

**MID SUSSEX DISTRICT PLAN 2021–2039 EXAMINATION
HEARING STATEMENT
FROM THE HURSTPIERPOINT SOCIETY
RESPONDENT NUMBER 1186922**



Matter 7 Site allocations

DPSC 3 – 7 Sites in Sayers Common

b) The implications for the wider transport network (including the impact on nearby communities) and how necessary mitigation measures would be delivered.

We remain concerned that, despite detailed representations submitted at Regulation 18 and 19 stages, together with previous Examination Statements, there continues to be insufficient recognition of how the proposed sites in Sayers Common will impact the village of Hurstpierpoint — particularly in relation to traffic within and passing through the village. This is illustrated by the lack of any mention in either the Mid Sussex Transport Plan Strategic Transport Assessment (T10), or the West Sussex Transport Plan 2022 to 2036 (T14), of either Hurstpierpoint, or the B2116, which is the east-west route through the village along the High Street, despite Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council raising these issues many times for more than 30 years. In February 2024 Hurstpierpoint Society prepared its own Strategic Assessment, which was submitted as part of our Regulation 19 submission. It is disappointing that no response has been received to this Assessment from either WSCC or MSDC.

Therefore, this is another attempt to raise serious concern regarding these issues, which are affecting both the quality of life of residents and the viability of the otherwise thriving trading in the High Street.

Hurstpierpoint sits on a Greensand ridge and developed as an agricultural centre dating back to Saxon times. The village prospered after the Norman Conquest connecting with other Downland villages along this ridge, along an east-west route. Later, it became a north-south route crossing point at the crossroads in the centre of the village. It is likely that Hurstpierpoint would have become one of the main towns in the area except for the building of the London to Brighton railway, which opened in 1841. The railway had to avoid several large country estates and instead of following a coaching route through Cuckfield and Hurstpierpoint, it was built to the east creating the stations and population centres of Haywards Heath, Burgess Hill and Hassocks. Improved north-south routes developed to the east and west of Hurstpierpoint, but the east-west route for the Downland villages was not replaced, or improved, yet still remains an important road.

The strategic importance of this route was not fully understood during the piecemeal post war housing development in the village, nor was the nature and volume of future road traffic. Hence the land that could have provided an alternative route through the village was built on, leaving the High Street as the only road connecting Henfield, Albourne and other Downland villages to Hassocks (where the nearest railway station is situated, together with the local secondary school), Lewes and beyond.

Additionally, residents living in the eastern part of Hurstpierpoint travelling by car, must use the High Street to reach the car parks, enlarged primary school, medical centre and the library. Although pedestrian and cycle routes have been improved, there is no land available to improve the road in this rural area, where many rely on their cars. The advent of the South Downs National Park, directly abutting the Southern built up boundary of the entire village, further limits an alternative option.

The Hurstpierpoint Society Traffic Assessment from February 2024 highlights the problems in the High Street. This road dates to medieval times, with the earliest buildings from the 15th and 16th centuries. It is very clear that this medieval road was not designed for either the current level of traffic, the width of modern car design, nor the likely increase from the proposed 2,500 (approx) dwellings in Sayers Common, (nor the proposed developments at DPSC1 and DPA12 sites).

The District Plan talks about active and sustainable travel, together with building the infrastructure to include community facilities, which is intended to remove the need to travel to, or through Hurstpierpoint. However, when, or realistically how, or will this actually happen?

The document issued in January 2026 titled MS08: Development Management Policies – Proposed Modifications MSDC Response to IDJB-02 January 2026, states on page 42:

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that development should only be refused on highway grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or where, 'the residual cumulative (transport) impacts on the road network would be severe' (Paragraph 111). The Mid Sussex Transport Study has been prepared in consultation with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in their capacity as the Highway Authority and National Highways (NH) as the Highway Authority for the Strategic Road Network. The Study informs whether the development proposed by the District Plan is practical to deliver in principle; and whether mitigation of any significant impacts arising from the development on the transport network can be cost effectively mitigated. Strategic Objective 6 seeks to ensure that development is accompanied by the necessary infrastructure to support development and the community and any transport mitigation that is required to support development, will be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Yet the two studies referred to in this document do not include Hurstpierpoint, or the B2116, indicating that this is not considered to be a problem needing mitigation and it is difficult to see how it could be cost effectively mitigated.

The document issued in January 2026 titled MS-TP1: Updates since Submission, states in para 3.21:

...it was agreed with NH that the Monitor and Manage approach, which is being proposed in the District Plan, is the primary mechanism to be used to demonstrate that any impacts arising from development within the District Plan can be managed satisfactorily. This is recorded in MSDC-AP016 which captures the agreements reached following the initial hearings and meetings between the parties.

The Society is concerned that unless the traffic problems in the High Street are recognised, how can they be monitored, and from what starting point?

At times of heavy traffic, the High Street experiences near-daily congestion, and emergency vehicles can encounter difficulty passing through. Pedestrians must step into doorways to avoid large lorries using the pavement to get through, which then causes damage to the kerbstones creating further problems, especially for those with vision and mobility issues, or children's pushchairs.

A traffic light solution is frequently suggested by residents. However, the numerous access points from side roads and private driveways render this impractical. Additionally, several single-lane sections would result in queues backing up from red signals during peak periods, potentially blocking junctions and causing wider network paralysis.

Therefore, we request an acknowledgement of these concerns, together with a clear explanation of how they will be addressed and mitigated.

c) The implications for the impact on, and provision of, social and community facilities (such as schools and health facilities) and how necessary facilities would be funded and provided

Even with the level of infrastructure in Policies DPSC3-7, there is concern over the timing of this. The smaller sites DPSC 4 – 7 are already beginning to submit planning applications (MS-TP2: Housing January 2026 p9) but the main infrastructure is planned to be located in DPSC3. In the latest housing trajectory dated 1st April 2025 (H8) and MS-TP1: Updates since Submission, January 2026, site DPSC3 is not expected to yield any dwellings until Year 6 or 2030 at the earliest. It is unclear whether the associated infrastructure would be delivered at that stage or later.

Significantly, in response to the recent planning applications on site DPSC4, Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View (DM/25/1434), site DPSC5, Land at Coombe Farm, (DM/25/2661) and site DPSC 6 Land to the West of Kings Business Centre, (DM/25/3067), concerns have been raised about the infrastructure provision. NHS Sussex have responded that Mid Sussex Health Centre, which provides healthcare across Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common, Hassocks and Ditchling, is at capacity and significant financial contributions are needed to either extend a current site or build new premises. WSCC have advised that primary/secondary/further secondary schools within the catchment area would not have spare capacity to accommodate the assumed potential from these sites.

Until/unless the proposed infrastructure in Sayers Common is completed, people will need to use healthcare, education facilities, etc outside the immediate area of the proposed sites, which will not only be a strain on these, but will further impact on the traffic issues in Hurstpierpoint.

It is a huge concern that applications on these sites are being prematurely considered before the infrastructure has been legally secured.

**MID SUSSEX DISTRICT PLAN 2021–2039 EXAMINATION
HEARING STATEMENT
FROM THE HURSTPIERPOINT SOCIETY
RESPONDENT NUMBER 1186922**



Matter 7 Site allocations

DPSC1 Land West of Burgess Hill and North of Hurstpierpoint

NB Despite a previously agreed amendment to the site description following the Regulation 18 submissions, the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) (S3) between Mid Sussex District Council and Thakeham Homes, issued February 2026, refers to this site as Land West of Burgess Hill, ignoring its location in the Parish of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common.

c) The implications for the impact on, and provision of, social and community facilities (such as schools and health facilities) and how necessary facilities would be funded and provided

The SOCG anticipates receiving planning consent by Summer 2027, with the primary site access in Years 1 and 2 from Cuckfield Road, which is the road from Goddards Green to Hurstpierpoint. Access to the A273 (Jane Murray Way in Burgess Hill) is anticipated in Year 3, and the primary school is scheduled to open in Year 4, when the cumulative housing total is anticipated to be 324. Until that time, it is not clear which Primary School(s) will be used by residents, whether in Burgess Hill and/or Hurstpierpoint.

If residents are using the community facilities in Hurstpierpoint, there is concern for the capacity to absorb this, especially if it is a short-term measure needing a temporary solution, increasing local pressure on existing infrastructure in Hurstpierpoint.

It is noted that financial contributions will be made towards existing GP practices, but neither the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2025 (IV6), nor the SOCG clarify the location of these. NHS Sussex have commented in response to applications in Sayers Common:

Current Estate is at capacity in the Burgess Hill area.... The GP practice [Mid Sussex Health Centre, Hurstpierpoint] is at capacity and services this fairly large rural area.

Additionally, due to the location of the site in open countryside, there would be an intrinsic requirement to travel by car to Hurstpierpoint, as the planned sustainable transport links assume travel to the town centre in Burgess Hill.

There needs to be more clarity to the infrastructure plans and the potential detrimental impact on Hurstpierpoint.

**MID SUSSEX DISTRICT PLAN 2021–2039 EXAMINATION
HEARING STATEMENT
FROM THE HURSTPIERPOINT SOCIETY
RESPONDENT NUMBER 1186922**



Matter 7 Site allocations

DPA12 Land west of Kemps

There is some uncertainty about the inclusion of this site and the MSDC document MS-TP2 Housing January 2026 states that the Council is considering removing it from the potential supply.

There are several reasons why this should be removed, or reconsidered in terms of numbers:

1. The traffic issues in Hurstpierpoint are documented in the response to the sites in Sayers Common. Although this is for a smaller number of houses (90 dwellings) than the sites in DPSC3-7 and DPSC1, this will exacerbate existing issues and add to the cumulative effect of these nearby sites in terms of traffic issues and infrastructure. DPA12 includes highway works but, for the reasons previously stated, it's not clear how the existing problems can be mitigated.
2. The site is at risk of flooding from surface water and a surface water drainage strategy using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) is suggested to reduce the rate of discharge from houses. However, looking at the geology (bedrock is Weald clay formation mudstone) and the topography, it is easy to understand why the site regularly becomes waterlogged, especially in the southwestern section, and why SUDS may not be viable here.
3. The site abuts the grounds of Langton Grange (a listed building) to the south and southeast. Development here would impact the character of the Grange and diminish the sense of separation and rural isolation from the village of Hurstpierpoint. It would be necessary to significantly reduce the number and density of dwellings to protect the setting of this and the Langton Lane Conservation Area.