[redacted]

16th October 2026

Hearing Statement in relation to the Additional Sites with reference to MM 92.

From : Geoff Zeidler, District Councillor for the Downland Villages Ward of MSDC.

This statement supplements the submissions made on 6th September 2026 and which focused on the facts that:

- Sites were selected on their support for the 5 year land supply when the infrastructure plans did not provide the water and waste facilities required in that timescale. In addition MM92 had no mains foul water management. As a result there is a high risk MM99 would lead to Grampian conditions to be invoked making the plan undeliverable and hence unsound.
- MSDC have failed to "address the issue" of Hurstpierpoint High Street or reasonably consider the traffic impacts on rural lanes. Incremental traffic is likely to lead to exponential issues such that "monitor and manage" cannot be an effective solution.
- There are no safe routes to allow residents of MM92 to use DPSC3 as part of a 20 minute community; and that the phasing meant that, if developed first, it would be unsustainable and embed such behaviours.

It also highlighted that the additional sites in Albourne and Sayers Common were not consistent with the direction of the new NPPF.

The issues raised by the Inspector for comment in relation to MM92, and my related additional comments are set out below. Where appropriate, these may be assisted by the proposed "Statements of Common Ground" raised to MSDC by WILD which I hope have been agreed in advance as factual, the drafts of which I include for reference. I would also like to reinforce my support for the issues raised by Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council in its letter to MSDC on 12th October. This addresses the effectiveness of DPSC-GEN in ensuring that all the developments in the Sayers Village area, many of which are being brought forward independently, should be co-ordinated to ensure that the overall planning objective is achieved and that the impact on the lives of residents over a very extended construction period can be minimised through effective co-ordination.

Access and movement

- *Relationship to overall access and movement strategy*

SoCG 2 : *The Main Modifications do not identify any specific mitigation measures to address impacts on the lanes and Hurstpierpoint High Street.*

***SoCG 6** : Site (SHELAA No.) 1124 is intended for early development but will only become within an active travel distance for retail provision when facilities in DPSC3 are provided; until then, residents will have to rely on car transport because there is no retail provision in Albourne. The site should therefore be scored as a minor negative on this count in the Main Modifications report DP16.*

MM92 is separated from DPSC3 with no safe walking or cycling route between them. The B2116 Henfield Road is narrow with poor sightlines; cannot be widened to accommodate footpaths without the removal of traditional hedgerows; and will become increasingly busy including HGV traffic. There are proposals to include a traffic island, which may not allow the passage of larger HGV trucks with safe clearance margins for older or school-age residents; or a pedestrian

crossing which would slow traffic and may not have adequate approach space unless sited to the far east of the site. This creates a very long and meandering route that will not encourage usage.

As a result, all MM92 achieves is the delivery of housing at an early stage when none of the DPSC3 infrastructure or amenities, including bus services and through-road, are in place making it most likely to generate car traffic. Given its location this traffic will load the Albourne junction and Hurstpierpoint High Street for which there is no mitigation plan; as well as the other most sensitive rural lanes like Trusslers Hill and Twineham Lane.

Social and community infrastructure and open space

- *Relationship to the overall disposition of uses within Sayers Common*

As highlighted above, MM92 is at a distance from the centre of DPSC3 with no simple and attractive active travel route to access it. It is also expected to be developed in advance of any of these facilities and so the site should be assessed as a standalone "greenfield" site rather than as a development related to DPSC3.

There is no legal obligation or commitment MM92 can make to ensure that any of the relevant social and community infrastructure it requires will be implemented or in place; and given planning timescales, unless this is already available as a condition to its development, MM92 should not be able to assume that it will be. At present given the feeble nature of housing demand, all the associated independent "satellite" developments that rely on DPSC3 risk building a host of estates without the central glue and infrastructure that make them viable. MM92 more than any other. The plan must ensure that does not occur.

Countryside

- *Impact on the landscape and the separate identity of settlements*

SoCG 5 *: Given that site (SHELAA No.) 1124 is identified as being in a high risk area for surface water flooding it should be scored as a major negative for flooding in MM DP16.*

The landscape is subject to flooding and, as outlined in my response summarised above, M92 is not currently on mains sewerage, yet it is intended to be developed ahead of DPSC3 almost certainly ensuring that MM99 will be invoked with the probability that Grampian conditions will be imposed.

I do believe that the physical separation from Albourne is adequate to allow it to be identified as separate; although being so close down the Henfield road will distinctly increase the sense that Albourne is no longer a village in the countryside as the vistas of open landscape to the south which currently persist all the way to Trusslers Hill Lane are lost.

However, I also believe that MM92 will also have a very clear identity of its own, separate from DPSC3, and will become known as an island of houses with no connection to anything.

Conclusion

To make the allocation of MM92 sound as part of the District Plan it should be included within the Masterplan phasing and have conditions imposed such that it can <u>only</u> be available for development once the core facilities, including foul water systems, and other community infrastructure from DPSC3 are in place up to the northern boundary of the Henfield Road.

Prior to this, the development will be neither part of a 20 minute neighbourhood, nor sustainable which would make the plan unsound.