

**Contact:**  
Steve Ashdown  
Steve.ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk

3<sup>rd</sup> June 2026

Aimee Peckham  
Operations Officer  
Plannig Inspectorate

By email only

Dear Aimee,

**Re: Land east of Ansty - Appeal Ref: 6005786 – Inspector’s note of Amended Plans**

In respect to the Inspector’s Note on Amended Plans dated 30<sup>th</sup> May 2026, the Council can provide the following responses to the three questions highlighted in paragraph 8: -

**For the three main parties:**

d) If the Inspector determined Scheme A, would it be possible to provide adequate noise attenuation to effectively mitigate the County Council’s concerns about external noise impacts on school land, without adversely affecting the effective operation of the schools?

The Council defer to the comments made by the WSCC Education Authority on this point in their response to the Inspector of 2<sup>nd</sup> June and their formal response on this matter to the planning application (CD4.9).

e) If the Inspector determined Scheme B and imposed condition 3 with the Scheme B plans, which were then included in the definitions of Primary School Land and SEND School Land in the legal agreement, what certainty would the Inspector have that Schedule 4 on Care Provision within the legal agreement would be adequate to ensure that C2 care provision would come forward on site in a suitable form?

It would be for the appellants to come forward with an acceptable C2 scheme as part of a reserved matters application, it would be then open to the Council to refuse any such application should it not make suitable provision.

f) Recognising that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and there are no provisions within the Rules for amendments to be submitted, would it be appropriate to require the submission of revised parameter plans by condition (as suggested by the District Council at paragraph 12.59 of its Committee Report)? If so, do any of the proposed conditions need to be altered to reflect this?

The suggested condition as part of the Council’s Committee Report was to enable the issues around the school site to be resolved. As part of the appeal submission, Scheme B seeks to resolve this issue and the comments from WSCC Education set out their position on the acceptability of the proposed school. Considering this, the Council do not consider that a condition requiring the submission of

*Working together for a better Mid Sussex*

revised parameter plans is appropriate, or necessary in this instance, and condition 3 secures the parameter plans for both Scheme A and B. This enables the Inspector to consider the acceptability of the appeal proposal in the context of both Schemes.

Yours sincerely,

S.Ashdown

Steve Ashdown  
Head of Development Management