

24th April 2026

Our Ref: SB/9161

Email: s.brown@woolfbond.co.uk;

By Email to: aimee.peckham@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Mrs A Peckham
Operations Officer
Major Casework & Inquiries
The Planning Inspectorate

Dear Mrs Peckham,

LAND EAST OF ANSTY, CUCKFIELD BYPASS, CUCKFIELD (PINS REF: 6002030) (LPA REF: DM/23/2866)

SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE PLANS FOR CONSULTATION

1. General

- 1.1. This letter sets out the specifics of the Appellant's request for Alternative Application Plans to be considered at the forthcoming Inquiry, pursuant to the Wheatcroft principles.
- 1.2. They are 'alternative' plans as the Appellant remains of the view that the originally submitted plans are acceptable in relation to the proposed education uses. However, if the Inspector chooses to accept the plans as part of the appeal process, the Appeal will be determined based on the alternative plans.
- 1.3. The Appellant and the Schools Organisation and Capital Team at WSCCC have been in positive and collaborative discussions about the education land to be provided. The Appellant is grateful to WSCC for their engagement and constructive dialogue in recent months, which has resulted in the proposed amendment.
- 1.4. Those discussions have resulted in the preparation of an alternative **Updated Illustrative Masterplan No. 009-17**, which provides for the school land further into the Site, with a greater setback distance from the A272 when compared to the position on the original Illustrative Masterplan No. 009-14.
- 1.5. Formal submission of the alternative plans follows consideration of the matter at the Case Management Call ("CMC") on 17 April 2026 and the Appellant's subsequent email to the Planning Inspectorate ("PINS"), Mid Sussex District Council ("MSDC") and the Parish Councils (A "Rule 6 Party") on 21 April 2026.

2. The Proposed Amendments

- 2.1. To assist the Inspector and interested parties, a summary of the key changes between the original scheme and the alternative proposal for the education land now being countenanced is as follows:
1. The 4.5ha of land proposed to accommodate the two full-time equivalent (2FE) primary school and separate SEND provision (the 'land for education purposes') has been moved to the east, allowing an approximate 50-60m landscape buffer along the western edge of the site to the A272.
 2. The land for education purposes replaces the land parcel previously proposed to accommodate the 90 x C2 residential care units.
 3. A specific location of 90 x C2 residential care units is no longer included within the land use parameter plan. Rather, these units will be distributed across the remainder of the development parcels, with a specific location(s) to be agreed at the reserved matters stage.
 4. The area previously proposed to accommodate the 90 x C2 residential care units was classified as 'up to 2 storey (up to 10.0m ridge height)', is now 'zone for school building up to 10.0m ridge height'.
 5. The remainder of the area previously proposed to accommodate the 90 x C2 residential care units was classified as 'up to 1.5 storey (up to 8.0m ridge height) is now a 'zone for school building, up to 6.0m ridge height' (a decrease in maximum heights of two metres).
 6. The densities across the remainder of the site have been altered to accommodate the relocation of the 90 x C2 residential care units maintaining the total housing capacity of the site overall.
- 2.2. As considered by the Council when the Application was reported to Planning Committee, the land for the 2FE Primary and SEND School is shown on the original Illustrative Masterplan 009-14 as #8. The C2 care element is shown as #7.
- 2.3. The Alternative Illustrative Masterplan (**009-17**) shows the land for the 2FE Primary and SEND School as #8.
- 2.4. The C2 care element (90 x residential care units (as per the application description)), previously shown as #7, will be dispersed across the Site. This has resulted in an increase in densities across parts of the Site (**Plan No. 045-14**).

2.5. For comparative purposes, the changes to the Illustrative Masterplan are shown on the plan extracts below.

Extract from the **Originally Submitted Illustrative Masterplan (No. 009-14)**



Extract from the **Alternative Illustrative Masterplan (No. 009-17)**



2.6. For completeness, corresponding amendments have been made to the supporting parameter plans.

3. The Alternative Plans: Amendments

3.1. The alternative proposal for the education land is shown on the amended plans.

3.2. The original and alternative/updated plan references are summarised in the table below.

Plan Title	As Submitted	The Alternative/Updated Version
Illustrative Masterplan	009-14	009-17
Density Parameter Plan	045-12	045-14
Heights Parameter Plan	040-13	040-15
Land Use Parameter Plan	039-13	039-16
Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan	037-10	037-11
Access and Movement Parameter Plan	036-14	036-16

3.3. The amendments are also accompanied by an **Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) Statement of Conformity**. This has been prepared by Ramboll, dated April 2026.

3.4. The EIA Conformity Statement concludes that the proposed amendments have no material bearing upon the likely significant environmental effects reported within the November 2023 ES and Non-Technical Summary. The conclusions within the November 2023 ES and Non-Technical Summary in relation to likely significant effects, residual effects and mitigation remain valid and unchanged. Furthermore, the ES is considered to remain comprehensive, enabling informed decision-making, and can be relied upon by the planning authority when determining the planning application.

4. Next Steps

4.1. In accordance with the approach set out at section 16 of the PPG Guidance: Planning Appeals-England (Updated Feb 2026); and the **‘Wheatcroft’** principle, as refined by subsequent case law (see R(on the application of Holborn Studios) v Hackney LBC). the Inspector is invited to accept the amendments to the Appeal Scheme.

- 4.2. In relation to substance, for the reasons set out above, the changes are, in the context of the Appeal Scheme as a whole, minor and they do not result in a Scheme which is substantially different to the Appeal Scheme as applied for.
- 4.3. In relation to procedure, no one is deprived of the opportunity to make representations on the changes. As envisaged in paragraph 12 of the Inspector's CMC Summary Note, MSDC will undertake further public consultation on the Alternative Plans and EIA Conformity Statement. Accordingly, there will be no procedural unfairness.

We trust the above assists.

Yours sincerely,

Woolf Bond Planning Ltd

Steven Brown BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI
Managing Director

For Woolf Bond Planning Ltd (obo Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd and The Norris Family)

Enc.