

Site	Sites in Horsted Keynes (SA28, SA29, 216, 68, 69 and others)
MIQ concerned	2.1 Is the Plan supported by the SA and HRA? 2.2 What evidence is there that the SA has influenced the Plan and/or undertaken a <u>full assessment of realistic alternatives</u> ?
Part of document deemed to be unsound	SSP2 - Site Selection Paper 2: Methodology for Site Selection, SSP3 Site Selection Process: Housing including Appendix B. In summary: Stage 3 of the site selection process and the resultant realistic alternative comparisons and sustainability assessments (SA) leading to site allocations.
Soundness criteria	Fails on: positively prepared and justified (positively prepared / justified / effective / consistent with national policy)
New Information available	Although not strictly new information, presented here are representations made to the Reg 18 consultation of the Site Selection DPD, that the inspector will have not seen. Much of this detailed information was not published following the consultation, and is thus not recorded. Many carefully considered comments had been ignored, chopped up, suppressed and misrepresented at the Regulation 18 consultation. It is assumed MSDC deemed that comments were not pertinent as some were primarily framed as concerning sites that were not allocated, but de facto they also question the process leading to realistic alternatives and the SA of sites. The complete failure to acknowledge or respond to these critical, professionally reasoned challenges of this key assessment <u>undermines confidence</u> in this part of the process. It has been questioned through public consultation on multiple occasions. No response to these challenges suggests that the public weren't meant challenge of test this part of the process, and the way that the process had been followed. As such the realistic alternative comparisons and sustainability assessments (SA) leading to site allocations have been used negatively, not enabling choice of sites, to give pre-conceived allocations for Horsted Keynes.
Reasons for failure	<p>The shortlisting (at Stage 3) to realistic alternatives, and resultant sustainability appraisal (SA) of prospective housing sites within Horsted Keynes (HK) has been limited prematurely to meet the minimum residual housing need, and as a result <u>no true assessment</u> of realistic alternatives has occurred. The results of the current allocations are thus a foregone conclusion which have not been based on choice, and as a result they have not been thoroughly tested through comparison to realistic alternatives and SA.</p> <p>The plan as presented is therefore <u>not suitably supported by the SA</u> due to evidencing being limited, and <u>realistic alternatives being contrived</u>.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is the most detailed assessment of prospective sites that has been undertaken in MSDC's SADPD process – and was carried out following a three-stage sieving process to filter the number of sites down to a manageable shortlist.</p> <p>The conclusions of the SA for the HK sites are flawed, due to two prospective sites in HK (sites 68 and 69) being demonstrably filtered out prematurely at Stage 3 that could have been used as realistic alternative comparisons, and would have scored equally or better than those taken to allocation. This has led to a sub-optimal site allocation for Horsted Keynes in the DPD. This is demonstrated in the submission by Paul Fairbairn to Reg 18 (Appendix 4), and also by my own representations to both Reg 18 (Appendix 5) and Reg 19. A summary of the Stage 3 assessment of these two sites (68 and 69), and a comparison with the allocated sites SA28 and SA29 is found below also.</p> <p>In the SA, 20 'Sites that Perform Well' are proposed for development in the SADPD, of which 2 are in Horsted Keynes: SHLAA Site 184 (SA29): Land south of St. Stephens Church, Hamsland, and SHLAA Site 807 (SA28): Land South of The Old Police House, Birchgrove Road, Horsted Keynes. Of the 16 'Sites that Perform Poorly', 1 is in Horsted Keynes: SHLAA Site 216: Land at Police House Field, Birchgrove Road, Danehill Lane (note that the proforma information for this site is NOT available in SSP3 Appendix B). I show a copy from MSDC Reg 18 documentation (no longer available online) in Appendix 6.</p>

Site 216: Land at Police House Field was used as the realistic alternative site, and for clarity it lies wholly within and is subsumed by SHLAA Site 807 (now allocated SA28). SHLAA Site 216 appears to have been selected as a 'realistic' alternative and categorised as 'Sites that Perform Poorly' in order to be excluded. This suggests a foregone conclusion was steering the selection of sites at Stage 3. **It is not a realistic alternative site** and other sites in the village should have been used.

The conclusions of the SA for Horsted Keynes (DPD1) can be found in p140 -141. Given the strength and clarity of these conclusions, it highlights the need to have high confidence that the Stage 3 screening decisions for HK that are summarised in SSP3 stand up to close scrutiny. This is particularly so as this **site selection process is seeking to establish a comparison and prioritisation of possible sites for development**, as set out in paragraph 3.5.5 of the SADPD Site Selection Paper 3, which states:

'The SA tested each site option on a settlement-by-settlement basis. This was important for two reasons. First, it tested the individual sites against the SA objectives to establish a site's performance in absolute terms. Second, it enabled comparison of sites within the same settlement by establishing the performance of each site in relative terms. Understanding the best site in relative terms means that even if a settlement has a number of sites which individually perform well, only the best performing sites following assessment in that settlement need be considered for allocation when viewed in the context of the District Plan strategy.'

The site allocations DPD is flawed as the Stage 3 shortlisting process for sites in HK was demonstrably inconsistent and, consequently, a sub-optimal shortlist of sites within HK was taken forward to Sustainability Appraisal, and the required comparisons to high grade sites.

Sites 184 (SA29) and 807 (SA28) in combination are projected to deliver a total of 55 new homes against a minimum residual requirement for Horsted Keynes (after existing commitments and completions, of 53 new homes) as set out in Figure 2.2 of the Site Selection Paper 3. The decision effectively to submit only two sites totalling 55 new homes against a must-meet residual requirement of at least 53 new homes in HK does not enable the SA to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding choices in HK, as advocated in paragraph 3.5.5 of Site Selection Paper 3. There are two other sites that passed the stage 2 sift that should have remained in the shortlist after Stage 3 and been subjected to the Sustainability Appraisal (SHLAA Site 68: Farm Buildings, Jeffreys Farm – 6 new homes, and SHLAA Site 69: Jeffreys Farm Northern Fields – 22 new home). This would have enabled a meaningful prioritisation of credible choices to be undertaken as envisaged by paragraph 3.5.5.

As paragraph 3.4.7 states: *'A degree of professional judgement was required as the criteria were not assumed to be of equal weight'*, but this cannot be a crutch for maintaining a position that does not stand up to objective, evidence-based scrutiny in the site filtering process.

Despite the consultation document explaining that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) could be used to prioritise choices between sustainable sites within a settlement, the consequence of MSDC's decision to screen out sites 68 and 69 is that the SA for sites in Horsted Keynes was then left to appraise just three remaining sites, of which one was a subset of another. The scale of development proposed on those two remaining sites (55 dwellings) just delivered the required demand of 53 dwellings. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the SA found ways of concluding that these sites were sustainable and should be taken forward.

At each stage of the Sites Allocation DPD process, there appears to have been an incomprehensible push by MSDC to disregard two potentially highly sustainable sites (68 and 69). Site 68 is on previously developed land. The other site 69 has been filtered out on the basis of a hugely contentious AONB assessment that does not appear to be evidence-based, and also dismissively to ignore the reasoned concerns expressed by many villagers, whether directly affected or not, about the continuing and inexorable promotion of a large development of 30 dwellings on site SA29, a green field of medieval origin.

Below are summaries of the sites that appear to have been filtered from the process in an apparent pre-emptive manner to meet the housing numbers. Comments on the relative sustainability of allocated sites SA28 and SA29 follow also.

SHLAA Site 68: Farm Buildings, Jeffreys Farm

- Site should be considered as Previously Developed Land - 0.75 ha of land adjacent to existing housing, contiguous with the village, currently occupied by dilapidated farm buildings and as such an obvious candidate for sustainable development in accordance with MSDC Local Plan Policy DP4.
- one of only two sites in HK assessed as Low AONB impact.
- Local Road / Access - The Stage 3 assessment is based on two factually incorrect conclusions ('significant conflict with the existing junction (creating a crossroads)' and, 'third party land ownership' restricting visibility). This has been highlighted on several occasions to MSDC Reg 18 and Reg 19, but no attempt was made to change this qualitative information. This is part of a due process statement supplied for the hearings under MIQ 1.1 (ii).

There is no evidence-based reason, or apparent rational professional judgement reason for excluding Site 68: Jeffreys Farm Buildings at Stage 3, that then prevents its consideration at the SA stage. This appears to be a **highly sustainable site** for the proposed scale of development and its exclusion appears to be perverse and untenable.

SHLAA Site 69: Jeffreys Farm Northern Fields

- Site 69 is on the west of the village. Primary route out of the village is to the west with residents using the amenities provided by Lindfield and Haywards Heath rather than those in Forest Row and East Grinstead. This militates strongly in favour of sustainable development of suitable sites on the south and west of the village to reduce through flow of traffic, unless constrained by other more significant considerations.
- The principal reason for excluding this site appears to be the AONB High impact assessment. It is important that this assessment is robust and rational as important implications flow from this conclusion. This has been challenged by the site promoter (Appendix 7) and also in Reg 18 responses (Appendix 5). Statements provided by the AONB in response (Appendix 8) are completely at odds with the historic development and settlement pattern of Horsted Keynes. The dense screen of trees along Sugar Lane and at the junction with Keysford Lane is not affected by any development of SHLAA Site 69, so the site remains very well screened from the surrounding countryside. SHLAA Site 69 is acknowledged to be a modern field system (Appendix 9), so the evidence would not support this contributing to a High AONB Impact assessment of SHLAA Site 69. It remains difficult to comprehend how using the above evidence that on more subjective matters how professional judgement could rationally conclude that this site has a High AONB Impact, given other sites proposed on medieval field systems have been deemed low impact (SA29).

The consequence of this High Impact assessment is that a potentially highly sustainable site has been excluded at Stage 3 from further assessment at SA Stage 4.

- Existing density of the tree screening on Sugar Lane provides and would continue to provide a very effective visual screen for listed buildings and their setting, and the visibility of the site in general from the AONB.

There is no evidence-based reason, or apparent rational professional judgement reason for excluding SHLAA Site 69: Jeffreys Farm Northern Fields at Stage 3 that then prevents its consideration at the SA stage. This appears to be a **highly sustainable site** that could make a major contribution to meeting HK's minimum residual requirement of 53 new homes and its exclusion appears to be perverse and untenable.

Site 184 (SA29): Land South of St Stephens Church (please read in conjunction with my other SA29 statements to the hearings, giving more detail to these observations – 3.3 (ii) access, 3.3 (v) traffic flow, 3.3 (vii) ecology).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Low/Medium impact on Trees and TPO looks to be highly optimistic given the narrow width of the access route into the site from Hamsland. Damage to the mature trees currently screening the north-western boundary of the site seems inevitable. • A Highly Positive (Bright Green) impact assessment for Local Road/Access is impossible to reconcile with local knowledge. Hamsland is a narrow single track cul-de-sac serving a large number of dwellings and is already constrained by unavoidable on-street parking for houses on the north side of the road. • Ecology, Access and Traffic flow constraints, apparent from the planning application DM/20/4692 (available on the planning portal) on the site indicate the site should be zoned for a lower density development with fewer dwellings as it is on the edge of the village in an AONB. Refer to the Parish Council Holding Objection in Appendix 1. <p>Site 807 (SA28), Land South of The Old Police House, Birchgrove Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AONB Negative (Pink) Impact assessment appears generous, given the loss of a medieval field system with some visibility of the site from Danehill Lane. (On the evidence available, this appears to be a more severe impact than would be experienced on Site 69: Jeffrey's Farm Northern Fields a modern field system with mature screening on all sides of the site.) • The Neutral (Yellow) Less than Substantial Harm impact on the Grade 2 listed Lucas Farm is surprising given the building is directly over the road from the northern edge of the site and is unlikely to be heavily screened from the development. • the existing mature oak tree in the southern road verge, which currently provides some screening of the site from Lucas Farm, must be at risk of removal in order to be able to provide a safe visibility splay on exit from the site onto Birchgrove Road. <p>The above evaluations point towards sites 68 and 69 both being highly sustainable, and on a par, if not better ranked on sustainability criteria than the current assessments of the allocated sites SA28 and SA29.</p> <p>In summary: The Stage 3 shortlisting process for sites in HK was demonstrably flawed and, consequently, a sub-optimal shortlist of sites within HK was taken forward to Sustainability Appraisal. The Stage 3 screening by MSDC had reduced the sites still available down to a <u>minimum</u>, using a subset of one of the allocated sites as a realistic alternative, instead of other equally sustainable sites that has been apparently filtered from the process early. The filtering process reduced the number of sites to the point where the input to the process (numbers provided by the draft allocated sites) equated to the required output numbers, i.e. there was no opportunity for the more detailed sustainability appraisal described in the DPD SA to make any <u>meaningful prioritisation</u> between sites within the village.</p> <p>The number of respondents to consultations (Reg 18, Reg 19 and Reg 14) and planning applications in Horsted Keynes indicate that villagers have <u>little confidence</u> in the product of the site selection process, and it could be described as a sham for the way the process has been carried out for Horsted Keynes.</p>
<p>Reference to other DPD documents</p>	<p>DPD1 Site selection Paper 1 – SSP1 Site selection Paper 2 – SSP2 Site selection Paper 3 – SSP3 (both Housing, and Appendix B site proformas)</p>
<p>How could the document be made sound?</p>	<p>Currently the ASDPD (and specifically the allocations in Horsted Keynes) has not been supported by the SA. The inappropriate filtering at Stage 3 has negatively influenced the allocation of sites due to the <u>inappropriate use of realistic alternatives</u>.</p> <p>The Stage 3 shortlisting process for sites in HK should be readdressed consistently and following due process. The housing provided by the high graded sites (realistic alternatives) should be in excess of the housing need to prevent the output being a foregone conclusion. This reasonable and realistic list of alternative sites should be then assessed for sustainability with <u>robust and evidence supported allocations</u> being made to fulfil the housing numbers in DP6 for Horsted Keynes.</p>

<p>What is the precise change that is sought?</p>	<p>The <u>reassessment</u> of site allocations in Horsted Keynes should be addressed before material changes are made to the plan, however, if a robust evidence-based approach is used in assessing the sites through Stage 3, then shortlisting of realistic alternatives, and the resulting SA comparison I believe that the allocations will change.</p> <p>If the above changes were made, the Plan would be supported by the SA, and the use of realistic alternatives would have had appropriate influenced on the allocation of sites in Horsted Keynes.</p>
<p>Appendices</p>	<p>Appendix 1 - Holding objection to application DM/20/4692 on SA29 by Horsted Keynes Parish Council in 3 parts:- https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicDocuments/00759920.pdf https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicDocuments/00759917.pdf https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicDocuments/00757401.pdf</p> <p>Appendix 4 - Reg 18 response by Paul Fairbairn APPENDIX SENT AS EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Appendix 5 - Reg 18 response by Helena Griffiths APPENDIX SENT AS EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Appendix 6 – Proforma for SHLAA Site 216: Land at Police House Field, Birchgrove Road, Danehill Lane from MSDC Reg 18 documentation APPENDIX SENT AS EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Appendix 7 - Challenge to AONB Site evaluations by the site promoter APPENDIX SENT AS EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Appendix 8 – Response from AONB to challenge of Site evaluations APPENDIX SENT AS EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Appendix 9 – AONB assessment of field systems by age https://horstedkeynesparishcouncil.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/AONB-character-components.pdf</p>