David Goddard
College Lane, Hurstpierpoint
October 2026

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

Hearing statement: MM60 Land west and east of Malthouse Lane, Burgess Hill

Tuesday 3 November 2026, 10:30 session. Written statement; I cannot attend.

I am a resident of College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, and cannot attend the hearing. I ask that this statement be treated as my evidence on MM60 under the Inspector's agenda. It addresses only MM60, and I do not repeat my earlier representation. MM60 is described as at Burgess Hill, but the Parish Council's representations say much of it lies in the parish of Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common, and its effects would fall on Hurstpierpoint.

Why MM60 is unsound

The Council's own assessment rejected this land. SHELAA Site 1105 was rejected at its final stage because 750 homes would worsen the A23/A2300 junction and deliverability alongside DPSC1 was not shown. MM60 is the same site, with more allocations around it. Nothing published explains what has changed.

Its second access depends on another site being built. The secondary access runs through DPSC1, with works on Danworth Lane that the policy does not describe.

It sits on a lane that cannot stay open for one repair. Malthouse Lane has been closed for weeks at a time while a single sewer failure was dealt with. It would have to take the construction and occupation traffic of 750 homes.

Nothing is committed. There is no school, no committed bus service, no foul drainage or flood risk criterion and no delivery trajectory.

It would close the gap. The Parish Council measures the gap with Burgess Hill at about 1.5 km, falling to about 700 metres with MM60 and MM74 built.

My request: find MM60 unsound and delete it in full.

Considering the sites together

MM60 allocates 750 homes on 54 hectares. It sits beside DPSC1 (1,350 homes), MM74 and MM76 (150 each) and the three College Lane sites. Its secondary access depends on DPSC1. Its policy, like the others, is written as if the site stood alone, and no evidence tests the combined effect on the A273, the lanes serving Hurstpierpoint, the High Street, Stonepound Crossroads 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. The Council's own site assessment (SHELAA Site 1105) rejected this land at its final stage because the quantum of development was likely to worsen existing problems at the A23/A2300 junction, impacts were already arising from DPSC1, and the Council did not have sufficient evidence to be confident the site was deliverable in combination with DPSC1. MM60 is that same site, now with more allocations around it. Nothing published explains what has changed.

(a) Movement

Access. The primary access is a new roundabout on Jane Murray Way, and the secondary access is a new junction on Danworth Lane, reached through DPSC1 and unspecified Danworth Lane improvements. The second access therefore depends on another site being

built and on works that the policy does not describe. I have seen no evidence of what the roundabout would do to the A273, or of how 750 homes' traffic would join the road network, either alone or with DPSC1.

The lanes to Hurstpierpoint. MM60 sits directly on Malthouse Lane, which becomes College Lane. The Parish Council says Danworth Lane and Malthouse Lane are unsuitable for more traffic. The policy itself recognises the problem. It requires the northern extent of Malthouse Lane to "provide space for non-car modes" to retain rural character, but it contains no measure to stop cars using it. Traffic from MM60 heading for Hassocks, Stonepound Crossroads or the south could use Malthouse Lane and College Lane, avoiding the High Street, so it would not be counted in the High Street traffic surveys.

First-hand evidence. I live on College Lane, which Malthouse Lane joins directly. 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, so there is no room to add a footway or path. (The pavement ends at 50.932454, -0.163445 and the stretch ends at 50.935745, -0.163679.) At school drop-off and collection times, traffic there queues for five to ten minutes. Children and parents walk in the carriageway. Malthouse Lane has stretches without a pavement and is used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders alongside traffic. The made Neighbourhood Plan records that vehicle speeds on the parish's rural roads are unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, and the MM60 policy says nothing about horse riders beyond keeping public rights of way on their present alignment. Press reports record Southern Water closing Malthouse Lane for weeks at a time, with tankers working around the clock, while a sewer failure was dealt with. A lane that cannot stay open during one repair cannot take the construction and occupation traffic of 750 homes.

The High Street and Stonepound Crossroads. 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 says its pinch points are caused by its width, geometry and listed buildings, and that measures to ease flow were last carried out in 2018. The Council's transport report does not, in its text, assess the High Street or the lanes, and the Inspector has already found the Council's paper MS-13 to be largely about junction capacity. At Stonepound Crossroads the Council's study has 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.

Buses, walking and facilities. The policy offers bus service improvements to be "considered", including re-routing or extending services, mobility hubs and active travel routes along Malthouse Lane and Danworth Lane. It has no committed service and no route. It provides a neighbourhood centre and a nursery but no school. Education appears only as a financial contribution, and I have seen no evidence of where the children would go to school or how they would travel.

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) Landscape, countryside and heritage

Separate identity. According to the Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Plan's Proposals Map places the whole of MM60 within the parish 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 and loss of separate identity. The Parish Council measures the gap at about 1.5 kilometres, falling to about 700 metres with MM60 and MM74 built. The policy asks only for a landscape buffer on the western and southern edges "to minimise perceived coalescence". That is an admission of the risk, not an answer to it.

Landscape. The Parish Council describes the land as rural, falling from north to south, with the eastern parcel on an east-west ridge. Development there would be widely visible from the south, towards the South Downs National Park, and would end the clear edge to Burgess Hill that was planned and delivered with the town's western expansion. Public rights of way cross the land and give those views. The policy asks only that the watercourse and ponds be "considered".

Heritage. The policy requires views of the Hurstpierpoint College chapel to be retained and the setting of the Grade II listed Kents Farmhouse to be preserved or enhanced, "informed by a Heritage Statement" that has not been produced. The Parish Council says there are many viewpoints of the College from in and around the site, and that with MM74 and MM76 housing would surround it on several sides. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to the setting of listed buildings. The Plan cannot show it has done that.

(c) Infrastructure, delivery and capacity

Foul drainage and water. Wastewater from the area 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. No updated headroom figures for DPSC1, DPSC3 and MM71 to MM76 together with MM60 have been published. The MM60 policy has no foul drainage or water supply criterion, and MM39 deletes the sewerage phasing safeguard that tied DPSC1's occupation to adequate sewerage.

Flood risk. The policy has no flood risk criterion. It asks only that the Herrings Stream and nearby ponds be considered in the drainage strategy and provides a green corridor with SuDS. A drainage strategy is not a flood risk assessment, and I have seen none for this allocation.

Delivery. The policy text I have seen gives no trajectory or phasing for 750 homes. The highway works and sustainable transport measures appear only as headings, with no detail or costing. The secondary access depends on DPSC1, and the Council's own assessment doubted deliverability alongside DPSC1. A site with an uncertain access, no committed bus service, no foul drainage requirement and no delivery programme has not been shown to be deliverable.

My request to the Inspector

I ask the Inspector to find MM60 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.