



SSP 7:

Post Hearings – Site Selection Review – Initial Conclusions

May 2026



Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Site Selection Methodology Review	2
3. Methodology	3
Information Gathering	3
Individual Site Assessments	3
4. Site Selection - Initial Conclusions	5
Assessment against the Spatial Strategy	6
Protection of the High Weald AONB.....	6
Making effective use of Land	8
Growth at existing sustainable Settlements	9
• Category 1 Settlements.....	9
• Category 2 Settlements.....	9
• Category 3 Settlements.....	10
• Category 4 Settlements.....	11
Opportunities for extensions to improve sustainability of existing settlements - Significant Sites.....	11
• Land at Ansty Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty	12
• Broad location West of A23	12
• Land at Hangman’s Acre Farm and Little Walstead, Lindfield.....	12
Other Considerations.....	13
Consistency with the Spatial Strategy – Spatial Distribution.....	14
5. Next Steps	16

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 conclusion of this work is a list of sites that (following a fact check with site promoters) will be subject to in combination testing including through the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulation Assessment and Transport Assessment. Once this work is complete the Council will publish the final list of additional site allocations to be included in the submitted District Plan. At this time the Council will publish the updated evidence base, updated Site Selection Paper and final housing delivery trajectory.

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.

4. Site Selection - Initial Conclusions

21. Following the application of the revised approach to site selection a list of sites that are considered suitable for further testing has been produced. Individual scoring against the site selection criteria is set out in Appendix 1. Detailed assessment against all factors is set out by settlement in Appendix 2. At this stage the list of sites and the conclusions will be finalised following the in-combination testing.
22. The sites that are considered suitable for further testing are:

Table 1 - Sites for further testing

Cat.	ID	Site	Settlement	Yield
1	1105	Land east and west of Malthouse Lane	Burgess Hill	750
	961	1-5 Queens Walk and 22-26 London Road	East Grinstead	100
	1024	Land at Brook House Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	45
	1060	Land north of Hill Place Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	50
	1181	Land east of West Hoathly Road	East Grinstead	20
	680	Field rear of North Colwell Barn, Lewes Road	Haywards Heath	9
	844	Land at North Colwell Farm, Lewes Road	Haywards Heath	80
	988	Land to the North of Old Wickham Lane	Haywards Heath	49
	1136	Land at Lunce's Hill, Fox Hill	Haywards Heath	14
2	990	Courthouse Farm, Common Road	Copthorne	86
	686	Land r/o The Martins (south of Hophurst Lane)	Crawley Down	150
	1137	Land west of Ockley Lane	Hassocks	250
	19	Land east of College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	75
	582	South of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	9
	1075	Land north of Willow Way and Talbot Mead, Cuckfield Road	Hurstpierpoint	150
	1172	Land south of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane	Hurstpierpoint	35
	575	Land northeast of Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint	150
	29	Land off Snowdrop Lane	Lindfield	50
1006	Land to the north of Lyoth Lane	Lindfield	30	
3	1178	Land north of Henfield Road	Albourne	20

775	Grange View House, London Road	Albourne	10
789	Phase 1 Swallows Yard, London Road	Albourne	46
1173	Land east of London Road	Albourne	250
1175	Land at Brambletye School, Lewes Road	Ashurst Wood	25
28	Area south of Redbridge Lane at junction with London Road	Balcombe	20
165	Land south of Oldlands Avenue (Vintens Nursery)	Balcombe	40
802	Foxhole Farm Buildings, Foxhole Lane	Bolney	20
1191	Land north of Foxhole Farm buildings	Bolney	13
181	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105
1188	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196
603	Land to the West of Woodhurst Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700
818	Land north of Former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	41
1124	West House Farm, Henfield Road	Sayers Common	325
786	Land east of Avtrade, Reeds Lane	Sayers Common	75
787	Land at Kingsland Lodge, London Road	Sayers Common	75
TOTAL:			4,063

23. 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

24. 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

25. 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.

26. 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)
1175	Land at Brambletye School, Lewes Road	Ashurst Wood	25	Unlikely to be major development
28	Area south of Redbridge Lane at junction with London Road	Balcombe	20	Unlikely to be major development
165	Land south of Oldlands Avenue	Balcombe	40	Unlikely to be major development
1024	Land at Brook House Farm, Turners Hill Road	East Grinstead	45	Unlikely to be major development
1181	Land east of West Hoathly Road	East Grinstead	20	Unlikely to be major development
181	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105	Major development
818	Land north of former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	41	Unlikely to be major development
1188	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196	Major development
603	Land to the west of Woodhouse Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700	Major development

27. As part of the further testing, these 9 sites in the High Weald National Landscape will need to be assessed for their potential impact on the Protected Landscape taking into account national policy and guidance (the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance), as well as legislation setting out the duties on the local authority in relation to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This work will include a more detailed landscape assessment and an assessment of major development in the context of paragraph 177 of the NPPF (September 2023).
28. An initial assessment of whether the 9 sites are likely to be regarded as major development in the context of paragraph 177 of the NPPF is shown in the table above. This takes into account the nature, scale and setting of the site. Should a site be regarded as major development, it will need to be determined if there are exceptional circumstances and that the development would be in the public interest in line with national policy. This initial assessment is based on the work for ENV6 as well as more recent ongoing assessment undertaken as part of this site selection review.

29. As part of this site selection review and re-assessment, the potential benefits of developing the site have been considered.

- For the site in Ashurst Wood, this would provide much-needed affordable housing to the settlement and is capable of delivery in the first 5-years of the plan.
- For the sites at Balcombe, these are located within walking distance of the mainline train station and are therefore in a highly sustainable location from a transport perspective. They too could deliver much-needed affordable housing for the settlement.
- For the sites at East Grinstead, these are located on the edge of a Category 1 settlement, therefore are in close proximity to a range of services and facilities.
- For the site at Handcross, this would deliver much-needed affordable housing for the settlement. It is also proposed that a site of this size could deliver a new community facility (a community hall) and bowling green to replace existing provision which in turn could be redeveloped. The settlement's location in the north of the district is also in proximity to Crawley where housing need is arising.
- For the sites at Pease Pottage, whilst these are of a significant size, the Council has carefully balanced the positive impacts likely to arise. This includes the provision of additional community facilities and improvements/upgrades to existing facilities in proximity. The sites are near the Crawley boundary and therefore are ideally located to assist with unmet needs arising there. The quantum of development would generate a significant amount of affordable housing. For the previous development of 600 homes at Pease Pottage (a site allocation in the adopted District Plan), the Council agreed to share affordable housing nomination rights with Crawley Borough Council and this can be explored again here.

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 testing - Previously Developed

ID	Site	Settlement	Yield	Notes
961	1-5 Queens Walk and 22-26 London	East Grinstead	100	Previously developed town centre site, whilst this would be policy compliant an allocation would help

	Road, East Grinstead			unlock any potential barriers to development to enable it to come forward within the plan period
1191	Foxhole Farm buildings	Bolney	13	This forms an extension to the existing proposed allocation DPA14: Foxhole Farm, to incorporate the farm buildings.
818	Former Golf House	Pease Pottage	41	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.
775	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 re-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. Category 1 settlements are delivering the largest proportion of new housing over the Plan period. The most significant growth will be at Burgess Hill, with the 2018 District Plan Allocation's delivering the majority of this supply. Having reviewed the sites available at Burgess Hill, there is one site that is suitable for further testing, with a yield of 750 units.

34. At the Examination hearings, a number of representors were concerned that insufficient sites were being allocated at Haywards Heath given its category 1 status. The re-assessment has led to the inclusion of four additional sites with a total yield of 152 dwellings. Overall, Haywards Heath is delivering more growth than all Category 2 and Category 3 settlements aside from Copthorne and Sayers Common which have significant/sustainable community sites allocated within them.

35. At East Grinstead the committed supply is mainly from allocations in the Site Allocations DPD. Further growth at the town is constrained by the High Weald National Landscape to the east and south of the town. However, four additional sites with a total yield of 215 dwellings are considered suitable for further testing.

- *Category 2 Settlements*

36. The majority of the growth at category 2 settlement is coming from the sustainable community allocation DPSC2: Crabbet Park, at Copthorne settlement and on the edge of Crawley borough.
37. There remain no further allocations at Cuckfield (including Brook Street). The Council has carefully considered these sites and balanced whether positives outweigh negatives. As the harm of developing the promoted sites is not outweighed by the benefits of housing delivery, they are not being brought forward for further testing.
38. An additional site is proposed for testing at Crawley Down on the eastern boundary for 150 dwellings which would provide a sustainable extension.
39. Both Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks lie within the southern part of the district and therefore within the overlapping Coastal Housing Market Area. The Inspector has asked the Council to consider increasing its contribution towards Brighton's unmet need, which is significant. The Council's evidence shows that it should contribute 1,075 dwellings towards Brighton.
40. An additional site is proposed for testing at Hassocks for 250 dwellings which would form an extension to the adopted District Plan allocation at Clayton Mills.
41. At Hurstpierpoint, five additional sites are proposed for testing ranging from 9 – 150 dwellings. In the Council's assessment, these sites scored favourably on an individual basis due to their proximity to existing services and facilities and relatively low level of constraint. However, the Council is mindful of the discussions held at the hearings in relation to the impacts of development in Hurstpierpoint and wider area (such as Sayers Common) on Hurstpierpoint High Street. As these sites score favourably on an individual basis, the Council would like to test them further in-combination with each other and allocations already proposed within the submitted District Plan. Further detailed work on this area will form part of the in-combination testing.
42. Two relatively small sites are proposed for testing at Lindfield which would deliver 80 dwellings in total and would be capable of delivery in the early years of the plan period, helping to boost the five-year supply.

- *Category 3 Settlements*

43. Sayers Common has been identified as a location for a new sustainable community through the allocation of Land at Reeds Lane, DPSC3 and four smaller housing allocations delivering 2,526 dwellings. Further allocations at Sayers Common are proposed for further testing. Site 1124, West House Farm forms a logical extension to DPSC3, and will fill a gap between the east and western side of the allocation resulting in a more cohesive development. It is proposed that this would be brought forward as part of DPSC3 rather than an additional standalone allocation. Delivery of the site would be need to phased alongside the wider allocation. It would also be expected to make a proportionate contribution to the wider infrastructure requirements for Sayers Common.

44. At Albourne, three small sites are proposed for testing alongside one site for 250 dwellings. Given the proposed additional community facilities at Sayers Common planned already, these would be in a sustainable location. However, the Council is mindful of the potential impacts this quantum of development in this location could have. As the sites have scored well individually, the Council is of the view that they should be tested in-combination to explore likely impacts and assess whether mitigation is possible. It is anticipated that the sites at Albourne will make financial contributions towards the delivery of infrastructure at Sayers Common which will assist in its viability.
45. At Bolney, the submitted District Plan proposes to allocate one site for 200 dwellings at Foxhole Farm (DPA14). The site now has outline planning permission. During the call for further information, additional information was received relating to the wider land parcel at Foxhole Farm. Firstly, part of the allocated site, that was not included with the planning application site boundary, has been put forward as a separate site. It is considered that this site can be considered for further testing without any harmful impacts. Secondly, site 802 was not previously promoted as part of the allocated site (DPA14) and had been rejected at stage 2(a) as it was detached from the built up boundary of the settlement when considered in isolation however given the allocation and subsequent permission at DPA14 this can now be included. Both these sites would form a logical rounding off of the allocated site DPA14, which would not encroach further into the wider countryside. In total, the two sites with a total additional yield of 33 dwellings have been included for further testing.
46. There are five sites at Bolney that are relatively unconstrained and in isolation could be considered suitable for development. These are sites 526, 543, 930, 1040 and 1133. A strategy decision has been taken not to allocate these sites due to the level of growth already planned for the village and that any additional growth would not deliver any infrastructure benefits to the existing or future residents. It is also not well related to areas of unmet housing need.
47. Additional sites are proposed for testing at Handcross and Pease Pottage – justification for these is provided above in relation to development within the High Weald National Landscape.

- *Category 4 Settlements*

48. These settlements are the least sustainable of all the settlements in the district and therefore, in accordance with the spatial strategy of the Plan very few sites are proposed for allocation in these settlements. They are not well served by infrastructure such as schools and community facilities, and not close to centres of employment. The site selection review has not identified any suitable allocations at these settlements. As part of this review, the ability of larger scale sites to enable settlements to become more sustainable was considered. An update on the Council's assessment of Significant Sites is set out in the next section.

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

49. 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.

50. 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.
51. The following additional options for significant sites were considered.
 - *Land at Ansty Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty*
52. 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).
53. 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.
54. The site promoter did not submit any further information as part of its March 2026 submission on any mitigation measures it wished the Council to consider as part of the re-appraisal of the site. On that basis, the assessment of the site is consistent with the views reached as part of determining the planning application.
55. On balance it is not considered that the benefits of the site comprising the provision of homes, services and facilities, and a longer term contribution to the housing land supply would outweigh the unacceptable harm this scale of development would have on the High Weald National Landscape and the perception of coalescence between Ansty and Cuckfield.
56. The overall conclusion for the site remains that the site is not suitable for allocation.
 - *Broad location West of A23*
57. 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.
58. 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*

59. 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.
60. The overall conclusion for the site remains that the site is not suitable for allocation.

Other Considerations

61. 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.
62. 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.
63. 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
990	Courthouse Farm, Common Road	Copthorne	86
686	Land r/o The Martins (south of Hophurst Lane)	Crawley Down	150
181	Land west of Truggers	Handcross	105
1188	Land at Pease Field	Pease Pottage	196
603	Land to the West of Woodhurst Farm, Old Brighton Road South	Pease Pottage	700
818	Land north of Former Golf House, Horsham Road	Pease Pottage	41
Total			3,658

64. 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.

65. 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.

Consistency with the Spatial Strategy – Spatial Distribution

66. The spatial distribution, accounting for all commitments, Submitted District Plan allocations and additional sites for testing is as follows:

Table 5 - Spatial Strategy: Distribution

Category	Settlement	Submitted District Plan			Total Housing Supply	
		Commitments	Allocations	Additional Sites for Testing		
1	Burgess Hill	4150	1776	750	6676	9208
	East Grinstead	1110	44	215	1369	
	Haywards Heath	728	283	152	1163	
2	Copthorne	4	1950	86	2040	4136
	Crawley Down	99	459	150	708	
	Cuckfield	67	0	0	67	
	Hassocks	252	25	250	527	
	Hurstpierpoint	22	90	419	531	
	Lindfield	183	0	80	263	
3	Albourne	87	0	326	413	5354
	Ardingly	41	0	0	41	
	Ashurst Wood	69	8	25	102	
	Balcombe	32	0	60	92	
	Bolney	18	200	33	251	
	Handcross	71	0	105	176	
	Horsted Keynes	55	0	0	55	
	Pease Pottage	0	0	937	937	
	Sayers Common	18	2526	475	3019	

	Scaynes Hill	21	30	0	51	
	Sharpthorne	151	0	0	151	
	Turners Hill	61	0	0	61	
	West Hoathly	5	0	0	5	
4	Ansty	13	70	0	83	97
	Slaugham	7	0	0	7	
	Staplefield	2	0	0	2	
	Twineham	3	0	0	3	
	Warninglid	2	0	0	2	

5. Next Steps

67. In accordance with the methodology set out in MS-12, the site assessments will be subject to two-weeks fact checking by site promoters, concluding on 29th May 2026. The Council will review any feedback and document how it has had regard to it. Any revisions to the site assessments will then be published.
68. Once the fact-check is complete, the Council will carry out in-combination testing. This will test the list of additional sites alongside existing submitted District Plan allocations. The in-combination assessment will include:
- Transport modelling
 - Sustainability Appraisal
 - Habitat Regulation Assessment
 - Liaison with infrastructure bodies/providers (such as the West Sussex County Council Education, NHS, utilities) to understand infrastructure constraints, inform potential policy wording and develop a package of mitigation as appropriate for inclusion within an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
69. It is anticipated the in-combination testing will be complete by the end of July 2026. The Council will review the results and publish a list of sites proposed for allocation, alongside policy wording and other consequential proposed Main Modifications.
70. It is proposed that all Main Modifications (both as a result of this exercise, and any modifications already discussed during the examination) will be subject to a 6-week public consultation. This is likely to take place in Summer 2026 with precise details to be advertised on the Examination web page and communicated to participants.
71. Any updates or changes to the timetable will be communicated on the [Examination web page](#).