



Town & Country
Planning Act 1990 (as
Amended)

Appeal by Fairfax
Acquisitions Limited and
The Norris Family

Land East of Ansty Way,
Cuckfield Bypass,
Cuckfield, West Sussex
RH17 5AG

Highways Statement of Common
Ground between Fairfax
Acquisitions Limited & The
Norris Family and West Sussex
County Council

PINS Ref: 6002030
LPA Ref. DM/23/2866

April 2026

MILESTONE
TRANSPORT PLANNING

Land East of Ansty Way, Cuckfield Bypass, Cuckfield, West Sussex RH17 5AG

Project No: MTP Ref: 26045

Document Reference No: 26045/Reports/SoCG

Document Title: Statement of Common Ground (Highways)

Date: April 2026

Client Name: Fairfax Acquisitions Limited & The Norris Family

Project Manager: Matt Stevens

Author: Matt Stevens

Produced By: [Milestone Transport Planning Limited](#)
7 Ancells Court, Rye Close, Fleet, Hampshire GU51 2UY - Tel: 01483 397888
Gateshead IBC, Mulgrave Terrace, Gateshead, Tyne & Wear, NE8 1AN - Tel: 0191 3387220
Edmund House, 12-22 Newhall Street, Birmingham B3 3AS - Tel: 0121 661 9881

Email: mail@milestonetp.co.uk
Web: www.milestonetp.co.uk

Document history & status.

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared By	Checked By	Authorised By
	30.03.26	V1 - WIP for Issue to WSCC for comment	M. Stevens	M. Stevens	M. Stevens
A	02.04.26	V2 - updated to reflect WSCC comments	M. Stevens	M. Stevens	M. Stevens
B	07.04.26	V3 - final version with signatures	M. Stevens	M. Stevens	M. Stevens

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Relevant Planning Policy.....	4
3.	Relevant Background	6
4.	Matters Agreed.....	8
	<u>Accessibility</u>	8
	<u>Vision-Led Approach</u>	8
	<u>Vehicular Access Points</u>	9
	<u>Highway Network</u>	9
	<u>Public Rights of Way</u>	10
	<u>Cycle Route to Haywards Heath</u>	11
	<u>Masterplan Layout</u>	11
	<u>Car Club</u>	11
	<u>Mobility HUBs</u>	11
	<u>Traffic Regulation Order</u>	12
	<u>Travel Plan</u>	13
	<u>Travel Plan Monitoring</u>	13
	<u>Trip Monitoring Strategy</u>	13
	<u>Car / Cycle Parking</u>	14
	<u>Public Transport</u>	14
	<u>Highway Safety</u>	15
5.	Matters in Dispute	16
6.	Agreement.....	17

1. Introduction

1.1 This Highways Statement of Common Ground (“HSoCG”) relates to a Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 78 Planning Appeal lodged by Woolf Bond Planning LLP on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions Limited & The Norris Family (the “Appellant”) against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council’s (“MSDC”) decision (LPA Ref: DM/23/2866) to refuse an Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved except for access) for Land East of Ansty Way, Cuckfield Bypass, Cuckfield, West Sussex RH17 5AG (the “Appeal Site”).

1.2 The description of development (the “Appeal Scheme”), as set out in the Decision Notice, is:

“Outline planning application (All matters reserved except for access) for the redevelopment of land to the east of Ansty to create a new Garden Community, comprising of the erection of up to 1,450 homes (including 30% affordable housing), up to 90 residential care (C2 units), a primary school, a SEND school, health HUB, sports facilities including all weather hockey pitches and tennis centre, allotments, retail, community and employment uses together with ancillary and associated development including new and enhanced pedestrian/cycle routes, open spaces, and landscaping”

1.3 Milestone Transport Planning Limited (“MTP”) have been instructed to progress the HSoCG with WSCC and will be acting as Expert Witness for the purpose of the Appeal.

1.4 During the progression of the Outline Planning Application (“OPA”) submission, the Appellant had instructed Ardent Consultant Engineers (“ACE”) to act on their behalf. Reference is made throughout the HSoCG to the extensive consultation and matters agreed between ACE and West Sussex County Council (“WSCC”), acting as the Local Highway Authority (“LHA”) and statutory consultee of MSDC on the details submitted with the OPA submission.

1.5 The OPA was refused by MSDC at committee on 17 October 2025. The Decision Notice (17 October 2025) states that the proposal is contrary to the development plan, citing the following three reasons for refusal:

“1) The proposal consists of major development within the countryside, out of keeping with the rural character, which fails to protect the distinctiveness of the area by extending the settlement boundary of Ansty, resulting in the perceived coalescence with Cuckfield, eroding the rural nature of the site which is further harmed by the proposed loss of trees. The application is therefore contrary to policies DP12, DP13 and DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, policies AS1 and AS2 of Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan and policies CNP3 and CNP5 of Cuckfield Neighbourhood plan.

2) Due to the location and scale of the development, the proposal would result in an unacceptable urbanising feature, eroding the rural nature of the site that makes a positive contribution to the setting of the HWNL [High Weald National Landscape]. The proposal would therefore fail to avoid and minimise the adverse impact on the High Weald National Landscape to the detriment of the scenic beauty of the designated area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, policy AS1 of the Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan and policy CNP5 of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2024-2029 and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

3) The proposal fails to provide the infrastructure, contributions, and off-site highways works to serve the development and the required affordable housing. The application therefore conflicts with policies DP20, DP21, DP31 and DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2029 the Mid Sussex Supplementary Planning Documents 'Affordable Housing' and 'Development Infrastructure and Contributions'.

- 1.6 WSCC did not raise any substantive objection on transport grounds, as confirmed in its stakeholder response to the application, received by MSDC 9 July 2025, and included as Appendix 1 to the HSoCG, which states in conclusion that *"no objection is raised to the application subject to the following S106 requirements and conditions"*.
- 1.7 The substance of the Section 106 Agreement and Conditions to which the WSCC response references is set out within this HSoCG.
- 1.8 The OPA went to MSDC Planning Committee with Case Officer recommendation for approval, however, against Officer recommendation the Planning Committee refused the application. This HSoCG intends to outline the areas which allowed the Appellant and WSCC to reach agreement and as was substantiated within the Case Officers report to committee.
- 1.9 Reviewing the details of the three reasons presented for refusal of the OPA, the Appellant and WSCC agree that:
- Reason 1: Does not engage any transport matters. It is noted that Policy AS1 part (c) of the Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan requires *"An application is supported by a robust assessment of the impact of the proposal upon the local highway network"*. It is agreed between the Appellant and WSCC that this has been provided ACE as part of the comprehensive details submitted with the OPA.
 - Reason 2: The location and scale of the development contribute to the sustainability of the Scheme proposed. But otherwise, the matters raised by MSDC do not invoke any transport matters.

- Reason 3: References the procedure of securing planning obligations considered necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development, including off-site highways works.
- 1.10 The Appellant and WSCC will negotiate the mechanism for delivery of the relevant planning obligations under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with formal sanction of all measures forming part of the Appeal process.
- 1.11 Please also see the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG - Planning) between the Appellant and MSDC which includes Matters Agreed and Matters in Dispute relating to the consideration of the Appeal Proposal as a whole.

2. Relevant Planning Policy

- 2.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), planning applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.2 The relevant development plan policies constitute the primary decision framework. Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) confirms this statutory position and establishes that the NPPF is a material consideration in decision-making.
- 2.3 The OPA was supported by a Transport Assessment, prepared by ACE in accordance with relevant national and local guidance. It provides the technical evidence to inform the consideration of the proposal against the development plan policies relating to transport, highway safety, and accessibility, having regard to the following:
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, September 2023).
 - Adopted Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 - 2031 (Adopted March 2018).
 - West Sussex Transport Plan 2022 to 2036 (Adopted April 2022).
 - Neighbourhood Plan for Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street (February 2017).
 - DfT Circular 01/2022 - Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (2022).
- 2.4 Since the Transport Assessment (November 2023) was prepared, the NPPF has been updated with a revision released in December 2024 and with the most recent revision dated February 2025. Having regard to those amendments, the parties agree that the proposal remains in accordance with NPPF policy.
- 2.5 In the MSDC Case Officers report to planning committee (dated 16th October 2025), paragraph 2.14 stated:

“In terms of transport matters, the vehicular access arrangements are acceptable. On the basis of the submitted evidence and the formal responses from the relevant highway authorities, the application would comply with Policy DP21 and the relevant provisions of national planning policy, which require that development should not result in a severe impact on the transport network.”

Subject to the recommended conditions and mitigation, no such severe impact has been identified. Furthermore, the application incorporates appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport and in particular the proposed bus services provide public transport improvements that will benefit existing residents in Ansty and Cuckfield villages. These improvements will be secured with a s106 Legal Agreement, and it is considered that this is a benefit of the scheme that should be afforded significant positive weight.”

- 2.6 Given the limited planning policy grounds on which to bring into question the principle of development, the Appellant and WSCC agree that the matters seemingly under dispute with MSDC relate to the mechanisms for delivery of necessary highways and transport mitigation and are not related to transport policy.

3. Relevant Background

3.1 The OPA was supported by a comprehensive range of highways and transportation technical documents prepared by ACE, including a TA and associated technical work, prepared in accordance with the relevant national and local policy and guidance.

3.2 During the determination period, the technical material was supplemented with further assessment and liaison with WSCC in order to seek resolution and agreement on highways and transportation matters.

3.3 In reaching common ground, the Appellant and WSCC have relied on the following documents that relate to the nature and scale of the mitigation which the development proposals would deliver:

- Transport Assessment, ACE Ref. 2207280-R09 (November 2023).
- Framework Travel Plan, ACE Ref. 2207280-R10A (December 2024).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Northern Access), ACE Ref. 2207280-R13B (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Western Access), ACE Ref. 2207280-R14B (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Southern Access), ACE Ref. 2207280-R15B (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - A272 Cycle Scheme), ACE Ref. 2207280-R16B (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Ardingly Mini Scheme), ACE Ref. 2207280-R18A (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Bolney Mini Scheme), ACE Ref. 2207280-R19B (May 2025).
- Transport Addendum, ACE Ref. 2207280-R28D (May 2025).
- Designers Response (RSA1 - Tylers Green Roundabout Mitigation), ACE Ref. 2207280-R30 (May 2025).
- Technical Transport Note #13 (Bus Strategy), ACE Ref. 2207280-R33 (April 2025).
- Technical Transport Note #14 (Parkland Reserve Amendments), ACE Ref. 2207280-R34.

3.4 During the OPA determination period, the Transport Assessment (November 2023) was supplemented by the Transport Addendum (May 2025), which was tested against the consultee responses from WSCC Highways as well as other parties, including WSCC Public Rights of Way (“PRoW”), Active Travel England (“ATE”), and National Highways (“NH”).

3.5 The further analysis and assessment underpinning agreements reached between ACE and all highways and transport consultees is contained within the following documents that were provided as appendices to the Transport Addendum (May 2025):

- Technical Transport Note #8 (PRoW Response), ACE Ref. 2207280-R22 (May 2024).
- Technical Transport Note #9 (WSCC Response), ACE Ref. 2207280-R23 (May 2025).
- Technical Transport Note #10 (NH Response), ACE Ref. 2207280-R24 (May 2025).
- Technical Transport Note #11 (ATE Response), ACE Ref. 2207280-R25 (May 2025).

3.6 The above work allowed the parties to conclude, together with the responses from other statutory consultees, that the development would not lead to unacceptable impact on highway safety and that the residual cumulative impacts of the proposals would not be severe, having regard to the requirements of the NPPF.

3.7 No objection was raised by the above consultees on highways and transportation, subject to the imposition of planning conditions and contributions to secure the mitigation relied upon in reaching those conclusions. This position was summarised in the MSDC Case Officers report to Committee (dated 16 October 2025), which stated:

- WSCC Highways
 - no objection subject to Section 106 Agreement requirements and conditions.
- WSCC Public Rights of Way
 - no objection subject to conditions and securing suitable financial contributions towards upgrade works.
- Active Travel England
 - recommends approval of the application, subject to the agreement and implementation of planning conditions and/or obligations.
- National Highways
 - no objection subject to condition relating to the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan covering the period of build-out of the development.

4. Matters Agreed

4.1 The Appellant and WSCC agree common ground in respect to highways and transportation matters, a summary of which is outlined in the following sub-sections.

Accessibility

4.2 The Appellant and WSCC agree the basis on which the accessibility and sustainability of the Appeal Site has been assessed, with suitable reference to recognised guidance and parameters relating to accessibility by non-car modes, including:

- The walking distance guidance contained in the CIHT's Providing for Journeys on Foot (2000) and Manual for the Streets (2007) / Manual for Streets 2 (September 2010), including the principle of Walkable Neighbourhoods.
- The provision of bus stops, mobility hubs, and public transport facilities within recognised walking catchments, typically within approximately 400m of dwellings, where practicable.
- The provision of walking and cycling infrastructure designed in accordance with Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020), together with connections to the wider network identified within the Local Cycling and Walking Improvement Plan ("LCWIP") (March 2023), provided as evidence base for the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy DPT3 Active Travel.
- Assessment of connectivity to nearby settlements, services, and facilities, together with the inclusion of on-site facilities and mixed uses capable of reducing the need to travel and allowing a proportion of trips to be internalised within the development.
- The use of Travel Plan measures, sustainable transport infrastructure, and mobility hub provision to influence travel behaviour and reduce reliance on the private car, including the setting of modal shift targets and monitoring requirements.

Vision-Led Approach

4.3 The Appeal Site adopts a vision-led approach to transport planning, whereby the assessment considers the form and function of the development and the transport measures required to achieve the desired sustainable outcomes, including the provision of local facilities, opportunities for internalisation of trips, and good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport, with the level of highway mitigation then identified having regard to those objectives.

- 4.4 Through the transport measures that form the vision adopted for the Appeal Site, it is interconnected with the existing residential populations of Ansty, Cuckfield and Haywards Heath by active travel modes (foot and cycle) and public transport (bus), and also with Burgess Hill by public transport (bus), thereby also offering an enhancement for existing residents.
- 4.5 The impact of residual vehicular trips generated by the Appeal Site proposals was thoroughly tested through traffic modelling undertaken, the scope of which was agreed between ACE acting on behalf of the Appellant and WSCC, and the details of which were submitted with the OPA submission.
- 4.6 During the extensive discussions between ACE and WSCC in the lead up to the determination of the OPA, WSCC requested additional sensitivity testing in respect of the traffic modelling. This was not taken up; however, an alternative strategy was agreed between parties whereby the Appellant would undertake to deliver a Trip Monitoring Strategy, the full details of which are to be agreed as part of the S106 Agreement.

Vehicular Access Points

- 4.7 It is agreed between the Appellant and WSCC that the three vehicular points of access proposed will take the form of 3-arm roundabouts (ACE Drawings 2207280-003, 2207280-04 and 2207280-005).
- 4.8 The three vehicular points of access to the Appeal Site have been designed in accordance with applicable guidance and can accommodate the traffic effect of the Appeal Site proposals. The three vehicular access points have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit ("RSA1"), and all matters have been agreed between the Appellant and WSCC within the Designers Response ("DR").
- 4.9 The roundabout designs meet the needs of forecasted vehicular movements and wider connectivity, catering for pedestrian/cycle access.
- 4.10 It is agreed that the Appellant will enter into a Section 278 Agreement to implement the necessary access works.

Highway Network

- 4.11 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the Appeal Site proposals are supported by detailed modelling evidence base that assesses the impact on the local highway network.
- 4.12 The modelling evidence is based upon a 2039 future year forecast scenario and assesses both AM and PM peak hourly periods, both 'with' and 'without' the development.

4.13 The modelling evidence confirms that the residual impact of the proposals would not be severe, having regard to the requirements of the NPPF:

- A272 / B2036 roundabout:
 - The junction would operate within capacity.
- A272 / Tylers Green/Broad Street roundabout:
 - The junction would operate within theoretical capacity and, with an increase in average delay of two seconds, the development effect would not result in a requirement for mitigation.
- A272 / Tylers Green/Issac's Lane roundabout:
 - The mitigation scheme proposed will improve capacity of the junction such that the development effect would result in a 'nil detriment' situation compared to the 'without development' position.
 - An exception report has been agreed in relation to the entry path radius, with the mitigation design incorporating a betterment over the standards of the current junction layout. It is agreed that the Appellant will enter into a Section 278 Agreement to implement the necessary mitigation works.
- B2036 London Road / Ardingly Road mini roundabout (in Cuckfield):
 - Non-Motorised User (NMU) improvements incorporated within the junction to include relocation of the bus stop and widening the zebra crossing.
 - This would improve non-car access without leading to any significant vehicular delay. It is agreed that the Appellant will enter into a Section 278 Agreement to implement the necessary mitigation works.
- A272 / Bolney Road / B2036 mini roundabout (in Ansty):
 - NMU route improvements and widening of the western approach arm of the junction.
 - It is agreed that the Appellant will enter into a Section 278 Agreement to implement the necessary mitigation works.

Public Rights of Way

4.14 The parties agree that Footpath 8aCU towards Cuckfield will be upgraded to enhance the connection to Warden Park Academy, and that Footpath 69CR towards Copyhold Lane will also be upgraded to enhance the connection onto Bridleway 67CR.

4.15 It is agreed that the funding of these measures will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

4.16 It is agreed that all Public Rights of Way Footpaths across the Site will be upgraded to Bridleways, as part of the delivery of active travel infrastructure works.

Cycle Route to Haywards Heath

4.17 The Appellant and WSCC agree that a new cycle route connection into Haywards Heath will be delivered as outlined on ACE Drawing 2207280-SK05.

4.18 It is agreed that the Appellant will enter into a Section 278 Agreement to implement the necessary mitigation works.

Masterplan Layout

4.19 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the framework of routes / strategy within the Appeal Site are suitable subject to subsequent Reserved Matters application(s), with a hierarchy of street types identified and agreed to be utilised as a basis for Reserved Matters application(s).

Car Club

4.20 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the Appeal Site proposals will provide a minimum of 2 (two) and maximum of 4 (four) car club vehicles dependent upon realisation of demand, with these vehicles being located alongside the proposed Mobility HUBs.

4.21 It is agreed that the funding of these measures will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

Mobility HUBs

4.22 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the Appeal Site proposals will incorporate a main Mobility HUB to include cycle parking, real time information, and package delivery lockers, plus car club vehicle provision.

4.23 It is also agreed that mini-mobility HUBs will be provided at key points within the Appeal Site. Further details of their location will be provided at Reserved Matters stage.

Traffic Regulation Order

4.24 A suitable contribution is agreed between the Appellant and WSCC to enable the implementation of revised speed limits in the following locations, also shown in Figure 4.1:

- B2036 Harvest Hill - reduction to 40mph speed limit
- A272 - reduction to 50mph speed limit
- B2036 South Street, Cuckfield - reduction to 30mph speed limit

4.25 It is agreed that the funding of the TRO will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement to enable WSCC to publish and advertise the TRO process. Any works, including new signage, will be implemented by the Appellant in conjunction with the off-site Section 278 highway improvement works.

Figure 4.1 Revised Speed Limit Zones



Travel Plan

- 4.26 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the Framework Travel Plan (“FTP”) represents a suitable commitment to reducing vehicle trips in tandem with the Trip Monitoring Strategy.
- 4.27 The FTP commits to provide a £150 voucher to each dwelling and seek a target 10% reduction in single occupancy car journeys, with the anticipation being that each parcel would prepare a Travel Plan in accordance with the framework document. The funding of these measures will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

Travel Plan Monitoring

- 4.28 The Appellant and WSCC agree that a Travel Plan will be subject to a monitoring fee of £5,640 (indexed). The appropriate financial contribution will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

Trip Monitoring Strategy

- 4.29 The Appellant and WSCC agree that a Trip Monitoring Strategy will be developed, agreed and the details secured within the Section 106 Agreement. The Trip Monitoring Strategy builds upon the framework strategy submitted in the Transport Addendum (May 2025) where surveys would be undertaken (at 50%, 75%, 100% and +2 years of final occupation) to compare the trip generation figures used in the assessment work.
- 4.30 It is agreed that the funding of these measures, which are contingent upon traffic threshold exceedance thresholds triggering the agreed payment value, will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

4.31 The table below confirms the agreed strategy for triggers and anticipated mitigation:

Stage of Development	Traffic Threshold Exceedance (Indicative)	Fallback Mitigation Measure	Delivery Mechanism
50% Occupation	>5% but <10%	Additional £200 per dwelling travel voucher and personal travel planning	Delivered by the developer through the Travel Plan process
	>10%	Off-Site active travel enhancements to local enhancements up to the value of £20,000	Delivered by the developer through S106 / S278 process
75% Occupation	>5% but <10%	Additional £200 per dwelling travel voucher and personal travel planning	Delivered by the developer through the Travel Plan process
	>10%	Off-Site active travel enhancements to local enhancements up to the value of £20,000	Delivered by the developer through S106 / S278 process
Complete Development	>5% but <10%	Additional £200 per dwelling travel voucher and personal travel planning	Delivered by the developer through the Travel Plan process
	>10% but <20%	Off-Site active travel enhancements to local enhancements up to the value of £20,000	Delivered by the developer through S106 / S278 process
	>20%	Provision of active and sustainable travel fund to WSCC up to the value of £85,000	Delivered via the S106 Agreement
2 Years Post Completion	>5% but <10%	Additional £200 per dwelling travel voucher and personal travel planning	Delivered by the developer through the Travel Plan process
	>10% but <20%	Off-Site active travel enhancements to local enhancements up to the value of £20,000	Delivered by the developer through S106 / S278 process
	>20%	Provision of active and sustainable travel fund to WSCC up to the value of £85,000	Delivered via the S106 Agreement
Maximum Contribution Value:		£250,000	

Car / Cycle Parking

4.32 The relevant standards for cycle and car parking are agreed between the Appellant and WSCC, pending details to be provided within Reserved Matters applications.

Public Transport

4.33 The Appellant and WSCC agree that the Appeal Site will provide an enhancement to bus services in line with the agreed Bus Strategy. Full details of the Bus Strategy including funding, routing, frequency, and trigger point for the commencement of the service will be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

- 4.34 It is agreed with WSCC that the Appellant will secure a direct contract with a WSCC approved bus operator for a minimum period of 2 (two) years post the final residential occupation on the Appeal Site to deliver a half-hourly service between the Appeal Site and Haywards Heath and an hourly service between the Appeal Site and Burgess Hill during weekday daytime hours.
- 4.35 The precise trigger point for the commencement of the Bus Strategy will be agreed with the operator and WSCC as part of discussions informing the Section 106 Agreement, however, it is expected that the service will commence during Phase 1 of the residential development on the Appeal Site to secure the mode share targets identified within the FTP.

Highway Safety

- 4.36 The Appellant and WSCC agree that through the planning submission, a highway safety review was carried out across the road network study area.
- 4.37 The data is not indicative of any pre-existing road safety deficiency or clusters of accidents that would either affect the consideration of the Appeal Site's mitigation or be materially worsened by the Appeal Site proposals.
- 4.38 All proposed highways works, including the site access designs and any off-site infrastructure mitigation, have been the subject of an RSA1 and associated Designers Response for consideration at detailed design stage, as part of a Technical Approval process which will be overseen by WSCC.
- 4.39 The Appellant and WSCC agree that, subject to the planning obligations and financial contributions identified, the Appeal Site proposals will not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor would to severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network, having regard to the NPPF.
- 4.40 Therefore, the planning obligations and financial contributions identified are:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
 - Directly related to the development.
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 4.41 Accordingly, the Appellant and WSCC agree that the proposed planning obligations meet the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

5. Matters in Dispute

5.1 There are no matters that remain in dispute between the Appellant and WSCC.

6. Agreement

- 6.1 In accordance with 109, 110 and 115(a) of the Framework, the vision-led approach to the Appeal Site proposals ensures that it is sustainable, and through a comprehensive package of interventions, facilitates limiting the need to travel and enables a genuine choice of transport modes.
- 6.2 In accordance with 115(b) of the Framework, the three vehicular points of access to the Appeal Site, in the form of 3-arm roundabouts, make provisions for all road users, are safe and can accommodate background traffic demand on the network as well as the additional movements generated by the Appeal Site proposals.
- 6.3 The vision-led off-site package of works, agreed with WSCC and with input from other consultees including the PRow team, ATE and NH, and secured either by way of S106 or S278 Agreement, means that all capacity, congestion and highway safety impacts on the transport network arising from the Appeal Site have been comprehensively and cost-effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree, in accordance with 115(d) of the Framework.
- 6.4 Having regard to the above, there are no highways and transportation matters that remain in dispute between the Appellant and WSCC for the Appeal being considered under PINS Ref: 6002030 (LPA Ref. DM/23/2866) on Land East of Ansty Way, Cuckfield Bypass, Cuckfield, West Sussex RH17 5AG.

Signed on behalf of the Appellant:



Name: Matt Stevens

Date: 7 April 2026

Signed on behalf of West Sussex County Council, as Highway Authority:



Name: Stephen Gee

Date: 7 April 2026