



TECHNICAL ANNEX A

TECHNICAL ANNEX A	1
Transport and Highway Impact	2
A1. Introduction	2
A2. Existing Traffic Conditions	2
A3. Cumulative Assessment Methodology	2
A4. Network Constraints	3
A5. Sustainable Transport Considerations	4
A5. Rail Accessibility and Station Capacity	4
A6. Hassocks Station Capacity Constraints	5
A7. Burgess Hill and Displacement Effects	5
A8. Bus Connectivity	6
A9. Policy Implications	6
A10. Conclusion (Rail Accessibility)	6
TECHNICAL ANNEX B	7
Drainage, Surface Water and Wastewater Infrastructure	7
B1. Introduction	7
B2. Topography and Soil Conditions	7
B3. Sequential and Cumulative Considerations	8
B4. Wastewater Network Capacity	8
B5. Climate Change Resilience	9
B6. Conclusion (Drainage)	9
TECHNICAL ANNEX C	11
Landscape Character, Settlement Gaps and Coalescence	11
C1. Introduction	11
C2. Settlement Context	11
C3. Policy Context	11
C4. Cumulative Visual Impact	12
C5. Settlement Identity and Character	12
C6. Conclusion (Landscape)	13



Transport and Highway Impact

A1. Introduction

This Annex addresses the cumulative transport impacts of site allocations DPSC3, DPSC4, DPSC5, DPSC6 and DPSC7 in Sayers Common and assesses their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2023), particularly paragraphs 105, 114 and 115.

A2. Existing Traffic Conditions

A2.1 Sayers Common is located on the B2118, which provides access to the northbound A23 and serves as a through-route for traffic originating beyond the village.

A2.2 Traffic monitoring from Speed Indicator Devices (SID) between April 2024 and September 2025 recorded:

- 882,630 total vehicle movements
- 526,690 vehicles exceeding the 30mph speed limit

A2.3 These figures demonstrate that the village is already experiencing:

- High through-traffic volumes
- Persistent speed limit exceedances
- Pre-existing highway safety concerns

A2.4 The existing baseline therefore cannot be characterised as low-impact rural traffic conditions.

A3. Cumulative Assessment Methodology



A3.1 NPPF paragraph 114 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if residual cumulative impacts are severe or if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

A3.2 The key issue is cumulative impact.

A3.3 SCVS is concerned that Transport Assessments have considered individual allocations in isolation rather than modelling:

- All five sites together
- Background traffic growth
- Interaction with recent developments (Goldcrest, Winter Green Way, Woodlands)
- Through-traffic patterns linked to A23 access

A3.4 Without cumulative modelling, the assessment risks materially understating peak hour flows and junction stress.

A3.5 The Inspector must be satisfied that cumulative residual impacts have been robustly assessed, not inferred.

A4. Network Constraints

A4.1 The village lacks:

- A parallel east-west distributor route
- Strategic bypass capacity
- Alternative non-village access to the northbound A23

A4.2 As a result, local roads carry both local and strategic through-traffic.

A4.3 Increased dwelling numbers will inevitably increase:

- School-related trips



- Commuting trips
- Delivery vehicle movements
- Visitor traffic

A4.4 Even modest individual site trip generation, when aggregated across five allocations, becomes material in a constrained network.

A5. Sustainable Transport Considerations

A5.1 NPPF paragraph 105 requires significant development to be located where it can be made sustainable through genuine transport choice.

A5.2 Bus services operate at approximately one per hour with limited early morning and evening provision.

A5.3 Railway access at Hassocks and Burgess Hill requires car travel for most residents.

A5.4 As such, modal shift assumptions may be optimistic.

A5.5 Without substantial public transport enhancement secured and funded, the proposed scale of growth risks increasing car dependency.

A5. Rail Accessibility and Station Capacity

A5.1 The sustainability of the allocations partially relies upon access to rail services at Hassocks and Burgess Hill.

A5.2 However, Sayers Common has no direct rail access and limited bus connectivity to these stations.

A5.3 In practice, most rail users from Sayers Common must travel by private car.



A6. Hassocks Station Capacity Constraints

A6.1 Hassocks station car park reaches effective weekday capacity early in the morning peak period.

A6.2 Once capacity is reached:

- Commuters park in surrounding residential streets;
- Local congestion increases;
- Accessibility for residents diminishes.

A6.3 The cumulative addition of housing in Hassocks, Burgess Hill and Sayers Common will materially increase peak demand for station parking.

A6.4 Without confirmed parking expansion or alternative sustainable access provision, assumptions of rail modal shift may be overstated.

A7. Burgess Hill and Displacement Effects

A7.1 Burgess Hill station serves a larger urban population and is itself subject to substantial housing growth allocations.

A7.2 Increased demand from surrounding settlements may:

- Saturate existing parking provision;
- Increase journey times accessing the station;
- Displace commuters further afield.

A7.3 Haywards Heath station is also heavily used and frequently at weekday capacity.

A7.4 This creates a potential displacement pattern whereby growth in smaller settlements indirectly increases car mileage and congestion across the wider rail network catchment.



A8. Bus Connectivity

A8.1 Bus services from Sayers Common operate typically at hourly intervals with restricted early morning and evening coverage.

A8.2 Services are not demonstrably aligned with commuter rail timetables.

A8.3 Without high-frequency, timetable-integrated bus services secured via planning obligation, rail access cannot be assumed to be sustainable.

A9. Policy Implications

A9.1 NPPF paragraph 105 requires development to offer genuine transport choice.

A9.2 Where rail access is dependent on private car travel to stations with constrained parking capacity, the sustainability case is weakened.

A9.3 SCVS is not aware of:

- A cumulative station parking demand assessment;
- A funded station expansion programme aligned with housing growth;
- A secured bus service enhancement strategy.

A9.4 In the absence of this evidence, the Inspector cannot be satisfied that the transport impacts of the allocations are fully assessed or that sustainable travel assumptions are realistic.

A10. Conclusion (Rail Accessibility)

The reliance on nearby rail stations to demonstrate sustainability is not supported by evidence of:



- Sufficient parking capacity;
- Integrated bus connectivity;
- Cumulative demand modelling;

Accordingly, SCVS submits that the sustainability case underpinning the allocations is materially weakened.

TECHNICAL ANNEX B

Drainage, Surface Water and Wastewater Infrastructure

B1. Introduction

This Annex addresses surface water management, flood risk and wastewater capacity in relation to allocations DPSC3–DPSC7, with reference to NPPF paragraphs 162–169 and 180.

B2. Topography and Soil Conditions

B2.1 Sayers Common lies within a natural basin. Surface water from surrounding higher land flows toward the centre of the village.

B2.2 The area is characterised by clay-based soils with low permeability and reduced infiltration capacity.

B2.3 These baseline characteristics increase susceptibility to:

- Surface water accumulation



- Slow drainage
- Runoff concentration during heavy rainfall

B3. Sequential and Cumulative Considerations

B3.1 NPPF paragraph 162 requires application of the Sequential Test to steer development to areas of lowest flood risk.

B3.2 Paragraph 166 requires development not to increase flood risk elsewhere.

B3.3 The allocations are predominantly located on elevated land surrounding the settlement. Increased impermeable surfaces will increase runoff directed into the basin.

B3.4 SCVS is not aware of published cumulative hydrological modelling assessing:

- Combined runoff from all five allocations
- Interaction with recent developments
- Climate change allowances

B3.5 Without this cumulative modelling, the downstream risk profile cannot be fully understood.

B4. Wastewater Network Capacity

B4.1 Residents have reported sewage surcharge events and capacity pressures.

B4.2 NPPF paragraph 180(e) requires that development prevents unacceptable water pollution.

B4.3 Paragraph 35(c) requires plans to be deliverable.



B4.4 If the wastewater network is operating at or near capacity, additional load must be preceded by:

- Confirmed capacity upgrades
- Funded capital works
- Clear delivery phasing aligned with occupation

B4.5 Absent such confirmation, the allocations risk being undeliverable within the plan period.

B5. Climate Change Resilience

B5.1 NPPF paragraph 165 requires plans to take account of climate change over the lifetime of development.

B5.2 Increased rainfall intensity projections must be factored into drainage modelling.

B5.3 Incremental development on elevated land in a basin settlement creates systemic cumulative risk if not comprehensively managed.

B6. Conclusion (Drainage)

In the absence of:

- Cumulative runoff modelling
- Confirmed wastewater upgrade programming
- Infrastructure phasing guarantees

SCVS submits that the Inspector cannot be satisfied that the Plan is effective (NPPF para 35(c)) or consistent with flood risk policy (paras 162–169).





TECHNICAL ANNEX C

Landscape Character, Settlement Gaps and Coalescence

C1. Introduction

This Annex addresses landscape character and settlement separation in relation to allocations DPSC3 and DPSC5, with reference to NPPF paragraphs 127 and 180.

C2. Settlement Context

C2.1 Sayers Common is a small rural settlement distinct from Albourne and Hurstpierpoint.

C2.2 Open land at Coombe Farm and south of Albourne currently provides:

- Visual separation
- Physical open space buffers
- Retention of rural character

C2.3 These areas function as informal settlement gaps even where not formally designated.

C3. Policy Context

C3.1 NPPF paragraph 127(c) requires development to be sympathetic to local character and landscape setting.



C3.2 Paragraph 180(a) requires planning policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

C3.3 Preventing settlement coalescence is a recognised planning objective where rural identity is at risk.

C4. Cumulative Visual Impact

C4.1 Individual site landscape assessments may show limited localised harm.

C4.2 However, cumulative development on multiple edges of a small settlement alters:

- Perception of village scale
- Edge definition
- Relationship between built form and countryside

C4.3 Incremental erosion of open land between settlements risks long-term physical merging.

C4.4 SCVS submits that the cumulative visual and spatial effect of five allocations has not been adequately assessed as a single composite landscape impact.

C5. Settlement Identity and Character

C5.1 The village's rural character derives from:

- Compact form
- Clear countryside boundaries
- Open fields separating settlements

C5.2 Once eroded, settlement separation cannot be restored.



C5.3 The precautionary principle should therefore apply in spatial strategy decisions.

C6. Conclusion (Landscape)

SCVS submits that, without a comprehensive cumulative landscape assessment and clear protection of settlement gaps, the allocations risk conflict with NPPF paragraphs 127 and 180 and undermine the distinct identity of Sayers Common.