



Statement of Common Ground

On behalf of

Ansty & Staplefield Parish Council and Cuckfield Parish Councils (Rule 6
Party)

Land East of Ansty Way, Cuckfield Bypass, West Sussex, RG17 5AG

Planning Inspector Reference 6002030

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Landscape	4
3. Highways	5
4. Planning	6
5. Statement Signatory	7

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement of common ground is intended to assist the Inspector in isolating the key issues of agreement and disagreement between the parties. For simplicity and ease of reference, this statement does not seek to introduce additional matters or phrasing. Rather, it identifies relevant paragraphs from the appellant, the County Council and the Local Planning Authority that are agreed or disputed.
- 1.2 For brevity, this statement of common ground does not opine on all sentences stated in each common ground, and no inference should be made on those paragraphs unreferenced.
- 1.3 This statement of common ground is produced on behalf of the Parish councils with input from the relevant landscape, transport and planning witnesses providing evidence. Namely Louise Hooper (LHLA), David Lewis (Velocity) and Mark Connell (Sphere25).

2. Landscape

2.1 A Statement of Common Ground was produced by Clare Brockhurst on behalf of the appellant and agreed with the local planning authority. The document is dated 5th May.

Matters of Agreement

2.2 The following paragraphs and statements are agreed with by the Parish Councils.

- Paras 1.1 to 1.5
- Paras 1.7 to 1.11
- Paras 1.13 to 1.14
- Paras 2.1 to 2.7 We agree with these stated Areas of Disagreement

Not Agreed

2.3 The following paragraphs and statements are disputed by the Parish Councils.

- Para 1.6 We disagree with the assertion that the Appeal Site is not a Valued Landscape
- Para 1.12 We disagree with the recommendation of the Committee Update in respect of the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the HWNL

3. Highways

3.1 A statement of Common Ground was produced by Milestone Transport Planning. It was agreed with West Sussex County Council. The document is dated “April 2026” and issued as version 3.

Matters of Agreement

3.2 The following paragraphs and statements are agreed with by the Parish Councils.

- Para 4. 7 to 4.9 - we have raised no comment on the design of the site access junctions
- Para 4.11 to 4.13 – we have raised no comment on junction capacity modelling presented or proposed mitigation at off-site junctions.
- Para 4.24 - we have raised no comment on proposed traffic regulation orders.
- Para 4.32 – we have raised no comment on proposed car or cycle parking provisions.

Not Agreed

3.3 The following paragraphs and statements are disputed by the Parish Councils.

- Para 4.2 to 4.6 – we disagree that the proposals provide appropriate access by foot, by cycle or by public transport.
- Para 4.14 to 4.16 – we disagree with the proposals relating to works to public rights of way and their suitability to provide access to the site.
- Para 4.17 to 4.18 - we disagree that the proposals provide adequate cycle connections to local destinations, services and facilities.
- Para 4.33 to 4.35 – we disagree that the Appeal Scheme provides appropriate access to public transport.

Matters of Dispute

3.4 It is stated that there are no matters of dispute in the appellants statement of common ground with West Sussex County Council. This is not the position of the Parish Councils as identified above.

4. Planning

4.1 A statement of Common Ground was produced by Wolf Bond Planning. It was agreed with Mid Sussex Council as local planning authority. The document is dated “6 May 2026”.

Matters of Agreement

4.2 The following paragraphs and statements are agreed with by the Parish Councils.

- *“It is accepted that the Council is not currently able to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land.”* (Paragraph 5.1)
- *“It is accepted that development policies for the supply of housing are out of date”* (Paragraph 5.2)

Not Agreed

4.3 The following paragraphs and statements are disputed by the Parish Councils.

- It is not accepted that... *“the Appeal Site, subject to a suitable s106 Agreement to secure the delivery of the appropriate on-site infrastructure, can be considered to be a sustainable location”*
- It is not accepted that *“...the Appeal Site does not comprise a valued landscape”* (Paragraph 5.6)

Matters of Dispute

4.4 The matters of dispute listed in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.6 between the appellant and the local planning authority are also shared by the Parish Councils.

5. Statement Signatory

- 5.1 This statement of common ground is produced on behalf of the Parish Councils with input from the relevant landscape, transport and planning witnesses providing evidence. Namely Louise Hooper (LHLA), David Lewis (Velocity) and Mark Connell (Sphere25).



Dated 21 May 2026

Mark Connell
Sphere25 LLP
(On behalf of the Rule 6 Parish Councils)