

Examination of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039

Hearings: week 2

AGENDA

Wednesday 4 March

Inspector's opening and introductions

Matter 5: The Spatial Strategy

AM: Site promoters / developers / agents

PM: Local groups and individual objectors

- a. **Spatial distribution between settlements:**
 - whether appropriate levels of development have been ascribed to Category 1, 2 and 3 settlements, expanded settlements and sustainable communities, having regard to access to social and community facilities and transport.

- b. **Spatial distribution between areas:** whether the distribution of development reflects:
 - the housing needs and employment patterns of the District;
 - adjacent districts with unmet housing need.

- c. **Spatial distribution and constraints:** whether an appropriate balance is struck between the different (and potentially conflicting) objectives of:
 - strategic landscape designations
 - the sustainable location of development
 - the protection of settlement character and heritage
 - the protection of undesignated countryside
 - biodiversity.

- d. **Delivery:** whether the range of site allocation sizes would:
 - enable different housing needs and aspirations to be met;
 - ensure that sufficient homes would be brought forward in a timely manner to meet identified needs and ensure that the plan remains robust.

- e. **Spatial distribution and transport:** The implications of the spatial strategy for:
 - transport infrastructure (of all kinds) and how that infrastructure would be provided;
 - additional vehicle movement through existing communities and how that would be mitigated.

Thursday 5 March

Matter 6: The selection of sites for allocation in the plan

- a. Whether the site selection process was consistently applied (for example to comparable settlements).
- b. Whether the process of assessment of different sizes and types of site was fair.
- c. Whether sufficient confidence can be placed on the scoring and selection of the strategic sites relative to other sites, given their need for infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation.
- d. Whether sufficient granular detail and on-site assessment was used to inform the evaluation of sites.
- e. Whether the site evaluation process adequately considered the impacts on neighbouring communities, from (for example) additional traffic.
- f. Whether, on rejected sites, the possibility of mitigation was adequately considered.

Friday 6 March

Reserve / Inspector observations if necessary