DP6 / DP7 Settlement Hierarchy / Strategic Development at Burgess Hill – Burgess Hill has already taken its required housing numbers for the entire Plan Period according to the District Plan

DP12 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside. This is an unspoilt ancient field system full of protected wildlife and plants. This site is not required as there are sufficient sites identified elsewhere.

DP13 Preventing Coalescence. The southern boundary of Site SA13 lies within the parish of Keymer, so developing it will have caused Burgess Hill and Keymer to coalesce.

DP18 South Downs National Park – developing these sites will cause harm to the setting of the South Downs National Park, as stated by the SDNPA themselves

DP37 Trees Hedgerows and Woodlands – developing this site will destroy irreplaceable trees, hedgerows and woodlands

DP38 Biodiversity Allocating it for development cannot lead to the “net gain in biodiversity” that Mid Sussex Planning policy requires and will lead to ecological harm.

These sites are not sustainable under the terms of the NPPF, conflicting with paragraphs 17, 109, 133 and more.

These sites are not suitable, sustainable or deliverable due to the insurmountable traffic issues that would be caused. Local roads and junctions critical to the movement of traffic in the south of Burgess Hill are already at “severe” levels of congestion which adding 340 houses will make worse.

The SYSTRA study which attempts to show that mitigation will solve everything is fatally flawed – as illustrated by the GTA Civils Transport Study commissioned by SOFLAG. Crucially no Safety Study has been done, meaning that the document fails to comply with para 109 of the NPPF.

The proposed access to SA13 via Broadlands is unsafe, with insufficient visibility splays at the junction with Keymer Road, as proved by the Traffic Study carried out on behalf of the Broadlands Residents Association.

Considerable opposition from neighbouring local authorities and statutory bodies including the SDNP was raised at the first Consultation, which makes the Sites undeliverable.

The terrible harm that will be caused to the ecologically important habitat at Site SA13 cannot be mitigated, and there will be a significant loss of biodiversity. This is unsustainable.

MSDC has ignored its own evidence from previous housing and transport assessments in 2004, 2007, 2013 and 2016 which demonstrate that these sites are unsuitable. They are now more unsuitable than ever due to additional housing already built or planned for the local area.

MSDC has mishandled the entire Site Allocations DPD process up to now, omitting key selection criteria or applying them incorrectly and inconsistently, misleading key council meetings by omitting evidence or making incorrect statements, manipulating the buffer requirement to suit their own agenda and relying on a flawed transport study to justify their selections.

<p><b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b></p>	<p>Removing Sites SA12 and SA13 from the Site Allocations DPD would go some way towards making the document sound while maintaining the legally required 10% buffer.</p> <p>The DPD as a whole should be redone, this time assessing the housing sites properly and fairly, using the correct selection criteria and without the predetermined agenda evident throughout this whole process.</p> <p>The representation from SOFLAG outlines all this in much more detail, and should be carefully considered by MSDC and must be forwarded in its entirety to the independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<p><b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b></p>	
<p><b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b></p>	<p>No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination</p>
<p><b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b></p>	<p>yes</p>
<p><b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b></p>	<p>yes</p>
<p><b>Date</b></p>	<p>27/09/2020</p>

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 556

**Response Ref:** Reg19/556/1

**Respondent:** Mrs A Green

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Amanda Green
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Amanda Green
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12, SA13 and the housing site selection process as a whole
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound

**Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD**

I am objecting to the selection of Sites SA12 & SA13 as allocations for housing. Their inclusion means the whole DPD is unsound as it does not comply with local or national planning law.

The selection of sites SA12 & SA13 contravenes the following District Plan policies:

DP6 / DP7 Settlement Hierarchy / Strategic Development at Burgess Hill – Burgess Hill has already taken its required housing numbers for the entire Plan Period according to the District Plan

DP12 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside. This is an unspoilt ancient field system full of protected wildlife and plants. This site is not required as there are sufficient sites identified elsewhere.

DP13 Preventing Coalescence. The southern boundary of Site SA13 lies within the parish of Keymer, so developing it will have caused Burgess Hill and Keymer to coalesce.

DP18 South Downs National Park – developing these sites will cause harm to the setting of the South Downs National Park, as stated by the SDNPA themselves

DP37 Trees Hedgerows and Woodlands – developing this site will destroy irreplaceable trees, hedgerows and woodlands

DP38 Biodiversity Allocating it for development cannot lead to the “net gain in biodiversity” that Mid Sussex Planning policy requires and will lead to ecological harm.

These sites are not sustainable under the terms of the NPPF, conflicting with paragraphs 17, 109, 133 and more.

These sites are not suitable, sustainable or deliverable due to the insurmountable traffic issues that would be caused. Local roads and junctions critical to the movement of traffic in the south of Burgess Hill are already at “severe” levels of congestion which adding 340 houses will make worse.

The SYSTRA study which attempts to show that mitigation will solve everything is fatally flawed – as illustrated by the GTA Civils Transport Study commissioned by SOFLAG. Crucially no Safety Study has been done, meaning that the document fails to comply with para 109 of the NPPF.

The proposed access to SA13 via Broadlands is unsafe, with insufficient visibility splays at the junction with Keymer Road, as proved by the Traffic Study carried out on behalf of the Broadlands Residents Association. As a resident I can confirm this - it is necessary to stick right out into Keymer Road in order to see enough to turn out, which is just about manageable for the half a dozen cars a day from Broadlands but will be a dangerous nightmare if hundreds of new cars start trying to do it.

Considerable opposition from neighbouring local authorities and statutory bodies including the SDNP was raised at the first Consultation, which makes the Sites undeliverable.

The terrible harm that will be caused to the ecological important habitat at Site SA13 cannot be mitigated, and there will be a significant loss of biodiversity. This is unsustainable.

MSDC has ignored its own evidence from previous housing and transport assessments in 2004, 2007, 2013 and 2016 which demonstrate that these sites are unsuitable. They are now more unsuitable than ever due to additional housing already built or planned for the local area.

MSDC has mishandled the entire Site Allocations DPD process up to now, omitting key selection criteria or applying them incorrectly and inconsistently, misleading key council meetings by omitting evidence or making incorrect statements, manipulating the buffer requirement to suit their own agenda and relying on a flawed transport study to justify their selections.

**Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.**

Removing Sites SA12 and SA13 from the Site Allocations DPD would go some way towards making the document sound, while retaining the 10% buffer of housing supply required by planning law.

But ideally the DPD needs to be redone, this time assessing the housing sites properly and fairly, using the correct selection criteria and without the predetermined agenda evident throughout this whole process.

The representation from SOFLAG outlines all this in much more detail, and should be carefully considered by MSDC and must be forwarded in its entirety to the independent Planning Inspector.

**If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here**

**If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination**

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

**Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination**

yes

**Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination**

yes

**Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted**

yes

**Date**

27/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 562

**Response Ref:** Reg19/562/1

**Respondent:** Mrs L Cowell

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



<b>Name</b>	Linda Cowell
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because the site selection was unrepresentative and failed to follow the MSDC's own guidance.</p> <p>The traffic report is flawed . As a resident I know how bad the traffic congestion is in this area.</p> <p>Our infrastructure is already at breaking point fuelled by all the recent development in this area.</p> <p>Destruction of a biodiverse green site is something MSDC have ignored, despite the studies that have been submitted.</p> <p>This development would only be effective in providing more traffic pollution and putting a strain on an already overloaded social system.</p> <p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.</p> <p>What happened to the government promise to protect the countryside.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 564

**Response Ref:** Reg19/564/1

**Respondent:** Mr B Crouch

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** brian.crouch2 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 September 2020 11:58  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Objection to allocation of housing to sites SA 12 & SA 13 in the DPD

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** SiteDPD

I am objecting to the above allocation of housing for the following reasons.

The site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative, did not follow MSDC's own guidance. Representations made to the first consultation was 'lost'

The traffic report produced for MSDC is fatally flawed. Clearly the traffic situation is already at breaking point and nothing substantive can be done to address this.

The unique biodiversity within the site makes it unsuitable for development and MSDC ignored this.

Developing the vital green gap between Burgess Hill and villages to the south (Keymer and Hassocks) will result in coalescence. Burgess Hill's urban sprawl will eat further into neighbouring Hassocks' boundaries.

There is a lack of infrastructure and nothing is showing in the proposals to address this.

Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and National Planning Guidance.

Until there is in existence a by-pass around the southern and eastern sides of Burgess Hill the town cannot take any further traffic that any development will generate apart from that already agreed.

B W Crouch

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 567

**Response Ref:** Reg19/567/1

**Respondent:** Mrs S E Munier

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Sandra Munier
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Mrs Sandra E Munier
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>Allocating these sites for housing goes against the District Plan and national planning guidance</p> <p>Also, once again, it would appear that NO consideration has been given to the impact that any more building will have on the surrounding areas - living in Ditchling, we already have traffic numbers increasing exponentially almost on a daily basis, not to mention the pollution.</p> <p>PLEASE leave us some of our green spaces.</p>
<b>Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Site Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the reason you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness.</b>	<p>As per above, I don't consider there to be any changes that can be made to make the plan compliant or sound - it should be thrown out we need our clean air and spaces !</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when the publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	27/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 577

**Response Ref:** Reg19/577/1

**Respondent:** Mr P Loveday

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Phillip Loveday
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	Phillip Loveday
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/ SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the sites SA12/ SA13 for hundreds of houses.</p> <p>The are unsuitable. unsustainable and undeliverable. Their inclusion contravenes District Plan polices DP6, DP7, DP12, DP13, DP15 ,DP18 DP37, DP38 &amp; national planning law, &amp; makes the whole DPD unsound.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	28/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 578

**Response Ref:** Reg19/578/2

**Respondent:** Mr & Mrs T & V Walden

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x



<b>Name</b>	TOM WALDEN
<b>On behalf of</b>	TOM AND VICTORIA WALDEN
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Name or Organisation</b>	TOM WALDEN
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12 & SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	Yes
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>We wholeheartedly object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The traffic situation will become even worse than it already is. Living at the eastern end of Folders Lane we know first hand how choked the surrounding roads already are. The complete disregard for the 30mph speed limit, particularly by construction traffic/HGVs makes Folders Lane/Keymer Road very hazardous, particularly with young children in tow on the pavement. This would be made worse during the construction phase and once completed, by the many additional cars of the new estate's residents (approx 700 cars for the 350 units proposed). There is simply no more available capacity on the existing roads and little viable way to change this.</li> <li>- Potential strain on local services. The waiting time for GP appointments at Silverdale Surgery is already unreasonable and will only get worse with an increased local population</li> <li>- Years of living with a vast building site and associated disruption and noise.</li> <li>- The Haywards Heath Golf Club (a brownfield site) would be a far more environmentally sound option than greenfield sites SA12/13 which possess unique biodiversity</li> <li>- The green gap between Burgess Hill and Hassocks will pretty much disappear, thereby further expanding the urban sprawl that Burgess Hill already is.</li> <li>- What is very concerning is that the site selection process was unsound, unrepresentative and did not follow the district council's own guidance. Lost representations to the earlier round of consultation is very suspicious</li> <li>- Burgess Hill has more than enough housing provision fulfilled by the Northern Arc development and SA12/13 are simply unnecessary. It's about time the new housing developments were spread more fairly throughout the district.</li> </ul>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	

**If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination** No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

**Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination** yes

**Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination** yes

**Please notify me when-The Site Allocations DPD is adopted** yes

**Date** 18/09/2020

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** thomas walden [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 September 2020 12:05  
**To:** ldfconsultation  
**Subject:** Site Allocations DPD Consultation - SA12 & SA13

We wholeheartedly support the SOFLAG objection submission and vehemently object to the inclusion of sites SA12 & SA13 for housing. We urge the council to consider it fully and send it to the inspector.

Regards

Tom & Vicky Walden

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 590

**Response Ref:** Reg19/590/1

**Respondent:** Ms J Jenkins

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	June Jenkins
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing sites SA12 and SA13 in the DPD because the site selection did not follow MSDC's own guidance and representations made during the first consultation were at best lost or worst purposely not taken into account.</p> <p>The traffic congestion on the periphery and within the town centre of Burgess Hill is already at breaking point and not just at busy commuter times. Delays occur at any time during the day making journey planning and timing unreliable, frustrating and almost impossible. MSDC has not resolved traffic flow through our town now so adding more cross town traffic to the equation is untenable.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Date</b>	13/09/2020

## Site Allocations DPD: Regulation 19 Consultation Response

**Policy:** SA12 - SA13

**ID:** 592

**Response Ref:** Reg19/592/2

**Respondent:** Ms D Rees

**Organisation:**

**On Behalf Of:**

**Category:** Resident

**Appear at Examination?** x

<b>Name</b>	Doreen Rees
<b>Job title</b>	Retired
<b>Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Which document are you commenting on?</b>	Site Allocations DPD
<b>Sites DPD Policy Number (e.g. SA1 - SA38)</b>	SA12/SA13
<b>Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is in accordance with legal and procedural requirements; including the duty to cooperate</b>	No
<b>(1) Positively prepared</b>	Unsound
<b>(2) Justified</b>	Unsound
<b>(3) Effective</b>	Unsound
<b>(4) Consistent with national policy</b>	Unsound
<b>Please outline why you either support or object (on legal or soundness grounds) to the Site Allocations DPD</b>	<p>I am objecting to the allocation of housing to sites SA12 &amp; SA13 in the DPD because:</p> <p>1 Folders Lane cannot bare any more traffic as it is already badly congested and grid locked at times.</p> <p>2 Burgess Hill has already taken more than its fair share of increased building,especially bearing in mind the new development of the Norther Arc.This is bringing us nearer to Haywards Heath and now the proposal is going south of Folders Lane bringing us nearer to Keymer and Hassocks .Is the intention to create one massive town?</p> <p>3 The beautiful countryside of Mid-Sussex is being ruined.</p>
<b>If you wish to provide further documentation to support your response, you can upload it here</b>	
<b>If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination</b>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<b>Please notify me when-The Plan has been submitted for Examination</b>	yes
<b>Please notify me when-The publication of the recommendations from the Examination</b>	yes
<b>Date</b>	25/09/2020