

Appendix B: Response to Regulation 18 consultation responses

The following tables provide a summary of consultation responses received during the previous consultation (Regulation 18) and the Council's response to those comments. Comments are organised by plan chapter and policy number as they were during the Regulation 18 consultation. Note that some policies in the latest plan for Regulation 19 consultation have been renumbered.

| Chapter 1. District Plan - Introduction | | | |
|---|---|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 54 | Support: 3 | Object: 42 | Neutral: 9 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft District Plan should be withdrawn until outcome of planning changes are announced. | | The Government has emphasised that plan making must continue. There are no direct implications from the recent Levelling Up and Regeneration Act. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation period should have been 12 weeks. The Public Exhibitions were limited to 2 hours on a single date for each locality. Didn't like the timescale of the exhibition with only 10 days to respond before Christmas. There is a need within MSDC to have management plans for monitoring planning approvals that include conditions that the applicant needs to fulfil. Unacceptable lack of open, transparent consultation and publicity by MSDC to alert and brief all householders about the very important implications for the future and character of villages like Crawley Down. So far, the process has been undemocratic and rather elitist. Lack of community engagement in Plan's 2 years' preparation, up to this consultation. Documents referred to in Appendix 2 fact checking exercise, in relation to site 688, are not available to residents, to see the data that some of the responses are based on. Mid Sussex should restart the process for identifying sites to be able to demonstrate 5 years supply up to 2038. Shouldn't progress a District Plan in times of political uncertainty. The three-year housing delivery test for Mid Sussex is currently 125% (500 homes); must ensure that existing allocations are delivered sustainably before adding new sites. Plan should be put on hold while the proposed amendments to the relevant legislation are being debated and look set to result in some major alterations to the requirements placed on MSDC? MSDC did not (save for one meeting just before the Plan went out) satisfactorily engage with the Parish prior to the Reg 18 consultation; nor did it hold an exhibition in Albourne Parish. The online questionnaire and feedback mechanism is over complicated and hard to navigate unless you have at least a few hours to spare. It is not sufficient to involve communities only at the Regulation 18 Stage after the decisions have been made on which sites to include. | | <p>This chapter has been updated to reflect the progress made since Regulation 18.</p> <p>Public consultation at Regulation 18 stage exceeded legal requirements.</p> <p>The Council monitors the progress of developments with planning permission and takes enforcement action when appropriate.</p> <p>The Government has urged local authorities to continue with plan-making alongside their review of planning legislation and national policy.</p> <p>The Council has committed to engaging with Town and Parish Councils as the Plan progresses, more details on engagement to date are set out in the Committee Report. Further engagement at Regulation 19 stage is set out in the Community Involvement Plan.</p> |

| Chapter 2. Background | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|----------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 1 | Support: 0 | Object: 1 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| South Downs National Park | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested change to the text about the South Downs National Park. | | Change made. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| None | | | |

| Chapter 3. Achieving Sustainable Development | | | |
|--|---|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 52 | Support: 10 | Object: 33 | Neutral: 9 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| East Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public or community transport probably needs to be provided for the rural communities for the 20-minute neighbourhoods to work. | | Site allocations require onsite sustainable transport measures and financial contributions towards further sustainable transport, such as public transport. Sites have been selected following an assessment of their relationship to settlements and accessibility to services, including whether sites can be safely accessed on foot from the nearest settlement. |
| Homes England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports 20-minute neighbourhoods as key for Brookleigh. | | Noted. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Brighton and Hove City Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports 20-minute neighbourhood principle. | | Noted. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20-minute neighbourhood is not environmentally sustainable if using greenfield sites, need to use brownfield. | | There are insufficient available and deliverable brownfield sites to meet the district's objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period. Greenfield sites have been subject to a rigorous site |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | selection methodology to ensure only the most sustainable sites are allocated. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the plan acknowledging the environment challenges | Noted. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support actions that lead to additional cycleways and footpaths • Need to link DPSC1: Land at Crabbet Park and DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane to public transport so Crawley and Brighton can be easily reached • The 20-minute neighbourhood principle restricts freedom of movement and prevents privacy. • Mid Sussex too rural in main for 20-minute neighbourhoods to work. Will only work in urban areas. • Better public transport or community transport needed to get people living in rural areas into sustainable town centres. • Presumptuous to presume people will not drive to a cheaper supermarket out of town. • Funding for 20-min neighbourhoods needs to be explored. • Cycle paths and footpaths need to be improved/more designated. • Sustainable Development needs to be entwined within vision, objectives, policies and allocations chapters. | The sustainable communities policies and other site allocations include requirements for onsite sustainable transport measures and financial contributions towards offsite improvements. The principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods ensure that people have opportunities to access services and facilities by active travel modes, rather than being restricted to this area. A full explanation of the 20-minute neighbourhood principle is set out in the submission draft District Plan and this has been expanded to respond to comments raised. |

| Chapter 4. District Plan – Supporting Evidence | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 126 | Support: 12 | Object: 105 | Neutral: 9 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| East Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that mitigation measures implemented to avoid diverted trips across border, into adjacent networks (B2112 through Ditchling). | Noted. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Heritage topic paper, assets register or heritage survey could be a useful tool to present evidence and deliver a positive heritage strategy | Noted. Heritage is a key consideration of the Site Selection Process. Where allocations may have an impact on heritage assets, policy requirements have been added to request further heritage evidence and subsequent mitigation. | |
| Surrey County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about cumulative cross-boundary impacts (into Surrey). Consider the Local Model Validation Report to be an acceptable base model but would like some clarity on some points. | Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport evidence base work is not yet complete, further iterations ahead of Regulation 19. Require evidence of how appropriate transport strategy or highway measures can be delivered ahead of submission. | Additional transport modelling has now been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing need should be based on latest housing projections rather than 2014-based projections – NPPF is going to be amended | The Council has actively lobbied Government (through the formal consultations on such matters) that the most recent housing projections should be | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | used. However, the current national policy and guidance position is that only the 2014-based projections are acceptable. The NPPF has been subject to consultation regarding revisions, a revised NPPF has not been published. Therefore, we must continue to comply with current national policy. The Council will continue to monitor the situation accordingly. |
| Bolney Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree with the findings within the Sustainability Appraisal High Weald impact should be 'high' therefore would fail methodology | Detailed comments are provided regarding the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal. In general, the SA has been prepared on a consistent basis across all sites, using the same data sources and benchmarking. Any issues raised regarding factual inaccuracies will be investigated and amendments made if required, ahead of Regulation 19 stage. The conclusion against criteria 1 (Landscape / AONB) has been scored on a consistent basis. It is based on information from the High Weald AONB Unit. A site would only score "Very Negative" where the AONB assessment has been concluded as having high impact on the AONB or likely major development within the AONB – the justification is included in a separate Topic Paper. The AONB Unit has not formed this conclusion and the site is not within the AONB so cannot be considered 'major' in NPPF paragraph 179 terms. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary Ecological Appraisals and Green Infrastructure Mapping/ Ecological Network Mapping should be used in supporting the Plan. | Since the Regulation 18 consultation, ecology surveys and other information have been provided for a number of sites. Note that there is a difference between what is required to support an allocation, and a subsequent planning application. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDC too reliant on external providers to provide infrastructure. MSDC powerless to control this. Site 677 (Land south of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down) should not be omitted from the plan. Promoting land off Silver Birches in Haywards Heath for development. Ambiguities and inconsistencies about DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane. Further clarity is needed with regards to infrastructure delivery of DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane. The options selected for comparison are inconsistent qualitative and too restricted in number. Transport modelling has proved virtually useless, at best misleading. Brownfield sites should be developed as a priority and build higher-density developments. Water facilities at maximum. Flooding an issue. Parking at all three stations needs to be increased significantly. Lack of information provided on Sustainable Communities' sites Traffic won't cope in the proposed locations. Inaccuracies in text relating to Sayers Common. Site Selection methodology and conclusions are wrong; criteria are fundamentally flawed. Plan needs to consider aerodrome safeguarding (air safety). Sustainability Appraisal based on out of date info. Insufficient waste management to cope with new housing volumes. The Plan shouldn't rely on Census data 2021 which was taken during the pandemic. The site selection process lacks a quantitative assessment of different options to demonstrate that the proposed allocations represent the most sustainable solution. Evidence base should be renewed and under constant review. | Site promoters for omission sites will have an opportunity to attend the plan's examination and make a case for their inclusion. Further site-specific evidence will be published alongside the Regulation 19 consultation. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Many changes have been made to the plan since the Regulation 18 consultation in response to comments, including further requirements and detail on flood risk and drainage, aerodrome safeguarding, and green infrastructure. Comments related to the Site Selection Methodology and Site Selection: Conclusions paper have been addressed within updated versions of these documents which have been republished at Regulation 19. Census data is the most reliable source of information available. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect references in the HRA. • No evidence of the Duty to Co-operate. • Need to consider Crawley's unmet housing need. • Unfortunate factual errors have now been incorporated into the evidence base. • No Statement of Common Ground published. | <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been updated to include strategic infrastructure requirements set out by statutory bodies and infrastructure providers as well as local infrastructure identified through engagement with Town and Parish Councils. Statements of Common Ground have and will continue to be prepared and the evidence base updated.</p> <p>The Evidence Base has been updated and new studies and reports added to the online library. It is likely that additional studies and topic papers will be prepared to support Submission.</p> <p>Duty to Co-Operate is ongoing to the point of Submission – a Duty to Co-Operate statement will be published at that time setting out the mechanisms and outcomes reached. The consideration of unmet need from neighbouring authorities is set out within the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| Chapter 5. Vision and Objectives | | | |
|--|---|------------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 26 | Support: 7 | Object: 14 | Neutral: 5 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested additional wording regarding biodiversity, net gain and nature recovery to reflect Environment Act 2021, Environment Plan and Environmental Improvement Plan. | | Strategic objectives amended. |
| Homes England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 strategic development principles for Brookleigh align with the 3 priority themes and 15 objectives | | Noted. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support but "Environment" should include recognition of the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change, net zero economy | | Strategic objectives amended. |
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested wording to objective 3 to broaden reference to the range of special qualities of protected and valued landscapes. | | Strategic objective to protect valued landscapes encompasses broad special qualities, with further detail set out in heritage policies. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Lindfield Rural Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P27 – 29 Environment/Economy/Growth – we support these objectives provided that the correct balance can be agreed between them and funding is identified to deliver a realistic plan. | | Noted. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental objectives fail to reflect the ambition and urgency needed to restore the natural environment. Suggested wording to objective 3 or new objective provided. | | Strategic objectives amended. |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives haven't been uniformly applied in the housing developments Social element of building and maintaining communities has been ignored Housing demand methodology is not helpful Objectives not applied through the plan | <p>Site allocations and other policies in the plan are considered to be consistent with the strategic objectives.</p> <p>The strategic objectives include a social element, to support sustainable communities and meet the needs of all sectors of the community. Each policy notes which objective it is contributing to.</p> |
|---------------|--|---|

| Chapter 6. District Plan Strategy | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 209 | Support: 7 | Object: 184 | Neutral: 18 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change "good public transport" to "relatively good public transport" to better describe category 1 towns. | Amendment made. Developments at category 1 towns include requirements for financial contributions to sustainable transport measures, helping to further improve public transport accessibility and provision. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Brighton and Hove City Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support approach for identifying development potential | Noted. | |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support "making effective use of land" Supports allowing extensions of existing settlements | Noted. | |
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support protection of designated landscapes, but concerned if the NP and its setting have been considered Pages 33 and 34 fail to consider South Downs National Park | South Downs National Park is referenced in relevant sections of the plan, emphasising the importance of protecting its special qualities and setting. A separate Topic Paper will be published to demonstrate consideration of the SDNP when assessing sites. | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council | The development strategy for the existing District Plan should be continued rather than focusing more development at the villages. Landscape impact is only one consideration, and great weight should be given to transport impacts associated with this new strategy. | | The draft District Plan explained (Chapter 6) that there is a need to review and update the current strategy. The outcome of additional evidence base work (e.g. transport and sustainability appraisal) will provide justification for whether the site would meet the plan strategy or not (noting that, even if compliant with the plan strategy, it may not be suitable for allocation for other reasons). |
| Cuckfield Parish Council | The development strategy for the existing District Plan should be continued rather than focusing more development at the villages. Landscape impact is only one consideration, and great weight should be given to transport impacts associated with this new strategy | | The draft District Plan explained (Chapter 6) that there is a need to review and update the current strategy. The outcome of additional evidence base work (e.g. transport and sustainability appraisal) will provide justification for whether the site would meet the plan strategy or not (noting that, even if compliant with the plan strategy, it may not be suitable for allocation for other reasons). |
| Lindfield Rural Parish Council | Infrastructure must be provided in advance of new developments being occupied. | | There is ongoing engagement with infrastructure providers to ensure that development is supported by the appropriate infrastructure. The Council will also be engaging with Town and Parish Councils ahead of |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | Regulation 19 stage to discuss local infrastructure requirements resulting from the draft allocations. This will inform individual site policy requirements and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies the District Plan. |
| Peycombe Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amount of housing proposed will decrease the remaining countryside and increase urbanisation, with wider impacts on surrounding infrastructure and less availability of services for residents living in outlying villages. Development will have a serious impact on local highways, increasing pollution and noise. There needs to be further assessment of environmental impact including water supply and drainage. | <p>The District Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines impact on the transport network. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise.</p> <p>The policy requirements include provision of on-site wastewater infrastructure including new wastewater treatment works.</p> |
| Poynings Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing target should not be based on the standard method now that the government has moved away from mandatory targets. | The NPPF has been subject to consultation regarding revisions, but a revised NPPF has not been published. Therefore, we must continue to comply with current national policy. The Council will continue to monitor the situation accordingly. |
| Balcombe Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development cannot be the only way to retain vital services. Pleased that allocations have been removed from the AONB. | Noted. |
| Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no justification for avoiding any development in the AONB, which already includes some large settlements. MSDC could be more proactive in identifying and bringing forward brownfield sites. Too much greenfield land is being allocated. The small amount of development planned at the 3 main towns does not reflect the plan's strategy of promoting an urban focus. There should be greater emphasis on urban renewal and redevelopment. The plan does not focus growth at the 3 main towns or distribute it evenly across larger villages. MSDC has selected sites based primarily on where land has been promoted by developers through the SHLAA. Growth should be focused at the main towns. | <p>The District Plan strategy aims to protect designated landscapes such as the AONB, however it does not preclude development – in fact, the draft District Plan allocates sites within the AONB.</p> <p>It does, however, restrict large-scale ('Major') development – this is in accordance with the strong protection afforded to protected landscapes within national policy. In accordance with National Policy, allocations are first sought in areas which are not afforded the highest level of protection.</p> <p>The UCS has been prepared by expert consultants and forms the Council's evidence on this matter. It assesses the potential for development on Brownfield sites over the plan period, accepting that this is a form of 'windfall' and will need to be justified.</p> <p>The draft District Plan contained allocations on brownfield sites (Burgess Hill Station, Orchards Haywards Heath, LVS Sayers Common).</p> <p>The distribution of development is based on the availability and suitability of sites. Regardless, Tables 1a and 1b within the draft Plan demonstrate that (aside from the Northern Arc allocation) there is a fair distribution between the three towns.</p> |
| East Grinstead Town Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that East Grinstead has limited growth potential due to the Ashdown Forest zone of influence and the AONB. | Noted. |
| Worth Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crawley Down has already taken significant development and infrastructure is insufficient for further growth. The plan should allow more growth in SDNP and the AONB. | <p>The District Plan strategy aims to protect designated landscapes such as the AONB, however it does not preclude development – in fact, the draft District Plan allocates sites within the AONB.</p> <p>It does, however, restrict large-scale ('Major') development – this is in accordance with the strong protection afforded to protected landscapes within</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | national policy. In accordance with National Policy, allocations are first sought in areas which are not afforded the highest level of protection. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will housing targets be reconsidered after government housing target changes? • Is the environmental evidence base supporting the local plan sufficient to confidently ensure this housing need can be delivered sustainably? • Consider other national ecological assets alongside AONBs and High Weald - map needed | A new NPPF has not been published therefore there are no changes to the calculation of housing need. The objectively assessed housing need for Mid Sussex is unlikely to change significantly. The evidence base and Policies Map have been updated. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends guidance on: <i>Residential development and trees – the importance of trees and green spaces</i> | Noted. The plan has been amended in several places to take account of specific recommendations by the Woodland Trust. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levelling up bill updates re: non-mandatory targets should be taken at face value • Needs calculation not realistic as 60% of MSDC is National Park or AONB • Affordable housing targets not likely to be achieved • Decrease development in countryside • Site allocation doesn't consider the impacts of infrastructure needs • Overloaded water supply and serious impact on highways A23, A2300 and A272 • Growth is not the only way to support provision of local services – strategy needed to retain and support existing services in rural communities • New strategy for service provision where further development is not suitable • limited growth potential at East Grinstead noted • Not positively prepared, justified or consistent with National planning policy • Amend to allocate developments in AONBs – developments should be limited but not excluded • Emphasise the potential for urban renewal and redevelopment to contribute to housing supply needed • Distribute areas of growth in and around HH and EG – areas of growth are not balanced between main towns • Ansty is not considered an appropriate settlement for expansion but supports DPH24: Challoners, Cuckfield Road and DPH25: Land to the West of Marwick Close, Bolney Road if the development is proportional to the scale of the village • Supports development at sustainable settlements BH, EG and HH • More investment in infrastructure needed • AONB and SDNP cannot be immune from development • New developments must have infrastructure provisions - no capacity in existing towns • Ansty is not considered an appropriate settlement for expansion • Supports proportionate development at Cuckfield in line with the Neighbourhood Plan • Fairer distribution of development needed • Mention other ecological assets • Sustainability of allocated sites • More development on brownfield sites. Effective use of land – increasing supply in Turners Hill | <p>A new NPPF has not been published therefore there are no changes to the calculation of housing need. The objectively assessed housing need for Mid Sussex is unlikely to change significantly. The evidence base and Policies Map have been updated.</p> <p>Site allocations have been through an objective site selection process and subject to Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Further site-specific evidence will be published alongside the Regulation 19 consultation. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.</p> <p>Many changes have been made to the plan since the Regulation 18 consultation in response to comments, including further requirements and detail on flood risk and drainage, aerodrome safeguarding, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Site allocations include requirements for onsite infrastructure and financial contributions towards offsite provision.</p> <p>The examination following Regulation 19 consultation will determine whether the plan is sound.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Chapter 7. Policies | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 7 | Support: 1 | Object: 6 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standalone policies are not sufficient in relation to heritage risk. Policies should be tested against the potential risks they might have on heritage. | Amendments have been made to policies and supporting text to take account of Historic England comments. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes the approach that MSDC have taken to give clarity to the policies and their status within the plan. | Noted. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First paragraph top of page 43, change from "Mandatory" to "Advisory". Non-strategic policies in the NPs must remain valid. Will residents be expected to fund the writing of a new Parish Plan to make it fit with the new District Plan, at a time when there are severe financial constraints? MSDC should have made clear what the changes were to existing policies. A longer plan period may be appropriate. | <p>Where relevant, the plan cross-references neighbourhood plan policies and requires consistency with their policies. The approach taken for strategic/non-strategic policies is in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>There is no legal requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed or updated.</p> <p>All changes to existing policies were set out in track-changes at Regulation 18 stage. Any changes between Regulation 18 and 19 are also set out in track changes.</p> <p>The plan period accords with the NPPF – a minimum 15 years from the point of adoption.</p> |

| Chapter 8. Sustainability | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 157 | Support: 16 | Object: 130 | Neutral: 11 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider updating Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and take account of other sources of flooding Support natural flood management and nature-based solutions <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: Suggested wording for consistency with recently updated PPG. | A revised SFRA will be published. Policy DPS4 amended as suggested. | |
| East Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Impact Assessments (HIA) or screening for HIA should be supported by separate guidance and a template to provide clarity on the council's expectations. Potential to specify HIA triggers. | Additional wording in supporting text to clarify expectations and cross-reference guidance that should be followed. | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS1 Climate Change</u>: Specific reference to protection of heritage assets should be included <u>DSP3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes</u>: Specific reference to heritage assets in bullet (i) should be included | Policy DSP3 has been redrafted and includes specific references to protecting heritage assets. The plan should be read as a whole. Policy DPB2 will be applied to any development affecting a heritage asset. | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Homes England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>: Support | Noted. |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: SuDs should be encouraged in minor developments (1-9 dwellings) too. | Development size threshold deleted so the policy applies to all development. |
| Southeast Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan must do its part in addressing root causes of climate change. • <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>: Suggest the council could be more ambitious in relation to water use, grey/rainwater harvesting. • Supports DPS3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes and DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage • <u>DPS5 Water Infrastructure and Water Environment</u>: should reference specific water target – recommend council be ambitious. | Policy DPS2 amended to include additional requirements regarding water resources and water efficiency. Policy DPS5 now refers to water neutrality and the policy on water and wastewater infrastructure has been moved to Policy DPI7. |
| National Grid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest additional criteria to DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction to reference the presence of existing infrastructure in design | Policy DPI1 supports service providers delivering utility infrastructure, subject to accordance with other policies in the plan, and requires that development is coordinated with the delivery and maintenance of infrastructure, both onsite and offsite. |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPS1 Climate Change</u>: Support • <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>: Clarity needed on water efficiency standards are being set • <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: Suggested wording to strengthen use of natural flood management solutions • <u>DPS6 Health and Wellbeing</u>: Reference could be made to NE's Green Infrastructure Framework | Further detail added to Policy DPS2 regarding water efficiency. Policy DPS4 amended to show a preference for soft flood management methods over hard engineered solutions. Policy DPS6 amended to include new references to accessible open space and countryside, and enhancement of recreational routes and PROWs. |
| Thames Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>: suggest amendment to ensure water efficiency and reduction of water consumption in the design of developments • <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: suggest amendment to ensure surface water does not drain to the foul sewer. | Policy DPS2 amended to include additional requirements regarding water resources and water efficiency. Policy DPS4 amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>: Plan should require development in Southern Water's Sussex North Water Resource Zone (WRZ) to be water neutral. | There is a new policy on water neutrality (DPS5), which refers to Sussex North WRZ and follows the same approach as the Crawley Local Plan submitted policy. |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports inclusion of sustainability chapter | Noted. |
| Town and Parish Councils | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see requirement for alternative energy supplies for development to be applied | Policy DPS3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes supports proposals for new renewable and low carbon energy projects provided that certain criteria are met (e.g. related to landscape, ecology and neighbouring amenity). In addition, policy DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction supports alternative energy sources for new developments and requires new developments to be net zero-carbon. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Bolney | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek wording change to <u>DPS3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes</u> to reflect cumulative impact of such schemes. | The wording changes proposed are accepted and will be reflected in the next version of the Plan. |
| East Grinstead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS5 Water Infrastructure and Water Environment</u> Would welcome a commitment (DPS5) for the district to work with SE Water and Southern Water re upgrading infrastructure | South-East Water and Southern Water are both statutory consultees to the plan-making and planning application processes. They prepare Water Resource and Wastewater management plans (in a similar fashion to District Plans) to plan for increasing demand and their plans to address that. |
| Hassocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u> may not be strict enough re water use standards. | DPS2 reflects the findings within the evidence base, as well as balancing this against what can be delivered in feasibility and viability terms. The requirement has been strengthened to 85/litres/person/day to be consistent with similar policies arising in Crawley and Horsham (as there is a joint evidence base on this matter). |
| Horsted Keynes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS1 Climate Change</u> and <u>DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction</u>, would like to see these taken further with a requirement to demonstrate developments are “zero carbon ready” | The Council has commissioned consultants, Ricardo, to prepare an evidence base for tighter sustainability standards. These policies have been updated ahead of Regulation 19 to require new developments to be net zero-carbon. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan/policies needs to go further to emphasis the context and importance of taking action to address climate change and securing sustainable development. Robust and transparent monitoring is required to support the ambition in the policies. Economic and social value to the countryside needs to be given more weight. Will the ambition in the Sustainable Economic Strategy (SES) for net zero-carbon ready homes be achieved. | New supporting text for Policy DPS1 provides further detail on climate change evidence, policies and strategies in place at the national and local levels. Policy DPS2 provides options for development to demonstrate zero operational GHG emissions, providing necessary flexibility around specific assessment frameworks. The policy requires post-occupancy monitoring to ensure the objectives of the policy are being realised in practice. Other policies in the plan recognise the wide-ranging value of the countryside. |
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes</u>: Suggested wording to reference early engagement with Gatwick Airport <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: suggest additional wording to ensure SuDS do not give rise to increased bird strikes. | Policy DPS3 and supporting text amended as suggested. Reference to bird strikes added to Policy DPS4. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: suggest additional wording in support of natural flood management. | Policy amended with reference to soft engineering. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes</u>: seeks clarity that impacts extend to connection to the grid. <u>DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage</u>: suggest additional wording in support of natural flood management. <u>DPS5 Water Infrastructure and Water Environment</u>: wording should be strengthened to include reference to biodiversity, climate change, maintenance and management commitments. | Policy DPS3 refers to connection to the grid. Policy DPS4 amended with reference to soft engineering. Policy DPS5 replaced by a new water neutrality policy and the previous policy on water and wastewater infrastructure has been moved to Policy DPI7. |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to align with the Sustainable Economic Strategy to build 'net zero-ready homes' and set out how the Plan will support achieving net zero targets and address scope 3 emissions Higher standards are not necessary or justified, goes against the NPPG and Written Ministerial Statement – should not go beyond national standards in Building Regulations Viability impacts need to be fully understood Lack of transparency – what the HQM standards actually mean for the development needs to be clearer – will it be net zero housing, what renewables will be integrated, will gas boilers be allowed and how water will be managed? Standards are not ambitious enough in water and energy – below net zero ready standard Require design to optimise orientation for maximising solar gain, avoid overheating and minimise heat loss Needs to be seeking higher standards for retrofitting existing buildings – LETI standard <u>DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes</u>: Renewable energy policy should set specific measurable 5 yearly fossil fuel reduction targets and limit the scale of infrastructure in single locations | <p>New supporting text added to Policy DPS1 to provide further detail on climate change evidence, policies and strategies in place at the national and local levels. Council-wide climate change commitments justify higher standards in the plan.</p> <p>The cost implications of sustainability policies have been factored into the plan's viability assessment. Policy DPS2 provides options for development to demonstrate zero operational GHG emissions, providing necessary flexibility around specific assessment frameworks. The policy requires post-occupancy monitoring to ensure the objectives of the policy are being realised in practice. Policy DPS2 also requires conformity with the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.</p> |
|---------------|--|--|

| Chapter 9. Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 195 | Support: 19 | Object: 169 | Neutral: 7 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u>: 'Green infrastructure' should be changed to 'green and blue infrastructure'. <u>DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas identified as opportunities for nature recovery should be safeguarded from development. Watercourses should have an 8m ecological buffer zone Policy should include reference to river restoration opportunities Provide cross reference to DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain <u>DPN6 Pollution</u>: Amend policy to include suggested statement on pollution prevention practices <u>DPN10 Land Stability and Contaminated Land</u>: Amend policy to reference "potential pathways for identified risk to receptors" | | <p>Further detail provided in supporting text, regarding nature recovery and river restoration opportunities. References to blue infrastructure added to policies. Watercourse buffer zone added to Policy DPN1. Policy DPN6 amended to refer to pollution prevention practices. Policy DPN10 amended as suggested.</p> |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</u>: Support | | Noted. |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery</u>: amend wording suggested to provide clarification and strengthen policy <u>DPN2 Biodiversity Net Gain</u>: Amend wording suggested to strengthen policy <u>DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u>: amend wording suggested to strengthen policy via inclusion of other blue/ green infrastructure (see NE's GI Framework) <u>DPN7 Noise Impacts</u>: Amend wording suggested to include reference to natural solutions | | Policies and supporting text amended to strengthen and provide clarification, as suggested. |
| Southeast Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query the justification for the higher 20% BNG threshold for the identified significant sites. Higher BNG targets would create contradiction and complexity | | Higher BNG requirements for the significant sites (Policies DPSC1-3) will help these developments create sustainable new communities. Many LAs are proposing higher BNG requirements than the national minimum, and not only for the largest sites. |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPN6 Pollution</u>: amend wording to include 'Development should not result in or be adversely affected by pollution or hazards, including air, noise, vibration, light, water, soil, odour, dust or other pollutants...' | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPN8 Light Impacts and Dark Skies</u>: Suggested wording to reference Park's designation as Moore's Reserve and guidance. | New supporting text to reference Moore's Reserve. |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could include reference to cross boundary opportunities to connect habitats and create wider ecological networks. | Additional references in policies and supporting text to local nature recovery strategies, ecological corridors and river restoration, the benefits of which will extend beyond MSDC boundaries. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPN4 should name the large tracts of ancient woodland in the north of the district (such as Worth Forest and Tilgate Forest). • Biodiversity Net Gain should be provided on or in close proximity to the development | It is not necessary, or practical, to name each ancient woodland. Ancient Woodland is strongly protected by local and national policy and the size/status/importance of each individual woodland does not affect this strong protection. Provision of Biodiversity Net Gain is governed by legislation, which allows for BNG to be provided off-site. However, more credits are achieved for locating BNG on or in close proximity to the development, therefore there is an advantage to developers for achieving this. |
| Burgess Hill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPN9 Pollution</u> should enforce emission free zones around schools, and address emissions from open slurry lagoons | The District Plan can only include policies that can be taken into account when determining planning applications. Creating emission-free zones is not a planning function, therefore this text can't be added to the policy. |
| East Grinstead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</u>. Remove the word 'normally' from 'will not normally be permitted'. | In some occasions it will be necessary to permit development that will lead to the loss of trees and this will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. |
| Hassocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u> Green Infrastructure should specifically list sites identified as Local Green Space in the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan. | There is no requirement for this policy to duplicate policies in Neighbourhood Plans however can refer to them for completeness. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New policy: Development should only be permitted when demonstrated that water and sewerage infrastructure is sufficient to avoid exacerbating unauthorised releases into water courses. • If water pollution is continued to be dealt with in DPS5: Water Infrastructure and Water Environment, then cross reference to DPN6: Pollution is needed. • <u>DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery</u>: amend wording to include Council's Ecological Network and Green Infrastructure mapping work • Plan should set out express target for new woodland and hedgerows • <u>DPN6 Pollution</u>: should be a strategic policy • <u>DPN7 Noise Impacts</u>: amend wording to provide clarification • <u>DPN8 Light Impacts and Dark Skies</u>: - The light pollution map could valuably be used at the site allocation stage. • <u>DPN9 Air Quality</u>: amend wording to reference the hierarchy principle of avoidance <i>then</i> mitigation | There is a new policy on water neutrality, while the policy on water infrastructure has been moved to Policy DPI7, and other policies include additional requirements for water treatment and drainage. Policy DPN3 refers to green infrastructure mapping. Various changes to policies and supporting text to provide clarification, including change to Policy DPN9 to reflect the hierarchy of avoidance of impact and then mitigation. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u>: Suggested wording to reference design of infrastructure and risk of bird strike | Reference added to supporting text for Policy DPN3. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see a map of the ecological networks; proposed development sites should not impinge on these networks. • Bird nest boxes should be provided on all development sites, and for Wakehams Green to require the provision of Swift bricks on a proportion of the new dwellings. • Pet and human free areas which are set aside for nature should be included in Significant Sites (DPSC1-3). | Policy DPN1 amended to require specific biodiversity features to be incorporated into development, such as bird boxes. Various changes made to policies and supporting text in this chapter to strengthen wording on ecological networks and nature recovery strategies. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside, needs to be consistent with DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain, DPN3: Green Infrastructure, and DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows. • <u>DPN2 Biodiversity Net Gain</u>: Amend policy to reference that BNG is in addition to requirements of Mitigation Hierarchy • <u>DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</u>: amend policy to include reference to “soils” | The plan should be read as a whole. Policies in this chapter are considered to be consistent with policies in the Countryside chapter. Supporting text clarified regarding BNG being in addition to the mitigation hierarchy. Reference to soils added. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports UK’s Committee in Climate Change (CCC) proposed rapid increase rate of woodland creation in tackling biodiversity and climate crisis. • Strengthen wording with explicit reference to ancient woodland pasture and historic parkland as habitats that should be given same consideration as ancient woodland. • Support setting greater than 10% target for BNG • Encourage the consideration of developing a local metric for urban/ brownfield sites • Offsite BNG should be part of a comprehensive Nature Recovery network approach. • <u>DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u>: Amend wording to include reference to Local Nature Recovery Network • <u>DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</u>: Amend wording to strengthen reference to: the protection of Ancient Woodland; integration of trees into development (including minimum canopy); source of new trees; replacement trees and buffer zones. | Policy DPN3 amended to refer to nature recovery networks. Additional wording in Policy DPN4 regarding buffer zones and replacement trees. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the policies are supported, but text is suggested to strength the policy. • <u>DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</u>: lack of recognition of Worth Forest. Mainly mentions the Ashdown Forest in the policies. • Worth Forest should be designated as a Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Zone. • Worth Forest will be destroyed by Center Parcs. • Insufficient recognition of Oldhouse Warren and Tilgate, High Beeches, Brantridge, Balcombe and Monks Forests as well. St.Leonard’s (Plummers Plain, Newells, Leonards Lee, & Free Chase are under designated for wildlife interest at both national & local levels. • Wider geographical recognition of important green infrastructure sites needed, particularly those in the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan. • Protected species (identified by Woodland Flora and Fauna Group) are at risk from housing developments. • Long time periods (10-20 years) are required for nature recovery on new sites • increased pollution will be concentrated in narrow village centre streets such as Hurstpierpoint High Street • For BNG, a management plan must be made together with enough money for long term funding before development proceeds. • The policy should include provision for the replacement on a 1:1 basis of ash trees or other trees that are felled due to ash die-back or other disease with alternative natural species. • The plan should set out quantitative values for “unacceptable levels of noise” • The policy should specify warm yellow (i.e. temperature of 3000K or less) for outdoor lighting adjacent to sensitive habitats such as ancient woodland. • <u>DPN10 Land Stability and Contaminated Land</u>: should prevent developments from raising the ground level if could result in reduced or blocked water flow from or into adjacent properties. | MSDC has no control over designation of sites as SPAs or SCAs. Policy DPN4 and others will apply to development affecting Worth Forest and others. Note that there is no proposal for Center Parcs in Mid Sussex. Policy DPN1 requires ecological impact assessments and all the policies in this chapter work together to ensure impacts to the natural environment are avoided, mitigated, and BNG delivered. Policy DPN2 amended to ensure BNG is maintained and monitored for at least 30 years. Various changes to policies and text to provide clarification and additional detail, e.g. noise impacts, aerodrome safeguarding, and appropriate lighting. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature recovery and enhancement should be given further priority within DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery. Electric vehicles won't solve everything. 'off-site net gain' needs defining Reduce bird strike risk near Gatwick by a policy covering green and blue infrastructure. Add wording to DPN3: Green Infrastructure, to cover aerodrome safeguarding. <u>DPN9 Air Quality</u>: Pollution - should create emission-free zones for streets around schools. Protecting the Green spaces Is welcomed but it is felt this could have gone further. Strongly urge the Council to identify additional areas of existing green infrastructure and opportunities for enhancing and creating new green infrastructure within the plan. <u>Interactive map/ DPN3 Green Infrastructure</u>: boundary of DPSC1: Land to the West of Burgess Hill should be amended to remove the "Green Circle". To achieve the objective of policy DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, Land at Ansty Farm should be reinstated | |
|--|---|--|

| Chapter 10. Countryside | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 82 | Support: 14 | Object: 52 | Neutral: 16 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPC3 New Homes in the Countryside</u>: Needs to clarify that this will not be permitted if it conflicts with other policies or planning guidance | | Plan should be read as a whole therefore not necessary to state this. |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports, DPC2: Preventing Coalescence, DPC3: New Homes in the Countryside, DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and DPC5: Setting of the South Downs National Park | | No change required. |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside</u>: barrier to statutory utility providers - amend wording to permit development for essential utilities infrastructure | | Policy DPS5 (water and wastewater infrastructure, now DPI7) permits the development or expansion of water supply or sewerage/ sewage treatment facilities, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impacts and that any such adverse impact is minimised. Policy DPC1 permits development in the countryside that is supported by a specific policy elsewhere in the plan, which includes DPS7. No change required. |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u>: Wording should be strengthened in line with paragraph 176 NPPF. | | Wording strengthened as suggested. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC</u>: suggested wording for clarification purposes | | Policy wording amended. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC5 Setting of the South Downs National Park</u>: Support but amend for clarity and to reflect NPPF and include responsibilities MSDC have as per the section 62 duty of regard. | Amendments made and agreed with SDNPA. |
| Town and Parish Councils | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u> Would like to see stronger policy on AONB, and state which policies do not apply in the AONB (e.g. DPC4) | The Development Plan should be read as a whole, the introduction of cross-references may help the reader however can appear to be too definitive. There are certain instances (e.g. through National Policy) which place tighter restrictions on development in the AONB. |
| East Grinstead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC1 Countryside</u> should include ma showing where Grage 1,2, and 3a agricultural land is. • <u>DPC2 Preventing Coalescence</u>: Would like to see a list/map of areas where coalescence should be resisted | It is not possible to include such layers on a Policies Map as it covers the whole of the district outside built-up areas. In addition, Grade 3a agricultural land is not mapped – it is assessed on a case-by-case basis. Policy DPC2: Preventing Coalescence can be applied on a case-by-case basis. It is not possible to include a map of areas where coalescence should be resisted, as that will depend on the type/scale/mass of development proposed. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| The Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC</u>: Supports protection of Ashdown Forest buffer zone and SANG requirements | No change required. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u>: Support but add wording explicitly referring to ancient woodlands | Policy incorporates all the landscape components of the AONB and should not emphasise one over the others. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside</u>: scope of this policy should go beyond intrinsic character and beauty. Ensure it doesn't conflict with DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain, DPN3: Green Infrastructure, and DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Policy DPC1 has been amended to reference the wider benefits of the countryside, including social and environmental value such as the provision of ecosystem services, a nature recovery network and resilience to the effects of climate change. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u>: large scale housing, industrial and leisure within AONB shouldn't be supported | Policy amended to clarify that major development will not be supported other than in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC</u>: explain process being undertaken to determine whether MSDC will be providing SANGs | The District Plan provides high-level information and the detailed process is explained on the Council's website at https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/protecting-ashdown-forest/ . The HRA also includes more information. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u>: Add that large-scale housing, industrial and leisure developments within the AONB will not be supported. | Policy amended to clarify that major development will not be supported other than in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC</u>: Further explanation of the process undertaken to determine provision of SANGS is required. | The District Plan provides high-level information and the detailed process is explained on the Council's website at https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/protecting-ashdown-forest/ . The HRA also includes more information. |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| <p>Others</p> | <p><u>DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs and sustainability of farming and forestry must be given strong weight • More incentives for footpaths and right of way • A map is needed to show areas being covered • Needs strengthening • Reference the need to use The Cuckfield Landscape Character Assessment 2012 • Should go further and include stronger preservation of ancient hedgerows • Support, but agricultural development, including development to support an agricultural activity, should be allowed • Policy should allow for development of previously developed land (PDL) in the countryside. | <p>Minor changes made to supporting text and policy to strengthen or clarify wording where necessary.</p> <p>The plan and Policies Map define “countryside” for the purposes of this policy.</p> <p>The policy requires reference to landscape evidence used in the preparation of neighbourhood plans, where relevant, including the Cuckfield Landscape Character Assessment 2012.</p> <p>The policy does not prevent non-agricultural development which is necessary to support an agricultural activity (necessary for the purposes of agriculture), subject to policy criteria that minimise landscape impacts and loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The policy allows for development in the countryside that is supported by specific policies elsewhere in the development plan, such as DPH2 (sustainable development outside the built-up area) and DPH34 (rural exception sites). Some development of previously developed land is already permitted under the General Permitted Development Order and can happen without reference to development plan policy.</p> |
| | <p><u>DPC2 Preventing Coalescence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict development in local gaps • More evidence required at planning stage • Include a list of areas where coalescence is to be resisted • Identification of local gaps should include land between Hurstpierpoint and settlements of Hassocks, BH and Albourne and Sayers Common • Supports Policy DPC2: Preventing Coalescence. Should include a Local Gap between Cuckfield and Haywards Heath. • Supports DPC2: Preventing Coalescence, but the wording of the policy impacts more on large scale developments, small scale should be included | <p>Minor changes made to policy and supporting text, referring to individual and cumulative harm, local gaps identified in other plans, and the need for landscape and visual impact assessments. The policy provides sufficient protection without identifying specific local gaps, though the Policies Map identifies local gaps that have been defined in neighbourhood plans.</p> |
| | <p><u>DPC3 New Homes in the Countryside:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less restrictions on replacement dwellings • Restrict replacement agricultural buildings • Rural buildings should not be converted for at least 15 years from construction | <p>Policy wording amended to be less restrictive for replacement dwellings.</p> <p>Permitted development rights allow new agricultural buildings and conversion of agricultural buildings in many cases, without reference to the development plan. For developments that require planning permission, Policy DPC3 ensures recently constructed buildings are not eligible and that their re-use is beneficial for heritage, visual amenity, or landscape character.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><u>DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict major developments • Specific local housing needs and infrastructure • More clarity is needed to demonstrate the interaction of this policy with others through the plan | <p>Policy wording amended to restrict major development and refer specifically to new housing development.</p> <p>Clarification provided regarding the crosscutting role of the AONB Management Plan, informing climate change strategies and site allocations.</p> |
| | <p><u>DPC5 Setting of the South Downs National Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF coherence – amend wording | <p>Minor policy amendments.</p> |
| | <p><u>DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SCA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Plan should clarify whether sites will be prioritised in recognition of strategic SANG being delivered. • Support for the 7km protection zone and policy approach. • Concern that 7km zone of influence is being expanded by policy requirement for mitigation adjacent or close to the boundary. | <p>The site selection methodology does not prioritise sites that deliver SANG but the assessment identifies positive and very positive environmental impacts, and shortlisted sites are then subject to detailed evidence testing and Sustainability Appraisal, to ensure the most suitable and sustainable sites are taken forward.</p> <p>Minor amendments to policy and supporting text to clarify the approach to developments adjacent or close to the 7km zone of influence.</p> |

| Chapter 11. Built Environment | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 22 | Support: 4 | Object: 17 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter omits reference to archaeology • <u>DPB3 Conservation Areas:</u> Support but would like further clarity on: How the plan will address heritage at risk, how the archaeology in the plan area will be managed, how environmental records and local list might assist, How <u>Article 4 Directions</u> may be employed to provide an additional conservation mechanism, What opportunities are there for <u>heritage-led regeneration</u>, What potential is there for new <u>heritage-led tourism</u> initiatives. | | <p>Policies DPB1 and DPB2 amended to make further reference to heritage assets and a specific reference to archaeology.</p> |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DPB1 Character and Design:</u> Recommend that quantitative density standards for different types of location are set out as part of this approach in order to ensure that development sites make efficient use of land. | | <p>Policy and text amended to strengthen links to the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD. Quantitative density standards may be too prescriptive, but Policy DPB1 ensures development is suited to its context.</p> |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Cuckfield Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest Policy DPB1 amended to include reference to specific aspects of design such as height, spacing, and layout. | | <p>Various policy amendments and cross-reference to the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.</p> |
| Balcombe Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPB2 in combination with other policies fails to protect the setting of listed buildings. | | <p>Other policies in the plan set out requirements for protecting heritage assets, including site-specific requirements for some site allocations.</p> |
| East Grinstead Town Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest strengthened wording to ensure design prioritises people rather than cars. | | <p>Policy amended.</p> |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPB1 Character and Design</u>: Ensure appropriate wording is used to support Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements. | Section on aerodrome safeguarding requirements added to the policy. |
| The Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPB3 Conservation Areas</u>: Suggest adding reference to trees. | Reference added to policy. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPB1 Character and Design</u>. Include specific reference in the policies for the LCWIP to show how this is integral to allow walking and cycling routes in and around the town. <u>DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets</u>. Enhance wording about trees being incorporated in new development. DPSC3: Crabtree Park and DPH11: Land east of Borde Hill Lane, HH fail to meet the requirements on setting of Listed Buildings in this policy. Set out more clearly how higher densities and compact forms of development may be appropriate. | <p>Reference to the LCWIP is included under Policy DPT3. The plan is to be read as a whole rather than repeating parts of policies. Further information has however been added in relation to 20-minute neighbourhood, strengthening the relationship with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Policy and text amended to strengthen links to the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, providing more detail on appropriate densities and other aspects of design.</p> |
| General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stronger requirements for dark sky implementation with recognition and wider public support identified from local groups of historic and notable buildings. This proposal contradicts 20-minute policy. Policy DPB1: Character and Design needs amending. The chapter omits reference to archaeology. Will developments of 500+ expect to have a 'mixed use element'. | Various changes to policies and text in this chapter to strengthen links to the Mid Sussex Design Guide and make specific reference to archaeology. |

| Chapter 12. Transport | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 74 | Support: 15 | Object: 42 | Neutral: 17 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| East Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity</u>: pg 88. Update to reflect TfSE and mention WSCC Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) <u>DPT3 Active Travel</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation on what the LCWIP is is needed. Reference should be made to West Sussex's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) | Further detail added to supporting text and Policies DPT1 and DPT3, regarding TfSE, LCWIP, and BSIP. | |
| National Highways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to reduce trips and reliance on private vehicles are welcomed | Noted | |
| South East Water | Support | Noted | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>West Sussex County Council</p> | <p><u>DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to the WSTP text (paragraph 1.10) p88 fourth paragraph refers to “county boundaries”. This should refer to “<i>local authority boundaries</i>” or more generally to “<i>administrative boundaries</i>” revision of text on page 88 third paragraph to “The WSTP seeks to move away from <i>traditional</i> ‘predict and provide’ approach which historically has focused on <i>large capital investment for</i> building capacity in the <i>transport</i> network to cater for forecast <i>unconstrained</i> traffic growth which has often led to exacerbate other impacts, such as <i>increased car ownership, reduced public transport use and service viability, high investment in infrastructure assets which could be utilised for other services</i>, health and well-being and achieving climate change mitigation.” Add requirement to undertake and report regular monitoring of travel movements in and out of sites. Add objective to demonstrate how needs for external travel will be minimised. i.e provision of facilities and services. <p><u>DPT3 Active Travel:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not described strongly enough. Statement should acknowledge that users have different abilities. Cycling 5 miles and walking 10 minutes to better sell the concept <p><u>DPT4 Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typo Ref third paragraph on p92 suggested amendment: “<i>Where feasible, higher standards for non-residential development will apply in line with Policy DPT4 below, unless or until higher standards are required nationally.</i>” Section c) non-residential requirements for EV charging differs to the standards in WSCC Guidance on Parking which do not specify a minimum charging speed, nor do they include a minimum threshold for parking where the policy applies. Suggest policy amended to ensure DPT4: Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure captures schemes with less than 10 parking spaces and/or footnote 10 is amended to clarify where the policy differs to the guidance. | <p>Policies and supporting text amended.</p> |
| <p>MPs/ Local Authorities:</p> | | |
| <p>Crawley Borough Council</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support, but should refer to link to and support to Crawley’s LCWIP in relation to Crabbet Park development. | <p>Reference made to neighbouring authority LCWIPs.</p> |
| <p>South Downs National Park Authority</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria to address impacts on roads in the setting or within the National Park. | <p>Addressed in Policy DPC3.</p> |
| <p>Town and Parish Councils:</p> | | |
| <p>Burgess Hill</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPT3 Active Travel</u> should anticipate new methods such as e-scooters and plan for cycle hubs | <p>DPT3 refers to provision of ‘active travel’ infrastructure, not limited to only walking and cycling. The supporting text and first paragraph of the policy refers to “walk and wheel”. Therefore, this would be applicable for methods such as e-scooters.</p> |
| <p>East Grinstead</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPT1 Placemaking and connectivity</u> should require highways improvements to be delivered before housing is occupied <u>DPT3 Active Travel</u> should link with the LCWIP | <p>This will need to be assessed on a site-by-site basis. For example, for a large scheme to be delivered over a number of phases, mitigation may only be required for later phases. It may not be feasible or viable to deliver all the necessary improvements up front. The LCWIP is mentioned within the policy text</p> |
| <p>Other consultee bodies:</p> | | |
| <p>CPRE Sussex</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPT2 Rights of Way and Other Recreational Routes:</u> Suggested wording to ensure accessibility <u>DPT3 Active Travel:</u> Policy should reference provision of facilities and infrastructure that facilitate accessibility to open spaces and countryside for the disabled. | <p>Additions made to supporting text and Policies DPT2 and DPT3 regarding accessibility.</p> |
| <p>Gatwick Airport</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:</u> a proportionate approach that is locationally specific is required. <p><u>DPT5 Off-Airport Car Parking:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should reference Airports existing Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) Amend as follows: “<i>Controlling the extent of off airport parking, on and off airport helps encourage the use of alternatives sustainable transport modes whilst ensuring sufficient parking is available to passengers and staff who have no other option.</i>” | <p>Supporting text updated.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| The Woodland Trust | <u>DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage policies for wildlife bridges, green corridors restoration of damaged ancient woodlands • Strengthen to say highway improvements will be delivered before housing occupation • Acknowledge need of improvements to A22/A264 • Add wording to encourage green infrastructure networks | Policy DPT1 amended to address these points, including a requirement that green infrastructure is incorporated in travel routes. |
| Others | <u>DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of power supply for vehicle charging • Highway improvements are needed • Prioritise developments in areas with rail access • Incentives for developers to provide walkability and cycling routes | Policy DPT1 has been amended to include additional detail on monitoring of travel plan outcomes. The policy makes it clear that sustainable transport infrastructure will be required. |
| | <u>DPT2 Rights of Way and Other Recreational Routes:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace “encourage” with “required” • New point to be inclusive of people with disabilities | Policy DPT2 amended to include a criterion on accessibility. |
| | <u>DPT3 Active Travel:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle-hire schemes • Include the words “safe”, “convenient” and “direct” • Provide wheelchair accessible footpaths • Not enough incentives for developers to comply • BH to HH cycle path must be built prior to completion of Brookleigh secondary school • Anticipate new forms of micro-mobility • Financial incentive funds should contribute to bus services and cycling infrastructure. • Upgrade rural footpaths • “Where appropriate” open to interpretation, needs strengthening | Additions made to policy and supporting text regarding accessibility and micro-mobility. |
| | <u>DPT4 Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ducting for future use could be extended to cover developments where parking of less than 10 spaces is required to 100% of spaces or require in all developments regardless of size • Doesn’t comply with West Sussex Guidance on Parking in New Developments | Policy amended to apply to developments with fewer than 10 parking spaces. |
| | <u>DPT5 Off-Airport Car Parking:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage non-road travel, improving rail and bus links to airport. • Support but should go hand in hand with improvements to train, bus and tram links to airport | No changes required. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports actions that lead to additional cycle and footpaths • Support, but concerns over the capacity of A264 | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Chapter 13. Economy | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 45 | Support: 5 | Object: 34 | Neutral: 6 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to quantum of development is made. | Policy DPE3 amended to specify the scale of development in line with the strategic transport modelling. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should reference that a small stretch of the Bluebell Railway is within Wealden district. | DPE9 supporting text amended. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Balcombe | DPE7 Smaller Village and Neighbourhood Centres Need to relook at the Town and Village Centre for Balcombe. Should remove the threshold of 5 units for local parades from this policy. | The Town and Village centres have been defined by consultants preparing the Retail Study. These are tightly defined to avoid any unintended consequences e.g. allowing for 'town centre uses' as defined by the NPPF in areas not intended for such a use. The definition of 'Local neighbourhood parades' is a standard definition provided by Government. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support that Gatwick is recognised as a major employment location and its role in economy | Noted. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording change to DPE9: Sustainable Tourism and Visitor Economy. | Policy DPE9 amended to cross-reference Policy DPC4. |
| The Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPE9 Sustainable Tourism and Visitor Economy</u>: Suggested inclusion of wording to include reference biodiversity | Policy DPE9 amended to include references to biodiversity and habitats. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't build on land prone to flooding What's happened with the NRR proposal for developing Burgess Hill town centre? Concern about lack of local employment opportunities. A car required to reach most employment options. Concern about traffic through Hurstpierpoint. Little employment opportunities planned for areas gaining most housing, particularly Sayers Common. Concern East Grinstead is not connected to Haywards Heath or Burgess Hill by rail. More detail needed on employment opportunities created by the Science & Technology Park. What sort of skills are needed for the area? Need to ensure the rural landscape and natural environment are not adversely affected. Actively support and assist start up companies by allowing them to have access to unused shops for a nominal rent. Balcombe has a defined village centre. This should be shown. Development proposals for new tourism accommodation and attractions should be supported if not in conflict of DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. New neighbourhood centres should be created where lots of new housing is proposed. Support for the extension of the Bluebell Railway. A site specific policy requested for Wakehurst Place. Large industrial warehouse units at Brighton Road, Pease Pottage (in AONB) and Bolney junction on M23 (setting of AONB) were not in accordance with this policy. Suggested changes to Land West of Burgess Hill to improve it. West Hoathly Brickworks, Sharpthorne should be looked at for employment site. The boundary of an existing employment allocation at Farmers Stores should be enlarged slightly. Existing employment allocation at West Hoathly Brickworks should be removed. Omission site – land at Copthorne/Gatwick Middle Field should be allocated for employment under Policy DPE3. | <p>Evidence shows there is no need for additional employment allocations in this plan period, over and above what is already allocated/planned. However, the sustainable settlements (Policies SPSC2 and SPSC3) include an employment allocation to provide opportunities for residents to live and work locally, reducing the need to travel. There is insufficient evidence to justify removal of any existing employment allocations at this time.</p> <p>Additions and amendments to policies and supporting text have been made, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting a balanced community, reducing the need for out-commuting. New appendix providing additional guidance on justifying non-employment uses on protected employment sites, and loss of tourism accommodation and attractions. Cross-reference to 20-minute neighbourhoods in the context of protecting services and facilities. Additional references to other policies in the plan regarding protection of the countryside, biodiversity and AONBs. Boundary of existing employment site (Policy DPE3) amended to be consistent with planning permission DM/23/1051. |

| Chapter 14. Sustainable Communities (General) | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 12 | Support: 1 | Object: 10 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| National Highways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where developments have long timescales, the Plan needs to be clear on what mitigation is needed and how it will be delivered 2039 future modelling assessments will be needed ahead of Regulation 19 consultation. Any strategic road network schemes need to be deliverable within highway land or land controlled by the promoter, ensure that the traffic generated by the development is accommodated, meets standards within DMRB and fully funded by confirmed sources. | <p>Sustainable community policies have been amended to ensure development is carried out in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan which includes a phasing strategy. A new policy has been inserted which applies to all three sites, requiring a detailed phasing strategy with any planning applications. This will set out the timescale for mitigations and ensure highways works are deliverable.</p> <p>Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period..</p> | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| CPRE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites are incompatible with Plan's Vision | The sustainable communities are considered compatible with the plan's vision. | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the delivery of a cohesive ecological framework been considered? No mention of BNG within the policy requirements | A new policy has been inserted in front of the individual site allocations, setting out strategic requirements which include BNG and green infrastructure. | |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two of the proposed allocations would help fulfil the housing need from the Coastal Sussex HMA Lack of ecological evidence Overreliance of the plan on the delivery of significant sites and lack of information with regard to delivery programme/trajectory | <p>The North West Sussex Housing Market Area Housing Need Statement of Common Ground confirms a priority order for assisting with the unmet need.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) provides ecological evidence. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications.</p> <p>Existing commitments from sites allocated in previous plans provide significant housing completions in the coming years, alongside smaller sites allocated in this plan. This provides a pipeline of housing ahead of construction starting at the sustainable communities.</p> | |

| DPSC1: Land to the west of Burgess Hill | | | |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 145 | Support: 2 | Object: 136 | Neutral: 7 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the site – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment needs consulting to understand future flood risk and the extent in these areas. Opportunities for river restoration which could contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain. | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to impact the setting of Grade II listed Sportman's Inn and North End Farm. Suggest policy amended to include retention and enhancement of historic landscape character | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Homes England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals should be coordinated with consented Brookleigh scheme | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater network has limited capacity and needs reinforcement. Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference needed to Brick Clay (Weald) safeguarding area Metal recycling consultation area Suggested amendment to policy to include reference to Early Years and SEND at the primary school Location of primary school needs further consideration to avoid area of flood risk | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPSC1: West of Burgess Hill and DPSC2: Sayers Common would be a significant incursion into the countryside. The 'indicative masterplan' provided by the promoter is not sufficient to represent an adequate spatial planning document nor the sensitivity of the encroachment between settlements. | | The policy wording for DPSC1 and DPSC2 and accompanying maps set out the policy requirements and mitigation |
| Burgess Hill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West of BH should include a plan for a bus route connecting the site to the town centre and A2300 | | As part of the sustainable transport measures proposed for this site, the site promoter has confirmed they intend to provide bus routes connecting the site to the town centre, railway stations, and A2300 (which is in walking distance of most of the site). |
| Twineham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to DPSC1: West of Burgess Hill due to encroachment into countryside and increase in highways movements. | | <p>Whilst this site would extend into the countryside as currently defined, it would not lead to coalescence.</p> <p>Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms.</p> |

| Other consultee bodies: | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording added to reference the need for early engagement with Gatwick Airport | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important biodiversity elements on the site should be referenced in the policy Policy (or DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocation) should reflect the need to contribute towards Local Nature Recovery. | Policy amended to include additional requirements for environmental enhancement and BNG. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the inclusion of areas of ancient woodland in the development sites. Insufficient buffer to ancient woodland, recommend 50m- Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) should be completed Suggested amendment to refer to protection of ancient woodland Northend Copse should be excluded from development | Policy amended to exclude areas of Ancient Woodland from development and require that any impacts on Ancient Woodland are addressed. The development must also comply with Policy DPN4 (trees, woodland and hedgerows) which references the recommendation to complete an ATI. |
| Other | Character/landscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of scale - harmful landscape impacts, Coalescence with Hurstpierpoint Loss of green field development/ agricultural land - should prioritise brownfield Harmful impact on historic and rural character Site needs to be fully masterplanned - vision document is inadequate Development land parcels are isolated from the main settlement of Burgess Hill Site area is insufficient to accommodate 1400 and associated mitigation and infrastructure | The policy requires a comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy. Policy amendments ensure that development will respect historic landscape character and the setting of heritage assets. |
| | Infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impacts and highway safety concerns - Lack of alternative transport - occupants will be reliant on car Lack of infrastructure Insufficient affordable housing provision Flood risk | Policy amendments require improvements to sewerage infrastructure in addition to sustainable transport provision, community infrastructure, and active travel connections to other developments and the town centre. Areas of flood risk will be excluded from the development. Standard affordable housing requirements apply alongside a requirement for extra care housing. |
| | Biodiversity/Sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmful impact on biodiversity, ancient woodland, natural environment, loss of green infrastructure and wildlife New housing must be built to be climate resilient and low/zero carbon Community energy generation and community heat networks should be planned for No evidence to support 20% biodiversity net gain achievable Ecological reports are required to assess the quality of the habitats, especially the grasslands | Policy amendments introduce new requirements for environmental enhancement and biodiversity net gain. The policy has been informed by Habitats Regulations Assessment. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with BNG and other policies when submitting planning applications. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for climate resilience and low/zero carbon. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query need and housing numbers - LURB implications Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Harmful impact on air quality Lack of community engagement - consultation period too short and close to Christmas Query the development will be viable No information on trajectory. Question speed of housing delivery - oversaturation of Burgess Hill | Community consultation exceeded requirements under the regulations. A masterplan and phasing strategy will provide more detail on the housing trajectory. The policy has been amended to require additional protection and enhancement of the environment and active travel routes, which will improve air quality. |

| Number of Comments Received | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Total: 417 | Support: 7 | Object: 402 Neutral: 8 |
| Comments Received | Response to comments | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should note potential impact on nearby protected listed buildings and setting. | Policy amended as suggested. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to Brick clay (Weald) safeguarding area within policy. Policy wording amendment; 'retain and enhance the existing PRoW' Policy wording amendment; inclusion of secondary school provision (consistency with infrastructure requirement). Also, may need expansion land. | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Andrew Griffith MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment Long history of flooding due to inadequate sewage and waste systems. Reliant on cars for retail. Inadequate provision and access to public transport Local schools at capacity Rural lanes cannot support increased traffic Already pressure on GPs. Policy requirement of 'health provision' unclear. | <p>Policy requirements include onsite infrastructure such as wastewater/sewerage, schools, sustainable transport and healthcare. The development must also provide offsite community infrastructure and highways improvements.</p> <p>The policy includes a new criterion regarding the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods to ensure facilities and services are accessible by active travel modes, alongside provision of public transport services.</p> |
| Mims Davies MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment and would exceed needed housing numbers for area. Out of character and outweighs size of local communities. Potential to become a dormitory town. Lack of and/or poor-quality infrastructure to support scale of development. Flood risk High water stress area. | The allocation includes employment use as well as housing, and the policy requires significant onsite and offsite infrastructure. A comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy is required, to ensure a coordinated and environmentally responsible approach to the development and associated infrastructure. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Albourne | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sayers Common site DPSC2 is entirely within Albourne Parish Size of development is unsustainable and will fundamentally change the nature of the Parish and lead to coalescence DPSC2 does not deliver any infrastructure required by existing residents so removal would not be a loss Should include a 'green circle' within the site to ensure limitations on the boundary and not encourage creeping urbanisation Significant traffic issues (B2118 and B2116) Public transport limited; rail network is poor Landscape, flooding and waste water and water supply issues | <p>The site is proposed as a Sustainable Community. It will be a mixed-use development comprising residential dwellings as well as employment and retail to serve day-to-day needs. The scale of the site means that a range of facilities will be provided on-site. This includes an all-through Primary and Secondary school, play space, library, leisure facilities, healthcare, community facilities and open space. Sustainable transport measures will be required, particularly on key routes to Burgess Hill, Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks. It is proposed that the southern boundary should be maintained as open-space and a green gap to avoid coalescence with Albourne village. This is shown on the indicative masterplan accompanying the site – additional mapping will be provided in the next version of the Plan to set this out more clearly.</p> <p>The District Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. No objection has been received from the County Council in their role as Highways Authority. As part of discussions with the site promoters and the ongoing transport evidence base work, the promoters have committed to providing financial contributions towards enhancement of local bus services to provide enhanced connections between the site and Burgess Hill, Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks</p> <p>The policy requirements include provision of on-site wastewater infrastructure including new wastewater treatment works. This may also help to alleviate existing issues in the village</p> |
| <p>Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at Sayers Common DPSC2 (up to 2,000 dwellings) will result in substantial and significant change. • Sustainability benefits of DPSC2 are not justified e.g. no certainty within the Plan or IDP that education/healthcare will be provided on-site, therefore may not accord with 20-minute neighbourhood principles • Drainage issues with DPSC2, potential for flooding which will need to be considered in the SFRA, sequential test and exceptions test. • Detrimental impact on road network, particularly Hurstpierpoint High Street and B2117. • DPSC1: West of Burgess Hill and DPSC2: Sayers Common would be a significant incursion into the countryside. The 'indicative masterplan' provided by the promoter is not sufficient to represent an adequate spatial planning document nor the sensitivity of the encroachment between settlements. | <p>It is accepted that this site is at a scale which will lead to significant change. However, the allocation of this site will improve the sustainability of Sayers Common. As explained in the District Plan, it will provide education, healthcare, retail and community facilities to support the planned growth but also enable existing residents to reduce the need to travel by car. On-site infrastructure is a policy requirement. This includes provision of primary/secondary education, healthcare, community facilities and open space. These will be set out in the accompanying Infrastructure Development Plan</p> <p>No flooding specific issues were identified by the Environment Agency at Regulation 18 stage. The Regulation 19 District Plan will be accompanied by the SFRA Sequential and Exceptions test as part of evidence.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Transport Study identifies transport capacity impacts on Hurstpierpoint High Street. Refined sustainable mitigation scenarios will be tested (this will include modal shift, active travel and internalisation on the Sayers Common site e.g. local residents using local facilities such as education, rather than travelling off-site).</p> <p>The policy wording for DPSC1 and DPSC2 and accompanying maps set out the policy requirements and mitigation</p> |
| <p>Twineham</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to DPSC2: Sayers Common as this represents a change in policy from previous District Plans which focused development at towns and larger villages. • DPSC2 contrary to NPPF as it does not protect the natural environment and is too large to promote substantial economic growth. It would not meet the principles of the 20-minute neighbourhood, would lead to unsustainable travel, more highways movements, flood risk and issues with electricity supply. | <p>As explained within the draft District Plan, it has been necessary to revisit the current adopted plan strategy. This is because there are insufficient suitable sites to continue with the current strategy of focussing development at the three towns with proportionate growth elsewhere.</p> <p>DPSC2 includes on-site infrastructure such as education, health, retail, employment, community facilities and leisure. Currently existing residents are required to travel outside the village to use such</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>facilities. Instead, they will be within 20-minute's walking time of all. It is therefore considered the site is an excellent example of the 20-minute neighbourhood principle.</p> <p>No specific flood risk or electricity supply issues have been raised by the relevant responsible bodies.</p> |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording added to reference the need for early engagement with Gatwick Airport | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane, should include a strong statement emphasising importance of land west of the proposed DPSC2 remaining undeveloped because of its importance for wildlife including birds | Noted. Other policies in plan protect the wider countryside from development. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot support allocation without ecological surveys. Drains and hedgerows provide corridors and connectivity, particularly to Ancient Woodland. Not immediately obvious proximity of other sites to establish cumulative impacts. | <p>The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as DPN4 (trees, woodland and hedgerows) and DPN2 (biodiversity net gain).</p> <p>Site promoters will need to undertake ecological surveys to meet the requirements of DPSC GEN to meet BNG requirements.</p> |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) is recommended. | <p>The masterplan required for the site will identify ancient, veteran and notable trees on the site and at its boundaries, as part of a detailed ecological survey. The development must also comply with Policy DPN4 (trees, woodland and hedgerows) which references the recommendation to complete an ATI.</p> |
| Other | <p>Character/ Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment. Coalescence with Albourne and Henfield Impact on the South Downs National Park If DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane goes ahead it should include a Green Circle like Burgess Hill (amend DPN3: Green Infrastructure) Loss of rural living This is not an urban extension. SW part of site ('hamlet') disconnected, isolated from rest of site; should be considered and assessed separately. Should be removed. Land has had multiple 'refusals' for development. Development will lead to loss enjoyment of countryside by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. | <p>The site allocation has been through a thorough site selection process and sustainability appraisal. The policy has been amended to require a coordinated approach with other allocations to support the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods and deliver high-quality placemaking.</p> |
| | <p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of wildlife; including protected species and red-listed species. Loss of habitats and ecological networks. No indication of consultation with Woodland Flora and Fauna Group, SWT, British Trust for Ornithology, or Ecology faculty of University of Sussex. Fields currently provide irreplaceable hunting areas for owls | <p>The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). The masterplan required for the site will provide further detail on how habitats and ecological networks will be protected and enhanced. The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies, such as DPN4 (trees, woodland and hedgerows) and DPN2 (biodiversity net gain). Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Sustainability/ Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should include artificial grass for an all-year round sports facility and a gym. • Sewage systems already cannot cope • Lack of bus services and poor connectivity to train stations (Hassocks and Burgess Hill). • B2118 is a rat run for lorries and speeding traffic • Increased flood risk and drainage; impermeable clay. B2118 in Albourne floods causing hazardous driving conditions. • Proposed access onto B2118 is high surface flood risk area • Rural roads cannot cope with additional traffic (B2116); multiple sharp, blind corners. • No local employment for new residents • Lack of public transport • GP surgeries already overstretched. Is provision realistic; can they be staffed, is a convalescent home more useful? • Insufficient digital infrastructure • No local school; children bussed into schools. What will happen to existing primary schools? When will the school be delivered? • New primary school not needed; already undersubscribed. • Nearest primary and secondary schools full • New secondary school will bring additional congestion • Infrastructure needs to include childcare (included in Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill) • Size of site unlikely to support a sixth form; students will have to travel out of village • Lack of capacity on railway network and lack of parking at stations. • Already a water stressed area. Insufficient water supply. No reference to water neutrality. | <p>Following liaison with the County Council and site promoters, the policy includes a requirement for an all-through school, which will provide sports facilities that could be made available for community use, as well as the policy requiring financial contributions towards sport facilities.</p> <p>The policy requires a comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy, to ensure that infrastructure is delivered at the appropriate time.</p> <p>The site will deliver employment uses as well as housing, and must conform to 20-minute neighbourhood principles so that most services and facilities are accessible via active travel modes, alongside the provision of new public transport services.</p> |
| | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access point: potential for comprehensive access scheme with DPH20: Land at Coombe Farm, London Road • No assessment of traffic impacts locally. No proper assessment of additional traffic onto A23 (north and south bound slip roads (A2300 and Muddleswood). • Worsening of air pollution • Site name should be changed to 'Land to the north and south of the B2116 Henfield Road Albourne' • Council's transport studies and models don't consider smaller surrounding roads • Area should be made safer for horse riders with routes across site and parallel with London Road • Increased congestion through Hurstpierpoint and at Stonepound Crossroads (an AQMA), as well as Cowfold to the west • Proposed development is contrary to the Visions and other policies within draft District Plan (i.e. 20 minute neighbourhood) • Will contribute to climate change • Ignores the neighbourhood plans (strategic gaps) • Government has changed position on housing need; site not needed. Shouldn't be building beyond the local need; should be planning for 7/800 not 1,100dpa. Mid Sussex is accommodating a wholly disproportionate number of new builds. • Site should be removed and the need spread more evenly across the District. Development should be concentrated in Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath, and other urban areas. • Why is a spine road running parallel with Reeds Lane and a new junction proposed? • Housing must reflect local needs; smaller properties. • Why not incorporate employment element between established Avtrade and Kings business centre and increase housing on site • Policy requirements and promoter's Vision Document not aligned. Masterplan provided is insufficient. • Loss of dark skies • Gypsy and Traveller accommodation provision should be removed; not needed | <p>Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.</p> <p>The policy requires the provision of sustainable transport and highways improvements.</p> <p>There will be a masterplan and phasing strategy providing more detail on the housing mix and how the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods will be achieved.</p> <p>The Council has followed the government's standard method for assessing housing need.</p> |

| DPSC3: Land at Crabbet Park | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 53 | Support: 4 | Object: 43 | Neutral: 6 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should note potential to impact on nearby listed buildings and their setting. | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity sought on what work has been done regarding potential impacts on AONB. | | Policy amended to require mitigation of impact on the AONB which lies to the south of the site. |
| Surrey County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Series of Ordinary Watercourses on site. Development should seek opportunities to reduce causes and impacts of flooding. | | Policy DPS4 (flood risk and sustainable drainage) will be applied to this development. The masterplan required for this development will consider watercourses on the site and incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would welcome discussions on self-build; opportunities to help meet Crowley's demand Suggested inclusion of wording to reflect that the site is an urban extension to Crawley Clarity sought on infrastructure provision and proposals; consistency with other significant sites and cross boundary | | Noted. An updated IDP will be published alongside the District Plan. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Worth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure requirements should be consistent with the other two significant sites. School and healthcare provision needs to be clarified. In principle support the development however delivery needs to be made more certain (e.g., through Homes England involvement). | | As a result of further discussions with WSCC Education and the NHS, this will be clarified. The infrastructure requirements for this site will be consistent with DPSC1 and DPSC2. The promoter of this site has a long history of delivery and is currently bringing forward similar sized schemes (with accompanying infrastructure) across the County therefore the Council are confident it will be able to deliver. Homes England only become involved in cases of market failure to unlock delivery of sites. |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that Crabbet Park is contrary to countryside heritage and AONB policy | | Site is not within the High Weald AONB although are adjacent to it. The policy requirements for site require mitigation to reduce any potential impact on the AONB and heritage assets. The High Weald AONB Unit was consulted at Regulation 18 stage and raised no objection. |
| East Grinstead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should not be phased to reduce infrastructure provision, concern over new secondary school provision and placing pressure on EG secondary schools | | The policy requirements establish that school provision must be delivered on-site. Due to its scale the development will need to be phased, however this will not reduce the need for a school. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot support allocation without ecological surveys. Watercourses, hedgerows and linear woodlands provide corridors and connectivity. Policy requirements fail to reflect aforementioned biodiversity elements | | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as DPN4 (trees, |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | woodland and hedgerows) and DPN2 (biodiversity net gain). Site promoters will need to undertake ecological surveys to meet BNG requirements when planning applications are submitted. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importance of area east of M23 for Red Listed, Schedule 1 and Section 41 species. Database of bird records provided. | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and considers the impact of the plan on internationally important habitats and protected species. Mitigation will be required for residential development within 7km of Ashdown Forest. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) is recommended. A minimum 50m buffer to Ancient Woodland should be incorporated. Suggested wording to include protection of ancient woodland | Policy amended to include a criterion about addressing any impacts associated with ancient woodland, on and adjacent to the site, and excluding these areas from development. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in density of the area, no longer countryside Lower housing numbers Conflicts with Natural Environment and green infrastructure policies | A comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy are required, which will consider density, scale, and massing of development. The policy requires protection of ancient woodland, while other policies in the plan will ensure landscape impacts and provision of green infrastructure are addressed. |
| | Flood Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk around Burstow stream – drainage issues | Policy DPS4 (flood risk and sustainable drainage) will be applied to this development. The masterplan required for this development will consider watercourses on the site and incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within AONB – to be saved and improved, not developed. | The site is outside the AONB, though adjacent. The policy requires mitigation of impact on the AONB. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impact on listed adjacent listed buildings | Policy amended to ensure listed buildings and their settings are protected. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing should be 40% Unsuitable location | The evidence suggests that 30% affordable housing is viable in accordance with Policy DPH32, while recognising that strategic sites must also deliver significant onsite infrastructure. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity with Copthorne One road in private property Policy requirement to retain and enhance the existing PRow that cross this site | Policy amended to ensure that existing PRow are retained and enhanced. The masterplan will address connectivity. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of secondary school needed Transport infrastructure required to reduce car dependency Provision of retail and leisure space Onsite provision of sports facilities | Secondary school requirement added to policy. The policy requires sustainable transport measures, a neighbourhood centre, and a range of community facilities. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include description of "urban extension" as done on DPSC1: Land to the West of Burgess Hill and DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane • Need for allotments on site • On site gypsy and traveller provision • Increased noise and air pollution | <p>Policy amended to require good acoustic design to address noise impacts of proximity to M23.</p> <p>The policy requires that development will be in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy to be agreed with the Council. This will include green infrastructure and community infrastructure.</p> <p>The development will provide funding for offsite gypsy and traveller pitches.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| Chapter 15. DPH1: Housing | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 395 | Support: 180 | Object: 209 | Neutral: 6 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Mims Davies MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall housing numbers need to be robustly looked at with the forthcoming new NPPF • Housing should avoid creating dormitory towns • Need to balance housing growth and employment opportunities with delicate environment and keeping Mid Sussex special • Ensure brownfield sites are utilised first to protect ecosystems, biodiversity, landscapes and farming land in rural communities. • Mid Sussex is Serious Stress Water Area; need to joint working with water companies in relation to water supply and flooding. | | <p>The Plan Strategy seeks to focus growth at existing settlements rather than create dormitory towns. Detail on how the Council has arrived at the proposed housing numbers, distribution of development, and how the plan's policies are designed to minimise and mitigate negative impacts are set out within the Plan itself. Additional wording has been included in the Plan Strategy to clarify this.</p> |
| Brighton and Hove City Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current provision should not be a ceiling; should plan positively for further opportunities to help meet unmet needs of neighbours. | | <p>The housing numbers in the plan are not a ceiling, but in a plan-led system, the aim is to avoid significant speculative proposals on non-allocated sites. The identification of sites for allocation has been informed by the Site Selection Methodology and a balance between boosting housing supply and negative impacts (such as environmental constraints) – this is captured within the Site Selection Conclusions paper and the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> |
| Crawley Borough Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider context of the Northern West Sussex HMA and unmet needs should be acknowledged in this section. | | <p>Additional information regarding the Northern West Sussex HMA has been included within the Plan.</p> |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Ansty and Staplefield | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing need should be based on latest housing projections rather than 2014-based projections – NPPF is going to be amended • Considers the windfall allowance should be increased by around 800 dwellings and therefore equivalent housing site allocations should be removed | | <p>The NPPF has been subject to consultation regarding revisions, a revised NPPF has not been published. Therefore, we must continue to comply with current national policy. The Council will continue to monitor the situation accordingly.</p> <p>National Planning Policy is clear that the planning system should be plan-led rather than reliant on speculative development. Whilst allowances can be made for windfall, these must be supported by a</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | robust evidence base. Expert consultants, Troy Planning, were commissioned by the Council to provide evidenced justification for a windfall allowance and this informed the content of the Regulation 18 plan. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan sets excessive housing target with unnecessary and inappropriate significant rural allocations. | The identification of sites for allocation has been informed by the Site Selection Methodology and a balance between boosting housing supply and negative impacts (such as environmental constraints) – this is captured within the Site Selection Conclusions paper and the Sustainability Appraisal. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposed housing need supported by necessary environmental evidence; question ability of MSDC's natural capital to absorb level of development. | The evidence base for the plan includes a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment. Natural England and the Environment Agency, among others, have identified opportunities for environmental enhancement through development, which are incorporated in policies where appropriate. |
| Other | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmful landscape and heritage impact Traffic and highway safety issues Insufficient infrastructure/ local services Not enough affordable housing Loss of biodiversity/ habitat Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Overall number is excessive and should be challenged in line with Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill Spatial strategy results in disproportionate growth Brownfield first Insufficient buffer No detailed trajectory SHMA needs to be reviewed to explicitly address social housing deficit in Mid Sussex Standard method is flawed - based on outdated targets and inappropriate assumptions Windfall allowance is underestimated Where relevant allocations should include reference to retaining and enhancing PRow (see individual allocations) Plan period should be extended to 2041 | <p>The district plan is underpinned by a comprehensive evidence base which has been updated as sites and policies are finalised. For example, this includes evidence of housing need (applying the national standard method), infrastructure requirements, urban capacity, environmental impacts, transport modelling, and development viability.</p> <p>The identification of sites for allocation has been informed by the Site Selection Methodology and a balance between boosting housing supply and negative impacts (such as environmental constraints) – this is captured within the Site Selection Conclusions paper and the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| DPH2: Sustainable Development – Outside the Built-up Area | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 25 | Support: 4 | Object: 20 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| National Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts with DPC3: New homes in the Countryside | Policy DPC3 (new homes in the countryside) permits development in the countryside if it complies with this policy, or policies on rural exception sites and protecting the countryside. There is no conflict. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Hassocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPH2: Development outside built-up area boundaries should only be permitted where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply | The Council's windfall allowance is reliant on developments for fewer than 9 dwellings outside Built-up Areas. Therefore, if this requirement was amended, the windfall allowance would need to be reduced and additional allocations would be required in order for the Council to demonstrate it can meet its housing need. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent Coalescence Policy is unclear Omit developments of "fewer than 10 dwellings" Too restrictive – Increase "fewer than 10 dwellings" to 30 Conflicts with DPC3: Land at Crabbet Park, DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside and DPH34: Rural Exception Sites Add point: And/or where the council can't prove a 5-year housing supply Amend to restrict development within High Weald and AONB. i.e., not conflict with DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Amend to only allow development proportionate in site with the existing settlement Remove "local need" to allow developments that meet district wide needs Include "or where the side is previously developed land" | <p>The plan should be read as a whole. Other policies in the plan control impacts on the AONB and the countryside.</p> <p>Development outside the built-up area would not be permitted if it caused coalescence of settlements, as that would be contrary to Policy CPC2: preventing coalescence.</p> <p>A requirement for fewer than 10 dwellings where there is a local need ensures that expansion of windfall housing beyond settlement limits is constrained, while rural exception sites providing 80-100% affordable housing (Policy DPH10) can be larger when justified.</p> |

| DPH3: Sustainable Development – Inside the Built-up Area | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 12 | Support: 4 | Object: 8 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council | Support | | Noted |
| Cuckfield Parish Council | Support | | Noted |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment of the Martlets centre in BH Development of brownfield sites should be a priority | | Martlets Centre has planning permission for redevelopment which could be implemented before the plan is adopted, so no site allocation is required. Brownfield sites have been allocated when they are available and suitable for redevelopment and have |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | met the site selection criteria, e.g. environmental constraints. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to prevent loss of existing community facilities and services. Plan focuses on development outside the built-up area – contrary to NPPF | <p>The plan should be read as a whole. Development proposals involving loss of community facilities or employment sites will be assessed against the relevant policies.</p> <p>There is insufficient available and suitable land within existing settlements to meet the identified housing need for Mid Sussex to 2039.</p> |

| DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocations | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 29 | Support: 5 | Object: 23 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include additional bullet points referring the sequential and exception tests of paragraphs 023 and 037 of the NPPF Amend to read: "Provide a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) / surface water drainage strategy in areas at risk from (delete - fluvial or surface water flooding from) <u>any source (such as fluvial or surface water flooding)</u> to inform the site layout and any appropriate mitigation, <u>resilience and resistance</u> measures that may be necessary. (Delete - Areas at risk of flooding should be avoided in the first instance.) <u>Any proposal must demonstrate that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere, and provides a betterment wherever possible (i.e. a net flood risk benefit).</u>" Consider greywater recycling Refer to the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (CAMS). Developments should connect to public foul sewer as a priority | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewrite: "Undertake pre-determination evaluation of potential archaeological features on the site prior to any planning application being submitted, <u>unless it can be demonstrated that such an evaluation is not appropriate for this site</u>" Add: "<u>Respect Listed buildings, conservations areas...</u>" <u>including those that are undesignated</u> Settings or LB and CA need to and should be conserved and enhanced | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. | |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider applying same standards to other housing allocation sites, not just significant sites | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to Joint Minerals Local Plan should read: <u>West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (July 2018, Partial Review March 2021)</u> (JMLP). Make reference to Waste Local Plan New homes should provide suitable space for home working to reduce external travel Requirement to undertake and report travel plan monitoring of movements in and out of sites. | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Burgess Hill Town Council | Recommendation on water efficiency standards. | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. | |

| Other consultee bodies: | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Gatwick Airport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement to engage with Gatwick Airport at an early stage on housing proposals Add Aerodrome Safeguarding Policy as per policy DD5 in Crawley's Local Plan Under Aerodrome Safeguarding Requirements add the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of buildings, structures and construction equipment on Communication, Navigation & Surveillance (CNS) equipment & Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs). Impacts of buildings, structures and construction equipment on Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) Lighting schemes that could dazzle pilots or ATC or could be confused with aeronautical ground lighting Buildings/structures in proximity to the airport that could create induced turbulence or thermal uplift from vapour plumes from flues/cooling towers. | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearer inclusion of BNG - minimum 10-20% | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bullet point 3, delete "identify how the development will..." Include requirement of Passivhaus principles Repetition with other policies, needs to be simplified No justification for the 4* BRE HQM Water consumption of 85 litres p/p against NPPG – evidence needed. Council should adopted requirements 85 litres per person (l/p/p) to 80 l/p/p for strategic developments, inline with Gatwick's Sub Regional Water Cycle Study. All new developments should achieve 100 l/p/p Require 11 HQM credits as a minimum for water efficiency. Delete policy and incorporate in specific allocation site policies instead. Include reference to DPH5: Batchelors Farm, Keymer Road, DPH6: Land at Brow Hill, Janes Lane, DPH7: Burgess Hill Station and DPH8: Land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead and delete reference to DPH29: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure: make clear the need to delivery BNG on each allocation 20% biodiversity net gain is excessive Make reference to DPH30: Self and Custom Build Housing, DPH31: Housing Mix and DPH32: Affordable Housing under "Significant Sites" | Policy deleted and principles embedded elsewhere. |

| Site DPH5: Batchelors Farm, Keymer Road, Burgess Hill | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 10 | Support: 1 | Object: 8 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested policy wording to refine policy requirement in relation to flood risk. | The plan should be read as a whole. All planning applications for allocated or non-allocated sites will be assessed against Policy DPS4: flood risk and sustainable drainage (which has been amended to take account of EA comments), as well as site-specific criteria being included in site allocation policies where appropriate. | |
| Historic England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested amended wording to strengthen and provide clarification | The plan should be read as a whole. All planning applications for allocated or non-allocated sites with a potential impact on heritage assets will be assessed against relevant built environment policies such as DPB2: listed buildings and other heritage assets | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | (which has been amended to take account of Historic England comments). |
| Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ask that the water standards set for significant sites are set for all housing allocations. | The plan should be read as a whole. Relevant policies on biodiversity, sustainable design and the water environment will be applied to all development proposals, while criteria in site allocation policies focus on site-specific matters. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include reference to Keymer Road Brick Clay safeguarding area Suggest policy requirement added here, or to DPT1: Placemaking and Connectivity, for monitoring travel movements to enforce travel plan targets. Reference should be made to the Waste Local Plan | Policy amended to include reference to the Minerals Safeguarding Area and the Minerals Local Plan. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional criteria to ensure harm is avoided to the transitional landscape character of this area as part of the setting of the SDNP Adjacent to SA13 (site allocation DPD) – concerns over erosion of the transitional landscape character | Policy amended to require that landscape impacts and views from SDNP are minimised. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys have been submitted Consider how nature reserve will be managed | Ecology information has now been provided. The policy requires development to provide a positive edge to the nature reserve, while other policies in the plan will be applied regarding the protection and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity. |
| Others | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape implications - close proximity to South Downs National Park Coalescence | Policy amended to require that landscape impacts and views from SDNP are minimised. The development would not result in coalescence of settlements. |
| | General Unsuitable number of dwellings | The site and housing number are considered suitable. |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|------------------------------|
| Site DPH6: Land at Hillbrow, Janes Lane, Burgess Hill | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 10 | Support: 0 | Object: 9 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to include reference to Janes Lane Brick Clay safeguarding area | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys have been submitted Number of established trees and hedgerows | The evidence base has been updated to include ecological surveys. Policy DPN4 and others set the policy criteria for protecting trees and hedgerows. |
| Others | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density of development not suitable for the area | Policies elsewhere in the plan will ensure landscape impacts are avoided or mitigated, and the development is designed in accordance with the MSDC Design Guide SPD. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against the removal of established trees Detrimental to the Biodiversity of the site | Policies elsewhere in the plan will be applied to ensure there is biodiversity net gain and an acceptable approach to the protection of trees and hedgerows. |
| | Flood Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood Risk area | Flood risk and impacts will be assessed under Policy DPS4: flood risk and drainage. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsuitable number of dwellings | The yield has been re-assessed and is considered appropriate. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dangerous access- unsuitable | WSCC as highway authority have informed SHELAA process which fed into site selection. It is considered possible to provide safe access. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No infrastructure in place | The site is on the edge of a settlement with existing infrastructure, while the development is required to provide highways works and sustainable transport measures, alongside financial contributions towards offsite infrastructure. |
| General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name of allocation to be revised as to not be associated with Hillbrow House Amend boundary to incorporate of land to the east | Land to the east included. | |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Site DPH7: Burgess Hill Station, Burgess Hill | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 94 | Support: 0 | Object: 94 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested amendment to ensure development is phased to align with delivery of sewerage infrastructure and to ensure access to the infrastructure is maintained | Policy amended as suggested. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Mims Davies MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of vital and scarce allotment space. • Loss of green spaces in town centre. • There is insufficient infrastructure, including public transport links, medical services, civic amenities and schools. • Impact on the wide biodiversity and animal habitats. • Area prone to flooding. • Water constraints in area. | <p>New site allocation policy for replacement allotments, on land in MSDC ownership. Policy DPH7 requires the delivery of at least an equal number of compensatory allotments. The policy requires developer contributions towards education, healthcare, and a range of community and green infrastructure. Other policies in the plan also apply, regarding biodiversity and flood risk, to avoid and mitigate impacts.</p> |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Burgess Hill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to DPH7: BH Station due to loss of allotment site, pressure on transport network, loss of existing parking, adjoining ancient woodland, loss of open space • Identified allotment deficit, provision needs to be made | <p>Policy DPH7 requires re-provision of the allotment site and sets out requirements for parking. Ancient woodland adjoins the site to the south, a small area is within the ancient woodland buffer – additional wording will be added to ensure no development takes place in this area. There is no loss of open space; the policy requirement requires the scheme to positively address existing open space at Queens Crescent which is to be retained. The Regulation 19 Plan will include an allocation for additional allotment space which will replace those at Chanctonbury Road with potential for excess supply.</p> |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allotment requirement should be a precondition to the grant of any future planning application. | <p>Policy DPA3 requires provision of at least equal number of allotments through the delivery of DPA3a Allotment Site Nightingale Lane. Policy requires allotments to be complete and operational before development of the form allotments can commence.</p> |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ecological surveys have been submitted • Accessibility of new allotments should avoid the need to travel by car • Policy wording needs strengthening to reflect the loss of habitat and address need to retain features of importance such as mature trees | <p>The plan should be read as a whole. The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure chapter includes policies on biodiversity net gain and the approach to protecting trees, woodland and hedgerows. Ecological surveys will be required to meet the requirements of these policies.</p> |
| Others | <p>Biodiversity/green space/allotments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of allotments which are a vital community facility - impact on wellbeing, health, food growing • Will increase the existing deficit in allotment space in the town • No opportunities to re-provide allotments within walking distance and plan does not include sufficient provision overall • Allotments are not brownfield, they do not appear on the council's brownfield register • The allotment are/ should be designated a Local Green Space • Loss of open space • Loss of biodiversity/ wildlife • Impacts ancient woodland abut southern boundary | <p>Allotments will be replaced with better terms in a convenient location. The plan should be read as a whole. The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure chapter includes policies on biodiversity net gain and the approach to protecting trees, woodland and hedgerows.</p> |
| | <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and highway safety concerns • Loss of parking • Lack of infrastructure | <p>The policy requires sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and compensatory community allotments, as well as financial contributions to a broad range of infrastructure.</p> |
| | <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Selection and Sustainability Appraisal are flawed • Flood risk issues and subsidence likely | <p>The site selection methodology and sustainability appraisal provide a fair, consistent, and robust approach to site assessment. This methodology was</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan policy G5. • Housing should be allocated on the Martlets site instead • Housing numbers no longer need to be met at planned levels | <p>used for the Site Allocations DPD and tested at examination, where that plan was found sound and subsequently adopted. A masterplan is required to take account of the Neighbourhood Plan. Martlets site already has planning permission. Other policies address flood risk and other environmental matters.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| Site DPH8: Land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 6 | Support: 1 | Object: 4 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to Brick clay (Wadhurst) safeguarding area | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to site; creates a significant and isolated peninsula of development | | The site is well-related to the existing town, being adjacent to the settlement boundary at the northern point of the site and opposite existing properties on the other side of West Hoathly Road. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ecological surveys provided. Data shows priority habitats onsite, Ancient Woodland adjacent | | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of ancient woodland should be removed from allocation. Cautionary minimum 50m buffer should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation. • Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) | | Policy amended to require an appropriate buffer for ancient woodland and priority habitat within the site and to the east. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be allowed until solution to increased congestion in East Grinstead is found | | The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highways works. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |

| Site DPH9: Land at Hurstwood Lane, Haywards Heath | | | |
|---|--|-----------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 4 | Support: 1 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Haywards Heath | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to DPH9 and DPH10 (Hurstwood Lane) as they could support speculative development in Lewes district. Unacceptable impact in combination with Hurst Farm site. Road safety and traffic concerns. | | <p>The policy requirements include retention of existing trees and provision of landscape buffers to stop the spread of the site into open countryside to the east.</p> <p>The sites have been assessed in combination with the Hurst Farm site (in traffic terms) – no concerns have been raised by the highways authority and no 'severe' impacts arise from the transport modelling.</p> |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided. | | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May encourage further incursion into the countryside | | A plan-led system, informed by a rigorous site selection process and sustainability appraisal, ensures that expansion of settlements is controlled and sustainable. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional pressure on town's infrastructure; financial contributions will go to Lewes District Council Road safety of Fox Hill significant concern | | The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works, and financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to meet the 20-minute neighbourhood principles Site should be removed in favour of alternative site: Land at Colwell Farm | | A range of services and facilities are accessible within 20 minutes via active travel modes, and the site is close to a bus route. All site allocation policies have been assessed against a rigorous site selection methodology and subject to sustainability appraisal. |

Site DPH10: Land at Junction of Hurstwood Lane and Colwell Lane

| Number of Comments Received | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|------------|
| Total: 4 | Support: 1 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | Response to comments | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Haywards Heath | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to DPH9 and DPH10 (Hurstwood Lane) as they could support speculative development in Lewes district. Unacceptable impact in combination with Hurst Farm site. Road safety and traffic concerns. | <p>The policy requirements include retention of existing trees and provision of landscape buffers to stop the spread of the site into open countryside to the east.</p> <p>The sites have been assessed in combination with the Hurst Farm site (in traffic terms) – no concerns have been raised by the highways authority and no 'severe' impacts arise from the transport modelling.</p> | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | No ecological surveys provided. | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. | |
| Other | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional pressure on town's infrastructure; financial contributions will go to Lewes District Council Road safety of Fox Hill significant concern | The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works, and financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. | |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to meet the 20-minute neighbourhood principles Site should be removed in favour of alternative site: Land at Colwell Farm | A range of services and facilities are accessible within 20 minutes via active travel modes, and the site is close to a bus route. All site allocation policies have been assessed against a rigorous site selection methodology and subject to sustainability appraisal. | |

| Site DPH11: Land east of Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath | | | |
|---|--|---|------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 134 | Support: 1 | Object: 129 | Neutral: 4 |
| Comments Received | | Response to comments | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations. May be opportunities for restoration/ enhancement of northern watercourse; could add to BNG | Policy amended to avoid developing areas of existing and future flood risk. Policies DPN1 and DPN2 require new development to restore and protect | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | watercourses within or adjacent to the site, and provide biodiversity net gain. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to include reference to mineral safeguarding and consultation areas | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Mims Davies MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already taken houses at Penlands Farm Impact on biodiversity and habitats. Adjacent to ancient woodland and semi-natural woodland. Greenfield site, part of the Haywards Heath – Cuckfield strategic gap. High water stress area Insufficient infrastructure. Access roads are narrow lanes. Area prone to flooding. | <p>Policy amended to avoid developing areas of existing and future flood risk. Policies DPN1 and DPN2 require new development to restore and protect watercourses within or adjacent to the site, and provide biodiversity net gain. Other policies in the plan will require the development to avoid and mitigate impacts to woodland and other habitats, provide sustainable drainage, and incorporate water efficiency measures as part of sustainable design.</p> <p>The development must provide highway works and sustainable transport measures, as well as financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure.</p> |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that site is contrary to countryside heritage and AONB policy Object to DPH11 Borde Hill, concern over impact on AONB, landscape, traffic impact on rural villages. | Site is not within the High Weald AONB although are adjacent to it. The policy requirements for site require mitigation to reduce any potential impact on the AONB and heritage assets. The High Weald AONB Unit was consulted at Regulation 18 stage and raised no objection. Mitigation regarding AONB and landscape is set out in the policy requirements. The Transport Study does not indicate any 'severe' impacts resulting from this site. |
| Haywards Heath | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to DPH11 (Land east of Borde Hill Lane). Greenfield site bordering the AONB. Other sites are more suitable, does not meet the 20-minute neighbourhood principles, transport challenges re footpaths and roundabout layout. | <p>The policy for DPH11 requires development to be contained to the central and eastern parts of the site to mitigate any impact on the adjacent AONB. No objection has been received by the High Weald AONB Unit.</p> <p>TravelTime mapping confirms that the site is within 20 minute of public transport, main service centre, health and retail facilities. It is within 15 minutes' walk of a Primary School.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted potential options for achieving safe and suitable access. The strategic Transport Study does not identify any severe transport impacts on the network.</p> |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with northward extension, proximity to AONB | The policy includes measures to reduce impacts on the setting of the AONB, including a LVIA requirement. |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided. Data shows presence of priority habitat | Policies in the natural environment and green infrastructure chapter of the plan will be applied. Ecological surveys will be required for developers to be able to demonstrate policy compliance. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion of rural setting Erosion of green barriers between Haywards Heath, Cuckfield, Lindfield and the High Weald AONB Impact on the AONB Impact on infrastructure (traffic, health, education, utilities) Archaeological value of the site Flooding Contrary to adopted Neighbourhood Plan The proposal does not accord with the 20-minute neighbourhood principles Promise that the land would not be developed for a period of 15 years Fails to meet the objectives identified in the sustainability appraisal SA DPD suggested no further development was required for Haywards Heath; already taken its share of development The plan is oversupplying housing and therefore the site is not needed Proposed development within Ansty & Staplefield Parish but will impact on Haywards Heath, Cuckfield and Balcombe Impact of biodiversity. The proposal is in contradiction with the recent money awarded to Borde Hill Gardens to promote biodiversity Impact of construction on neighbouring properties. Loss of greenfield whereas development should be directed to brownfield land | <p>The policy contains criteria to address impacts, e.g. on the AONB, archaeology, flooding, heritage assets, and Borde Hill Gardens. The plan should be read as a whole. Other policies provide additional detail and requirements for protecting the natural environment and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The policy requires highway works and sustainable transport measures in addition to financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure.</p> <p>Services and facilities are accessible within 20 minutes via active travel modes. All site allocation policies have been assessed against a rigorous site selection methodology and subject to sustainability appraisal.</p> |

| Site DPH12: Orchards Shopping Centre, Haywards Heath | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 6 | Support: 0 | Object: 5 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping | Policy amended as suggested. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater emphasis should be given to sustainable transport access | The policy requires provision of sustainable transport measures, and financial contributions towards a range of offsite infrastructure, including sustainable travel. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Haywards Heath | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports DPH12 (Orchards) which fits with the Town Council's "Destination Haywards Heath" and Masterplan. Concerns over requirement for residential parking which will need to be addressed at application stage. | The policy includes the requirement to provide sufficient car parking to support the allocation. | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy to include positive delivery of green infrastructure | The plan should be read as a whole. Other policies require green infrastructure provision and biodiversity net gain. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No need for a multistorey carpark Site should be used for affordable housing Increased parking density at Orchard Shopping Centre may release other smaller car parks | The policy requires 30% onsite affordable housing, which is consistent with other sites. The provision of parking is considered necessary in this case, but the policy also requires sustainable transport measures and well designed pedestrian links to adjacent areas. |

| Site DPH13: Land to west of Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 59 | Support: 0 | Object: 57 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Thames Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate sustainable surface water strategy needs to be agreed with Lead Local Flood Authority Scale of development doesn't materially affect sewer network. Careful design of new network needed to avoid surcharge. Upgrades to wastewater network likely to be needed; joint working with promoter and MSDC needed on an infrastructure phasing plan to ensure timely delivery | The policy requires wastewater network upgrades, and a criterion has been added to the policy to require SUDS, delivering flood resilience. Other policies in the plan also require sustainable drainage and efficient use of water through design. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct pedestrian and cycle access to Worth Way should be provided Improvements to footway on Turner's Hill Road needed, notably to the bus stop Severe impact at Wallage Lane and A2028 junction | Policy amended to ensure suitable pedestrian and cycle connections to Crawley Down are provided, including via the Worth Way, and to provide suitable access to Turners Hill Road. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Worth Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant local constraints. Development would be out of character with Crawley Down. It is not clear whether primary school provision is sufficient to meet the additional need. The infrastructure requirements in the policy are formulaic. | It is unclear how the scheme would fall short of Levelling Up proposals. The site has been assessed through the Site Selection process and performs well – there are no showstopper constraints and the site is of a significant size that mitigation will be achievable. | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Worth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPH13: Land west of Turners Hill Road – not supported as it is likely to fall short of the Government's Levelling Up proposals, significant local constraints and out of character with current developments. | The site has been assessed through the Site Selection process and performs well – there are no showstopper constraints and the site is of a significant size that mitigation will be achievable. | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological survey has been provided. Question whether development is suitable or viable without affecting connectivity of habitat to wider landscape | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. Policy amended to | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | ensure development is integrated with the site to the north, including through green infrastructure and ecological corridors. Buffers are required adjacent to woodland and hedgerows. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Ancient Woodlands – Full ecological assessment needed • Increase density of houses elsewhere instead | The policy has been amended to address any impacts associated with ancient woodland and exclude ancient woodland from development. Development must avoid the most sensitive areas of the site and provide a country park. |
| The Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of ancient woodland should be removed from allocation. Cautionary minimum 50m buffer should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation. • Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) | The policy has been amended to address any impacts associated with ancient woodland and exclude ancient woodland from development. Development must avoid the most sensitive areas of the site and provide a country park. Policy amended to ensure development is integrated with the site to the north, including through green infrastructure and ecological corridors. Buffers are required adjacent to woodland and hedgerows. |
| Other | Infrastructure/ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure • No space in local schools • Power cuts • Need for developers to contribute towards The Haven Sportsfield area • Increased traffic • Need for walking routes | The policy requires significant onsite infrastructure such as allotments and sports pitches, as well as sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and highway works. Financial contributions are required towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure including sustainable transport and education. Policy criteria refer to active travel routes through the site, linking to other sites and Crawley Down. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| | Flood Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of grey infrastructure – flooding risk • Drainage issues | Policy amended to require a sequential approach that directs development away from areas of flood risk and integrate sustainable drainage. Other policies in the plan also apply, regarding flood risk, drainage, and sustainable design for efficient use of water. |
| | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of landscape • Dangerous access to site • Adjacent to ancient woodland • Not build on local gaps • Destruction of farmland and woodlands | The policy has been amended to address any impacts associated with ancient woodland and exclude ancient woodland from development. Development must avoid the most sensitive areas of the site and provide a country park. Policy amended to ensure development is integrated with the site to the north, including through green infrastructure and ecological corridors. Buffers are required adjacent to woodland and hedgerows. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dangerous access to site | The policy requires highway works including suitable access to the site. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density does not match demand • Lack of community involvement in the site selection process | Policy prevents development in the most sensitive areas and other policies in the plan will be applied to ensure suitable design for the location. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Pollution Adverse impact on economy and community Too many houses in Crawley Down | |
|--|---|--|

| Site DPH14: Hurst Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down | | |
|---|---|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | |
| Total: 16 | Support: 1 | Object: 14 Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | |
| Thames Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate sustainable surface water strategy needs to be agreed with Lead Local Flood Authority Scale of development doesn't materially affect sewer network. Careful design of new network needed to avoid surcharge. Need for engagement between developers and Thames Water to understand drainage requirements and anticipated loading/flow Upgrade delivery time shouldn't be underestimated, can be 18 months – 3 years Include information provided with planning application to provide assurance that water and waste matters are being addressed. | Policy amended to require a sequential approach that directs development away from areas of flood risk and integrate sustainable drainage. Other policies in the plan also apply, regarding flood risk, drainage, and sustainable design for efficient use of water. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus waiting facilities at stops outside site need improving. | Financial contributions are required for offsite infrastructure, including sustainable transport, which could be used to upgrade the bus stop. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Worth Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site could have support in principle, subject to access designs not having a severe impact on existing traffic flows. Debatable whether the principles of a 20 minute neighbourhood can be achieved in practice. Infrastructure requirements in the policy are formulaic. Infrastructure is not sufficient for the needs of the village. | The site promoter has indicated access is achievable. The site at Burleigh Way is allocated in the Site Allocations DPD. It is not appropriate to de-allocate the site, which is still capable of delivery in the plan-period. DPH14 will be required, alongside all other proposed allocations, to meet the district's housing need. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Worth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPH14: Hurst Farm – could be supported in principle subject to access being achieved. Suggest this is a substitute for the 50 homes at Burleigh Way allocated within the Sites DPD. | The site promoter has indicated access is achievable. The site at Burleigh Way is allocated in the Site Allocations DPD. It is not appropriate to de-allocate the site, which is still capable of delivery in the plan-period. DPH14 will be required, alongside all other proposed allocations, to meet the district's housing need. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment – ecological information needed Status of the site unclear, aerial photographs show construction underway | The site has been partly developed. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| The Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland – keep as buffer and create new native woodland habitats in its surroundings • Complete ATI to comply with NPPF | Policy requires appropriate buffers adjacent to ancient woodland, and integration with the site to the south, including through green infrastructure and ecological corridors. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater need for agricultural land • Need for a 50m buffer to be maintained between development and ancient woodlands | This site has been through a rigorous site selection process and subject to sustainability appraisal. The policy requires appropriate buffers adjacent to ancient woodland. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full • Traffic pressures | Financial contributions are required for offsite infrastructure, including sustainable transport and education. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient provision of infrastructure • Need for a road traffic solution prior to delivery • Lack of public transport | Financial contributions are required for offsite infrastructure, including sustainable transport. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No demand for more housing | Housing need has been assessed using the national standard method. |

| Site DPH15: Land rear of 2 Hurst Road, Hassocks | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 6 | Support: 2 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend wording to reference Soft sand safeguarding area. | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Hassocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to DPH15 Land Rear of 2 Hurst Road as it is understood the promoter/developer may not own all the site. • The SHELAA report in January 2022 stated that access issues would unlikely be mitigated – the Parish Council remains concerned over the access arrangements proposed and the impact on the Stonepound Crossroads AQMA | | The site promoter has confirmed that the entirety of the site is in control of the promoter. This has also been confirmed by the current landowners. The position in January 2022 has been superseded by additional information provided by the site promoter, which has been agreed with the Highways Authority. Concerns regarding the AQMA are not back up by the Council's Air Quality Report which deems the proposals in the draft District Plan to be acceptable in air quality terms. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment – ecological information needed | Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep green space buffer – danger of coalescence | Development will not cause coalescence. Policy requires retention and enhancement of trees and hedgerows, including screening to A273, and appropriate landscaping to preserve views to the north-west. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsuitable for development – access concerns | The policy requires suitable access, including offsite highways works. |

| Site DPH16: Land west of Kemps, Hurstpierpoint | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 73 | Support: 1 | Object: 70 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically | Policy amended to remove requirement for wastewater treatment upgrades. Policy requires sustainable drainage. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to include reference to mineral safeguarding area | Policy amended as requested. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of site would be harmful to the character and setting of Longton Lane Conservation area | The policy requirements for DPH16 require appropriate mitigation – including requirement for a mitigation strategy informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment. The draft masterplan prepared by the site promoter intends to limit development to the eastern parcels only as per the policy requirement | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided. Onsite habitat: trees, hedgerows and waterways; should not be compromised by development. | The policy requires protection and enhancement of streams on the site and ecological corridors between the site and the countryside. Other policies in the plan address the need for green infrastructure, protection of habitats, and biodiversity net gain. | |
| Other | Landscape/ Character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the land will result in coalescence Overdevelopment of the site Loss of public open land | The development is not considered to cause coalescence. The policy requires a landscape-led approach, with upgrades to PROWs, environmental enhancement, and public open space. | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Infrastructure/ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of appropriate infrastructure • Site prone to flooding • Land subject to sewage contamination • Inadequate proposed access • Propose access incompatible with current use the road | <p>The policy requires sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and highway works, in addition to financial contributions towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure. SFRA does not lead to this site being discounted. Other policies in the plan ensure a sequential approach that directs development away from land at risk of flooding, while avoiding water pollution. A suitable access from Orchard Way is required.</p> |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of biodiversity • Insufficient affordable housing provision • Submission from site proponent | <p>Affordable housing provision is consistent with other site allocations. Other policies in the plan will ensure an appropriate approach to green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain.</p> |

| Site DPH17: The Paddocks, Lewes Road, Ashurst Wood | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 5 | Support: 0 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern Water infrastructure crosses the site – access to be preserved • Add a policy requirement to ensure the layout of the development be planned to ensure future access to underground infrastructure | | Policy criterion added as suggested. |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any potential cross boundary impacts should be fully explored with Wealden DC and ESCC. • Within 7km Ashdown Forest buffer zone – mitigation measures required | | Policy requires LVIA to ensure development conserves and enhances AONB. Policy DPC6 sets out the mitigation measures required for development within the 7km buffer zone for Ashdown Forest. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend wording to include reference to Ashurst Wood Brick Clay consultation area | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site within AONB • Consider 100% affordable housing or increase density in developments elsewhere | | Policy requires LVIA to ensure development conserves and enhances AONB. Site provides 30% affordable housing, consistent with other site allocations. |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment – ecological information needed – within High Weald AONB | | HRA has been updated. Policy requires LVIA to ensure development conserves and enhances AONB. |

| Site DPH18: Land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney | | | |
|--|--|-------------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 271 | Support: 2 | Object: 268 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. | | Policy amended to require development aligned with delivery of sewerage infrastructure in consultation with SW. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area Will continue to monitor position re: education provision, not currently required. | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Mims Davies MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenfield site. Would double size of Bolney. New builds out of character. Insufficient infrastructure, including reliability. Poor sustainable transport links. Potential impacts on biodiversity. A272 already extremely busy. Are prone to flooding | | Policy requires highway works and sustainable transport measures, and financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure including sustainable transport. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Other policies in the plan ensure a sequential approach is taken to flood risk, so development is directed towards areas of lower flood risk. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Bolney Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the scale proposed is not sustainable Concerned about impact on road safety, sustainable transport, stress on village infrastructure, poor public transport provision Unacceptable impact on rural setting, historic character and loss of views On-site infrastructure is proposed however Parish do not agree that the settlement/site will be sustainable by its provision – do not see how a country park, allotments would make the settlement more sustainable. Other elements such as community facility, education land are not required. High Weald impact should be 'high' therefore would fail methodology | | <p>The proposal at DPH18 includes on-site community infrastructure that will enable sustainable development in line with the proposed strategy. The site promoters have prepared evidence detailing arrangements for safe and feasible access and there are no concerns from the highways authority regarding safety.</p> <p>The site promoters are in discussions with bus providers regarding additional provision, recognising that the addition of a further 200 dwellings at this location could lead to a critical mass by which new services become more viable. This would be to the benefit of new and existing residents.</p> <p>The accompanying evidence base includes landscape and heritage reports – the policy includes requirements to mitigate any impacts.</p> <p>The provision of on-site infrastructure is predominantly to meet additional needs generated by the site proposal. The additional 200 dwellings may necessitate the need for allotments, community facility and education land for example. If these facilities can also help remediate existing issues</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | and/or be for the benefit of existing communities, then that is a positive. The conclusion against criteria 1 (Landscape / AONB) has been scored on a consistent basis. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage. Clarification sought on location of country park; will there be a minimum size in policy? | Ecological feasibility appraisal has been provided. The policy does not stipulate the size or location of the country park. |
| Other | Landscape/ Character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on the village setting Impact on landscape and biodiversity Impact on heritage Overdevelopment/ disproportionate growth of the village Loss of local amenity Loss of historic settlement pattern Coalescence with the hamlet of Crosspost | The policy requires a Heritage Impact Assessment and a layout and design which protect the setting of a nearby listed building and the Bolney Conservation Area. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements for green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, and character and design of development. The development of this site is not considered to cause coalescence with other settlements. |
| | Infrastructure/ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor public transport Pedestrian and cycle infrastructure is not suitable or safe to access services The road network in and around Bolney is at capacity and unsafe A272 junctions already suffer from delays and further development will add to these Additional development will increase traffic and car accidents on the A272 Further development will impact on traffic through the village Local infrastructure such as education and health are already under pressure Utility companies are already unable to provide their service The infrastructure promoted alongside the development is not necessary in a rural location The site floods and development is likely to result in an overflow on existing properties Increased air pollution which is already high in Bolney Affordability issues which include affordable home | Policy requires highway works and sustainable transport measures, and financial contributions towards a broad range of infrastructure including sustainable transport. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Policy amended to require development aligned with delivery of sewerage infrastructure in consultation with SW. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. Other policies also ensure a sequential approach is taken to flood risk, so development is directed towards areas of lower flood risk, while avoiding pollution. |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Site DPH19: Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 17 | Support: 3 | Object: 14 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS. | Policy amended as suggested. | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage. Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common | Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other allocations in Sayers Common. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk The sewage infrastructure is deficient Impact of additional traffic on the local area | Policy amended to avoid developing areas of existing and future flood risk. Utilities companies have been consulted regarding sewerage infrastructure. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |

| Site DPH20: Land at Coombe Farm, London Road, Sayers Common | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 25 | Support: 1 | Object: 22 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS. | Policy amended as suggested. | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically | Policy amended to remove requirement for wastewater treatment upgrades. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed | Policy refers to brick clay safeguarding area. Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage. Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common | Ecological evidence has now been provided. Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cautionary minimum 50m buffer to Ancient Woodland should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation. Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) | Policy amended to require an updated ancient tree inventory (ATI). |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on ancient woodland Detrimental to biodiversity Flood risk Lack of suitable infrastructure | Policy requires protection of ancient woodland and has been amended to require an updated ancient tree inventory (ATI). Policy amended to incorporate EA suggested wording on flood risk. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements for green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain. Policy requires sewerage network upgrades and sustainable transport measures, as well as financial contributions towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Site DPH21: Land to the West of Kings Business Centre, Reeds Lane | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 15 | Support: 1 | Object: 14 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS. | Wording amended as suggested. | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically | Policy amended to remove requirement for wastewater treatment upgrades. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed | Policy refers to brick clay safeguarding area. Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |

| Other consultee bodies: | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage. Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common | Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. |
| Other | Landscape/ Character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of identity as the proposed developments would merge several villages together. | Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. A comprehensive masterplan is required. Development of these sites is not considered to cause coalescence with other settlements. |
| | Infrastructure/ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate infrastructure. The increase of traffic would particularly be a problem for Hurstpierpoint High Street and Cowfold that already has an Air Quality Control area. Water security; need for a reservoir? Limited capacity for the wastewater network. Flooding issues. Reeds Lane often floods. Poor transport links in the area. No employment opportunities in the area. | Policy requires sewerage network upgrades and sustainable transport measures, as well as financial contributions towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Policy amended to incorporate EA suggested wording on flood risk. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements for green infrastructure, air quality, biodiversity net gain, and efficient use of water through sustainable design. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on wildlife habitats with rare species; onsite and Downland. | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19). Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. Policy DPN1 requires that planning applications for development likely to affect protected habitats or species will provide appropriate surveys along with an ecological impact assessment report. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions the Housing Need number. Contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policies. No pavements or street lighting pushes people towards using a car. Disproportionate number of new homes proposed in local area. Too much for a tier 3 settlement. Welcomes the inclusion of Land to the West of King Business Centre as a proposed allocation. | The plan's housing number has been determined using the national standard method. The policy requires sustainable transport measures including financial contributions towards offsite infrastructure. |

| Site DPH22: Land at LVS Hassocks, London Road, Sayers Common. | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 14 | Support: 0 | Object: 14 | Neutral: 0 |

| Comments Received | | Response to comments |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Statutory Consultees: | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS. | Policy amended as suggested. |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program. Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically | Policy amended to remove requirement for wastewater treatment upgrades. Other policies in the plan will ensure planning obligations are secured and infrastructure provided at the right time. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed | Policy refers to brick clay safeguarding area. Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage. Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common | Ecology evidence has now been provided. Policy amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. |
| Other | Landscape/ Character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over development. Too much development for a Category 3 settlement. Poor public transport. | The policy requires sustainable transport measures including financial contributions towards offsite infrastructure. The policy requires a coordinated approach with other site allocations and adherence to the principles of a 20-minute neighbourhood to deliver high-quality placemaking and public transport services. |
| | Infrastructure/ Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of infrastructure in area. Flooding issues already in the area. Traffic issues and Cowfold is already has an Air Quality Control area. The wastewater and sewerage system need reinforcements or improvements made. Healthcare system already struggling with the number of people | Policy requires provision of a special school, highway works, sewerage network upgrades and sustainable transport measures, as well as financial contributions towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Policy amended to incorporate EA suggested wording on flood risk. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements to improve air quality. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damage to habitat of Roe deer and large mature oak trees. Impacts on ecosystem | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and ecology evidence provided. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | for green infrastructure, air quality, biodiversity net gain, and nature recovery. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government policy is changing; housing number could change. | The plan's housing number has been determined using the national standard method. Numbers are unlikely to change significantly and it is important to progress the plan if MSDC is to avoid speculative development in less sustainable locations. |

| Site DPH23: Ham Lane Farm House, Ham Lane, Scaynes Hill | | | |
|---|---|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 25 | Support: 0 | Object: 22 | Neutral: 3 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDE Waste and Aggregate Recycling Facility consultation area and close to Eastlands Farm aggregate recycling. Amend wording to reference Building Stone consultation area | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Lindfield Rural | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note protection of ancient woodland | | Noted |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment – ecological information needed | | Noted. |
| Woodland Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to inclusion of ancient woodlands within development sites – need for a 50m buffer The Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) for the area may be incomplete. Complete to comply with NPPF | | Ancient woodland lies to the SE of the site. Policy DPN4 has been amended to require that development adjacent to ancient woodland and ancient, aged or veteran trees must incorporate appropriate buffers. The policy includes multiple criteria to ensure ancient woodland is protected. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breaching of green gap between Haywards Heath and Scaynes Hill Overdevelopment in the area | | This site allocation is relatively small and is not considered overdevelopment for Scaynes Hill, or to cause coalescence between settlements. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impact on character | | The plan should be read as a whole. Policies on sustainable design and construction (DPS2) and character and design (DPB1) among others, will ensure only high quality development is approved on this site. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | |
| | Developability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of demand | This sites contributes to meeting the district's housing need, which has been determined through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the national standard method. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ham Lane is a private road – alternative access required. No cycling routes and public transport in place Heavy traffic | Policy requires highway works and sustainable transport measures, as well as financial contributions towards a broad range of offsite infrastructure including sustainable transport. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Policy requires new pedestrian links to existing PROW network. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and sewage issues Flood risk Lack of public infrastructure and facilities Lack of streetlights | Utilities company has not raised issues with wastewater and sewerage. The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works (which can include streetlighting), in addition to financial contributions towards a range of offsite infrastructure. SFRA does not lead to this site being discounted. Other policies in the plan ensure a sequential approach that directs development away from land at risk of flooding, while avoiding water pollution. |

| Site DPH24: Challoners, Cuckfield Road, Ansty | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 31 | Support: 0 | Object: 30 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a policy requirement to ensure the layout of the development be planned to ensure future access to underground infrastructure | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment – ecological information needed | | Noted |

| | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment | Policy requires that the design and layout of the site should reflect the rural character of the site and avoid being urban or suburban in character. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecologically sensitive area | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and the policy includes criteria to protect trees and hedgerows. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements for green infrastructure, air quality, biodiversity net gain, and nature recovery. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental to the character of Ansty | Policy requires that the design and layout of the site should reflect the rural character of the site and avoid being urban or suburban in character. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainty over requirement for more housing – reference to the levelling up bill Contrary to neighbourhood plan | This sites contributes to meeting the district’s housing need, which has been determined through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the national standard method. It is important to progress the plan if MSDC is to avoid speculative development in less sustainable locations. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate access at Marwick Close with no footpath or streetlights | Policy requires suitable access and integration with the site to the west by providing pedestrian and cycling connections. Design policies will be applied, ensuring routes are suitable. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of public transport Lack of infrastructure and facilities – Doctors and shops, school Lack of public infrastructure - water and electricity Traffic issues | Utilities company has not raised issues with wastewater and sewerage infrastructure in this area. The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works, in addition to financial contributions towards a range of offsite infrastructure including health and education. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of privacy for Marwick Drive residents | Policy requires that the layout of the site should take into account trees and allow for their future retention, and to prevent overshadowing private gardens. Design policies will be applied to preserve privacy for adjoining residents. |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Site DPH25: Land to the west of Marwick Close, Bolney Road, Ansty | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 25 | Support: 1 | Object: 22 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| None | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| None | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment – ecological information needed | Noted. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment | Policy requires that the design and layout of the site should reflect the rural character and avoid being urban or suburban in character. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecologically sensitive area | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and the policy includes criteria to protect trees and hedgerows. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed, including requirements for green infrastructure, air quality, biodiversity net gain, and nature recovery. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental to the character of Ansty Design and layout should reflect the rural character of the settlement | Policy requires that the design and layout of the site should reflect the rural character of the site and avoid being urban or suburban in character. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contrary to neighbourhood plan Unsustainable location | Site allocations in the plan have been through a rigorous site selection process which considers the location's accessibility and sustainability. This was followed by Sustainability Appraisal, to ensure only the most sustainable sites were taken forward for allocation. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic issues Bolney road access A272 is dangerous | The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works, in addition to financial contributions towards a range of offsite infrastructure including sustainable transport. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of public transport Lack of infrastructure and facilities; health facilities, school | The policy requires sustainable transport measures and highway works, in addition to financial contributions towards a range of offsite infrastructure including sustainable transport, health and education. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of dwellings incompatible with policy requirements – DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocations Lower density to 20dph | Policy criteria and other policies in the plan will ensure a layout and design that achieve high quality development. |
|--|---|---|

| DPH26: Older Persons' Housing and Specialist Accommodation | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 14 | Support: 4 | Object: 9 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Balcombe Parish Council | Policy needs clarification on what happens if a criterion is not met. Suggested change of wording. | | Various amendments and clarifications added to the policy and supporting text. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the 3 items under loss of older persons accommodation to describe what will happen if xii applies Prevent loss of older people accommodation Affordable older persons accommodation is required and social housing Provide older care accommodation within or contiguous to existing built development on a sustainable location Change 'contiguous' to 'adjacent' under criterion iii, iv and v Unable to provide affordable elder care accommodation at 30%, reduce to 25% | | The policy prevents the loss of older persons' accommodation unless certain criteria met. The word 'contiguous' is consistent with other policies controlling development outside built-up areas. Viability assessment indicates that 30% affordable housing is achievable. |

| Site DPH27: Land at Byanda, Hassocks | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 5 | Support: 1 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend wording to reference Soft Sand safeguarding area | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Hassocks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support the allocation at Byanda for C2 use (DPH27), was refused at planning committee. Unsuitable to support a site of this size. | | This site has now been approved by Planning Committee. It will continue to be allocated within the District Plan to provide certainty of delivery (in the event the application expires). |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | No comment – needs ecological information | Noted. |
| Other | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. number of units required • Unsuitable location for care home • No guarantee site will deliver sufficient housing | Site is considered well located for older persons' accommodation. |
| | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Built-up area to include Byanda | Built-up area boundaries have been reviewed and no change to BUA at this location is proposed. |
| | General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on site previously refused on committee | Noted. |

| Site DPH28: Land at Hyde Lodge, Handcross | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 6 | Support: 0 | Object: 4 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culvert partially located within site (southeast of site). Opportunities to open up/daylight some of the culvert could be explored | | Policy amended as suggested. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment – needs ecological information | | Noted. |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within High Weald AONB • Extends built-up area of Handcross • Increase density of houses elsewhere instead | | The policy requires a landscape-led approach to development, and a LVIA to ensure an appropriate development in the AONB. A new criterion has been added to strengthen this protection of rural character on the edge of the settlement. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. number of units required • Ecological impact • Additional land is needed to meet market/affordable home needs in the area and older persons' accommodation | | Policy has been amended to ensure an appropriate buffer to the priority habitat at the western boundary. |

DPH29: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

| Number of Comments Received | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------|
| Total: 7 | Support: 2 | Object: 4 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | Response to comments | | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amendment suggested re connection to main foul sewer | Policy amended as suggested. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| South Downs National Park Authority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amendment suggested re setting of SDNP | Policy amended as suggested. | |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for identifying provision – will continue to work collaboratively on strategic issue | Noted. | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Other | Clarification wanted re. existing sites | Noted. | |

| DPH30: Self and Custom Build Housing | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 12 | Support: 1 | Object: 10 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | Response to comments | | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the inclusion of such a policy Requirement too high; further evidence needed Other sources of demand show higher need Greater flexibility needed | Policy amended to reduce requirement from 5% to 2% on sites of 100 or more dwellings. | |

| DPH31: Housing Mix | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: | Support: 23 | Object: 22 | Neutral: 1 |

| Comments Received | | Response to comments |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Statutory Consultees: | | |
| None | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Wealden District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports and welcomes the opportunity to engage further with MSDC regarding the most appropriate dwelling mix for Crabbet Park | Noted. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Mix policies set out in Neighbourhood Plans reflect local need and should not be superseded by Housing Mix policies in this plan. | Where there is a conflict, legislation states that the latest adopted plan must take precedence. In order to keep Neighbourhood Plan policies up to date (bearing in mind the evidence used to support them is now aged) the Neighbourhood Plans can be reviewed and updated as necessary. The policy does, however, allow for alternative approaches to be used (such as local evidence), where justified. |
| Horsted Keynes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that housing mix policy sets standards that may not reflect local needs of villages like Horsted Keynes, note the flexibility but should include ability to rely on local housing needs surveys | Housing need evidence, including Housing Mix, is established in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The policy allows for alternative approaches to be used (such as local evidence), where justified. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed mix of housing across district do not reflect needs in some rural settlements Strengthening needed by providing requirements for different mix, when supported by evidence. Housing mix should include policies on older people and disabled accommodation Add section to say parishes may retain specific mix requirements in neighbourhood plan Older people's housing requirements to not only apply to larger developments Guidance should be adhered to on all developments Should be incorporated in every development <i>Specialist housing</i> should be exempt from meeting requirements Incorporate co-living projects Detailed housing needs surveys are needed Not sufficient provision for smaller affordable homes Lack of low cost rest and small starter homes through the district Housing mix should reflect local needs at the time Should not be applied to dev under 10 units Include reference to the SHMA | This policy is based on the evidence in the SHMA. The housing mix is accepted as a starting point in the policy. Other mixes may be justified in rural settlements, if supported by evidence as set out in the policy. Reference added to older persons' accommodation. |

| DPH32: Affordable Housing | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 27 | Support: 2 | Object: 22 | Neutral: 3 |
| Comments Received | | Response to comments | |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| Balcombe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern re Affordable Housing policy – commuted sums are not acceptable in rural villages and ‘local connection’ should be enforced in policy | As a result of comments received during the Regulation 18 consultation, this policy has been amended. Within AONB 30% on-site is required and financial contributions will only be agreed in exceptional circumstances. |
| Horsted Keynes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing should be provided on-site rather than commuted sums in rural communities where housing is needed | As a result of comments received during the Regulation 18 consultation, this policy has been amended. Within AONB 30% on-site is required and financial contributions will only be agreed in exceptional circumstances. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a higher target through viability tests –50% 30% affordable housing for all sites of more than 6 units within the AONB – provision onsite Amend wording suggested in reference to financial contributions and delivery of <i>affordable</i> housing. | A higher affordable housing target would reduce the funding available for infrastructure. Various policy amendments to provide clarity and additional flexibility to account for different circumstances. The policy recognises that financial contributions may be justified in lieu of onsite affordable housing on small sites. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be incorporated in every development Amend the use of “a couple” for clarity Policy does not provide circumstances where on-site provision is inappropriate i.e. less than 10 units Need for 50% affordable housing within AONB Provide exceptions for older care accommodation Allow for flexibility in forms/models of delivery Reduce requirements on brownfield sites Include provision of shared ownership Part iv is too vague – evidence-based specification required. Financial contributions prior to commencement may not be possible, flexibility required. | The policy recognises that financial contributions may be justified in lieu of onsite affordable housing on small sites. Planning obligations can include trigger points for when financial contributions are due. Viability assessment for brownfield sites may justify a reduction in the affordable housing requirement, subject to compliance with Policy DPI8. A higher affordable housing target would reduce the funding available for infrastructure. Various policy amendments have been made to provide clarity and additional flexibility to account for different circumstances. |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| DPH33: First Homes | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 14 | Support: 3 | Object: 10 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| East Grinstead Town Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What criteria were used to establish £250,000 as the threshold. This is still unaffordable. | The definition of First Homes has been defined by Government in a Written Ministerial Statement and accompanying guidance at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes | |

| Other consultee bodies: | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be incorporated in every development • What criteria was used to establish £250,000 as a threshold – it is unaffordable • Clarification needed as to why 3 and 4 beds are included • Provide evidence to support the viability of this approach • 30% discount is still unaffordable for many – minimum should be 40-50% • No demand for 1 bed first homes • Contradictions within policy's subtext • Provide definition for "first home exception sites" | The policy requires that First Homes will be provided with most housing developments as part of their affordable housing requirement. The supporting text defines "first home exception sites". The definition of First Homes has been defined by Government in a Written Ministerial Statement and accompanying guidance at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes |

| DPH34: Rural Exception Sites | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 8 | Support: 2 | Object: 4 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Lindfield Rural Parish Council | Unclear what role parish councils would play in the identification of people who might apply for the housing. | | Clarification provided on the role of parish councils in identifying need and delivering rural exception sites. |
| Balcombe Parish Council | Welcome 20% market housing allowance. | | Noted. |
| East Grinstead Town Council | Welcome inclusion of older people accommodation in the housing mix. | | Noted. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| CPRE Sussex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should consider if policy is effective in delivering developments | | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest a minimum threshold is applied for when mix is required. • Policy should include allowance for updated evidence on needs and supply to be provided and considered. • First Homes and homes for social rent needed • More should be done to encourage small affordable sites (less than 10 affordable homes) - including within AONB • The role of Parish Councils in the identifying people entitled to apply for this housing is unclear | | Clarification provided on the role of parish councils in identifying need and delivering rural exception sites. Updated evidence will be accepted – housing need surveys should be less than 5 years old. The policy allows for social rent, and first homes are the subject of a separate policy. |

| DPH35: Dwelling Space Standards | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 5 | Support: 2 | Object: 3 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| None | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| East Grinstead Town Council | Welcome inclusion of older persons accommodation in the housing mix. | Noted. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governments' internal space standards are optional – evidence needed to justify inclusion of standards in policy | Minimum space standards help to ensure that new housing in Mid Sussex is of an acceptable quality to meet the needs of residents. |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| DPH36: Accessibility | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 9 | Support: 1 | Object: 8 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Balcombe Parish Council | The policy should be applied to developments of any size, otherwise small sites are disadvantaged. | This policy requirement has been considered in the plan's viability assessment. | |
| East Grinstead Town Council | Welcome older peoples needs being met in these policies. | Noted. | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptable houses do not provide on-site support, care and companionship offered by specialist developments. Delete: <i>The Requirement will also apply to private extra care, assisted living or other such schemes designed for frailer older people or others with disabilities and those in need of care or support services.</i> Not enough evidence for new dwellings to comply with Building Regulations Part M4 (3). Requirement should only apply to 10 dwellings or more. Should make clear that it is subject to viability. Viability concerns in increasing M4(2) requirement from 20% to 100%. Repetition with DPH32: Affordable Housing – should be made more concise Housing mix should include policies on older people and disabled accommodation Limitation of fewer than 10 dwellings disadvantages small villages; should be applied to all developments Further evidence needed to justify that all new dwellings meet Part M4(2) | The SHMA evidence is considered to justify the requirement for 100% of new dwellings meeting Building Regulations Part M4, as set out in the supporting text for the policy. This policy requirement has been considered in the plan's viability assessment. | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sayers Common Village – General Comments | | | |
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 101 | Support: 0 | Object: 99 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| None | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| Andrew Griffith MP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment • Long history of flooding due to inadequate sewage and waste systems. • Reliant on cars for retail. • Inadequate provision and access to public transport • Local schools at capacity • Rural lanes cannot support increased traffic • Already pressure on GPs. Policy requirement of 'health provision' unclear. | <p>Site allocations in Sayers Common require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and contributions towards education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail.</p> <p>Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.</p> <p>Policies require a coordinated approach with other site allocations and adherence to the principles of a 20-minute neighbourhood to deliver high-quality placemaking and public transport services.</p> <p>Policies have been amended to incorporate EA suggested wording on flood risk. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed.</p> |
| Horsham District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts from development on infrastructure across the border should be considered | <p>Policies ensure that development provides onsite and offsite infrastructure, sufficient to meet its needs.</p> <p>Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.</p> |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| See site allocation policies. | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Ornithological Society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area west of Sayers Common has an ecological importance due to the presence of Nightingales, Turtle Doves and Barn Owls • Huge expansion of village; urban sprawl. | <p>The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and ecological information has now been provided for a number of sites in Sayers Common. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. The site selection process and sustainability appraisal identified Sayers Common as one of the more sustainable locations for growth.</p> |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ecological surveys undertaken for allocations • How are allocations taking account of other Local Plans and strategic documents i.e. Southern Water's Draft Water Resources Management Plan and potential new reservoir | <p>The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and ecological information has now been provided for a number of sites in Sayers Common. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to</p> |

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| | | demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. Water companies have been consulted and their comments have resulted in amendments to the plan. |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment of Sayers Village • Coalescence of Sayers Common, Albourne and Hurstpierpoint • Detrimental effect on views from Devils Dyke and SDNP • Light pollution | The site selection process and sustainability appraisal identified Sayers Common as one of the more sustainable locations for growth. The site allocations are not considered to cause coalescence between settlements, and an up-to-date Local Plan will help to prevent speculative developments in less preferable locations. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for development affecting the countryside and protected landscapes. |
| | Flood Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Flood Risk on the area (specially Reeds Lane and London Road) • Maintenance of streams/ponds/drainage channels – danger of flooding • Historic groundwater flooding | The Environment Agency has been consulted and a number of amendments made to the plan, to avoid developing areas of existing and future flood risk, and to require sustainable drainage. Utilities companies have been consulted regarding wastewater infrastructure. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on wildlife • Loss of Countryside • Consider the advice of RSPB, SWT, CPRE and SOS to preserve the countryside | The HRA has been updated for the submission draft District Plan (Regulation 19) and ecological information has now been provided for a number of sites in Sayers Common. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications. Several policies in the plan have been amended to take account of comments regarding nature recovery, biodiversity, and protection of the countryside. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic along B2118 and A23 – accident prone • Roads are too narrow to support further traffic • Need for a comprehensive traffic study | Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. Site allocation policies require highways works and financial contributions to sustainable transport. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of development in brownfield sites • There already are a number of unsold dwellings on new housing developments • Local need for more affordable housing • Proposals segregated from community services and infrastructure • Category 3 – not suitable for large developments. | Brownfield sites have been included in the plan where they are available, deliverable, and suitable. Policies have been amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. The plan's affordable housing target has been informed by evidence, including viability assessment that also considers the ability of development to fund necessary infrastructure. All sites have been through an objective site selection process that considers accessibility to services and facilities, discounting sites that fail to meet the criteria. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Infrastructure and public transport • Developments in Sayers Common need to provide additional infrastructure i.e medical centres and commercial facilities • Wastewater and Sewage system issues - inadequate • Schools are full | Site allocations in Sayers Common require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and contributions towards |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for a bus route to Burgess Hill station | <p>education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail. Policies have been amended to incorporate water company suggestions regarding sewerage and wastewater infrastructure requirements.</p> |
| | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of arable land should not be encouraged • Housing targets are now advisory • Village status needs to be preserved • Albourne Neighbourhood Plan has been ignored in particular policies ALC2 and ALC3 • Unbalanced growth, mainly concentrated in Hurstpierpoint and Sayers common • Premature review process, wait for stability in planning processes and demographics • Developments in Sayers Common are not consistent with National Policy • Massive negative impact on character of village and rural lifestyle; will be turned into a town. • Disproportionate growth • Contrary to neighbourhood plans. Loss of local democracy. • Requires more infrastructure and affects more rural nature than other two significant sites. • No more capacity on rural roads through village. Development would increase congestion at High Street / B2117 junction. • Houses may not be needed following Government's propose policy changes • Areas regularly floods due to clay and insufficient drainage systems • Negative impacts on biodiversity. Fragmentation of natural environment due to development. No meaningful options to realise BNG due to proximity to other settlements and neighbouring authority. • No assurance on required and timely delivery of infrastructure needed. • Will worsen air quality at Stonepound Crossroads with people accessing Hassocks train station. • Need to add childcare to list of infrastructure required from new builds • Is the 20 minute neighbourhood concept achievable or fundable in this area? • Detrimental to the setting of the South Downs National Park • Boundary of DPSC2: Land to the south of Reeds Lane need checking, includes private gardens. | <p>Policies have been amended to require a coordinated approach with other housing allocations in Sayers Common. All sites have been through an objective site selection process that considers accessibility to services and facilities, discounting sites that fail to meet the criteria.</p> <p>Site allocations in Sayers Common require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and contributions towards education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail.</p> <p>Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period.</p> <p>Policies have been amended to incorporate advice from EA and water companies. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed.</p> |

| Burgess Hill – General Comments | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|---|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 16 | Support: 0 | Object: 15 | Neutral: 1 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| See site allocation policies. | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Other | <p>Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental to the landscape and rural character of the area • Coalescence of Burgess Hill with surrounding villages and towns • The proposals will reduce green spaces within and around burgess hill | | <p>The site allocations are not considered to cause coalescence between settlements, and an up-to-date Local Plan will help to prevent speculative developments in less preferable locations. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | development affecting the countryside and protected landscapes. |
| Biodiversity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife habitats must be protected | Development of sites in Burgess Hill will be assessed against all relevant policies in the plan, including policies on green infrastructure, natural recovery and biodiversity net gain. |
| Developability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disproportionate housing allocated to Burgess Hill Prioritise brownfield sites within Burgess Hill Revitalise the town centre with 4-5 storey housing/apartments | The site selection process and sustainability appraisal identified Burgess Hill as one of the more sustainable locations for growth. Brownfield and town centre sites have been included in the plan where they are available, deliverable, and suitable. |
| Accessibility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for a plan to improve movement around Burgess Hill Severe traffic congestion and roadworks | The site allocation policies require sustainable transport measures and highway works, where appropriate. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. |
| Infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sewage treatment facility does not have capacity for new developments Inadequate public transport Lack of infrastructure (shops, medical centres and facilities) One new school is not enough Severe pressure on fresh water supply during summer Insufficient parking for local residents | Site allocations in Burgess Hill require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and contributions towards education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail. Policies have been amended to incorporate water company suggestions regarding sewerage and wastewater infrastructure requirements. Other policies in the plan ensure efficient use of water and sustainable drainage. |
| General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long waiting lists for allotments in the area (240), disbelief than an alternative allotment will be provided Need for redevelopment of the town centre of Burgess Hill (unused retail buildings and demolition sites) Advisory housing targets – Levelling up and regeneration bill Air pollution caused by traffic congestions | The replacement allotment site is in MSDC ownership and will be made available in perpetuity, which is an improvement on the current allotment terms. Town centre sites are assessed when they come forward for consideration during plan preparation. The plan only includes sites that are available and deliverable. The objectively assessed housing need for Mid Sussex is unlikely to change significantly in the medium term. Other policies in the plan set out requirements regarding air quality and pollution. |

| Hurstpierpoint – General Comments | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 48 | Support: 0 | Object: 45 | Neutral: 3 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| None | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | |
| None | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | |
| See site allocation policies. | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Other | Landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental impact on views from the countryside and SDNP • Overdevelopment of Hurstpierpoint with 633 further homes • Coalescence with Burgess Hill and Hassocks | The site allocations are not considered to cause coalescence between settlements, and an up-to-date Local Plan will help to prevent speculative developments in less preferable locations. Other policies in the plan set out requirements for development affecting the countryside and protected landscapes. |
| | Flood Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water flooding • College Lane, Malthouse Lane and Danworth Lane flood regularly | Policies have been amended to incorporate advice from the Environment Agency and water companies. Other policies in the plan set out the environmental criteria against which development proposals will be assessed. |
| | Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of wildlife habitats • Current developments proposals will destroy efforts of The Woodland, Flora and Fauna Group to preserve the biodiversity of the countryside | Development of sites will be assessed against all relevant policies in the plan, including policies on green infrastructure, natural recovery and biodiversity net gain. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of historical and archaeological importance • Character of the village will be lost • Traffic congestions along Conservation Area • Need to preserve the village status | Where development would have site-specific impact on heritage assets, including sites of archaeological importance, appropriate policy requirements have been included. Other policies in the plan set out general requirements regarding character and design, heritage assets, and conservation areas. Amendments have been made following Historic England comments. |
| | Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestions at High Street • Increase in car travel as most of the allocated sites are in areas with lack of public transport • Lack of public footpaths and cycle routes for children travelling to school • B2116 is a dangerous road for pedestrians and cyclists | The site allocation policies require sustainable transport measures and highway works, where appropriate. Additional transport modelling has been carried out alongside ongoing discussion with WSCC and will continue in the lead up to submission – liaison with National Highways will also continue during this period. The site selection process considered the proximity of sites to services and facilities, and policies include requirements for financial contributions towards offsite infrastructure including sustainable transport. |
| | Developability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hurstpierpoint borders the SDNP – leaving a small area which cannot take any further development • Lack of affordable housing in the area • Disproportional allocation for growth – half concentrated around Hurstpierpoint | Site allocations are not proposed on the side of Hurstpierpoint that borders SDNP. Standard affordable housing policies apply, based on evidence of need and viability. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of healthcare services • Inadequate infrastructure to facilitate the developments | Site allocations require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage back up during heavy rain – drainage issues • Insufficient parking around high street • Lack of sixth form education • No planned cycle routes • No post office or appropriate retail • Inappropriate timing of provisions of new schools and healthcare facilities – these need to be provided before housing completions • Inadequate transport links | <p>measures, and contributions towards education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail. Policies have been amended to incorporate water company suggestions regarding sewerage and wastewater infrastructure requirements. Other policies in the plan ensure efficient use of water and sustainable drainage. The site selection process considered the proximity of sites to services and facilities, and this location for development was also subject to sustainability appraisal.</p> |
| | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing targets will no longer be mandatory • District Plan seems to be led by demands of developers whose motivation is profit • Overestimation of housing figures • Local air pollution will be exacerbated • Request for a Q&A meeting at Hurstpierpoint Village Hall • Negative impact on High Street with further congestions | <p>The objectively assessed housing need for Mid Sussex is unlikely to change significantly in the short to medium term. Other policies in the plan set out requirements regarding air quality and pollution.</p> |

| Crawley Down – General Comments | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 4 | Support: 0 | Object: 4 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| None | | | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| See site allocation policies | | | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Other | <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments in the area creating coalescence with Copthorne | The site allocations at Crawley Down are not considered to cause coalition with Copthorne. | |
| | <p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of maintaining open spaces and protecting the countryside due to a range of natural species that inhabit these spaces (i.e. deer and bees) | Further ecological information has now been provided. Site allocations and other policies in the plan set out requirements to ensure the countryside is protected and biodiversity enhanced. | |
| | <p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water flooding issues - low permeability of clay soil | Advice from the Environment Agency and water companies on flood risk, drainage and the sewerage/wastewater network has resulted in several amendments to the plan. | |
| | <p>Developability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for different types of accommodation, according to local demand • Brownfield sites should be allocated before greenfield sites | Brownfield sites have been included in the plan where they are available, deliverable, and suitable. Other policies in the plan set out the housing mix for market and affordable housing, based on evidence of need, | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | and some allocations include a requirement for extra care housing. |
| | Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New houses are being designed with disregard for the local character | The plan requires development proposals to have regard to the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and they will also be expected to comply with policies character and design, heritage assets, and conservation areas. |
| | Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing allocations of the last 13 years do not coincide with infrastructure provision Need for more GPs, schools and public transport – services overcrowded Local roads are in poor condition Restricted access to water provided by South East Water Recurrent power cuts Lack of local shops Sewage system needs to be improved | Site allocations require onsite and offsite infrastructure provision including highway works, sewerage network upgrades, sustainable transport measures, and contributions towards education and health infrastructure. The IDP provides more detail. Policies have been amended to incorporate water company suggestions regarding sewerage and wastewater infrastructure requirements. Other policies in the plan ensure efficient use of water and sustainable drainage. The site selection process considered the proximity of sites to services and facilities, and this location for development was also subject to sustainability appraisal. |

| Chapter 16. Infrastructure | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 61 | Support: 11 | Object: 35 | Neutral: 15 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southern Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPI1 Securing Infrastructure</u>: Support early engagement to help with timely delivery | | No change required. |
| Sport England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPI5 Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities</u>: Support. <u>DPI1 Securing Infrastructure</u>: No reference given to natural environment | | New supporting text has been added for Policy DPI1 to define infrastructure, including GI. |
| West Sussex County Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPI1 Securing Infrastructure</u>: Support. Cross reference to site allocations could be made | | Reference to compliance with other policies in the plan are included in site allocation policies. |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| Horsham District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts from development on infrastructure across the border should be considered | | Policy DPI1 requires that development will provide infrastructure and mitigation measures beyond the district boundary when necessary. |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| East Grinstead Town Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would welcome a commitment (DPS5) for the district to work with SE Water and Southern Water re upgrading infrastructure | | South-East Water and Southern Water are both statutory consultees to the plan-making and planning application processes. They prepare Water Resource and Wastewater management plans (in a similar fashion to District Plans) to plan for increasing demand and their plans to address that. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Twineham Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the lack of a policy covering electric infrastructure. | This has been addressed in the plan. |
| Other consultee bodies: | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>DPI1 Securing Infrastructure</u>: No reference given to natural environment How are allocations taking account of other Local Plans and strategic documents i.e. Southern Water's Draft Water Resources Management Plan and potential new reservoir | New supporting text has been added for Policy DPI1 to define infrastructure, including GI. Site allocation policies refer to other plans and strategies, where relevant. |
| Other | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned infrastructure provision is inadequate for additional growth Infrastructure should precede housing developments No more houses in river catchment areas until water companies resolve and repair damage Transport system is not integrated and public transport is generally poor. Railway network constrained by Balcombe tunnel, Viaduct and platform lengths Insufficient fresh water, water storage and water treatment to sustain new homes More allotments needed as new houses have small gardens Further details on "Financial contributions" against site allocations would be welcomed <p><u>DPI1: Securing Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over publishing viability appraisals; could prejudice more complex sites coming forward. Council should review position. Clarity sought on "timing of improvements". Should be made clear what infrastructure developers are expected to contribute towards. Mechanism for apportioning costs, such as CIL Regulation 122, could be used. Wording amendment: standard of replacement facilities include; same floorspace, volume, functionality and purpose. Wording regarding early engagement should be strengthened <p><u>DPI2: Planning Obligations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should only include "reasonable" costs and these should be agreed prior to Agreement Appendix 3 does not set out infrastructure quantity and accessibility standards as policy states. Should be increased annually according to inflation rate on a fixed day of the year <p><u>DPI3: Major Infrastructure Projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should be split in 2 to reflect MSDC's role as decision maker and statutory consultee. Clarity needed for terms: "reasonably foreseeable future". "Delivery Plans" should be removed as not statutory Needs to take account the Gatwick Airport DCO and impacts in north of district. <p><u>DPI5: Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include flexibility for dual use of open space, sport and recreation facilities between schools and public. Support principle; Wakehurst as a major centre for science education/research also appropriate exception. Play studies cited in policy not found in evidence base. Policy wording should be amended to reflect that studies don't cover all types of sport (climbing). Countryside has its own recreational value; should be balanced when considered for new facilities. Should include engagement with Town/ Parish Councils (same with DPI6: Community and Cultural Facilities and Local Services) | <p>Infrastructure requirements in the plan have been informed by engagement with infrastructure providers.</p> <p>Site allocation policies set out specific requirements for onsite and offsite infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy DPI7 sets out requirements for water and wastewater infrastructure, to ensure sufficient capacity for development.</p> <p>An appendix with the plan will set out the planning obligations requirements for new development in the district.</p> <p>Open book viability assessment is a common local plan requirement to ensure transparency, and complex development proposals have still come forward. Supporting text added which clarifies details including timing of infrastructure provision set out in Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Supporting text makes it clear that planning obligations must meet legal tests so they cannot be unreasonable. S106 contributions are negotiated case by case. Supporting text amended to refer to inflation reviews and clarify what is included in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Policy amended to separate NSIPs from other MIPs. The policy sets the framework for MSDC's role in the Gatwick Airport DCO and does not need to specify individual DCOs.</p> <p>'Climbing' added to supporting text in list of facilities. Policy amendments include cross-reference to the MDSC Design Guide SPD, a requirement for meeting the strategic aims of relevant open space and playing pitch evidence, and clarifications to the approach taken to the loss of existing provision. The evidence base has been updated.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <u>DPI6: Community and Cultural Facilities and Local Services</u> | Policies DPI1 and DPI2 ensure that housing developments provide community infrastructure where appropriate. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community centres must be provided with larger areas of housing to avoid cultural deserts | |
| | <u>DPI8: Viability</u> | Minor delays due to advanced stage viability review are justified as they enable developments to become more or fully policy compliant in their delivery of affordable housing and infrastructure. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support open book viability assessment Concern over second viability review; could hinder delivery | |

| Chapter 17: Implementation and Monitoring | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 11 | Support: 0 | Object: 9 | Neutral: 2 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Statutory Consultees: | | | |
| Southeast Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will water efficiency be policed / monitored / measured? | Policy DPS3 sets out requirements for sustainable design and construction, including post-occupancy evaluation and measures to increase water efficiency, such as water efficient appliances and greywater recycling. Beyond these measures that can be incorporated into housing design, it is not the role of the planning system to police people's water consumption. | |
| MPs/ Local Authorities: | | | |
| None | | | |
| Town and Parish Councils: | | | |
| Lindfield Rural Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish council can support with monitoring. | Noted. | |
| Burgess Hill Town Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Words like 'minimise' or 'increase' are too vague. | Noted. | |
| Other consultee bodies: | | | |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would benefit from including an additional column to the table, which indicates management actions that would be taken if the target for the monitoring were not being met. Saved policies not marked on the interactive policies map. | MSDC produces an authority monitoring report, which will report against each of these monitoring indicators and will be subject to scrutiny. If policies are proving ineffective or are no longer appropriate, they will be reviewed. Enforcement action can be taken on individual developments that have not met their obligations. The Policies Map will be updated. | |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is essential that the Council has a robust delivery plan for properly allocating the Section 106 contributions from developers. Saved policies in the Neighbourhood Plans could be mentioned here by a simple line to say; 'All allocations set out in the districts Neighbourhood Plans' are saved. Targets needs numerals defined. Don't just say 'increase'. A robust delivery plan needs to be included. 'Management actions' should be added as a table column. | Section 106 contributions must be spent as specified in the agreement and usually within an agreed period. Neighbourhood plans remain part of the development plan but do not require a reference in the district plan's monitoring and implementation section. MSDC produces an authority monitoring report, which will report against each of these monitoring indicators and will be subject to scrutiny. If policies are proving ineffective or are no longer appropriate, they will be reviewed. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| Chapter 18: Saved Policies | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 2 | Support: 0 | Object: 2 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Saved policies in the Neighbourhood Plans should be mentioned by adding a sentence. The saved allocations need to be mentioned in the plan and added to interactive map. | | Neighbourhood plans remain part of the development plan but have not been referenced among the saved policies at district level. Saved allocations will be included in the Policies Map. |

| Chapter 19: Glossary | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Comments Received – None | Response to comments |

| Appendix 1: District Plan Policies – Review Status | |
|--|----------------------|
| Comments Received – None | Response to comments |

| Appendix 2: Town Centres and Primary Shopping Area Boundaries | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 2 | Support: 0 | Object: 2 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Haywards Heath Town Centre boundary excludes estate agents and 2 car parks. Why is this? Why has the town centre boundary changed? | | Amendments to Town Centre boundaries were informed by the Mid Sussex Retail Study March 2022 |

| Appendix 3: Policy DPI7: Viability supporting tables | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| Number of Comments Received | | | |
| Total: 2 | Support: 0 | Object: 2 | Neutral: 0 |
| Comments Received | | | Response to comments |
| Other | Appendix 3 does not set out infrastructure quantity and accessibility standards as policy DPI2: Planning Obligations states. | | The appendices have been revised. |

| Annex 1: Overview of Policy Requirements for Housing Allocations | |
|--|----------------------|
| Comments Received - None | Response to comments |

| District Plan – Other | |
|-----------------------|--|
|-----------------------|--|

| Comments Received | Response to comments |
|---|---|
| <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support all comments made by Twineham Parish Council. • The plan is too non-specific. • MSDC isn't leading on many aspects; consequently, developers are not building houses suitable for future needs. • Fully support CPRE's response. • This is in general, a well researched and presented, carefully compiled document, which seeks to address the many conflicting demands and issues facing Mid Sussex. • Stand-alone policies are not sufficient; there are areas of omission, including heritage at risk. • The draft Local Plan is unsound. • The Plan is not deliverable over the plan period because there is no evidence to demonstrate how the strategic allocations will be achieved. | <p>Noted. Many of these comments have been addressed elsewhere against specific policies.</p> |