

## **APPENDIX 1 – Summary of Consultation Responses and Proposed Changes**

**Total Respondents: 243**

The following tables summarise the key points raised by both responses to the questionnaire and emails. The ‘Summary of Comments’ section includes qualitative comments received by either response to the eForm questionnaire or email/post. Note that some comments were made multiple times by different respondents.

### **General Issues**

<b>General Objection</b>
<b>Total Comments: 8</b>
<b>Summary of Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why was the Masterplan not mentioned in the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan – how does the Masterplan relate to the Neighbourhood Plan? (Resident)</li><li>• The Masterplan does not contain any firm proposals (Resident)</li><li>• The map on page 31 is out of date re: development on Perrymount Road</li><li>• The Masterplan does not go far enough in its environmental/zero carbon/climate change ambitions (CPRE Sussex)</li><li>• The Masterplan is narrower in scope compared to the 2007 version, the boundary should be expanded (Resident)</li><li>• There is little detail on how retail will be improved / additional retailers encouraged to move here (Cuckfield Parish Council)</li><li>• Whilst the document notes that Haywards Heath has a diverse cultural offer, this isn't reflected on the ground (x2 Residents)</li></ul>
<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>
As noted on page 14 of the draft Masterplan, the Masterplan has been prepared within the context of the adopted District Plan and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan. The content of the Masterplan builds upon proposals set out in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Town Council's “Destination Haywards Heath” document, providing supplementary detail.  The Masterplan's role is to set out principles not make firm proposals. More detail will be required and provided as specific proposals are brought forward through the planning process.  Officers note that the Map on P31 is now out of date and will obtain up-to-date information from Ordnance Survey.  The Masterplan sets out proposals to encourage greater sustainable transport usage which will contribute to sustainable development aims. The role of Planning Policy in responding to climate change/zero carbon and sustainable development is a strategic matter which can be considered in the District Plan review (scheduled to commence in 2021).  The Council carefully considered the boundary for the new Masterplan and concluded that the boundary as currently drawn reflects the area containing town centre uses.  An adopted Masterplan will provide certainty for those making investment decisions. Improving the retail/leisure offer (e.g. proposals for The Orchards) and providing easy access (both by sustainable modes as well as by car) will encourage an improved retail and leisure offer within the Town Centre.

## **Proposed Changes**

- Amendments to maps to ensure they reflect recent planning permissions and completions (e.g. Perrymount Road)

## **General Support**

### **Total Comments: 6**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- Generally supportive of the proposals (x3 Residents)
- The Masterplan represents an opportunity to make Haywards Heath a destination and is supported (Resident)
- The Masterplan correctly notes the disjointed nature of the town's key locations (Resident)
- Supportive of the drive to increase provision for tourism, and hope this will support surrounding villages too (Lindfield Parish Council)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

Noted

## **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed

## **General Neutral**

### **Total Comments: 7**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- Any proposals for wind turbines would require consultation with Gatwick Airport (Gatwick Airport)
- Not likely to have major effects on the Natural Environment, however the SPD could consider provision for Green Infrastructure (Natural England)
- No comments to make (Tandridge District Council / National Grid)
- No comments re Gas Supply for any opportunity site proposals (Southern Gas Networks)
- Opportunity Sites are in areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1) – no comment to make (Environment Agency)
- No impact on the Strategic Road Network, and support development of sustainable transport options (Highways England)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

These comments are noted. Provision for Green Infrastructure is covered by proposals related to public realm improvements and those for Victoria Park. Future proposals would also need to accord with District Plan policy DP38: Biodiversity.

## **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed.

## **Consultation**

### **Total Comments: 9**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- Better engagement is required, only found out about the consultation via Facebook
- Was not aware of the consultation (Resident)
- There has been no communication of the proposals by the Council (Resident)
- The consultation period was too short, and not appropriate in the run up to Christmas/ongoing pandemic (Resident)

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation does not comply with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) / Community Involvement Plan (CIP) / LGA consultation principles. (Resident / Mid Sussex Labour Party)</li> <li>• A public exhibition / virtual exhibition should have taken place (Resident)</li> </ul> |
|--|

<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>
---

The Council is satisfied that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the SCI and CIP. The consultation ran for 6-weeks, which is two weeks longer than required by legislation for a Supplementary Planning Document.

The consultation was publicised on the Council's social media feeds, in the local newspaper (Mid Sussex Times) and within the Council's Mid Sussex Matters magazine which is delivered to every household in the district. In addition, statutory bodies and those on the Council's Planning Policy mailing list were notified.

The Masterplan was available to download from the Council's website. In addition, an Interactive Map was prepared so that users could navigate the town centre and click on proposals to view further information. This was viewed over 7,500 times.

Due to restrictions in place as a result of Covid-19, it was not possible to hold a public exhibition. However, 'exhibition panels' formed part of the interactive map and were available to download from the Council's website. Given the amount of times this facility was viewed, the Council is satisfied that the content of the Masterplan was advertised sufficiently and was accessible.

<b>Proposed Changes</b>
-------------------------

No amendments proposed.
-------------------------

## Vision, Objectives and Baseline

### **Vision, Objectives and Baseline**

#### **Questionnaire Responses**

##### **Do you agree with the 8 objectives for the Masterplan?**

<b>Yes</b>	50%
<b>No</b>	50%

##### **Do you agree with the aim of encouraging economic recovery, growth and investment?**

<b>Yes</b>	70%
<b>No</b>	30%

##### **Do you agree with the Character Areas identified?**

<b>Yes</b>	58%
<b>No</b>	42%

##### **Do you agree with the areas that should be protected and enhanced?**

<b>Yes</b>	56%
<b>No</b>	44%

<b>Total Responses</b>	117
------------------------	-----

#### **Comments**

<b>Total Comments by email/post: 19</b>
---

#### **Summary of Comments**

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the objectives as a fair reflection of the improvements required in Haywards Heath (Haywards Heath Town Council / Residents)</li> </ul> |
|---|

- Agree with the objectives that look to improve the town for pedestrians and cyclists - traffic concerns (Resident)
- Masterplan boundary should be extended to include the Dolphin and Sainsbury's as these are important aspects of the town (Resident)
- Economic growth should not be at the expense of the environment (Resident)
- The plan lacks imagination and/or vision (Resident)
- The objectives could be addressed more simply (Resident)
- Leisure provision (e.g. Clair Hall) should be protected (Resident)
- The improvements suggested go a long way to attracting investment (Resident)
- There are not enough clear proposals to attract additional retailers, SMEs, residents (Resident)
- The Masterplan does not set out a retail strategy (Resident)
- There is too much focus on retail on not on any other forms of employment (Resident)
- Objectives should consider pedestrianising key areas rather than simply 'discouraging' traffic (Resident)
- The Vision and Objectives do not set out any clear environmental/sustainability objectives, or climate change ambitions (Resident)
- The Vision and Objectives infers a range of diverse attractions and cultural facilities – disagree with this statement (Resident)
- Not sure that the Vision and Objectives would give Haywards Heath any advantage over competing towns (Resident)
- Objectives 3 and 6 should refer to street redesign so that benefits to pedestrians and cyclists can be realised, Objective 4 should include consideration of parking guidance signage/apps to help circulation (Resident)
- The contents of the report are based on flawed assumptions re: Covid, Vision and Objectives don't reflect Covid sufficiently (Resident)
- Uncertain whether the Vision and Objectives can all be delivered, some are not compatible with others (particularly the conflict between encouraging sustainable transport and parking) (Resident)
- Public Transport is an important aspect and should be mentioned (West Sussex County Council / Metrobus)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The draft Vision and Objectives resulted from engagement with District Ward and Town Council Members to ensure they reflected the views of residents and to ensure compatibility with related documents such as the Hayward Heath Neighbourhood Plan and the Town Council's "Destination Haywards Heath".

Those that did not agree mainly raised concerns regarding culture/leisure provision and wished to see these objectives strengthened. Others were unsure whether the objectives were strong enough, however did not provide any alternative suggestions.

Comments were also received regarding the incompatibility between encouraging sustainable transport and increasing parking. Both are valid aims – the Masterplan is concerned with removing unnecessary traffic (i.e. those making through journeys or could otherwise be made by sustainable modes). However, it is also recognised that a healthy town centre relies on the ability of people to visit from further afield and their ability to park. By focussing parking in one location, as proposed, this should also relieve traffic circulation and congestion caused by seeking parking spaces.

The Masterplan recognises the Government's view that Town Centres are now reliant on more than just retail to thrive. It therefore provides a framework for encouraging

investment in a number of uses (leisure, entertainment, retail, residential), enables flexibility and accords with national policy.

The Masterplan mentions the fact that Covid-19 will change the way that town centres operate, particularly in the short-term. However, the medium-long term impacts are not yet known. The Masterplan therefore aims to set principles that are flexible to support economic recovery and growth.

Comments related to fully pedestrianising South Road/The Broadway are addressed under their separate sections below.

No additional objectives were suggested, and none were suggested for deletion.

#### **Proposed Changes**

- Amendment to objective 3 to refer to Public transport

## **Public Realm and Transport Improvements**

### **Commercial Square and Station**

#### **Questionnaire Responses**

#### **To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?**

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	24%
<b>Agree</b>	41%
<b>Unsure</b>	23%
<b>Disagree</b>	9%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	3%
<b>Total Responses</b>	91

#### **Comments**

#### **Total Comments by email/post: 7**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- Agree with the proposals for artwork and better lighting to the Railway bridge (Resident)
- Agree with the cycling proposals at Commercial Square but should extend to Lindfield / Scaynes Hill (Resident)
- Increase in housing will increase traffic problems near the station (Resident)
- Signage and wayfinding at the station is poor, agree with the proposals (Resident)
- Welcome the key concepts of the Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study (2015) being taken forward. Preliminary design work and consultation for progression of schemes for South Road and Commercial Square Roundabout is currently included within the County Council Annual Delivery Programme and we welcome continuing to work with Mid Sussex District Council and other local stakeholders to progress these schemes. (West Sussex County Council)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The majority of comments received agreed with proposals at this location.

The proposals within the Masterplan are limited to the area within the Town Centre boundary, therefore it cannot provide detail on any suggested proposals outside the boundary.

#### **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed.

## Perrymount Road

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	20%
<b>Agree</b>	47%
<b>Unsure</b>	18%
<b>Disagree</b>	7%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	8%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>88</b>

### Comments

#### Total Comments by email/post: 6

#### Summary of Comments

- Agree that this is a key route between the station and town centre (x2 Residents)
- A missed opportunity to rectify existing traffic problems related to the station/Waitrose (Resident)
- Existing office spaces are under-utilised (Resident)
- Do not agree with cycling advisory lanes (Resident)
- The Masterplan should comment more fully on what the opportunities for cycle facilities are (on-road painted facilities, off-carriageway shared paths, segregated/stepped track facilities), balancing the different demands in respect of road space, in particular with regard to on-road parking. (West Sussex County Council)

### Officer Comments/Recommendations

The majority of comments received agreed with proposals at this location.

The aims and principles of the Masterplan are to encourage economic recovery and growth. By providing an attractive environment to work and live, this should encourage investors (including businesses) to the area and help with the retention of existing businesses.

Comments were received in relation to cycling advisory lanes and cycle standards. Officers propose to seek further information from West Sussex County Council in relation to cycle opportunities and will amend the Masterplan accordingly.

### Proposed Changes

- Clarify the text related to cycle improvements based on discussions with West Sussex County Council.

## Muster Green Gyratory

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	31%
<b>Agree</b>	25%
<b>Unsure</b>	29%
<b>Disagree</b>	4%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	11%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>91</b>

### Comments

#### Total Comments by email/post: 11

### Summary of Comments

- Removing the gyratory is supported (Resident)
- The pedestrianised area should also ensure benefit to cyclists and public transport (West Sussex County Council)
- Traffic impacts of any future proposal should be modelled to establish impacts (West Sussex County Council)
- Traffic through the town is not a problem, amending the gyratory is an unnecessary cost (Resident)
- Taller buildings are not supported in this location (Resident)
- Do not support the proposals for shared space/pedestrianisation of the area to the south of The Broadway around the Star Public House. This proposal was considered and objected to by HHTC during the development of the Atkins Report. It conflicts with our subsequent adopted policy, Destination Haywards Heath document which details our preferred delivery for a one-way gyratory system based upon known desire lines and traffic flows. (Haywards Heath Town Council)
- This permanent diversion around the Broadway will add further journey time to bus services, making them less attractive to the public and may jeopardise the viability of bus services. It would be more beneficial to change this section of The Broadway to a bus/cycle only road with added bus priority traffic measures at the end to make bus travel more attractive. (Metrobus)
- Further heritage work should be carried out to determine the impact on the Muster Green Conservation Area (Historic England)

### Officer Comments/Recommendations

The responses to the questionnaire suggest there is strong agreement overall for the proposals for the Muster Green gyratory.

The proposals suggested at Muster Green follow the recommendations of the Haywards Heath Transport Study (2015) as well as an independent review by Civic Engineers as part of the Masterplan consultant team. The high-level principles have therefore been tested and concluded as the most suitable way of addressing the existing gyratory. Further detailed work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.

### Proposed Changes

- Add additional text to refer to the requirement to carry out detailed modelling, impact assessments and costing before progressing any scheme at this location.

## The Broadway

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	29%
<b>Agree</b>	37%
<b>Unsure</b>	23%
<b>Disagree</b>	1%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>90</b>

### Comments

**Total Comments by email/post: 11**

### Summary of Comments

- The Broadway would be better suited to full pedestrianisation to support the food/beverage appeal of the area (x4 Residents)

- Agree with proposals to make the Broadway less attractive to traffic (Resident)
- Strongly support the proposals to lose the southern end of the Broadway, can be used for markets etc. (Resident)
- Encourage better signage between the Broadway and Heath Road car park (Resident)
- Slowing down traffic would also slow down buses. Improvements to bus stops would be required (e.g. real time passenger information) and the current parking situation improved (Metrobus)
- Do not support the proposals for shared space/pedestrianisation of the area to the south of The Broadway around the Star Public House. This proposal was considered and objected to by HHTC during the development of the Atkins Report. It moreover conflicts with our subsequent adopted policy, Destination Haywards Heath document which details our preferred delivery for a one-way gyratory system based upon known desire lines and traffic flows. (Haywards Heath Town Council)
- Should highlight the impacts of the dominance of parking on the streetscape with the types of businesses on The Broadway lending themselves more to the quality of the public realm. The Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study proposed a greater level of reduction of parking along the Broadway to provide more space for pedestrians, as well as delivery restrictions at peak times. The Masterplan could set out more of the options around the level of parking provision, quality of the streetscape, space for dedicated cycle facilities, improvement of flow for bus services through The Broadway (linked to parking and width of highway), and provision of improved bus stop facilities (in particular northbound). (West Sussex County Council)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

There is strong support for the proposals at The Broadway, as it is recognised as an important food/beverage/entertainment location and is widely appreciated by residents as a distinct character area. Residents are supportive of reducing traffic and making the area more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists.

Some comments suggested full pedestrianisation. Whilst it is known that this has been considered in the past, the route itself is still important – in particular for buses, taxis and deliveries. The Masterplan notes (page 25) that this is a Primary road. Therefore, measures within the Masterplan strike the balance between retaining this route whilst reducing traffic to enhance public realm overall and is the conclusion of the Haywards Heath Transport Study (Atkins, 2015) and Civic Engineers assessment.

Destination Haywards Heath, prepared by the Town Council, suggests an alternative configuration for the Gyratory. However, this differs from the detail provided within the Haywards Heath Transport Study and Civic Engineers work as part of the Masterplan. As such, the Town Council's proposed configuration has not been modelled. The proposals within the Masterplan are indicative and set a framework for any future decisions, these will be subject to detailed modelling and design at the point they are brought forward, and may require adjustment in order to provide an optimal solution in terms of feasibility and design.

The Council will continue to work with West Sussex County Council on any detailed schemes and opportunities to add The Broadway to its Annual Delivery Programme in the future. In addition, further work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.

#### **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed.

<b>South Road</b>	
<b>Questionnaire Responses</b>	
<b>To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?</b>	
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	24%
<b>Agree</b>	28%
<b>Unsure</b>	28%
<b>Disagree</b>	11%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	9%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Total Comments by email/post: 8</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with proposals to widen pavements and decrease traffic speed (Resident)</li> <li>• Agree with the aims of reducing overall traffic through South Road and encouragement to use the relief road instead (Resident)</li> <li>• Slowing traffic down will also slow buses down – need to ensure proposals are compatible with a viable bus service. Potential for time restrictions that allow for buses only (Metrobus)</li> <li>• Facades of buildings in South Road are poor and need improvement (Resident)</li> <li>• Would like to see South Road fully pedestrianised (Resident)</li> <li>• Disagree with proposals for a median strip along South Road (Resident)</li> <li>• A carefully planned low traffic zone along South Road should be proposed (CPRE)</li> <li>• It is noted that the indicative plans for South Road (p.50 and p.51) contain some key amendments to feasibility plans previously identified within the Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study, including the addition of a central median strip and amendments to the proposed location of bus stops. The rationale for these amendments is not entirely clear and it is suggested that these issues are considered further with stakeholders, including bus companies, as part of the WSCC preliminary design development of the South Road scheme (West Sussex County Council)</li> </ul>	
<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<p>Comments received were largely supportive of the aim to reduce traffic – both volume and speed, and that the area could be more pedestrian friendly. This in turn will help drive footfall by making Haywards Heath an attractive place to visit.</p> <p>Some comments suggested full pedestrianisation. Whilst this has been considered in the past, the route is still key – the Masterplan notes on page 25 that this is a Primary road. It is important for buses, taxis and deliveries as well as passing trade. Therefore, measures within the Masterplan strike the balance between retaining this route whilst reducing traffic to enhance public realm overall.</p> <p>The Masterplan suggested a central median strip along South Road. This is indicative; it would be subject to land availability and the ability to meet design standards. Additional work since the consultation commenced suggest this may be difficult to achieve, so wording can be clarified on this point.</p> <p>The buildings on South Road are in private ownership and are a range of ages and condition, therefore the Masterplan has little control over improving numerous facades.</p>	

Preliminary design for the South Road highways scheme is being progressed by West Sussex County Council – officers will continue engagement to inform future proposals. Further work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.

### **Proposed Changes**

- Amend text related to the median strip, add caveat “subject to meeting required design standards and in consultation with WSCC and bus companies.”

## **Sussex Road**

### **Questionnaire Responses**

#### **To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?**

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	23%
<b>Agree</b>	39%
<b>Unsure</b>	24%
<b>Disagree</b>	3%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>87</b>

### **Comments**

#### **Total Comments by email/post: 2**

### **Summary of Comments**

- Support - scope to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport to local schools, encouraging habits for future generations (Resident)
- Support the proposed changes to the roundabout to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians (Resident)

### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The majority of comments received were supportive of this proposal. Whilst some disagreement was indicated in the questionnaire, no explanation was provided and no objections were received by email/letter.

### **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed.

## **Speed Limit**

### **Questionnaire Responses**

#### **To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?**

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	38%
<b>Agree</b>	24%
<b>Unsure</b>	12%
<b>Disagree</b>	13%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	12%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>89</b>

### **Comments**

#### **Total Comments by email/post: 7**

### **Summary of Comments**

- Strongly agree with the suggestion to reduce the speed limit to 20mph (Haywards Heath Town Council / Resident)
- Speed limit changes could be implemented relatively quickly (Resident)

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be extended to surrounding roads and villages (Resident)</li> <li>• Risk that a change of speed limit may cause congestion (Resident)</li> </ul> |
|--|

<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>
---

<p>There was strong support, both in terms of the questionnaire response and email comments received, for this proposal. Whilst some suggested it could be extended outside the Masterplan boundary, the Masterplan can only provide guidance for areas within the boundary itself.</p>
---

<b>Proposed Changes</b>
-------------------------

No amendments proposed.
-------------------------

## Cycling

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	27%
<b>Agree</b>	34%
<b>Unsure</b>	20%
<b>Disagree</b>	10%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	9%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>93</b>

### Comments

**Total Comments by email/post: 16**

### Summary of Comments

- Strongly agree with the proposals for improving cycling infrastructure (Resident)
- Document needs to include more references to cycle parking or bike rental schemes (Resident)
- Would support a proposal to extend any cycling routes into surrounding villages such as Lindfield and Cuckfield (Lindfield Parish Council / Cuckfield Parish Council)
- Cycling proposals need to be worked up more fully (Resident)
- Cycle design standards have progressed since the Atkins study (2015) therefore proposals will need to be considered against these design standards (West Sussex County Council)
- Cycling (section 4.9) should also refer to walking and other non-motorised users (Resident)
- Additional routes would be welcomed (outside the TC Masterplan boundary) (Resident)
- Perrymount Road/Clair Park cycle route would be difficult to implement as it is too steep (Resident)

### Officer Comments/Recommendations

There was strong support, both in terms of the questionnaire response and email comments received, for the provision of additional cycling infrastructure within the town centre.

The role of the Masterplan is to set the framework and principles for proposals. In relation to comments about design standards and the feasibility of implementing any particular route, these will be addressed at the detailed design stage for each scheme as and when they are progressed.

Additional commentary can be provided in the Cycling section to refer to appropriately designed and located cycle parking/storage.

<b>Proposed Changes</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional commentary regarding appropriate cycle storage</li> <li>• Refer to non-motorised users in section 4.9</li> </ul>

<b>Parking</b>												
<b>Questionnaire Responses</b>												
<b>To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?</b>												
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Strongly Agree</b></td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Agree</b></td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Unsure</b></td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Disagree</b></td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Strongly Disagree</b></td> <td>42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Responses</b></td> <td><b>100</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15%	<b>Agree</b>	16%	<b>Unsure</b>	15%	<b>Disagree</b>	12%	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	42%	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15%											
<b>Agree</b>	16%											
<b>Unsure</b>	15%											
<b>Disagree</b>	12%											
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	42%											
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>100</b>											
<b>Comments</b>												
<b>Total Comments by email/post: 10</b>												
<b>Summary of Comments</b>												
<p><b>Note: additional detail comments are addressed under Opportunity Sites (The Orchards and MSDC Car Parks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional parking is proposed, this is in conflict with the aims to encourage sustainable transport use (Resident)</li> <li>• There is no evidence to suggest that motorists spend a long time searching for a parking space (Resident)</li> <li>• The smaller car parks are welcomed and are vital for people to access services (Resident)</li> <li>• There is no mention of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (Resident)</li> <li>• Car parking capacity should be maintained not reduced (Resident)</li> <li>• Free parking should be provided to encourage shoppers/visitors (Resident)</li> </ul>												
<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>												
<p>The provision of sufficient parking is vital to encourage additional visitors to the town centre. Whilst the Masterplan supports sustainable transport modes (to encourage those that wish to travel by such modes to use them) it is recognised that some users will require the use of a private car.</p> <p>The Masterplan proposes consolidating car parking into one car park – potentially a multi-storey at The Orchards. This will provide visitors a ‘go to’ destination and will be an efficient way of increasing parking capacity as well as reducing traffic movements in the town centre. It should be noted that the closure of smaller car parks will be subject to additional future work through the Council’s Parking Investment Strategy, which will consider capacity and other measures. Any closure of car parks will be subject to the outcomes of this work, and the assurances that sufficient parking capacity exists in the town centre to meet current and demand.</p> <p>Similarly, it is not the role of the Masterplan to determine fee regimes – this will be reviewed in line with the Council’s Parking Strategy (2020).</p>												
<b>Proposed Changes</b>												
No amendments proposed.												

<b>Victoria Park</b>	
<b>Questionnaire Responses</b>	
<b>To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?</b>	
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	30%
<b>Agree</b>	37%
<b>Unsure</b>	18%
<b>Disagree</b>	4%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	11%
<b>Total Responses</b>	91
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Total Comments by email/post: 9</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The raised area between South Road and Victoria Park could be better utilised as a community space (x3 Residents)</li> <li>Disagree with the removal of the hedge on South Road, as this provides a landscape buffer between open space and the road / screening (x5 Residents)</li> <li>HHTC supports the improvement and vision for Victoria Park and looks forward to the delivery progression of the Victoria Park Masterplan, following our earlier representations. (Haywards Heath Town Council)</li> </ul>	
<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>	
Comments received were largely supportive of this proposal, particularly the role that Victoria Park plays in providing leisure and open space within the town centre. It was also recognised as having potential for community uses.	
Opinion was divided on the proposed removal of the hedge along South Road. Whilst five residents felt that this provides a vital landscape barrier/buffer, others indicated that opening up Victoria Park would help integrate it better with The Broadway and South Road, and could provide opportunities for alternative uses on the northern boundary.	
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	
No amendments proposed.	

<b>Gateways and Wayfinding</b>	
<b>Questionnaire Responses</b>	
<b>To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?</b>	
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	27%
<b>Agree</b>	37%
<b>Unsure</b>	22%
<b>Disagree</b>	2%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	12%
<b>Total Responses</b>	88
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Total Comments by email/post: 11</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of gateways would help form the Town Centre's identity (Resident)</li> <li>Support the idea of improved signage and wayfinding, particularly if by local artists (x4 Residents)</li> <li>Concerned that too much signage would mean clutter (x2 Residents)</li> <li>Signage to parking and public transport would be a benefit (x2 Residents)</li> <li>Why invent a 'gateway' if one already exists (Muster Green) (Resident)</li> </ul>	

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The addition of signage and gateways would not benefit existing residents as they are already aware of their town (Resident)</li> </ul> |
|--|

<b>Officer Comments/Recommendations</b>
---

<p>The principle around improving navigation around the town was largely supported. In particular, it was felt that tourists and visitors would benefit – especially those likely to be arriving by public transport or other sustainable modes. There was support for wayfinding and signage to be locally distinctive (potentially by local artists) and to avoid clutter.</p>
--

<b>Proposed Changes</b>
-------------------------

No amendments proposed.
-------------------------

## Other Small Scale Improvements

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	21%
<b>Agree</b>	42%
<b>Unsure</b>	21%
<b>Disagree</b>	6%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10%
<b>Total Responses</b>	84

### Comments

**Total Comments by email/post: 0**

### Officer Comments/Recommendations

These proposals were largely supported, based on the questionnaire response. No comments were provided on this matter.

### Proposed Changes

No amendments proposed.

## Meanwhile Uses

### Questionnaire Responses

#### To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	21%
<b>Agree</b>	30%
<b>Unsure</b>	38%
<b>Disagree</b>	5%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6%
<b>Total Responses</b>	81

### Comments

**Total Comments by email/post: 0**

### Officer Comments/Recommendations

These proposals were largely supported, based on the questionnaire response. No comments were provided on this matter.

### Proposed Changes

No amendments proposed.

## Opportunity Sites

The Orchards	
Questionnaire Responses	
<b>Do you agree with the principle of encouraging non-retail uses (such as leisure) to The Orchards?</b>	
Yes	63%
No	37%
<b>Do you agree that public realm improvements would make The Orchards more inviting?</b>	
Yes	62%
No	38%
<b>Do you agree that The Orchards should be the focus for enhanced car parking within the town centre?</b>	
Yes	44%
No	56%
Total Responses	117
Comments	
<b>Total Comments by email/post: 28</b>	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional retail, town growth, residential and leisure facility at The Orchards would necessitate more parking provision (x4 Residents)</li> <li>• Would like to see new cinema/theatre/leisure facility on this site (x4 Residents)</li> <li>• Would be a good location for the local library (Resident)</li> <li>• Providing other uses here is a good idea and will help retain existing tenants by ensuring footfall (Resident)</li> <li>• The Orchards is a shopping centre, why is leisure proposed here? (Resident)</li> <li>• A better mix of shops / additional shops / more chains are required in the Orchards to drive footfall (Resident)</li> <li>• The Masterplan should be more prescriptive in what the 'leisure facility' on this site would be (Resident)</li> <li>• Has to be a balance between leisure and retail (Resident)</li> <li>• Support additional budget supermarket (Resident)</li> <li>• Night time economy is important as currently the centre is 'dead' after 5pm (Resident)</li> <li>• Disagree with residential development proposed for The Orchards (Resident)</li> <li>• Agree with provision of a multi-storey – parking is under significant pressure (x4 Residents)</li> <li>• Multi-storey would be over-dominating and too 'urban' / eyesore (x2 Residents)</li> <li>• Multi-storey car parks are not as safe as surface car parks (x2 Residents)</li> <li>• There is no need to increase car parking provision, multi-storey is not required (x5 Residents)</li> <li>• Focusing parking on The Orchards site would be detrimental to retailers adjacent to existing (smaller) car parks (Organisation) Orchards should include secure cycle hubs/parking (Resident)</li> <li>• The Orchards is dark and claustrophobic, removing the canopies would help (Resident)</li> <li>• Removal of the canopies in the northern end has not improved the centre (Resident)</li> <li>• The Orchards feels tired and in need of a facelift (Resident)</li> </ul>	

### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

Responses to the questionnaire suggested support for encouraging non-retail uses within The Orchards. This reflects recent Government changes to the Use Class order to attract non-retail uses to ensure that town centres remain vibrant and viable. Given the challenging times for retail (even before the Covid-19 pandemic) it will be vital to encourage other uses which will drive footfall and ensure that the town centre remains a focus for the community.

Respondents suggested that leisure uses would be supported overall – in particular, a cinema/gym/community building/library were raised. However, it is recognised that there needs to be a balance between leisure and retail, and that there has to be sufficient parking (as well as sustainable transport) to accommodate these uses.

Whilst it is not in the Masterplan's control to dictate the balance of retail or assign specific retailers, the improvements that can be made at the Orchards, in terms of encouraging multiple uses and public realm improvements, will assist in encouraging retailers to open premises in the centre by providing a welcoming and successful retail environment to trade in.

Concern was raised over the proposals for a multi-storey at The Orchards. These related to design (they are urbanising, and will impact on amenity of nearby residents), safety (they feel unsafe by comparison to surface car parks) parking fees and need. Further detail can be provided within the Masterplan to strengthen the principles regarding design. Other elements, including the need and capacity will be assessed further under a separate workstream (e.g. work arising from the recently adopted Parking Strategy).

### **Proposed Changes**

- Strengthen design elements, particularly in relation to the multi-storey car park proposal (refer to Design Guide SPD)
- Refer to Parking Strategy

### **Clair Hall**

#### **Questionnaire Responses**

##### **Do you agree with the aims and principles set out for the site on p.72?**

<b>Yes</b>	38%
<b>No</b>	62%

##### **Do you think there is a need for a community facility in the town?**

<b>Yes</b>	81%
<b>No</b>	19%

##### **What features would you expect a modern future facility to include?**

- Multi-purpose – wide range of uses
- Cinema
- Voluntary Spaces
- Citizens Advice
- Small theatre
- Performance venue (live music/comedy/theatre)
- Restaurant/Bar
- Public meeting space
- Venue with retractable seating / flexibility
- No need for a permanent stage
- Art gallery
- Health facility/blood donation/etc

- Same uses as existing – but modernised

**Would you support provision of a community facility if it required public subsidy?**

<b>Partial Subsidy</b>	49%
<b>Full Subsidy</b>	45%
<b>No Subsidy</b>	6%

**Do you think it should be included in the Clair Hall site?**

<b>Yes</b>	72%
<b>No</b>	28%

**If no, do you have any suggestions for an alternative location for such a facility?**

- Orchards (x3)
- Anywhere in Haywards Heath as long as it is accessible
- Don't only limit the search to the Clair Hall site, look for other opportunities
- Somewhere nearer the Broadway/South Road
- Unlikely to find somewhere with the same parking provision
- Redevelopment of the space between Poundland and Lloyds Bank on South Road
- Hazelgrove Road (currently occupied by Car Park/Tesco)
- Activities could be moved to venues such as Haywards Heath Social Club or church halls

<b>Total Responses</b>	117
------------------------	-----

**Comments**

**Total Comments by email/post: 66**

**Summary of Comments**

The Masterplan consultation asked a series of questions related to the Clair Hall site. These sought views on the content within the Masterplan but also sought the community's views on the permanent closure of Clair Hall. The response to these additional questions will be used to inform the assessment of need, in line with the requirement of the first principle of the Masterplan and will help to inform decisions about the future provision of community facilities.

Comments related to the closure and potential redevelopment of Clair Hall included:

- Fundamental objection to closure (i.e. no redevelopment)
- Redwood Centre should be retained
- Cinema/Theatre/Community Building should replace Clair Hall
- Redevelopment is required (e.g. current facilities are not fit-for-purpose)
- No alternative venues have been suggested / there are no alternatives in Haywards Heath
- Clair Hall has been underused as it is badly managed / lack of investment
- Should re-open until alternatives are found / planned for
- Existing building should be improved/replaced
- Site should contain a community building, not housing
- Closure process is unlawful / not justified / no consultation
- Agree with redevelopment, however proposals need to be clearer
- Alternative venues could be used
- Clair Hall is considered in the past tense ("it was" rather than "it is") (Resident)
- There is a lack of commentary on the Clair Hall closure in this section (Resident)
- Any redevelopment would need to protect The Heath Conservation Area (Clair Park) (Historic England)

### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The role of the Masterplan is to provide principles for any future redevelopment of the site, recognising the fact that the site presents an Opportunity for redevelopment (as identified in the previously adopted 2007 Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan). Decisions related to its closure and any future uses are not matters for the Masterplan. Comments received during the consultation process will inform any decisions made regarding the future provision of community facilities.

The first principle for any redevelopment is “An assessment to establish the need for such a facility, and whether community facilities could be re-provided on site or elsewhere within the town”.

In total, 62% of respondents did not agree with the Aims and Principles. However, the written comments that accompanied this question relate to the principle of closure of the existing building rather than the principles set out in the Masterplan.

The Masterplan contains principles for any future redevelopment, these include the relationship to Clair Park, The Heath Conservation Area, important trees, access/crossings and potential for active ground floor uses.

It is suggested, to amend the text to clarify that the additional principles only apply once the first principle (related to establishing a need/re-provision) has been satisfied.

### **Proposed Changes**

- Amend the Aims and Principles to clarify that the principles only apply once the first principle has been satisfied.

## **MSDC Owned Car Parks**

### **Questionnaire Responses**

#### **Do you agree with the principle for these sites set out on p.73?**

<b>Yes</b>	32%
<b>No</b>	68%
<b>Total Responses</b>	117

### **Comments**

#### **Total Comments by email/post: 33**

### **Summary of Comments**

- Object to the redevelopment of Car Parks C, D and E for residential as this would urbanise the town centre (Resident)
- Disagree that 3-4 storey buildings would be appropriate (Resident)
- Removal of the car parks for residential – where would new residents park? (Resident)
- Parking provision is required to support retailers on Sussex Road and Haywards Road, object to the removal of the smaller car parks (x14 Residents/Organisations)
- Surface car parks are safer than a multi-storey, existing car parks should therefore be retained (Resident)
- Removal of these car parks would make some areas of the town less accessible, particularly those with impaired mobility (Resident)
- There is no evidence to suggest that motorists spend a long time searching for a parking space (x2 Resident)
- The Car Park in Franklynn Road is used by residents who would find parking difficult without this facility (Resident)

- Should ensure there is sufficient parking provision before closure, to ensure the Town Centre attracts visitors (Resident)
- The smaller car parks are likely to be less expensive to park in than a multi-storey (Resident)
- Site E Franklyn Road car park – Any new development at this site would need to protect the setting of The Priory. (Historic England)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The Masterplan concludes that the three smaller car parks (C, D and E) present an opportunity for redevelopment.

It should be noted that the closure of smaller car parks will be subject to additional future work through the Council's Parking Investment Strategy (a key action in the Parking Strategy), which will consider capacity and other measures. Any closure of car parks will be subject to the outcomes of this work, and the assurances that sufficient parking capacity exists in the town centre to meet demand.

It is suggested that this is clarified in this section.

#### **Proposed Changes**

- Include additional supporting text to explain that the decision to close any of the car parks will be subject to additional assessment through the Parking Investment Strategy (arising from the Parking Strategy). This will be subject to sufficient parking capacity being demonstrated.

### **Additional Opportunity Sites**

#### **Questionnaire Responses**

##### **Do you agree with the principle for sites F-M set out on p.67?**

<b>Yes</b>	32%
<b>No</b>	68%

##### **Are there any other opportunity sites within the Masterplan boundary with potential for improvement?**

<b>Yes</b>	15%
<b>No</b>	85%

**Total Responses** 117

#### **Comments**

##### **Total Comments by email/post: 8**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- Stockwell Court should be added to the list of Opportunity Sites (x2 Residents)
- Agree with the proposals for the old Woolworths store (site I) (Resident)
- Identification of residential Opportunity Sites (e.g. Barbican Court – site H) – require clarity of future plans for existing residents (Resident)
- Support the proposals for 2 The Broadway (site G), suggested wording change to refer to 5 storeys to reflect live planning application (Nexus Planning - Promoter)
- The Priory (site K) – Any new development here would need to be sensitive to and contextual with the historic architecture of The Priory irrespective of the architectural approach taken. (Historic England)
- Most are too aspirational and therefore unlikely to come to fruition (Resident)
- What would happen to existing occupiers (e.g. Texaco, Royal Mail and Fire Station)? (Residents)
- Too much emphasis on increasing residential (resident)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

Whilst 68% disagreed with the principles for the additional opportunity sites, the accompanying comments do not reflect general disagreement to the individual proposals. Instead, comments disagree with the overall principle of additional residential within the town centre (particularly at South Road), traffic generation as a result, and the loss of car parks (which is unrelated to this question and dealt with under a separate issue). Some disagreeing with the draft principles were doing so because they suggested additional sites for inclusion.

Questions were raised regarding the viability and availability of these sites, in particular those that are currently occupied. The Masterplan addresses this, however amendments could be made to make this clearer.

A number of comments suggested that Stockwell Court should be added to the list of additional opportunity sites. Given that this is a significant flatted development above a range of mixed-use units and given the high number of different ownerships within the building, it is unlikely that a viable and deliverable scheme could be developed within the timeframe of the Masterplan however reference can be added to improving shop facades on this site.

#### **Proposed Changes**

- Minor amendment to Site G “2 The Broadway” to reflect recent planning application
- Review current text related to availability/viability to provide clarity
- Add additional wording related to improving shop façades at Stockwell Court

## **Policy Interventions and Implementation**

#### **Policy Interventions**

##### **Total Comments by email/post: 1**

#### **Summary of Comments**

MSDC should resist changes that diminish the availability of good quality office space in Perrymount Road.

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

Officers agree with the above statement. However, Permitted Development rights are outside of the control of planning policy. However, the District Plan (policy DP1: Sustainable Economic Development) and proposed Sites DPD policy SA34: Existing Employment Sites provide policy support for the retention of existing employment space.

#### **Proposed Changes**

No amendments proposed.

#### **Implementation**

##### **Total Comments by email/post: 6**

#### **Summary of Comments**

- More information on funding sources/specifcics would be welcomed
- There is too much risk for the Council in funding the schemes proposed
- HHTC anticipates involvement in the detailed development of the Masterplan as individual projects are promoted for delivery, not simply as a consultee after the

plan is drawn up. We aim to cooperate and support MSDC so that we can champion the best solutions to improve the town for its residents (Haywards Heath Town Council)

- The table on p.78 of the report also implies schemes for The Broadway, Perrymount Road and Sussex Road suggests are identified for further progression within our Local Transport Improvement Programme but this is not currently the case so should be clarified. (West Sussex County Council)
- For simplicity it would be helpful to amend references to Local Transport Improvement Programme to Annual Delivery Programme as the specific delivery mechanism for schemes varies depending on the size of scheme. (West Sussex County Council)
- Please note that inclusion of any scheme on the Annual Delivery Programme is subject to funding opportunities and prioritisation amongst schemes across West Sussex. (West Sussex County Council)

#### **Officer Comments/Recommendations**

The responses relate to the need for additional clarity on next steps, or to state intentions to support any future work. The Implementation Strategy cannot presently set out the types/sources of funding for every project as these are unknown – this is because the Masterplan sets the framework rather than being the vehicle for delivery. The individual workstreams within the Implementation Strategy will each provide more detail where relevant, as and when they are progressed.

#### **Proposed Changes**

- Additional text to set out examples of funding sources, and explanation that schemes are subject to funding being secured will be added.
- Additional clarity to set out that the Masterplan is not the vehicle for delivery of future schemes, however provides a framework
- Amend text to clarify the position related to WSCC's Local Transport Improvement Programme and amend to Annual Delivery Programme