



SSP 8:

Post Hearings – Site Selection Review – Final Conclusions

July 2026



Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Site Selection Methodology Review	2
3. Methodology	3
Information Gathering	3
Individual Site Assessments	3
Fact Check	5
In-combination testing.....	5
4. Site Selection - Final Conclusions	5
Assessment against the Spatial Strategy	8
Protection of the High Weald AONB.....	8
Making effective use of Land	9
Growth at existing sustainable Settlements	9
• Category 1 Settlements.....	9
Opportunities for extensions to improve sustainability of existing settlements - Significant Sites.....	11
• Land at Ansty Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty	11
• Broad location West of A23	11
• Land at Hangman's Acre Farm and Little Walstead, Lindfield	11
Other Considerations.....	12

APPENDIX 1 (separate file) – Individual Site Assessments against Site Selection Criteria

APPENDIX 2 (separate file) – Site Selection Conclusions by Settlement

1. Introduction

1. The initial District Plan Examination Hearing's took place between 24th February and 19th March 2026. During these hearing sessions the Inspector considered the Local Housing Need, the spatial strategy and site selection, amongst other topics. The Inspector concluded that the Council should test an overall housing target in the range of 1,200 to 1,300 dpa, which will include a substantial component for the unmet housing needs of adjacent authorities. The Council was also asked to identify sufficient additional housing sites to meet a requirement towards the upper end of that range. The Inspector's interim conclusions are set out in full in [IDJB-12](#).
2. This paper sets out the work that the Council has undertaken to identify additional housing sites to meet a higher housing requirement. The Council published an initial list of 35 sites for further testing in May 2026. These sites have been subject to in combination testing including through the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulation Assessment and Transport Assessment. The Council has published its final list of additional site allocations to be included in the submitted District Plan as set out in DP2a Schedule of Main Modifications, alongside the supporting evidence base.

2. Site Selection Methodology Review

3. During the Matter 5 and 6 hearings, the Inspector noted that the Site Selection Methodology [[SSP1](#)] was generally sound although there were matters that needed to be addressed through the re-appraisal process. These matters are set out in MS-12: Post Hearings Site Selection Methodology Review.
4. The Council published [MS-12](#), which described the methodology that the Council intended to apply to re-appraise housing sites. The revised methodology was published for comments on 6th March and interested parties had until 13th March to respond.
5. The Council published the responses to MS-12 on 17th March and these are set out in [MS-14](#). The Council received responses from nine organisations and individuals. The Council also provided a summary response to comments made.
6. In his interim conclusions letter IDJB- 12, the Inspector states that the spatial strategy of the plan is sound and that it will be used to guide the selection of additional sites for inclusion in the Plan. He also concluded that the site selection methodology as set out MS-12 is sound and reflects the plan's spatial strategy. The Inspector provided the Council with additional advice regarding the application of the methodology in the site selection process, he stated:

“.....However, site selection is not a purely mechanical process and will be subject to professional and political judgement. Such judgement will be required when, for example, comparing the positives and negatives of sites that support different principles of the spatial strategy, and it will need to take into account a range of

considerations. Many of these considerations are set out in MS-12 paragraphs 9 and 10, but the methodology itself cannot wholly prescribe the outcome and should be regarded as guidance. In any event, all conclusions will need to be thoroughly justified”.

7. The Council has taken the Inspector’s interim conclusions into account when re-appraising sites and making decisions on sites to be subject to in-combination testing.

3. Methodology

8. This section of the paper explains the actions the Council has taken to reappraise sites, taking into account the methodology set out in MS-12 and the interim conclusions of the Inspector.

Information Gathering

9. The Council committed to updating the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) with the most up to date information from site promoters and include any new site submissions. The Council contacted representatives of all sites on its database, inviting them to complete a Site Information Request form which asked for updated information on yield, site ownership, constraints, delivery timescales and any supporting evidence related to mitigation and infrastructure. The Council received 91 completed forms and 67 emails with information on known sites.
10. An additional 20 new sites were submitted during this call for additional information, which have now been included in the SHELAA and Site Selection Assessment, alongside any other sites submitted to the Council since the previous SHELAA was published.

Individual Site Assessments

11. The Council committed to reviewing all site assessments, irrespective of the stage at which they were previously rejected. The review has regard to any newly submitted information, as well as updates from the Council’s evidence base, which has included recent appeal decisions. In addition, the Council has reviewed the potential for sites within the submitted District Plan to accommodate higher yields to maximise these sites and make efficient use of land. This work has been completed and is reflected in the revised site selection assessment.
12. The Site Selection Methodology (SSP1) paragraphs 20 – 24 explain that sites that do not contribute to sustainable pattern of development will be excluded, based on the degree of separation from an existing settlement built up area boundary. This was Stage 2(a) of the process.
13. As part of the review the Council has re-appraised sites previously discounted at Stage 2(a) to determine whether other allocations in the submitted District Plan or emerging/proposed allocations/applications in neighbouring authority areas materially change the basis on which

sites were discounted. This has resulted in an additional 26 sites progressing to the next stage of assessment.

14. The Site Selection Methodology (SPP1) paragraphs 41 – 44 explain that the second stage of the site selection process (Stage 2(b)) rejected sites where environmental constraints would result in very negative impact against the assessment criteria. This included constraints such as major development in the High Weald National Landscape, significant areas of flood risk and substantial harm to a heritage asset. Such sites were not subject to further assessment.
15. In the light of the Inspector's comments, the Council agrees that, whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) September 2023 may mean that sites in this category face "strong headwinds", the question of whether there is a "strong reason" to reject them requires consideration of the particularities of the individual site including any benefits that could potentially arise from its development. This approach will ensure that the judgement reached by the Council is demonstrably consistent with paragraph 11b of the NPPF.
16. As part of the review the Council has re-appraised all sites previously discounted at Stage 2(b) on this basis. This has led to four sites being progressed to Stage 3 which had previously been rejected.
17. As part of the overall re-assessment, the Council has considered how the sites individually or collectively contribute to the delivery of the spatial strategy and how the sites individually or collectively contribute towards the wider ambitions for individual settlements, recognising the need for economic prosperity, thriving centres that deliver a range of services and facilities to meet needs, provision of and support for existing/new services and facilities.
18. When undertaking the re-assessment of sites, the Council has considered how sites contribute to the delivery of wider or local social and economic benefits or other local priorities including, for example, the protection of valued employment spaces, reflecting the district's distinctive towns and villages, retaining their separate identity and character and preventing coalescence.
19. The Council also recognises the importance of maintaining a 5-year housing land supply in order to ensure that development is genuinely plan-led and reduce the risk of speculative development. In arriving at the sites to be tested in-combination, the ability to contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply was considered. This has inevitably led to a focus on smaller, "oven-ready" deliverable sites being included but has not discounted larger sites which can contribute either longer-term, or across a longer timespan.
20. This assessment has balanced any negative impacts/harms with benefits in line with NPPF paragraph 11b and therefore their potential contribution to positive planning given housing need (in particular, unmet need in neighbouring authority areas) is high. The re-assessment has sought to demonstrate how this judgement has been arrived at both in relation to the appraisal of the individual site/collection of sites as well as the scale of development that is proposed at individual settlements/areas of the district. These conclusions are reflected in Appendices 1 and 2 and in the following sections.

Fact Check

21. In accordance with the MS-12 the updated site assessments were subject to two-weeks fact checking by site promoters. The results of the fact check exercise were published in MS-16. The factual amendments have been made to the site assessments and included in the Appendices to this Site Selection Review - Final Conclusion's paper. After careful review of the additional information provided, the Council concluded that the comments received did not impact the overall conclusions reached.

In-combination testing

22. Following the conclusion of the site assessment work the sites were then subject to in-combination testing including Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulation Assessment and Transport modelling. The conclusions of the in-combination testing are set out in MS-TP5: In-Combination Testing Conclusions. The full reports can also be found on the examination page of the web site.

4. Site Selection - Final Conclusions

23. As a result of the conclusions reached following in-combination testing the Council proposes that the original 24 sites in the Submission District Plan and the additional 35 sites are included as allocations in the District Plan.
24. The sites that are considered suitable for allocation are:

Table 1 - Sites Allocations (Submission and Main Modifications)

Ref	Site	Settlement	Yield
Category 1 - Towns			
DPSC1	Land to the West of Burgess Hill and North of Hurstpierpoint	Burgess Hill	1,350
DPA1	Batchelors Farm, Burgess Hill	Burgess Hill	26
DPA2	Land south of Apple Tree Close, Janes Lane, Burgess Hill	Burgess Hill	25
DPA3	Burgess Hill Station	Burgess Hill	375
MM60	Land east and west of Malthouse Lane	Burgess Hill	750
DPA4	Land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead	East Grinstead	45
MM61	1-5 Queens Walk and 22-26 London Road	East Grinstead	100
MM62	Land at Brook House Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	45
MM63	Land north of Hill Place Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	50
MM64	Land east of West Hoathly Road	East Grinstead	20
DPA5	Land at Hurstwood Lane, Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	36
DPA6	Land at Junction of Hurstwood Lane and Colwell Lane,	Haywards Heath	30
DPA7	Land east of Borde Hill Lane, Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	117
DPA8	Orchards Shopping Centre, Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	100
MM65	Field rear of North Colwell Barn, Lewes Road	Haywards Heath	9
MM66	Land at North Colwell Farm, Lewes Road	Haywards Heath	80
MM67	Land to the North of Old Wickham Lane	Haywards Heath	49

Ref	Site	Settlement	Yield
MM68	Land at Lunce's Hill, Fox Hill	Haywards Heath	14
Category 2 – Larger Villages			
DPSC2	Land at Crabbet Park	Copthorne	1,950
MM69	Courthouse Farm, Common Road	Copthorne	86
DPA9	Land to west of Turners Hill Road	Crawley Down	430
DPA10	Hurst Farm, Turners Hill Road	Crawley Down	
MM70	Land r/o The Martins (south of Hophurst Lane)	Crawley Down	150
DPA11	Land rear of 2 Hurst Road	Hassocks	25
MM71	Land west of Ockley Lane	Hassocks	250
DPA12	Land west of Kemps	Hurstpierpoint	90
MM72	Land east of College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	75
MM73	South of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	9
MM74	Land north of Willow Way and Talbot Mead, Cuckfield Road	Hurstpierpoint	150
MM75	Land south of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	35
MM76	Land northeast of Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	150
MM77	Land off Snowdrop Lane	Lindfield	50
MM78	Land to the north of Lyoth Lane	Lindfield	30
Category 3 – Medium Villages			
MM79	Land north of Henfield Road	Albourne	20
MM80	Grange View House, London Road	Albourne	10
MM81	Phase 1 Swallows Yard, London Road	Albourne	46
MM82	Land east of London Road	Albourne	250
DPA13	The Paddocks, Lewes Road	Ashurst Wood	8
MM83	Land at Brambletye School, Lewes Road	Ashurst Wood	25
MM84	Area south of Redbridge Lane at junction with London Road	Balcombe	15
MM85	Land south of Oldlands Avenue (Vintens Nursery)	Balcombe	20
DPA14	Land at Foxhole Farm	Bolney	200
MM86	Foxhole Farm Buildings, Foxhole Lane	Bolney	20
MM87	Land north of Foxhole Farm buildings	Bolney	13
MM88	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105
MM89	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196
MM90	Land to the West of Woodhurst Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700
MM91	Land north of Former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	43
DPSC3	Land to the South of Reeds Lane	Sayers Common	2,000
DPSC4	Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View	Sayers Common	26
DPSC5	Land at Coombe Farm	Sayers Common	210
DPSC6	Land to the West of Kings Business Centre	Sayers Common	80
DPSC7	Land at LVS Hassocks	Sayers Common	210
MM92	West House Farm, Henfield Road	Sayers Common	325
MM93	Land east of Avtrade, Reeds Lane	Sayers Common	75
MM94	Land at Kingsland Lodge, London Road	Sayers Common	75
DPA15	Ham Lane Farm, Ham Lane	Scaynes Hill	30
Category 4 – Small Villages			
DPA16	Land west of North Cottages and Challoners	Ansty	30
DPA17	Land west of Marwick Close	Ansty	40

25. Appendix 2 sets out detailed assessments for each site on a settlement-by-settlement basis. This includes the reasons for inclusion and rejection and how positive impacts have been balanced with negative impacts to arrive at this conclusion.

Assessment against the Spatial Strategy

26. As set out above, the Inspector has concluded that the spatial strategy in principle is sound and that it should be used to guide the selection of additional sites. In undertaking its assessment, the Council has been mindful of the Inspector's interim conclusion that site selection is subject to professional and political judgement; and the judgement will need to take into account a range of considerations. The remainder of this section explains how the Council has applied the principles of the spatial strategy through the re-appraisal process.

Protection of the High Weald AONB

27. As part of the re-assessment, all sites in the High Weald National Landscape (designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; AONB) have been re-assessed. During the Examination hearings, there was debate as to whether the Council had unduly excluded sites in the National Landscape having considered major development in the National Landscape a 'showstopper' constraint due to anticipated harm that the development of the sites would have. The revised Site Selection methodology MS-12, paragraph 8 explains that the Council will consider whether the "strong reason" to reject these sites remains having considered the particularities of the individual sites including any benefits that could potentially arise from its development.
28. A total of 9 additional sites within the High Weald National Landscape are considered suitable for further testing. These are as follows:

Table 2 - Sites for testing in the High Weald National Landscape

ID	Site	Settlement	Yield	Major development (initial assessment)
MM83	Land at Brambletye School, Lewes Road	Ashurst Wood	25	Unlikely to be major development
MM84	Area south of Redbridge Lane at junction with London Road	Balcombe	15	Unlikely to be major development
MM85	Land south of Oldlands Avenue	Balcombe	20	Unlikely to be major development
MM62	Land at Brook House Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	45	Unlikely to be major development
MM64	Land east of West Hoathly Road	East Grinstead	20	Unlikely to be major development
MM88	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105	Major development
MM91	Land north of former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	43	Unlikely to be major development
MM89	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196	Major development
MM90	Land to the west of Woodhouse Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700	Major development

29. The Council's further assessment of sites in the National Landscape are set out in ENV22 Major Development in the High Weald National Landscape.

Making effective use of Land

30. In seeking to make effective use of land, the Council has sought to maximise as far as possible the opportunities for housing delivery on previously developed land, whilst recognising the limited quantities of brownfield sites within the district. The following four sites comprising previously developed land have been identified as suitable for further testing:

Table 3 - Sites for allocation- Previously Developed

ID	Site	Settlement	Yield	Notes
DPA3	Burgess Hill Station	Burgess Hill	375	Previously developed town centre site.
MM61	1-5 Queens Walk and 22-26 London Road, East Grinstead	East Grinstead	100	Previously developed town centre site, whilst this would be policy compliant an allocation would help unlock any potential barriers to development to enable it to come forward within the plan period
DPA8	Orchards Shopping Centre	Haywards Heath	100	Previously developed town centre site
MM87	Foxhole Farm buildings	Bolney	13	This forms an extension to the existing proposed allocation DPA14: Foxhole Farm, to incorporate the farm buildings.
MM91	Former Golf House	Pease Pottage	43	This site has previously been used for employment (to be re-provided on site) and contains a substantial amount of hardstanding most recently used for parking.
MM80	Grange View House	Albourne	10	This site contains a number of buildings (glasshouses)

31. When undertaking the site assessment, the Council has sought to ensure that the anticipated yield maximises the full development potential of a site, whilst respecting the character of the area and the landscape setting of a site.

Growth at existing sustainable Settlements

32. In assessing sites, the Council has sought to understand how they can contribute to maximising the sustainability of settlements across the district.

- *Category 1 Settlements*

33. The largest amount of growth is directed to the most sustainable category in the hierarchy, the three towns. **Burgess Hill** was the focus for growth in the adopted District Plan, largely due to the strategic allocations at Northern Arc (Brookleigh) for 3,500 dwellings. The amount of growth proposed at **East Grinstead** and **Haywards Heath** is broadly similar, and aside from the two locations containing Sustainable Communities sites (DPSC2: Crabtree Park at Copthorne, and DPSC3-DPSC7 at Sayers Common), greater than any settlements further down the hierarchy.

- **Category 2**

34. Category 2 contains the larger villages which act as local service centres, providing key services in rural areas, including to nearby smaller settlements. Levels of growth proposed at **Crawley Down, Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint** and **Lindfield** is greater than at any settlement further down the hierarchy (again, aside from those locations containing sustainable communities, and at Pease Pottage).

- **Category 3**

35. Category 3 contains the medium villages which provide essential services for the needs of local residents. Growth proposed in these settlements is generally smaller in scale. The exceptions are at **Albourne, Pease Pottage and Sayers Common**.

36. Sayers Common includes the Sustainable Communities sites DPSC3-DPSC7 and sites 1124, 786 and 787. These sites provide new community facilities (such as education, health, employment and community buildings) alongside housing in order to provide day-to-day services and facilities close to where people live. This is in accordance with the '20-minute Neighbourhood' principles that the Plan is based on and in accordance with the "Opportunities for extensions, to improve sustainability of existing settlements" strategy principle. Growth proposed at Albourne, the settlement adjacent to Sayers Common, will also benefit from these services and facilities.

37. Pease Pottage includes three proposed allocations 1188, 603 and 818. As set out elsewhere in this Topic Paper, the Council recognises that these sites are located within the High Weald National Landscape. However, in accordance with the methodology set out in MS-12, the Council has given consideration to the benefits that could potentially arise from their development and not ruled these sites out on their position within the National Landscape alone. Pease Pottage is adjacent to Crawley Borough, where significant unmet housing need exists. The key justification for increasing the housing requirement is to assist Crawley with its unmet need, sites at Pease Pottage would be sustainably located to do so.

- **Category 4**

38. Category 4 contains small villages. The principle of allocating sites at Ansty was discussed at the hearings, with the Council justifying their inclusion based on the services and facilities provided at this settlement, the sites being small in scale, and scoring positively during the

selection process. Aside from small-scale existing commitments, no further growth is proposed at Category 4.

39. Overall, the Council strongly believes the spatial distribution of proposed allocations is consistent with the settlement hierarchy and plan strategy as a whole.

Opportunities for extensions to improve sustainability of existing settlements - Significant Sites

40. The Site Selection Conclusions Paper (SSP3) paragraphs 3.3 - 3.38 explain the approach and the conclusions of the assessment of significant sites. These are sites of a significant quantum that could also deliver on-site facilities such as education, health, employment, retail, community buildings and sports/open space.
41. SSP3 explains that a total of six significant sites were submitted to the Council for consideration and three of those have been included in the submitted District Plan as allocations for new sustainable communities. These are DPSC1: Land west of Burgess Hill/north of Hurstpierpoint, DPSC2: Crabbet Park and DPSC3: Reeds Lane, Sayers Common.
42. The following additional options for significant sites were considered.
- *Land at Ansty Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty*
43. The site was promoted for 1,450 dwellings along with associated infrastructure to support a new community. The site was not included in the Regulation 19 plan due to significant uncertainties in transport terms regarding the site (SSP3, para 3.17 and Appendix 4).
44. Since then, a planning application for the site was submitted by the site promoter, which the Council resolved to refuse at Planning Committee on 16th October 2025 relating to the impact on the rural character of the area, perceived coalescence, and the setting of the High Weald National Landscape. The application is now subject of a planning appeal with the appeal 'recovered' by the Secretary of State for their decision.
45. The overall conclusion for the site remains that the site is not suitable for allocation.
- *Broad location West of A23*
46. The site was promoted for 2,000 dwellings along with associated infrastructure to support a new community. The site forms part of a new settlement crossing into Horsham District. As set out in SSP3, it has not been demonstrated that the infrastructure can be delivered to support the development of this site. In addition, there remain doubts about the availability of the site as there have been no representation made from the site promoter during the plan making period or the most recent request for further information.
47. The overall conclusion for the site remains that the site is not suitable for allocation.
- *Land at Hangman's Acre Farm and Little Walstead, Lindfield*

48. The site was submitted to the Regulation 18 consultation for a residential-led development. In the absence of a suggested yield, an estimated yield of 1,722 has been assumed. As set out in SSP3 there are concerns regarding the availability and deliverability of the site. No additional information has been received from the site promoter during the most recent request for further information therefore these concerns remain.
49. The overall conclusion for the site remains that the site is not suitable for allocation.

Other Considerations

50. In the Inspector's initial conclusions from the examination (IDJB-012) the Council has been asked to test a higher housing requirement predominantly to meet an additional 3,753 homes for the Northern West Sussex HMA (NWSHMA) (principally unmet need arising in Crawley) and 1,075 for the Coastal HMA (principally unmet need arising in Brighton & Hove). Further detail on this is set out in MS-TP4: Housing Post Hearings Update.
51. The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment notes that the NWSHMA overlaps with the entire district. Therefore, need arising from Crawley could theoretically be met anywhere in the district. However, for sustainability reasons, the Council's view is that housing need should be met close to where it is arising. The Council has taken account of this when determining additional sites for testing.
52. The following submission District Plan allocations and proposed sites for testing are either adjacent to the Crawley boundary or in settlements close to it.

Table 4 - Sites in Proximity to Crawley

Ref	Site	Settlement	Yield
DPSC2	Crabbet Park	Copthorne	1,950
DPA9 / DPA10	Land to the West of Turners Hill Road / Hurst Farm	Crawley Down	430
MM69	Courthouse Farm, Common Road	Copthorne	86
MM70	Land r/o The Martins (south of Hophurst Lane)	Crawley Down	150
MM88	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105
MM89	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196
MM90	Land to the West of Woodhurst Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700
MM91	Land north of Former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	43
Total			3,660

53. Whilst these sites would not be specifically ringfenced to meet Crawley's need or be solely available for Crawley residents (such as for 100% affordable housing nomination rights), the total yield proposed from them almost equals the amount of unmet need that Mid Sussex will contribute.

54. For Brighton, MS-TP4 explains that Mid Sussex will make a contribution of 1,075 towards unmet need arising in Brighton & Hove and this formed part of the site assessment considerations. The Coastal HMA overlap with Mid Sussex is only in the southern part of the district (south of Haywards Heath). There is already significant development proposed within this area within the submitted District Plan, however the additional sites for testing at Burgess Hill, Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint, Albourne and Sayers Common could contribute towards this figure.