

11 September 2026

Our Ref: SB/9161

PINS Ref: 6002030

LAND TO THE EAST OF ANSTY, CUCKFIELD BYPASS, CUCKFIELD

Appellant Response to the NPPF Statements Prepared by the Council and the Rule 6 Party

Introduction

The Appellant has only minor observations on the Statements submitted by the Council (**ID44**) and the Rule 6 Party ("R6P") (**ID45**), which relate to NPPF Policies DM4 and HO13.

NPPF Policy DM4 – Emerging Development Plan Proposals

The Council's Statement (**ID44**) suggests that their evidence 'clearly indicates' how the grant of planning permission would prejudice the plan-making process. It does not.

The Appellant's case on prematurity/prejudice to the emerging Local Plan process is set out at paragraphs 104 to 136 of its closing submissions (**ID35**).

As accepted in evidence (i) the Council agrees only limited weight should be given to the emerging Local Plan's spatial strategy, with moderate weight to the development management policies. This followed the oral evidence where Ms Salisbury for the Council agreed that the Appeal Scheme would be consistent and aligned with the spatial strategy in the emerging Local Plan.

Neither of the planning witnesses for the Council (Ms Salisbury nor Ms Jarvis) were able to explain how or why granting permission for the Appeal Scheme would lead to the de-allocation of any sites in the emerging Plan or prejudice the selection of any sites to be deleted through the modifications stage.

If the Council actually had any evidence that granting permission for the Appeal Scheme would lead to any preferred sites being removed, they would have produced it. They did not provide it at the inquiry, and nor have they provided any with their Statement on the NPPF. It is the Appellant's position that this is because no harm would be caused, and any grant of permission here can perfectly co-exist with the emerging plan.

It is common ground between the Appellant and the R6P that the emerging Plan only receives limited weight. Nothing in the Statement submitted by the R6P alters that position on the facts and evidence before the Inspector.

The Appeal Scheme is not premature to the emerging Local Plan. As the evidence demonstrates, the proposal is not so substantial, nor is its cumulative effect alongside other development proposals so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan.

The Council provided no evidence, non whatsoever to support a suggestion that the grant of planning permission would engage what was the 'test' at paragraph 50 of the previous NPPF (Dec 2024) and what is now the 'test' at Policy DM4(2) of the new NPPF.

The R6P's Statement on the NPPF (**ID45**) takes the matter no further.

NPPF Policy HO13 – Build out of Residential and Strategic Sites

As agreed by the Council in evidence, there are no significant constraints that would impact on the delivery of the Appeal Site in principle.

The site delivery estimates specific to this site in **CD5.20** suggest that 300 dwellings can be delivered in the five-year period ending 2030/31. This is achievable given the single landowner, the lack of any delivery constraints, and the ability to develop the site from multiple sales outlets. As the Appellant explained in evidence, the delivery estimates relied upon are more conservative than the delivery timescales the Council is anticipating from some of the sites they are now advancing as allocations in the emerging Local plan, which do not even have a live application in place.

As agreed in **ID20**, the parties have agreed the highest weighting possible to the delivery of housing from the Appeal Site (substantial).

The evidence demonstrates that housing completions are achievable on the Appeal Site within the current five-year period.

In the context of (i) the agreed shortfall in the five-year housing land supply position, which shortfall is agreed at 1,758 dwellings, representing a supply of only 3.75 years (**CD7.5**); and (ii) chapter 6 of the NPPF, where a key objective of the housing policies in the NPPF is to 'support the delivery of a substantial increase in the supply of homes', the Appeal Scheme would satisfy the Policy HO13 requirements.

Conclusion

For the reasons explained in evidence and the Appellant's NPPF Statement (**ID43**), the balance to be undertaken at Policy S5(j) of the NPPF weighs decisively in favour of granting permission.

Woolf Bond Planning Ltd

Steven Brown BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI

Managing Director

for Woolf Bond Planning Ltd (obo Fairfax Acquisitions and the Norris Family)