MID SUSSEX
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Position Statement

Mid Sussex District Council and National Highways

October 2026

Parties to the Agreement

- Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC)
- National Highways (NH)

Signatories



Date: 22 October 2026

Eric Owens
Interim Assistant Director of Planning and Sustainable Economy

Mid Sussex District Council



Date: 23 October 2026

Nigel De Wit, Spatial Planner
National Highways

1. Introduction and Background

1.1. This Position Statement is between Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) and National Highways (NH). It sets out the latest position with regards to the transport work that has been prepared to support the submitted Mid Sussex Local Plan, which is currently at Examination.

1.2. As set out in MS-TP5: In-Combination Testing – Conclusions [MS-TP5], prior to the Examination Hearings held in February and March 2026, the position of NH was agreed in a Statement of Common Ground (October 2024) [DC19] and the response to Action Point AP-016 [AP-016]. These were based on the position at that time, and in relation to the sites proposed in the Submission District Plan.

1.3. DC19 and AP-016 confirmed agreement that:

- Towards the end of the local plan period traffic flow are forecast to exceed design capacity at some of the merges and diverges of junctions on the A23. In some cases, this occurs in the reference case (i.e. pre-existing capacity issues that are likely to occur as a result of committed development and background growth) and are principally related to traffic flows on the A23 mainline. The Local Plan growth typically contributes only a small amount of traffic growth on the A23.
- There are mitigation solutions possible in some locations, although actual need is uncertain due to the inherent difficulty of accurately predicting future travel behaviours.
- The 'monitor and manage' approach is endorsed as the primary mechanism to observe, influence and react to actual travel behaviour change. In this way, NH is content that impacts arising from development can be managed satisfactorily. This is on the basis that design capacity exceedances are likely to arise towards the end of the plan period, and are only partly attributable to Local Plan growth. Therefore, the monitor and manage approach would be a satisfactory way of dealing with the matter.

2. Scenario 7

2.1 The Council has engaged closely with NH in preparing the updated transport study, which included an updated merge/diverge assessment focussed on the impact that the plan, including the additional 35 sites, have on the operation of the SRN.

2.2 The updated assessments do not demonstrate that the impacts associated with the additional 35 sites would impact on the overall soundness of the Local Plan in terms of the effect on the operation of the SRN. The results do not demonstrate that the plan would give rise to unacceptable safety impacts or otherwise severe impacts on the A23 mainline in terms of the definitions within the NPPF.

2.3 The reasons for this are the same as those which underpinned NH's original position, i.e. that traffic flows are forecast to exceed design capacity of the A23 mainline towards the end of the Local Plan period, but the local plan itself contributes only a small amount of the associated traffic growth. The A23 is a finite resource, and capacity improvement would be of a strategic scale for which the government has no current plans as made clear by the government's Road Investment Strategy (RIS) 3 being focused on maintenance and renewal. The Monitor and Manage approach, introduced at MM17, see below, will help to ensure that the M23/A23 continues to function as a safe and efficient strategic route for as long as possible by supporting sustainable transport policies and initiatives.

2.4 NH do not require any further analysis stemming from the Scenario 7 results. NH recognise that the further analysis may be required in relation to localised traffic impacts associated with individual allocations, on parts of the network not assessed within the Local Plan evidence base, for example, the access arrangements for Crabbet Park. This further analysis will inform approaches towards mitigation which can be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and monitored by the Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG) in due course. The IDP will include mitigation necessary to accommodate the growth in the plan. NH will support the delivery of necessary enhancement to its network but cannot fund or lead the delivery of infrastructure on the SRN outside of the RIS process.

3. Response to Main Modification Consultation

3.1 NH submitted a representation to the Main Modifications consultation. The representation is summarised in the table below:

Modification Number	Policy	Summary of comment
MM17	DPT1: Placemaking and Connectivity	NH supports the insertion on 'monitor and manage in line with national policy DfT Circular 01/2022, the Governments policy for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).
MM36	DPSCGEN: Significant Site Requirements	NH support the additional modification to Policy DPSCGEN in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and national policy DfT Circular 01/2022.
MM95	DPI1: Infrastructure Provision	NH welcomes the insertion of the 'monitor and manage' approach to deliver transport infrastructure in

		line with national policy DfT Circular 01/2022. NH request additional text to be included which reflects NH position with regards to delivery of improvements to the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

3.2 The Council notes NH support for the modifications to Policy DPT1, Policy DPSCGEN and Policy DPI1.

4. Conclusion

4.1 As set out in MS-TP5, both parties agree that the position reached prior to the examination hearings in 2026 demonstrated that there were no objections to the sites in the Submission District Plan.

4.2 Both parties agree that the updated transport study, including the updated merge/diverge assessments, concludes that overall, the additional 35 sites would not impact on the overall soundness of the Local Plan in terms of impact on the SRN. The results do not demonstrate impacts that would be considered 'severe' in terms of the definitions within the NPPF.

4.3 There are no unresolved Strategic Road Network (SRN) related matters in respect of the Mid Sussex District Local Plan.