

SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – REGULATION 19

REPORT OF: DIVISIONAL LEADER FOR PLANNING AND ECONOMY
Contact Officer: Andrew Marsh – Business Unit Leader Planning Policy
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision: Yes
Report to: Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth
Date of meeting: 11th March 2020

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to request the Scrutiny Committee to consider the submission draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (the submission draft Sites DPD). The draft Site Allocations DPD (Regulation 18) has been amended following consideration of the representations made following consultation in Autumn 2019. The Scrutiny Committee are also asked to consider the supporting material.
2. Following consideration of the documents, Scrutiny Committee is requested to recommend that Council approve the submission draft Sites DPD and supporting documents for six-weeks public consultation commencing 11th May 2020, followed by submission to the Secretary of State, for examination.

Summary

3. This report:
 - Summarises the purpose of the submission draft Sites DPD and the work carried out in its preparation;
 - Outlines the outcomes of the additional work that has taken place since public consultation (Regulation 18);
 - Sets out the amendments that have been made to the draft Sites DPD as a result of consultation and additional work;
 - Outlines the next steps including the proposed approach to the next stage of consultation (Regulation 19).

Recommendations

4. **That the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth:**
 - (i) **Considers and comments on the draft Site Allocations DPD and supporting documentation;**
 - (ii) **Recommends Council approves the submission draft Site Allocations DPD, along with supporting documentation, for six-weeks public consultation starting on 11th May 2020;**
 - (iii) **Recommends to Council that, after the conclusion of the public consultation, the submission draft Site Allocations DPD, along with supporting documentation, is submitted to the Secretary of State, for examination;**
 - (iv) **Recommends to Council that authority should be given to the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, to make any necessary minor typographical and factual**

changes to the submission draft Site Allocations DPD prior to public consultation; and

- (v) Recommends to Council that authority should be given to the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, to suggest any necessary modifications to the submission draft Site Allocations DPD during the examination process to help secure its soundness (pending further public consultation as required)**
-

Background

5. 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 – the residual number is currently **1,507** dwellings;
 - (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 – the residual need is currently **10-15 hectares**;
 - (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 set out additional Strategic Policies necessary to deliver sustainable development.
6. A robust methodology, consistent with national policy and guidance, was developed in order to select sites for inclusion in the Regulation 18 consultation draft Sites DPD (the draft Sites DPD). The development of the methodology and site selection process reflected expert legal advice and was overseen by a Members Site Allocations Working Group (SAWG) and were considered by the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth at meetings in January 2017, July, September and November 2018.
7. Following application of the Site Selection methodology, the preferred sites for inclusion within the draft Sites DPD were as follows:
- 22 sites were proposed for allocation for housing, totaling 1,962 dwellings. This represents an over-supply of 455 dwellings which provides flexibility and resilience;
 - 7 sites were proposed for allocation for employment, totaling 17.45ha. This represents a small over-supply of employment space which provides flexibility and resilience;
 - Land north of the A2300 for a Science and Technology Park
8. In addition to the proposed sites, five policies necessary to support development were proposed:
- **SA34:** Existing Employment Sites
 - **SA35:** Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements

- **SA36:** Wivelsfield Railway Station
- **SA37:** Burgess Hill/ Haywards Heath Cycle Network
- **SA38:** Air Quality

9. The consultation draft Sites DPD and supporting documentation was considered by Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth on 11th September 2019 and Council approved the consultation draft Sites DPD for public consultation at its meeting on 25th September 2019.

Consultation

10. Following Council approval, consultation on the draft Sites DPD (known as Regulation 18 stage) commenced on 9th October and concluded on 20th November 2019. Just over **1,300** respondents made **2,124** individual comments on the document and supporting evidence (including the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment).

11. Of the comments received:

- **115** were in support
- **90** were neutral
- **1,919** were objections, predominantly from residents to proposed sites

12. In addition to these comments 20 new housing sites and 8 new employment sites were promoted to the Council for consideration for allocation. In addition, 58 promoters objected to the outcome of the previous site assessment work and to the fact that their sites were not proposed for allocation (these are called Omission Sites).

Additional Work Since Regulation 18 Consultation

13. At its meeting on 22nd January 2020, this Committee considered the comments received and noted the additional work required and next steps ahead of the next round of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State. This additional work is now complete and the outcome of this work is set out below.

Assessment of Newly Submitted Sites

Housing

14. During the consultation, a total of 20 new housing sites were submitted by site promoters. These sites had not previously been assessed against the Site Selection criteria as they were not previously known to the Council. A list of the additional housing sites is included at Appendix 2.

15. Officers have now carefully assessed each of the newly submitted sites against the agreed methodology and criteria (the 'Site Selection process') which all previous sites were subject to prior to the publication of the draft Sites DPD.

16. The Site Selection process is summarised below.

Stage	Description
1: Call for Sites and SHELAA	Sites submitted by promoters during the Call for Sites. Sites assessed against the SHELAA methodology

2: High Level Assessment (Site Selection Paper 1)	Remove sites that are not compliant with the District Plan strategy (based on distance from existing settlements and yield)
3: Detailed Assessment (Site Selection Paper 3: Housing; and Site Selection Paper 4: Employment)	Assess against detailed criteria – 17 criteria for housing, 19 for employment. Criteria approved by the working group and considered by Scrutiny Committee.
4: Detailed Evidence Testing	Additional refinement within the Sustainability Appraisal, consultation with stakeholders, consideration of technical evidence
5: Preferred Option	22 housing sites included within the Regulation 18 draft Sites DPD

17. Of the 20 newly submitted housing sites:

Stage 2

- 3 sites were not compliant with the District Plan strategy and have therefore been rejected. A revised version of **Site Selection Paper 1** has been published which summarises the assessment and records this conclusion. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.

Stage 3

- 17 sites were subject to detailed assessment against the 17 site selection criteria. Of these, 13 sites did not meet the assessment criteria and therefore do not progress to the next stage (Stage 4). A revised version of **Site Selection Paper 3: Housing** has been published which summarises the assessment and records this conclusion. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.

Stage 4

18. The Committee will recall that a total of 47 sites had previously reached Stage 4 of the Site Selection process. These represented a shortlist of “Reasonable Alternatives” and were therefore subject to additional assessment within the accompanying Regulation 18 draft Sites DPD Sustainability Appraisal (SA).
19. As a result of further work described above of the 20 new sites, 4 sites have progressed to stage 4, the shortlist of reasonable alternatives has now increased from 47 to 51 sites. Sites that progress to Stage 4 are subject to additional assessment within the Sustainability Appraisal. The Regulation 19 draft submission Sites DPD Sustainability Appraisal has been updated to reflect this position and contains the updated site appraisals. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.

20. The 4 additional sites that have progressed to Stage 4 are:

Ref	Settlement Category	Site Address	Settlement	Yield
998	1	Old Court House, Blackwell Hollow	East Grinstead	12
988	1	Land to the North of Old Wickham Lane	Haywards Heath	60
983	2	Land at Walstead Grange, Scamps Hill	Lindfield	270
526	3	Land east of Paynesfield	Bolney	30

Outcome of Further Work at Stage 4

- **Site 998:** This site performs well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives; however, the site promoter has not been able to confirm that the landowner wishes to progress with the scheme. Therefore, deliverability cannot be demonstrated, and it is not proposed to include the site within the submission draft Sites DPD.
 - **Site 988:** This site does not perform well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. In fact, it does not perform any better than other sites on the Reasonable Alternative list that had previously been rejected at this stage. Therefore, it is not proposed to include this site within the submission draft Sites DPD.
 - **Site 983:** This site does not perform well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. It does not perform any better than other sites that had previously been rejected the Reasonable Alternatives stage. Therefore, it is not proposed to include this site within the submission draft Sites DPD.
 - **Site 526:** This site does not perform well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. It does not perform any better than other sites that had previously been rejected at the Reasonable Alternative stage. Therefore, it is not proposed to include this site within the submission draft Sites DPD.
21. Whilst these sites have not been considered suitable for allocation at this time, they will be revisited during the site selection process for the District Plan Review commencing 2020/21.

Employment

22. During the consultation, a total of 8 new employment sites were submitted by site promoters. These sites had not previously been assessed by Site Selection Process as they were not known to the Council when the assessment took place. A list of the additional employment sites is included at Appendix 2.
23. Officers have now carefully assessed each of the newly submitted sites against the same methodology and criteria (the 'Site Selection process') that all previous sites were subject to prior to the publication of the draft Sites DPD.
24. Of the 8 new sites, two propose a boundary change to an 'existing employment site' currently identified in the Sites DPD and subject to SA34: Existing Employment Sites, which supports their expansion or intensification where they meet certain criteria. These amendments have been made.
25. The remaining 6 sites have been assessed against the Site Selection Criteria. A revised version of Site Selection Paper 4: Employment has been published which summarises the assessments and conclusions reached. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD. These sites have also been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal. As a result of these assessments, no site is proposed for allocation in the submission draft Sites DPD. This is because they do not perform any better than the sites already proposed.
26. Whilst these sites have not been considered suitable for allocation at this time, they will be revisited during the site selection process for the District Plan Review commencing 2020/21.

Omission Sites

27. Of the 241 sites assessed in the Site Selection process (see above), a total of 58 site promoters objected to the draft Sites DPD as their site were not being proposed for allocation. These comprise of 54 housing and 4 employment sites. The majority of objections relate to how the site had been assessed against the site selection criteria in Site Selection Paper 3: Housing or Site Selection Paper 4: Employment.
28. Officers have carefully reviewed the responses made during the consultation and the evidence provided by site promoters and have reviewed the original assessments against the criteria. Factual errors within the assessments have been corrected or updated as a result of the information provided by site promoters. As a result, Site Selection Paper 3: Housing and Site Selection Paper 4: Employment have been revised. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.
29. Following this further work and amendments to the site assessments there is no change to the original conclusions of the Site Selection papers and the conclusions about these sites reached prior to Regulation 18 stage remain valid. This means no omission sites are proposed for progress i.e. to Stage 4: Detailed Evidence Testing.
30. Whilst these sites have not been considered suitable and/or compliant with District Plan strategy at this time, they will be revisited during the site selection process for the District Plan Review commencing 2020/21.

Transport

31. A revised Strategic Transport Assessment (February 2020) has been prepared to test the impact of mitigations proposals and to address comments made during consultation. This is available alongside the rest of the evidence base at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.
32. The transport model and report were produced by transport consultants SYSTRA in accordance with standard good practice as set out in the Department for Transport's (DfT) transport analysis guidance. The model was validated by West Sussex Council (the Highways Authority) and has been developed in close co-operation with them and the Highways Agency.
33. The purpose of the Strategic Transport Assessment is to assess the impact of development proposals within the Sites DPD using the approved transport model, testing the proposals against a baseline 'reference case' (which includes current traffic levels and growth already permitted, for example planning permissions and allocations in the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plans). In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds where the impact of proposals in the Sites DPD would lead to a 'severe' impact on the road network.
34. At Regulation 18 stage, the Strategic Transport Assessment did not forecast any 'severe' impacts resulting from the proposed housing sites and did not forecast any cross-boundary transport impacts. The further work to revise the Strategic Transport Assessment confirms this remains the case.

35. The previous Strategic Transport Assessment (September 2019) identified 2 junctions that were forecast to be 'severe' as a result of congestion from the proposed Science and Technology Park (SA9): these were the A23 / A2300 Southbound On-Slip, Burgess Hill and A272 / B2036, Ansty. The report recommends carrying out further model runs to identify and test mitigation to reduce these impacts.
36. The revised Strategic Transport Assessment identifies, and models, proposed mitigations related to the Science and Technology Park. This consists of a widening to the A23 southbound to three lanes from A2300 Southbound Off-slip to B2118/Mill Lane Off-Slip. The model concludes that this mitigation would be successful in removing 'severe' impacts at the two locations above.
37. Work is continuing with WSCC and Highways England to produce detailed design and costing information of this mitigation. Proposed Sites DPD policy **SA35: Safeguarding of Land for Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements** continues to safeguard land necessary for this mitigation to be implemented.
38. At Regulation 18 the outcome of the transport modelling was assessed in the accompanying Air Quality Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment. Updates to the transport model outcomes have not resulted in a change to the conclusions reached at Regulation 18 Stage. These reports have been re-published for Regulation 19 stage and are available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD

High Weald AONB – 'Major Impact' Assessment

39. Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) affords great weight to conserving and enhancing Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It states that "Planning permission should be refused for major development [in the AONB] other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest". Footnote 55 states that "whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined."
40. District Plan policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy accepts that there is a residual housing need at settlements within the AONB (this position was agreed by the District Plan Inspector). Growth is therefore expected at these settlements to ensure they thrive. The Council recognises the great weight placed on the AONB and has rejected all sites that were assessed as having High Impact against the AONB site selection criterion, based on information provided by the High Weald AONB Unit. A total of 2 employment and 6 housing sites were identified as having either low or moderate impact and when assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal performed well and were therefore proposed for allocation.
41. In their response to the Regulation 18 consultation, Natural England and the High Weald AONB Unit required the Council to carry out an assessment to determine whether any of the proposed sites within the AONB could be defined as 'major'.
42. The assessment is now complete and published in the "Major Development in the High Weald AONB" Topic Paper. This is available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD. The methodology has been developed and refined in discussion with Natural England, the High Weald AONB Unit and other partners across the High Weald AONB and other protected landscapes.

43. The following sites proposed for allocation are within the High Weald AONB:

Policy	Site	Settlement	Yield	Topic Paper Conclusion
SA7	Cedars, Brighton Road (Employment)	Pease Pottage	2.3ha	Not Major
SA8	Pease Pottage Nurseries, Brighton Road (Employment)	Pease Pottage	1ha	Not Major
SA25	Land west of Selsfield Road	Ardingly	100	Major
SA26	Land south of Hammerwood Road	Ashurst Wood	12	Not Major
SA27	Land at St Martin Close (west)	Handcross	65	Not Major
SA28	Land south of The Old Police House	Horsted Keynes	25	Not Major
SA29	Land south of St. Stephen's Church	Horsted Keynes	30	Not Major
SA33	Withypitts Farm, Selsfield Road	Turners Hill	16	Not Major

44. Site SA25: Land west of Selsfield Road, Ardingly, has been concluded as Major development at 100 dwellings. This is due to its scale and that development of the whole site would not fit the historic settlement pattern of Ardingly in relation to its two historic centres. This means there would be an impact on the purposes of the High Weald AONB, that is, to conserve and enhance its natural beauty. The assessment concluded that there are unlikely to be exceptional circumstances to justify allocating the whole site for development for 100 dwellings.
45. A possible development of the site focussing built-development on the eastern section, with the rest retained as open space, and which would deliver a yield of 70 dwellings has been assessed using the methodology. The assessment concluded that the revised proposal would not be Major development, given the reduced scale and revised location of built development would keep the two historic parts of Ardingly separate. The High Weald AONB Unit has indicated that this approach would significantly reduce the impact of the proposed development on the AONB. A similar sized scheme at Handcross, allocated within the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan, was not considered to be Major development. The site promoter has confirmed support for this approach.
46. Officers are aware of a letter from Ardingly Parish Council to Scrutiny Committee Members in which the Parish Council seek to reduce the scale of development and to protect the historic settlement pattern. The changes proposed in the submission draft DPD are consistent with the suggestions made by Ardingly Parish Council.
47. The High Weald AONB Unit also requested each site within the AONB to be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). These have now been submitted to the Council. These have been reviewed and taken into account when refining policy wording and supported the AONB Major Development Topic Paper.

Actions to Address Issues

48. A previous report to this committee on 22nd January set out a number of site-specific actions to address comments made during the consultation. These have been addressed by the additional work outlined above and amendments to policy wording to add additional requirements or to provide clarification have been made.
49. Officers have carefully considered all representations received during the public consultation. As a result of the additional work and amendments to policy wording, officers are confident that the Sites DPD is 'sound'. There is no evidenced justification for removing any of the sites that were included in the draft Sites DPD.

Site Allocations DPD – Regulation 19

50. The submission draft Site Allocations DPD (Regulation 19) is included at Appendix 1. This shows all amendments resulting from additional work outlined above in track changes. Subject to approval by Council on 1st April 2020, this version will be subject to public consultation and subsequent submission for examination to the Secretary of State.
51. As a result of the additional work discussed above, it is proposed to reduce the yield at SA25: Land west of Selsfield Road, Ardingly from 100 dwellings to 70 dwellings. The yield at SA12: Land south of 96 Folders Lane, Burgess Hill has reduced from 43 dwellings to 40 dwellings to reflect an updated site layout proposed by the developer.
52. The selection of sites within the Sites DPD must be consistent with the District Plan strategy set out in policies DP4: Housing and DP6: Settlement Hierarchy. As a result of changes made since the draft Sites DPD, the number of dwellings at Category 1 has reduced by 3 dwellings, the number at Category 3 has reduced by 30. This is still consistent with the District Plan strategy, which aims to direct development to the most sustainable settlements within the hierarchy. Overall, the submission draft Sites DPD proposes 1,929 dwellings (33 fewer dwellings compared to the draft Sites DPD); however, this continues to maintain an over-supply of 422 dwellings to provide resilience and flexibility.
53. Officers have considered representations received during the consultation period regarding assumptions in the Windfall Study note (September 2019). An update to this study in response to these representations has been prepared (available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD). The conclusion is that the windfall figure of 588 dwellings remains robust and sound.
54. There are no proposed changes to Employment sites (SA2-SA8) or the Science & Technology Park preferred site (SA9) other than refinements to policy wording to reflect comments made during consultation.
55. The following additional amendments have been made to the submission draft Sites DPD following consultation:
 - A new policy has been added - “SA GEN: General Principles for Allocations”. This information was in the draft Sites DPD as Appendix C. As a result of comments made during the consultation, and for clarity and ease of reference, this policy has been included in the main body of the submission draft Sites DPD.
 - Amendments to policy wording, to provide clarity and to address comments received. These are shown in track changes.
 - Typos/errors have been corrected, additional text has been provided within introductory text to add clarity where required. These are shown in track changes.
 - Policy “SA34: Existing Employment Sites”- site boundaries (Appendix 1 of the submission draft Sites DPD) have been amended where evidence provided by site promoters has warranted a change.
 - Appendices A: Saved Policies and B: Residual Amount for each Settlement within the draft Sites DPD have been removed to reflect comments received during the consultation.
 - A set of draft Policies Maps covering the district has been prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. These show the currently adopted

Policies Maps alongside any amendments resulting from the submission draft Sites DPD. Maps within the document have been amended to improve clarity.

Sustainability Appraisal Report/Habitats Regulations Assessment

56. In accordance with legal requirements, a revised Sustainability Appraisal report and a Habitats Regulations Assessment have been prepared to consider the potential impacts of the submission draft Sites DPD. These will be published for public consultation alongside the Plan. They are available as background documents, online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD.

Duty to Co-Operate

57. The Council has worked, and continues to work, in partnership with its neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate.
58. The Sites DPD is addressing how to meet the housing and employment need already established by the adopted District Plan. Strategic matters will be reviewed during the District Plan review and are not required to be covered at this stage.
59. In accordance with the NPPF, the Council has prepared Statements of Common Ground with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies.

Next Steps

60. Subject to Council approval on 1st April 2020, the submission draft Sites DPD will be subject to a 6-week public consultation. Due to the pre-election period for the Police and Crime Commissioner elections on 7th May 2020, it is proposed that the consultation will begin on 11th May 2020.
61. Following the close of the public consultation, the Sites DPD, accompanying documents and evidence base, and all consultation responses received at the Regulation 19 stage will be submitted to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will appoint an independent planning inspector to examine the Site Allocations DPD. It is anticipated that the examination will take place during Autumn 2020.

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 in planning processes.
63. The SCI commits the Council to prepare a 'Community Involvement Plan' for all planning policy documents. The Community Involvement Plan 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; and
- Static exhibitions will be held in the District Libraries and District Council Office.

Additional Work Prior to Submission

64. To reflect the submission of additional sites to the Council during the consultation, there is a need to update the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). A revised version including the 28 new housing and employment sites will be published ahead of submission.
65. It is common practice to prepare Topic Papers which summarise existing evidence and conclusions, to assist the Inspector during the examination of the plan. These will be prepared and published ahead of Submission of the document to the Secretary of State. The Planning Inspectorate also encourages Councils to conduct a self-assessment of the Plan against the legal requirements and tests of soundness. This will also be completed and submitted alongside the documents and supporting evidence.

Financial Implications

66. There is a budget to fund the submission and examination of the Sites DPD. This will be kept under review.

Risk Management Implications

67. As required by the District Plan inspector the Sites DPD will identify housing sites to enable the Council to meet the housing requirement identified in Policy DP4: Housing of the District Plan. It will allocate sites to support the five-year housing land supply; without this, the Council would be vulnerable to speculative planning applications.
68. The allocation of additional employment sites will make an important contribution to the delivery of the Council's Economic Development Strategy.

Equality and Customer Service Implications

69. It is important that the Council allocates sites for housing and employment to maximise accessibility for all to decent housing and employment opportunities. An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared to ensure opportunities to promote equality and/or barriers to service are considered and addressed.

Other Material Implications

70. There are no other material implications.

Appendices

1. Draft Submission Site Allocations DPD (Regulation 19)
2. List of New Housing and Employment sites submitted and assessed

Background Papers

Available online at www.midsussex.gov.uk/SitesDPD. Hard copies are available for Members to view in the Members Room.

1. Draft Submission Site Allocations DPD (Regulation 19) – No Track Changes
2. Sustainability Appraisal (Regulation 19) – Non-Technical Summary
3. Sustainability Appraisal (Regulation 19) – Full Report
4. Habitats Regulations Assessment (Regulation 19) – Non-Technical Summary
5. Habitats Regulations Assessment (Regulation 19) – Full Report
6. Air Quality Assessment (February 2020)
7. Strategic Transport Assessment (February 2020)
8. Site Selection Paper 1 (February 2020)
9. Site Selection Paper 3: Housing (February 2020)
10. Site Selection Paper 4: Employment (February 2020)
11. AONB Major Development Topic Paper
12. Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (February 2020)
13. Windfall Study Update (March 2020)
14. Viability Assessment Report
15. Community Involvement Plan
16. Equalities Impact Assessment

Previous Committee Reports relating to the Sites DPD are also available online at:
<http://midsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories>