David Goddard
College Lane, Hurstpierpoint
October 2026

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021–2039: Further Examination Hearings, 3–6 November 2026

Hearing statement: MM74 Land north of Willow Way and Talbot Mead, Cuckfield Road

Thursday 5 November 2026, 10:00 session (with MM76). Written statement; I cannot attend.

I am a resident of College Lane and cannot attend the hearing. I ask that this statement be treated as my evidence on MM74 under the Inspector's agenda for Hurstpierpoint. It addresses only MM74, and I do not repeat my earlier representation.

Why MM74 is unsound

The Council's own assessment rejected this land. SHELAA Site 1075 was rejected at its final stage because it could contribute to coalescence with Burgess Hill. The policy itself asks for a buffer "to limit perceived coalescence", which concedes the risk. The Parish Council measures the gap at about 1.5 km, falling to about 700 metres with MM74 and MM60 built.

150 homes, one High Street. About 6,700 vehicles a day already use it, and the Council's own model finds Stonepound Crossroads severe and too constrained for mitigation. MM74 requires no measure at either.

It relies on a footway the highway authority has declined to provide. In March 2026 West Sussex County Council said of a pavement on Chalkers Lane that "this is not something WSCC can take forward". The policy requires one.

The heritage work has not been done. The policy asks for a Heritage Statement to protect views of the Grade II listed Hurstpierpoint College. It should have come before the allocation, not after.

My request: find MM74 unsound and delete it in full.

Considering the sites together

The Inspector's agenda groups MM72 to MM76, and its questions about the road network, the separate identity of settlements and utilities can only be answered for the sites as a whole. MM72 to MM76 add 419 homes around Hurstpierpoint (75, 9, 35, 150 and 150), and more if MM72 rises to the 100 homes its developer's website refers to. They sit beside MM60 and the existing DPSC1 and DPSC3 allocations in the same parish. Yet each policy is written as if its site stood alone, and no evidence tests their combined effect on the High Street, Stonepound Crossroads, the lanes north of the village or the Goddards Green sewerage system. National policy tests whether the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. That is a test of the total, not of each site separately. At 150 homes MM74 is the largest of these allocations, and it should be judged with the rest.

(a) Movement

Access and the High Street. MM74 allows access from either side of Cuckfield Road. The Parish Council's representations say traffic heading south from Cuckfield Road would cross the roundabout at the western end of the High Street to reach the southbound A23, and would add to traffic through the High Street in both directions. The Obtrada assessment commissioned by the Parish Council records about 6,700 vehicles a day on the High Street, including HGVs despite the weight restriction. The Parish Council also says the High Street's pinch points result from its width, its geometry and its listed buildings, and that measures to ease congestion have already been tried, most recently in 2018. The Council's transport report does not, in its text,

assess the High Street, and the Inspector has already found the Council's paper MS-13 to be largely about junction capacity. The MM74 policy requires no measure for the High Street.

Stonepound Crossroads. Traffic going south and east would also use Stonepound Crossroads, which is already congested. The Council's transport study records the B2116 Hurst Road arm at 100% volume-to-capacity in the morning peak, and its Scenario 7 report finds the junction severe and too constrained for capacity mitigation, relying instead on walking, cycling and public transport.

College Lane. Danworth Lane and Malthouse Lane lead directly into College Lane, so some of MM74's southbound traffic could reach Hassocks Road without using the High Street. The Parish Council says those lanes are unsuitable for more traffic. I live on College Lane. Going north, the pavement on College Lane stops at Bankside and does not start again. From there to around 92 College Lane, about 365 metres, the lane is only wide enough for one car and the terraced houses' front gardens run right up to the road. (The pavement ends at 50.932454, -0.163445 and the stretch ends at 50.935745, -0.163679.) At school times traffic there queues for five to ten minutes. Children and parents walk in the carriageway. That route is not captured by the High Street counts, and nothing in the evidence assesses it.

The footway requirement. MM74 requires a new footway along Cuckfield Road, Danworth Lane and Chalkers Lane to connect the site southwards. The Parish Council notes that the width of the highway and its boundary trees and hedges make that difficult, and that it would mean removing vegetation that defines the landscape edge. Chalkers Lane is the clearest problem. The Parish Council's Highway and Cycleways Working Group minutes record that residents have asked for a pavement there, that the Working Group supports one, and that West Sussex County Council said in March 2026 that "this is not something WSCC can take forward". The policy requires a footway that the highway authority has declined to provide. Without one, residents will drive.

Traffic from DPSC1 is on top of this. DPSC1, Land West of Burgess Hill, is allocated for about 1,350 homes at the end of Malthouse Lane. Malthouse Lane leads into College Lane, and from there south to Wickham Hill, Hassocks Road and Stonepound Crossroads. Journeys to Hassocks station, Brighton and the A23 from those homes will naturally use the same lanes, the same crossroads and the same High Street that the Hurstpierpoint sites rely on. I have seen no evidence that the assessment of this site adds those trips to the lanes and junctions concerned. The Plan treats DPSC1 as part of the background. For the lanes, the crossroads and the High Street, it is the largest single addition of all.

(b) Village character, heritage and countryside

Separate identity. The Council's own site assessment rejected this land (SHELAA Site 1075) at its final stage, because it could contribute to coalescence of settlements. According to the Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Plan's Proposals Map places the part of the site east of Cuckfield Road within the Local Gap between Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill. Policy Hurst C3 permits development in the countryside only if it does not, individually or cumulatively, cause coalescence. The Parish Council measures the gap at about 1.5 kilometres, falling to about 700 metres with MM74 and MM60 built. The MM74 policy itself requires a landscape buffer on the northern and north-eastern edges "to limit perceived coalescence" with Burgess Hill and DPSC1. That is an admission of the risk, and a buffer cannot remove it. The land is rural, separated from Hurstpierpoint's northern edge by a tree and woodland belt along a watercourse, and development would sit as an incursion beyond that edge.

Heritage. The policy asks for a Heritage Statement and landscape assessment to protect views to the Grade II listed Hurstpierpoint College. Those assessments have not been done. The allocation depends on work that should have come first, and section 66 of the Planning (Listed

Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to the setting of a listed building.

(c) Infrastructure

Foul drainage and water. Wastewater from Hurstpierpoint drains to the Goddards Green works. Southern Water's Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (October 2022) records that system's permitted discharge as 9,917 cubic metres a day, and its BRAVA risk assessment (2020) found Goddards Green to be one of only 13 of 68 systems in the Adur and Ouse catchment at increased risk of breaching its permit because of additional homes and businesses. The Parish Council reports tanker queues at Goddards Green and supply outages and low pressure locally. I see tanker movements on Malthouse Lane and nearby lanes. No updated headroom figures for all of DPSC1, DPSC3 and MM71 to MM76 together have been published. The MM74 policy contains no foul drainage or water supply requirement, and MM39 deletes the sewerage phasing safeguard that would have stopped homes being occupied before capacity exists.

My request to the Inspector

I ask the Inspector to find MM74 unsound, because it is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy, and to delete it from the Plan in full. I do not suggest any conditional or alternative form of the allocation.