

MS-TP1:

Updates since Submission

In response to Inspector's Initial Letter [IDJB-01] Annex 1:

(g) Infrastructure planning including highways and social infrastructure

(h) Relevant updates relating to nearby authorities, for example progress on local plans, declarations of unmet housing need, and changing circumstances in respect of water neutrality.

(i) Public engagement and public policy alignment

January 2026



Contents

1. Nearby Authorities – Updates.....	2
Water Neutrality and Implications for Plan Making	2
Water Neutrality Position Statement	2
Implications of the Withdrawal Statement – Mid Sussex	2
Implications of the Withdrawal Statement – Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area	3
Other Neighbouring Authority Areas.....	4
Declarations of Unmet Housing Need	4
2. Public Engagement and Public Policy Alignment.....	6
Duty to Co-Operate Statement.....	6
Recording Engagement and Agreements	6
Outcomes	8
Strategic Planning Issue 1 - Meeting Housing Need	8
Strategic Planning Issue 2 - Jobs and Employment	9
Strategic Planning Issue 3 – Transport	10
Strategic Planning Issue 4 – Infrastructure	10
Strategic Planning Issue 5 – Environment	11
3. Infrastructure Planning – Update.....	12
Infrastructure Planning and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	12
Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD Revocation	12
Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update	13
Sayers Common equalisation approach	13
Transport	14
Additional Evidence since Submission.....	14
Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG).....	16

1. Nearby Authorities – Updates

This section responds to the Inspector’s Initial Letter [IDJB-01] Annex 1 (h) “Relevant updates relating to nearby authorities, for example progress on local plans, declarations of unmet housing need, and changing circumstances in respect of water neutrality.”

- 1.1. Given the time that has passed since submission of the District Plan in July 2024, the Council wishes to make the Inspector aware of some significant updates which are material to the Plan’s examination. These are:
 - withdrawal of the Water Neutrality Position Statement; and
 - the subsequent positive impact this will have on plan-making in the Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area (NWSHMA).
- 1.2. Further factual updates from nearby authorities are included at the end of this section for completeness.

Water Neutrality and Implications for Plan Making

Water Neutrality Position Statement

- 1.3. The Water Neutrality Position Statement was issued by Natural England in September 2021. This impacted on a small area of Mid Sussex District which falls within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone. As a consequence, Mid Sussex District Council was included in the formal governance arrangements established to address water neutrality and included the agreed joint policy approach in the Submitted District Plan (Policy DPS5).
- 1.4. On 31st October 2025, Natural England issued a Withdrawal Statement [ENV21] confirming that its Water Neutrality Position Statement of September 2021 had been withdrawn. This follows agreement between Natural England, Southern Water and the Environment Agency that a reduction in the licence cap on water abstraction will ensure with sufficient certainty that development will not adversely impact the protected Arun Valley habitats. This is the primary element of interest to local authorities in making decisions regarding relevant plans or projects, as it removes the connection between abstraction and growth.

Implications of the Withdrawal Statement – Mid Sussex

- 1.5. The Withdrawal Statement means that development within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone will no longer be required to demonstrate it is water neutral.
- 1.6. Working together with the other local authorities, a joint policy approach was developed for water neutrality. The Submitted District Plan includes a joint policy on water neutrality. Whilst Mid Sussex included a relatively small area within the water neutrality zone, no development

was proposed in that area and no sites were submitted for the Council's consideration within that area.

- 1.7. However, due to Natural England's Withdrawal Statement, Policy DPS5 of the Submitted District Plan is no longer required. The Council will formalise this position in response to the Inspector's Comments and Proposed modifications on Development Management policies [IDJB-02] in due course.

Implications of the Withdrawal Statement – Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area

- 1.8. The most significant impact from the withdrawal of the Water Neutrality Position Statement (2021) has been for Horsham District Council (HDC) and the progress with their Local Plan.
- 1.9. Horsham adopted its Local Plan in 2015 and were subsequently working on a review, with a Regulation 19 version of the Plan due to be subject to consultation in 2021. Work was progressing - a version of this Plan was due to be considered by Horsham's Cabinet. However, this was postponed and subsequently not progressed due to changes to the NPPF and the publication of the Position Statement in September 2021 which had significant impacts on the Plan's content.
- 1.10. In the draft Regulation 19 version, HDC had intended to meet its local housing need in full plus a contribution towards approximately half of Crawley's unmet need (at that time, Crawley's unmet need was 5,925). As a result of the Position Statement, work on the Local Plan was paused until the full implications could be assessed. Due to the unprecedented position the water neutrality affected Councils found themselves in and significant amount of work involved both on an individual and joint authority basis to understand the implications, a Regulation 19 Plan was not published by HDC until 2024. The evidence base at that time concluded that HDC could no longer meet its local housing need (with an unmet need of around 2,275 dwellings) and could not contribute towards the unmet needs of Crawley. This position is explained more fully in the joint Northern West Sussex SoCG – Housing [DC4].
- 1.11. HDC also submitted its Local Plan for examination in July 2024. As explained within the Submission Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040, water neutrality meant that the amount and timing of development that could come forward in the plan period was limited.
- 1.12. Initial hearings of HDC's Local Plan were held in December 2024, with the Inspector's initial conclusions published in April 2025. The Inspector was minded to fail the Plan on Duty to Co-Operate grounds.
- 1.13. HDC wrote to their Inspector on 22nd December 2025 [[Horsham ref HDC46](#)] to explain that the removal of the Water Neutrality Position Statement would be positive for the Plan. HDC reviewed their housing trajectory and established that it could increase its housing requirement to 965 dwellings per annum, which would mean Horsham's local housing need could now be met in full. This would be achieved through intensification on existing allocations and new site allocations.

- 1.14. Given the changes in circumstances (the revocation of the legal requirements relating to the Duty to Co-Operate and withdrawal of the Position Statement) the examination of the Horsham Local Plan remains open. A procedural meeting is due to be held on 26th February 2026 to explore the feasibility and practical arrangements for restarting the hearings given the change in circumstances.
- 1.15. The NWSHMA authorities have continued to meet regularly since MSDC and HDC plans were submitted. In particular, HDC and MSDC have continued to liaise over the implications of water neutrality being lifted and the potential positive impacts this would have on housing supply for the NWSHMA.

Other Neighbouring Authority Areas

- 1.16. The Council is part of the Greater Brighton City Region, along with Arun, Worthing, Adur, Crawley, Lewes and Brighton and Hove. Since submission of the District Plan, the positions have changed in respect of plan making for the following authorities:
- **Brighton and Hove City Council** – a review of the adopted City Plan (2016) has commenced, with a Key Issues consultation taking place in January 2025. The Plan is progressing towards formal consultation in 2026 under the new system for plan-making. Whilst it is recognised that the unmet need from Brighton and Hove will be significant, the precise figure has not been formalised.
 - **Lewes District Council** – an initial Regulation 18 consultation for a new Local Plan took place in January 2025, with a second phase currently underway (December 2025 – February 2026). This version of the Plan demonstrates an unmet need. The two Councils are engaging regularly on the content of this plan, however the two are not within the same Housing Market Area.
 - **Wealden District Council** – a Regulation 18 consultation on a new Local Plan for the district is underway and demonstrates an unmet need. The two Councils are engaging regularly on the content of this plan, however the two are not within the same Housing Market Area.
 - **Tandridge District Council** – the Council is at an early stage of plan-making, with a Key Issues consultation scheduled to take place in 2026. The two Councils are engaging regularly on the content of this plan, however the two are not within the same Housing Market Area.

Declarations of Unmet Housing Need

- 1.17. The Council has received requests for assistance in meeting unmet need from a range of authorities. These are set out in full in [MSDC-AP013 appendix A7ii](#).
- 1.18. Since submission of the District Plan, the Council has received requests from:

- **South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)** – the SDNPA are progressing a new Local Plan and have completed one round of Regulation 18 consultation. The SDNPA have requested assistance from authority areas where there is an overlap (as Mid Sussex District includes a proportion of land within the National Park). The Council’s longstanding position (as agreed by SoCG [DC10]) is that Mid Sussex District Council will seek to meet its local housing need in full which includes the area of the district falling within the National Park. In other words, the Council will not seek to reduce its housing need on the basis that 10% of the district is within the Park and will continue this approach in respect to SDNPAs latest Plan.
- **Hastings Borough Council** – the Council has noted the request, but given the advanced status of the District Plan, geography, and no strategic housing links, has informed Hastings Borough Council that it cannot assist.

2. Public Engagement and Public Policy Alignment

This section responds to the Inspector's Initial Letter [IDJB-01] Annex 1 (i) "Public engagement and public policy alignment."

- 2.1. The Council has carried out extensive engagement with local authorities and stakeholders ('prescribed bodies') during the preparation of the District Plan in order to inform its content.
- 2.2. The Examination Library contains extensive detail on the Council's engagement with neighbouring authorities and the outcomes that have been achieved. This is set out in [MSDC-AP013](#) and accompanying appendices.
- 2.3. This Topic Paper therefore provides a succinct summary of the Council's engagement throughout the plan making process. Where relevant, this includes details of engagement post-submission of the District Plan.

Duty to Co-Operate Statement

- 2.4. The Duty to Cooperate Statement [[DC1](#)] paragraphs 3 – 28, sets out who, why and when the Council has engaged with during the preparation of the Plan. Paragraph 29 explains how the Council has undertaken engagement with these organisations and the outcomes achieved.
- 2.5. The statement confirms the five Strategic Planning Issues, which were the subject of engagement throughout preparation of the Plan. These are:
 - 1) Meeting Housing Need**
 - 2) Jobs and Employment**
 - 3) Transport**
 - 4) Infrastructure**
 - 5) Environment**
- 2.6. The Statement summarises the key relationships with prescribed bodies and how the Council has engaged with them throughout the plan-making process up to submission of the District Plan. This includes the Council's role on a number of cross-boundary groupings as well as the relationships with individual authorities and bodies.
- 2.7. [MSDC-AP013](#) sets out detail of the partners involved, work undertaken and outcomes reached for each Strategic Planning Issue.

Recording Engagement and Agreements

- 2.8. The Council has prepared signed Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with relevant partners. Each SoCG has been prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. With

respect to agreement of strategic issues, the starting point for them was those matters agreed for the adopted District Plan and subsequent Site Allocations DPD. At the start of the plan-making process for the submitted District Plan, the strategic planning issues were reviewed and agreed. This agreement is documented in the SoCGs in the examination library.

- 2.9. The Council has agreed SoCGs with all its local authority neighbours and County Councils as well as relevant prescribed bodies.

Table 1 – Signed Statements of Common Ground

Ref	Signatories	Date Agreed
DC3	Northern West Sussex (Crawley, Horsham and Mid Sussex) – General	July 2024
DC4	Northern West Sussex (Crawley, Horsham and Mid Sussex) – Housing. An addendum update is proposed to reflect the latest position, accounting for the material change in circumstances set out in this Topic Paper. This will be submitted as part of the Council’s response to the Inspector’s MIQs.	July 2024
DC5	Brighton and Hove City Council	July 2024
DC6	Crawley Borough Council	September 2024
DC7	East Sussex County Council	August 2024
DC8	Horsham District Council	August 2024
DC9	Lewes District Council	July 2024
DC10	South Downs National Park Authority	July 2024
DC11	Surrey County Council	July 2024
DC12	Tandridge District Council	July 2024
DC13	Wealden District Council	July 2024
DC14	West Sussex County Council - Position Statement	July 2024
DC15	West Sussex County Council	September 2024
DC16	Environment Agency	September 2024
DC17	National Highways - Memorandum of Understanding	July 2024

DC18	Natural England	August 2024
DC19	National Highways – Statement of Common Ground	October 2024

2.10. All the Council’s neighbours, County Councils and prescribed bodies confirm that Mid Sussex has engaged on an on-going basis throughout the plan-making process. This position has been confirmed in Regulation 19 consultation responses and Statements of Common Ground.

2.11. In total, Mid Sussex has participated in over 175 formal meetings with neighbouring authorities, statutory bodies, formal groupings during the preparation of the submitted District Plan. This includes regularly programmed meetings (such as the Northern West Sussex HMA meetings held every 8 weeks) to ensure that key issues and priority actions were progressed in a timely manner to ensure outcomes of the discussions influenced the content of the Plan. These programme meetings were supplemented by additional follow-up calls/emails to ensure timely progress on key matters. Much of this engagement was on an ad-hoc basis and are not formally recorded.

Outcomes

Strategic Planning Issue 1 - Meeting Housing Need

2.12. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- The most appropriate way to plan to meet housing needs across the HMA, e.g. joint plan, joint evidence.
- The scope of evidence to support plans including any jointly procured evidence.
- Site selection processes and spatial strategy.
- Cumulative impacts of planned housing developments.
- Allocation of sites and engagement on policy requirements.

2.13. Summary of Outcomes:

- To maximise scale of housing delivery across the HMA agreement to progress with reviews of individual plans.
- Agreement to jointly commission housing evidence and evidence to maximise housing supply.
- Recognition in the Plan that the Northern West Sussex HMA should be prioritised.
- Joint working on cross boundary sites including the proposed allocation of DPSC2: Crabbet Park including ongoing discussions on the site-specific proposals and policy requirements including infrastructure and active travel requirements and commitment to exploring nomination rights for affordable housing.

- Agreement that there are no further site options on/close to administrative boundaries, which represent a strategic option for meeting housing needs across the HMA.
- Agreement on Site Selection principles to guide plan-making with the aim of maximising supply.
- Increase in supply of brownfield sites identified in submitted District Plan.
- Inclusion of the agreed priority order in supporting text to DPH1: Housing which sets out the agreed approach towards unmet need in the NWS HMA.
- Allocation of sites to meet Mid Sussex need with an identified contribution towards the unmet need arising within the NWS HMA.

- 2.14. The focus for meeting housing need has been between the Northern West Sussex HMA authorities, given this is the established primary HMA. This is in accordance with the agreed priority order set out in the Plan and agreed NWS HMA statement of common ground [DC4]. This work builds upon the strong relationships between the NWS authorities whereby unmet need within the HMA was met in full for the last suite of adopted Local Plans.
- 2.15. This is not to say that unmet housing need in other authority areas, in particular Brighton and Hove (which is in a secondary overlapping HMA with the southern part of Mid Sussex) has been ignored. As set out in Policy DP5: Planning to Meet Future Housing Need of the adopted District Plan, the Council committed to support joint work on a strategic multi-authority approach to address this need and has played a proactive role in this work. However, for reasons outside this Council's control (related to water neutrality), this work did not progress as expected. A SoCG between all parties involved sets out this position clearly and is in the evidence library [MSDC-AP012].
- 2.16. The Submission District Plan included an over-supply of 996 dwellings, which could contribute towards the unmet need arising in the Northern West Sussex HMA. It is notable that there is a full set of SoCG with neighbouring authorities, and no disquiet about the approach or quantum of development proposed towards unmet need within the Submission plan.
- 2.17. As a result of additional work carried out since submission, this position has significantly improved. Topic Paper 2 – Housing [MS-TP2] explains that the Council is now seeking to clarify the position towards unmet need, and is able to increase its contribution towards unmet need to 1,693 dwellings. An updated SoCG is proposed between the Northern West Sussex authorities to reflect this update and is intended to be submitted alongside the Council's response to Matters and Issues.

Strategic Planning Issue 2 - Jobs and Employment

- 2.18. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:
- Scope of evidence to be produced on a joint Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) basis
 - Determining employment need (and unmet needs) in the FEMA and beyond
 - Understanding of authorities' supply position and cumulative impacts

2.19. Summary of Outcomes:

- The joint evidence base has influenced the submitted District Plan by determining the employment need for the plan period and provide an understanding of the types of need within the FEMA. Given the jobs and employment position was concluded and agreed through the adopted District Plan and Site Allocations DPD and the review concluded no further allocations were required in the submitted District Plan.
- Sustainable communities sites are providing small-scale employment. Policy **DPE2: Existing Employment Sites** safeguards existing sites to ensure there is no loss in supply.

2.20. Further updates regarding Jobs and Employment are set out in Topic Paper 3 – Employment [MS-TP3].

Strategic Planning Issue 3 – Transport

2.21. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Preparation of transport evidence, including the Mid Sussex Transport Model
- Understanding cross-boundary impacts arising from Mid Sussex proposals and sharing these with neighbours
- Engaging with the West Sussex County Council Highways Authority and National Highways on results and determining interventions (both sustainable and physical)

2.22. Summary of Outcomes:

- Engagement with WSCC and NH to determine transport model assumptions and inputs
- Agreement from WSCC and NH that the transport model is fit-for-purpose
- Agreement from WSCC and NH on development assumptions such as trip rates, internalisation and sustainable travel
- Sharing cross-boundary impacts with neighbours (including neighbouring highways authorities) with no outstanding objections

2.23. Section 3 of this Topic Paper sets out updates with respect to Transport since submission, including ongoing engagement with WSCC and NH.

Strategic Planning Issue 4 – Infrastructure

2.24. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Understanding additional demand on existing infrastructure and requirements for new infrastructure resulting from proposed development
- The need to provide adequate healthcare facilities to meet the needs of the growing population

- The need to provide adequate education facilities to meet the needs of the growing population

2.25. Summary of Outcomes:

- Infrastructure requirements on a site-by-site and strategic basis set out in the District Plan policy requirements and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

2.26. Section 3 of this Topic Paper sets out updates that have taken place since Submission, including further engagement with statutory bodies on infrastructure requirements and delivery mechanisms.

Strategic Planning Issue 5 – Environment

2.27. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Understanding implications from water neutrality for Mid Sussex (as a small area of the district is impacted)
- Understanding implications from water neutrality for neighbouring authorities, including implications for meeting their housing need
- Identifying potential solution(s) to enable housing development to take place
- Assessing the impacts of the District Plan for the High Weald National Landscape (AONB), South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) and Ashdown Forest.

2.28. The position with regards to water neutrality has changed significantly since submission of the District Plan. This is discussed in more detail in other sections of this Topic Paper.

2.29. With regards to the High Weald National Landscape, South Downs National Park and Ashdown Forest, the Council has engaged with these groupings throughout plan making (as detailed in MSDC-AP013 appendices D2-D5) to assess the impacts of proposed developments on these designated sites, the identification of mitigation, and Policies DPC4 – DPC6.

3. Infrastructure Planning – Update

This section responds to the Inspector’s Initial Letter [IDJB-01] Annex 1 (g) “Infrastructure planning including highways and social infrastructure.”

Infrastructure Planning and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

- 3.1. In December 2023, the Council published an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as part of the Regulation 19 consultation ([IV1 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan \(January 2024\)](#)). The IDP was subsequently updated in September 2024 to reflect updated information, predominantly in relation to infrastructure requirements from providers and updated costings ([IV4 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan \(2024 Update\)](#)).
- 3.2. Since submission of the District Plan the Council has continued to progress work relating to the planning and delivery of infrastructure and developer contributions. These activities have been focused on the following four areas. A summary of progress made is provided in the following sub-sections:
- the revocation of the Council’s Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD;
 - the preparation of a further updated IDP; and
 - the approach to equalisation for infrastructure for the proposed strategic site allocation at Sayers Common.

Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD Revocation

- 3.3. In 2018 the Council adopted a Development Infrastructure and Contributions SPD (Development Contributions SPD), published shortly after the adoption of the 2018 Mid Sussex District Plan. The SPD provided further guidance in relation to how the Council would implement adopted Policy DP20: Securing Infrastructure of the District Plan and served as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
- 3.4. On 14 July 2025, the Leader of the Council agreed to revoke the Development Contributions SPD 2018¹. In the place of the SPD, the Council approved Position Statement 2 – Infrastructure [O16]. This was to ensure that planning applications could be assessed using up to date calculations set out in the Position Statement and that mitigation measures remained achievable and deliverable, by taking into account the latest IDP as the most current evidence available. The Position Statement reflects the content of Appendix 5 of the Submission Draft District Plan.

¹ [Delegated authority to revoke Development Infrastructure and Contribution SPD](#)

- 3.5. In accordance with paragraph 40 of the NPPF, the IDP has been subject to numerous consultations where there have been no unresolved objections. This means that some weight can be given to using latest calculations as a sound mechanism to charge higher levels of contributions to help alleviate the pressure on infrastructure created by new development and the Position Statement reflects this.
- 3.6. To date, two sites that are proposed for allocation in the Submission Draft District Plan have achieved planning permission. For both sites, the infrastructure contributions have been in accordance with the updated figures set out in the Position Statement and therefore the proposed requirements of Appendix 5 of the Submission Draft District Plan.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update

- 3.7. In August 2025, Council officers requested updates from infrastructure providers to inform an update to the IDP. Six responses were received from the following providers and have been incorporated into the updated IDP:
- Thames Water
 - Sussex Police
 - Southern Gas Network
 - Environment Agency
 - West Sussex County Council
 - Network Rail
- 3.8. In addition to these updates, Sussex Police and the NHS supplied revised Developer Contributions calculators for Police and Health contributions. These updated calculators have been published on the Council's website².
- 3.9. To reflect the work undertaken since the previous IDP was published, an updated IDP has been prepared and is published alongside this note [IV6].

Sayers Common equalisation approach

- 3.10. As outlined in the Submission District Plan, a series of sites at Sayers Common are proposed for allocation as a Sustainable Community, alongside delivery of services and facilities on-site to support sustainable growth. The allocations comprise the following³:
- **DPSC3:** Land to the South of Reeds Lane (1,850 dwellings, extra care housing provision, primary/secondary school, playspace, library, leisure facilities, healthcare provision, community facilities and open space)
 - **DPSC4:** Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane (33 dwellings)

² [Development Contributions - Mid Sussex District Council](#)

³ Topic Paper 2 – Housing, notes that individual applications have been submitted for DPSC4, DPSC5, and DPSC6 with revised yields.

- **DPSC5:** Land at Coombe Farm, London Road (210 dwellings)
- **DPSC6:** Land to west of Kings Business Centre, Reeds Lane (100 dwellings)
- **DPSC7:** Land south of LVS Hassocks, London Road (200 dwellings)

- 3.11. The delivery of strategic infrastructure must be carefully coordinated in consultation with all landowners and site promoters in this location. The Council has been working closely with infrastructure providers to ensure a holistic approach to infrastructure planning.
- 3.12. To achieve this, a proportionate and equitable approach to developer contributions is needed. The Council, in collaboration with West Sussex County Council and other infrastructure providers, are developing an equalisation approach to secure developer contributions and deliver the necessary infrastructure. This approach is being agreed in liaison with all landowners and site promoters for the proposed allocations and in accordance with the Sayers Common Statement of Common Ground [S1].
- 3.13. To further support this strategic approach, a Sayers Common Liaison Group has been established. The Liaison Group is led by Berkeley Latimer, as the site promoter for the largest parcel (DPSC3: Land to the South of Reeds Lane). The Group provides an open and constructive forum for local councillors, community representatives, the Council and Berkeley Latimer to share views and exchange information. Neighbouring land promoters and developers for the smaller allocations attend the meetings.
- 3.14. These positive updates help demonstrate the progress that has, and continues to be, made to secure infrastructure in this location, in accordance with the aspirations of the Submitted District Plan.

Transport

- 3.15. Following Regulation 19 consultation, National Highways determined that there were potential severe impacts on the Strategic Road Network (M23 and A23) and therefore suggested the Plan would need to take an alternative approach to either consider a different pattern of growth, commit to significant highways improvements, or commit to a more ambitious package of sustainable transport measures. A Memorandum of Understanding [DC17] was prepared to set out the additional work that was required in order to satisfy National Highways.
- 3.16. This additional work was undertaken and a Statement of Common Ground [DC19] prepared and agreed between MSDC and NH, on 23rd October 2024. This position has advanced positively since that time as set out below.

Additional Evidence since Submission

- 3.17. The following work was completed and forms the basis for the October 2024 SoCG:
- Mid Sussex District Plan Strategic Transport Assessment – October 2024 Update [T10]

- Merge Diverge Assessment Report – September 2024 [T11]
- Model Assumptions Note – September 2024 [T13]
- Safety Study Review – October 2024 [T15]

- 3.18. A Merge Diverge Assessment [T11] was published in September 2024. This was developed between Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC), its transport consultant Systra, West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and National Highways (NH) which demonstrated, based on modelling outputs, that in a number of locations, the Local Plan will have traffic impacts that, to comply with national policy in National Planning Policy Framework, Circular 01/2022 and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, would require the delivery of mitigation, mainly on grounds of safety.
- 3.19. The Statement of Common Ground identifies one agreed location for mitigation and a number of identified locations mentioned by either party as potentially requiring mitigation. It sets out that the precise list of locations of the necessary mitigations is not yet agreed and that further discussions are required between MSDC and NH to finalise the list.
- 3.20. To resolve the outstanding matters, MSDC and its transport consultant Systra had four further meetings with NH on 8th November 2024, 20th November 2024, 2nd December 2024 and 5th December 2024. The purpose of the meetings was to understand further the work required to overcome the remaining transport concerns set out within the Statement of Common Ground and to collaboratively agree a way forward.
- 3.21. Through these meetings, 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.
- 3.22. It was agreed that MSDC and NH endorse the Monitor and Manage approach as the primary mechanism for the following reasons:
- There is an element of uncertainty as to what the forecast level of traffic generation would be in five years' time. Current modelling uses a 2019 base and therefore may be an over-estimate given changes in driver behaviours since this date and moving forwards – particularly as a result of Covid-19. Monitor and Manage would ensure updated data could be taken into account, which may negate the need to commit to physical intervention at this early stage.
 - NH recognise that limited development is projected to come forward in the first five years of the Plan, therefore, at the planning application stage the position is likely to have changed; and

- Due to the development trajectory, should any physical interventions on the network be required (as a fallback to Monitor and Manage) these would not be until the latter part of the Plan period (estimated 2037 onwards).

3.23. To ensure successful implementation of the Monitor and Manage approach, it was agreed with NH that MSDC expedites the work on setting up a Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG).

Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG)

3.24. MSDC started work on setting up the TIMG in January 2025. The Terms of Reference for the TIMG were agreed and signed off in October 2025 [T16].

3.25. The Terms of Reference sets out details on the policy basis for the TIMG, the purpose and role, the membership, the frequency and form of meetings, agenda and reporting, key issues / agenda item for discussion, meeting chair and decision making, and record of meeting.

3.26. The Core Group of the TIMG (MSDC, WSCC and NH) have met twice in 2025 and a summary record of the meetings, including discussion points and actions, can be found in the table below:

Table 2 – TIMG Meetings

Date	Attendance	Discussion points	Actions
24/06/2025	MSDC WSCC NH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference – purpose and role; membership and meeting timeline; key issues and agenda items. • Date of next meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the draft Terms of Reference in light of the status of the submitted District Plan • Pull together a list of current transport schemes / funding pots to inform the IDP
01/10/2025	MSDC WSCC NH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference – agreed and signed off • List of transport schemes and funding pots – update on work • Update on IDP work • Monitoring – what is required • Date of next meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start to prioritise schemes identified within the IDP once list is received from WSCC

3.27. The next TIMG meeting is scheduled to be held on 4 February 2026. If it would be helpful to provide an update on the discussion points/actions arising from that meeting as part of our MIQ responses, please let us know and we would be happy to do so.