

SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – DRAFT PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

REPORT OF: DIVISIONAL LEADER FOR PLANNING AND ECONOMY
Contact Officer: Andrew Maxted – Business Unit Leader Planning Policy and Economy
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision: Yes
Report to: Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth
Date of meeting: 11th September 2019

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to request the Scrutiny Committee to consider the Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (the Sites DPD) and supporting material and to recommend Council approve the DPD for six-weeks public consultation commencing 9th October 2019.

Summary

2. This report:
 - Summarises the purpose of the Sites DPD and the work undertaken in its preparation;
 - Outlines the proposed site allocations and additional policies;
 - Outlines how the Sites DPD has been prepared in accordance with national policy, guidance and legislation; and
 - Outlines the proposed approach to consultation and the next steps

Recommendations

3. That the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth:
 - (i) Considers and comments on the Draft Site Allocations DPD and supporting documentation; and
 - (ii) Recommends to Council the Draft Site Allocations DPD, along with supporting documentation, for six-weeks public consultation commencing 9th October 2019.
-

Background

4. The District Plan 2014-2031 adopted in March 2018 sets out a commitment for the Council to prepare a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (the Sites DPD). The Sites DPD has four main aims, which are:
 - (i) to allocate sufficient housing sites to address the residual necessary to meet the identified housing requirement for the district up to 2031 in accordance with the Spatial Strategy set out in the District Plan;
 - (ii) to allocate sufficient employment land to meet the residual need and in line with policy requirements set out in District Plan Policy DP1: Sustainable Economic Development;

- (iii) to allocate a site for a Science and Technology Park west of Burgess Hill in line with policy requirements set out in District Plan Policy DP1: Sustainable Economic Development, and
 - (iv) to identify and set out Strategic Policies necessary to complement or replace those set out in the District Plan to deliver sustainable development.
5. This report summarises the preparation of the Sites DPD and recommends the sites for inclusion in the sites DPD.

Housing

Housing Requirement

6. One of the most important aims of the Sites DPD is to allocate sufficient housing sites to address the residual necessary to meet the agreed housing requirement for the plan period up to 2031 as set out in the adopted District Plan. This is necessary to ensure the Council can continue to demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply and ensure the District Plan continues to form the basis for planning decision making in the District.
7. The District Plan Policy DP4: Housing sets out the housing requirement for the District for the plan period of 16,390 dwellings. It is important to note that the housing requirement has been 'fixed' by the adopted District Plan and it is not the role of the Sites DPD to revisit this.

Housing Residual Figure

8. District Plan Policy DP4 sets out how the minimum number of homes required is to be met giving consideration to; Completions, Commitments, Strategic Allocations and Windfalls. This left a residual figure of **2,439 dwellings as at March 2018¹**.
9. At the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Community in November 2018, officers recommended that the Council consider allocating sufficient sites to meet this residual figure in full. However, since then additional work has been undertaken to review and establish the most up-to-date residual figure. Key changes include:
 - Additional housing completions;
 - Changes in the number of units identified as part of the Allocations to reflect planning permissions;
 - Changes to the number of units to be delivered at the Northern Arc in the plan period; and
 - An updated windfall calculation
10. Following the updated definition for windfalls in the NPFF, policy DP6 in the District Plan, and past delivery, the windfall allowance has increased from 45 dwellings per year to **84 dwellings per year**. This equates to a windfall allowance of 588 dwellings for years six onwards for the rest of the plan period up to 2031. The revised methodology is summarised in the supporting documentation and can be found at appendix 1.

¹ This figure is dated April 2017 as set out in the District Plan adopted March 2018.

11. The revised housing supply figures are set out below in Table 1, which illustrates that the 'residual' currently necessary to fully meet the district housing requirement is **1,507 dwellings as at April 2019**. This should be regarded as the 'minimum' number of dwellings to be allocated in the Sites DPD to ensure the district housing requirement is fully met.

Table 1: Housing Supply Position at April 2019

Category		Number of Dwellings
Housing Requirement for the full plan period (April 2014 to March 2031)		16,390
Housing Completions (April 2014 to March 2019)		3,914
Housing Supply (April 2014 to March 2019)	Known commitments (including Neighbourhood Plan Allocations)	7,094
	District Plan 2014-2031 - Allocations	3,287
	Windfalls	588
Residual necessary to fully meet the District Housing Requirement		1,507

Housing - Sites

Site Selection Methodology and Technical Work

12. A robust methodology, consistent with national policy and guidance, has been developed in order to select sites for inclusion in the Sites DPD. The development of the methodology was overseen by a Members Site Allocations Working Group (SAWG) at every stage of the process and was considered by the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Community at meetings in January 2017 September and November 2018. The methodology is summarised below and can be found at Appendix 1.
13. The first stage of the methodology involved preparation of the Council's Strategic Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), which followed a 'call-for-sites' consultation that identified a pool of 241 potential sites. A small number of sites were excluded from further consideration in the SHELAA due to high-level constraints, such as being located within the floodplain, or because they did not meet the site size threshold of 5 units/0.25ha set out within the SHELAA methodology.
14. The second stage of the process consisted of a high level assessment of the sites identified in the SHELAA for conformity with the District Plan Spatial Strategy set out in District Plan policies DP4 and DP6. Sites were discounted if they were more than approximately 150m from an existing settlement boundary or if the scale of the site was significant at an individual settlement level in relation to the Settlement Hierarchy.
15. The third stage of the process, the 'detailed assessment' considered 142 sites against the site selection criteria set out within Site Selection Paper 2, which this Committee considered in November 2018. This stage was also subject to a comprehensive 'fact-check' where the site promoters of all 142 sites were invited to provide detailed comments on the draft assessment. This resulted in 47 sites being identified for detailed consideration at the next stage.

16. These 47 sites were presented to the SAWG as 3 potential options all of which could be suitable for inclusion in the sites DPD, subject to further technical work (see table 2 and paragraph 19).
17. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a legislative requirement to be undertaken alongside the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and an SA Report is published alongside this report (Appendix 1). The role of the SA is to assess reasonable alternatives. The three options were assessed as reasonable alternatives. There is a non-technical summary available, along with an overview of how the SA has informed the site selection process set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper (**Appendix 1**).
18. The sites included in the three options are consistent with the Council's Spatial Strategy as set out in the adopted District Plan. This policy provides an indication of the number of dwellings required at each settlement, and has been updated in light of the amendments to the residual housing figure. The three options ensure the housing requirement for each of the settlement categories (see **Appendix 3**) are met. This is considered to be an appropriate strategy because it meets the Council's Spatial Strategy which seeks to focus growth as far as possible to upper tier settlements given that they offer the widest range of services and facilities and access to public transport and employment.

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives and Preferred Option

19. Therefore the fourth stage was the assessment of reasonable alternatives which was informed by detailed engagement with a range of stakeholders and experts, by the Sustainability Appraisal, and by detailed evidence for Transport, Air Quality and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (see **Appendix 1**). The 'detailed evidence testing' was undertaken iteratively alongside preparation of the Council's **Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**. This involved two main steps, an assessment of all the shortlisted sites from Stage 3 (i.e. 47 sites) on a settlement by settlement basis; and the identification of the three reasonable alternatives
20. The reasonable alternatives consisted of the three options summarised in Table 2:

Table 2: Summary of 'Reasonable Alternative' options tested to inform the MSDC Site Allocations Preferred Options Document

Option Number	Description
1	20 sites providing 1,619 dwellings This options ensures the necessary residual is met with a small additional supply of 112 dwellings
2	22 sites (as option 1) plus 2 additional sites at Burgess Hill providing 1,962 dwellings This option provides for a larger additional supply of 455 dwellings
3	21 sites (as option 1) plus 1 additional site at Haywards Heath providing 2,249 dwellings This option provides for a higher additional supply of 742 dwellings

21. The Council's SA has tested each of the shortlisted sites, individually; on a settlement-by-settlement basis, and the three Options described by this report (these are defined in the SA as Reasonable Alternatives and is a step required by legislation).
22. The final stage of technical evidence testing was to assess Options 2 and 3. The sites included in Option 1 are common to both of these options and provides for a smaller additional supply of housing than either Options 2 or 3. Consequently, it is assumed that if Options 2 and 3 are acceptable from a technical evidence perspective, that Option 1 will also be acceptable.
23. Following the Sustainability Assessment the high level findings from this work are:
 - There are generally very small differences in the results between Options 2 and 3 (Option 3 is marginally worse than Option 2) in relation to transport, air quality and HRA impacts;
 - Proposed highway mitigations are largely successful in removing any potential 'severe' impacts;
 - Two locations on the highway network remain at 'severe' for both options after consideration of initial mitigation proposals. These result from the proposed Science and Technology Park at Burgess Hill. However, the impacts are considered to be capable of being mitigated successfully following further detailed work. Further work will inform the next stage of preparing the Sites DPD to ensure the final version of the plan does not lead to any 'severe' impacts;
 - Overall, the air quality testing has shown that neither of the two options would lead to significant air quality impacts within and near the Stonepounds Crossroads AQMA;
 - Although Air quality results relating to Ashdown Forest identify 'potential' to cause adverse impacts, the Habitats Regulations Assessment, given consideration to all factors, and potential mitigation, concludes that any impacts are low enough to be ruled out from having adverse effects; and
 - The overall conclusion within the HRA giving regard to all potential impacts is that there are no adverse effects.
24. It must be remembered that the housing figures are considered the minimum and the thrust of the Council's policy is to significantly boost the supply of housing. In addition some housing over-supply provides additional flexibility and resilience and is important to ensure the Council can continue to maintain a rolling five-year housing land supply.
25. Twenty sites are common to all three options. These sites emerged from the site selection methodology as the best performing and most suitable sites overall having considered all the factors of the process taken together.
26. **Appendix 2** illustrates how the number of sites being considered at each stage of the methodology was refined following assessment.

Assessment of Options

27. In sustainability terms, Option 1 is not favoured as it does not provide sufficient flexibility and resilience to ensure the Council can continue to maintain a land supply position. Option 3 is not recommended as the level of growth is significantly above that required, the allocation does not meet the Spatial Strategy due to the scale of growth proposed at Category 1 and Haywards Heath significantly exceeds the identified need.
28. Following consideration of all the relevant factors and careful consideration by SAWG, Option 2 is considered to be the best performing option overall and is therefore recommended as the most appropriate option for inclusion in the Draft Sites DPD. This ensures the residual is fully met, it provides a reasonable over-allocation to provide flexibility, provides a range of sites across a wide geographical area and of a variety of sizes and best delivers District Plan policies DP4 and DP6. It also ensures that any potential impacts relating to highways, air quality or Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) are minimised.
29. The sites that make up the recommendation for inclusion within the 'Draft Plan' Site Allocations Document are shown at **Table 3**. These consist of the 20 sites that are common to all three options that were identified as the most appropriate overall, plus the two additional sites at Folders Lane Burgess Hill.

Implications for 5 Year Housing Land Supply

30. The Council's five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) position is currently **5.64 years (as at April 2019)²**. It is estimated that the addition of the sites proposed within Option 2, would increase this to **6.47 years**. This increase is helped by the predominantly small nature of the sites and their geographical distribution across the district in accordance with the Spatial Strategy.
31. The Council must also satisfy Paragraph 68 of the NPPF that requires 'at least' 10% of the housing requirement being provided for on sites no larger than one hectare. With consideration to existing completions and commitments, it is estimated that around 14% of the housing requirement would be provided on sites no larger than one hectare.

² Mid Sussex District Council. (2019). *Housing Land Supply Position: Annual Position Statement*.

Table 3: Proposed Site Allocations

Settlement Type	Settlement/ Parish	Site Name	Policy Reference	Number of Dwellings	
				Site	Category
Category 1 - Town	Burgess Hill	Land South of 96 Folders Lane	SA 12	43	1,412
		Land South of Folders Lane and East of Keymer Road	SA 13	300	
		Land South of Selby Close	SA 15	12	
		Land South of Southway	SA 16	30	
		The Brow and St. Wilfrid's School	SA 17	200	
		Woodfield House, Isaacs Lane	SA 18	30	
	East Grinstead	East Grinstead Police Station	SA 19	22	
		Land South of Crawley Down Rd	SA 20	200	
		Land South and West of Imberhorne Upper School	SA 21	550	
	Haywards Heath	Land at Rogers Farm, Fox Hill	SA 22	25	
Category 2 – Larger Village (Local Service Centre)	Crawley Down	Land North of Burleigh Lane	SA 23	50	235
	Cuckfield	Land at Hanlye Lane East of Ardingly Road	SA 24	55	
	Hassocks	Land North of Shepherds Walk	SA 25	130	
Category 3 – Medium Sized Village	Ardingly	Land West of Selsfield Road	SA 26	100	303
	Ashurst Wood	Land South of Hammerwood Road	SA 27	12	
	Handcross	Land at St. Martin Close (West)	SA 28	65	
	Horsted Keynes	Land South of The Old Police House	SA 29	25	
		Land South of St. Stephens Church	SA 30	30	
	Sayers Common	Land to the North of Lyndon, Reeds Lane	SA 31	35	
	Scaynes Hill	Land to the rear of Rear of Firlands, Church Road	SA 32	20	
	Turners Hill	Withypitts Farm, Selsfield Road	SA 33	16	
Category 4 – Smaller Village	Ansty	Ansty Cross Garage	SA 34	12	12
Total				1,962	1,962

Employment

32. Updated employment evidence, commissioned by the Council to take account of the recent employment forecast statistics, identified that a total requirement of around 35 to 40 hectares is needed up to 2031³. As 25 hectares employment land has already been allocated at Burgess Hill, within District Plan Policy DP1, this leaves a residual requirement of 10-15 hectares to be allocated within the Site Allocations Document.

³ Mid Sussex District Council. (2019). *Site Allocations Development Plan Document, Site Selection Paper 4: Employment Sites*.

33. The Sites DPD Policy **SA1: Sustainable Economic Development – Additional Site Allocations** allocates six new sites for employment use, plus an expansion at Bolney Grange Business Park, totaling approximately 17ha. The process for selecting these sites for allocation is set out in the Employment Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal (**Appendix 1**).

Science and Technology Park

34. District Plan policy **DP1: Sustainable Economic Development** identifies a broad location for a Science and Technology Park to the west of Burgess Hill, to support research and development and provide high quality employment for the wider area. The principle of the allocation and location itself was based upon a range of documents which assessed deliverability, market demand, feasibility and suitability.
35. The Coast to Capital Strategic Economic Plan (2014) (SEP) identified Burgess Hill as a strategic growth location. This was on the basis of the collective Northern Arc strategic development (3,500 homes), The Hub business park (creating approximately 1,000 new jobs) and the potential for the Science and Technology Park to provide 100,000m² of employment floorspace and 2,500 new jobs. The SEP supported the potential for the Science and Technology Park and recognised that it would impact positively on the wider region and beyond, supporting high end economic and business growth across the Coast to Capital and South East Local Economic Partnership areas.
36. Two specific sites have been promoted within the broad location to the west of Burgess Hill, essentially to the north and south of the A2300. Both sites were assessed against the employment criteria set out in Site Selection Paper 2. The conclusions of this assessment didn't provide a clear distinction between the two sites, therefore the promoters were asked to provide further detailed information based on a series of 14 questions. The questions requested details of proposed uses, vision, access and highways, and how any on-site constraints could be addressed.
37. Following assessment of the information provided for both sites, the site to the north of the A2300 has been concluded as the preferable option, principally for highway reasons. The proposed access mitigation for the park to the north of upgrades to an existing junction on the A2300 is shown to function more successfully than the access proposed by the site to the south which would involve the creation of a new junction on the A2300. Furthermore, the access solution proposed by the northern site is deliverable, within the land ownership of the site promoter. The northern site also benefits from better connectivity with the Northern Arc in pedestrian and cycle terms. Site Selection Paper 4: Employment explains the Council's rationale for selecting the preferred site option (See **Appendix 1**).

Additional Strategic Policies

38. Whilst the primary purpose of the Sites DPD is to allocate sufficient housing and employment sites, the document also provides an opportunity for the Council to include a limited number of additional Strategic Policies that are considered to be necessary to complement, or replace, selected policies set out in the District Plan to deliver sustainable development.

39. The five additional policies proposed are summarised below. The proposed policies are considered necessary to complement the District Plan and provide additional guidance or clarity. In the case of SA 39: Air Quality, this policy replaces the relevant section of DP29.

Employment

40. Policy SA 35 supplements District Plan policy DP1: Sustainable Economic Development by providing additional protection for the Districts existing employment sites. This is consistent with the Economic Development Strategy that was approved in 2018 aim to increase and minimise the loss of employment floorspace.

Air Quality

41. This policy replaces the sections of DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution that relate to air quality as set out in the District Plan and provides additional clarity on how proposals will be expected to address any air quality impacts. The policy is informed by and makes reference to the recently prepared Air Quality and Emissions Guidance for Sussex (2019)⁴ that has been prepared by the local authorities across Sussex, along with the County Council and a range of other stakeholders.

Transport

42. This policy has been developed in partnership with West Sussex County Council, who as Highways Authority has responsibility for delivering highway infrastructure across the district working in partnership with Highways England.
43. The policy seeks to ensure that land is safeguarded to support the delivery of strategic transport schemes identified by West Sussex County Council that will be necessary to support planned growth across the district, including development set out in the District Plan 2014-2031.
44. The identified schemes are listed below and are considered necessary irrespective of the growth proposed within the Sites DPD, although development set out within Sites DPD can assist in funding and delivering some of these schemes.
- A23/ A2300 Junction at Hickstead
 - A264 Corridor upgrades at Copthorne Hotel Junction
 - A22 Corridor upgrades at Felbridge, Imberhorne Lane and Lingfield Junctions
45. The areas to be safeguarded will be defined by detailed work in partnership with the County Council. The safeguarded areas will be set out in the final version of the Sites DPD and are proposed as a precautionary measure to ensure that future delivery of the transport schemes are not prejudiced.
46. The Council will ensure that any land needed for highway schemes is minimised and informed by appropriate detailed investigative work.

⁴ *Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex Authorities.* (2019).

Connectivity Improvements

47. Additional policies have been developed to support the safeguarding of land for, and delivery of, transport schemes related to the Burgess Hill growth programme and in particular, the ambitious programme of sustainable transport improvements. These relate to the expansion and upgrade of Wivelsfield Railway Station, to improve the efficient and effective operation of the station and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel and the Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath multifunctional network (for cycling, walking and equestrian). This network will promote road safety, reduce congestion and support healthy lifestyles. Policies SA36 and SA37 ensure that necessary land is safeguarded to ensure the delivery of these schemes is not prejudiced.

Compliance with national policy, guidance and regulations

48. The plan has been prepared in compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004⁵, and other relevant regulations. The NPPF indicates that Plans can be found sound if they are:
- a) positively prepared
 - b) justified
 - c) effective, and
 - d) consistent with national policy⁶.
49. The following sets out how the Sites DPD meets these tests.
- a) *Positively Prepared*
50. Officers consider the Sites DPD has been positively prepared. The Council has worked, and continues to work, in partnership with its neighbouring authorities under the Duty-to-Cooperate and has carried out an ongoing Sustainability Appraisal to ensure that the Sites DPD delivers sustainable development.
51. As the Sites DPD is addressing housing and employment need already established by the District Plan, these are less significant Duty-to-Cooperate matters in the context of the Site Allocations document itself. Clearly these matters will be reviewed again in the future through the Local Plan review process.
52. Other important Duty-to-Cooperate matters for Mid Sussex include giving consideration to potential impacts on the South Downs National Park, High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The National Park Authority, AONB Board and Natural England have all been engaged during the preparation of the plan and details of this are set out within the supporting papers and Habitats Regulations Report (**Appendix 1**). It is considered that the plan does not negatively affect these matters.

⁵ Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

⁶ *National Planning Policy Framework*. (2019). para. 35.

53. Planning for strategic infrastructure, particularly for highways, is an important consideration, including for the Sites DPD, and the Council continues to work with West Sussex County Council as Highways Authority, Highways England, and other stakeholders. Additional transport policies are proposed (discussed earlier in this report) and technical evidence has been prepared to inform the plan (**Appendix 1**).
54. The Sites DPD identifies additional site allocations to 'fully' meet the objectively assessed development requirements for the district, including the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for the Northern West Sussex Housing Market area (HMA) to be addressed within Mid Sussex.
 - b) *A justified plan:*
55. Officers consider the Sites DPD to be an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and that the Plan is based on proportionate evidence.
56. The Sites DPD complements the District Plan and the additional allocations are consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. The District Plan was based on a comprehensive understanding of the issues facing the district and this baseline has been updated to inform the Sites DPD.
57. A series of reasonable alternatives were developed and considered to inform the Sites DPD. The reasonable alternatives have been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which is described further below.
 - c) *An effective plan:*
58. The NPPF states that plans are sound if they are: "*effective - deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground*"
59. The Council has worked closely with landowners and developers to confirm that the additional sites proposed for allocation are deliverable. A Viability Study has been published alongside the Site Allocations Document (**Appendix 1**).
60. The Council has worked closely with a range of organisations and key stakeholders such as West Sussex County Council, who are responsible for providing or managing key services, including education and transport, and the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England. A number of Statements of Common Ground have been prepared with a series of key stakeholders and these are published alongside a Topic Paper summarising the Council's approach to meeting its commitments under the Duty-to-Cooperate (**Appendix 1**).
 - d) *Consistent with National Policy:*
61. Officers consider that the Sites DPD is consistent with national policy and the preparation has involved the testing of reasonable alternatives through a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Both reports have been published alongside this document (**Appendix 1**).

Approach to Consultation

62. The Councils approach to consultation is set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which is a 'code of practice' for how the council will engage people in planning processes.
63. The SCI commits the Council to prepare a 'Community Involvement Plan' for all planning policy documents. The Community Involvement Plan is appended to this report and sets out how the document will be produced, how and when community involvement will take place and what happens to the results of community involvement in taking decisions. The main consultation methods to be used will include:
 - Press release, email alert and utilise social media where possible;
 - Documentation available on Council website including an on-line response form;
 - Hard copies of documents available at the District's libraries, District, Town and Parish Council offices and help points;
 - Letters or emails to specific consultation bodies (statutory consultees) and to other organisations listed in the Community Involvement Plan (**Appendix 1**); and
 - Static exhibitions will be held in the District Libraries and District Council Office.

Background Papers and a List of all the previous Committee Reports

64. The background papers are listed by **Appendix 1**.

Appendix 1: List of Documentation

List of Documents attached

1. Draft 'Preferred Options' Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

List of Documents available online at:

<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/development-plan-documents/#topic-site-allocations-document>

2. Sustainability Appraisal Report (SA) Non-Technical Summary
3. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Non-Technical Summary
4. Transport Assessment Non-Technical Summary
5. Air Quality Assessment Non-Technical Summary
6. Site Selection (Housing Sites) Paper 3
7. Site Selection (Employment Sites) Paper 4
8. Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
9. Community Involvement Plan
10. Equality Impacts Assessment (EqIA)

List of Additional Documents available for Councillors to view on request

11. Windfall Sites Update Note
12. Sustainability Appraisal Report (SA)
13. Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (HRA)
14. Transport Assessment Report
15. Air Quality Assessment Report
16. Viability Assessment Report

Previous Committee Reports relating to the Sites DPD are also available online at:

<http://midsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories>

Appendix 2: MSDC Site Allocations Document Site Selection Methodology

Selection Stage	Description	No. of Sites	No. of Sites that meet criteria	Reference
1	<p>Call for Sites & Preparation of SHELAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for sites – notification of sites to Council from land owners, site promoters and interested parties • Identify pool of ‘potential’ development sites based on high level assessment of ‘suitability, availability and achievability’. 	241	233	SHELAA & Site Selection Paper 1
2	<p>High Level Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Level assessment to test conformity with the District Plan Strategy, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If sites are located more than 150 m from existing settlement and so deemed to be located in open countryside ○ If sites are of a significant scale in relation to the Settlement Hierarchy and indicative housing requirements for individual settlements and so may be more suited for consideration through a future Local Plan Review 	233	142	Site Selection Paper 1
3	<p>Detailed Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Assessment against a range of 17 assessment criteria • Fact Check - consultation with Site Promoters to fact check key assessment findings or assumptions 	142	47	Site Selection Paper 2
4	<p>Detailed Evidence Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional site filter/ refinement incorporating Sustainability Appraisal of sites at Settlement level • Consultation with Key Stakeholders, Infrastructure Providers and Specialist Officers • Consideration of additional Technical Evidence (Transport, Air Quality, HRA, Viability) • Refine shortlisted sites and identify Reasonable Alternative Options to inform Sustainability Appraisal 	47	23	Site Selection Paper 3
5	Identify Preferred Option	22		

Appendix 3: Spatial Distribution of Housing Requirement

Settlement category	Settlements	Minimum Required over Plan Period	Minimum Residual as identified in District Plan 2014 - 2031	Updated Minimum Residual as identified in Site Allocations DPD (as at 1 April 2019)	Proposed Housing Supply Options		
					Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1	Burgess Hill East Grinstead Haywards Heath	10,653	1,272	840	1,069 (+229)	1,412 (+579)	1,699 (+859)
2	Copthorne Crawley Down Cuckfield Hassocks and Keymer Hurstpierpoint Lindfield	3,005	838	222	235 (+13)		
3	Albourne, Ardingly Balcombe, Bolney Handcross, Horsted Keynes, Pease Pottage, Sayers Common Scaynes Hill, Sharpthorne Turners Hill, West Hoathly	2,200	311	440	303 (-136)		
4	Ansty Staplefield Slaugham Twineham Warninglid	82	19	6	12 (+6)		
5	Hamlets such as: Birch Grove, Brook Street Hickstead, Highbrook Walsted	N/A	N/A *	N/A *	N/A *	N/A *	N/A *
Total		16,390	2,439	1,507	1,619	1,962	2,249

* Assumed windfall growth only