

Planning Committee



Recommended for Permission

10th July 2025

DM/25/0958



©Crown Copyright and database rights 2025 Ordnance Survey 100021794

Site:	Former Methodist Church Hall 42 Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for permission in principle for development of up to 6no. residential dwellings across a floor space of up to 1,000sqm
Applicant:	Marymount Properties Ltd
Category:	Minor Dwellings
Target Date:	23rd May 2025
Parish:	Hurstpierpoint And Sayers Common
Ward Members:	Cllr Alison Bennett / Cllr Rodney Jackson /

Case Officer:	Hamish Evans
----------------------	--------------

Link to Planning Documents:

<https://pa.midsussex.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=SUCOE3KT04L00>

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider the recommendation of the Assistant Director for Planning and Sustainable Economy on the application for permission in principle as detailed above.

2.0 Executive Summary

- 2.1 The application seeks Permission in Principle for six dwellings at Former Methodist Church Hall 42 Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint.
- 2.2 Issued in support of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Guidance on Permission in Principle (published 28 July 2017 updated March 2019) sets out matters within the scope of a decision, which are limited to: 'location, land use and amount of development'
- 2.3 The application should therefore only take into consideration issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters. Other matters should be considered at the technical details stage.
- 2.4 A decision on whether to grant a permission in principle must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the NPPF and National Guidance, which indicate otherwise.
- 2.5 Courts have confirmed that the Development Plan must be considered as a whole, not simply in relation to any one individual policy. It is therefore not the case that a proposal must accord with each and every policy within the Development Plan.
- 2.6 The application site is located within built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint and is considered to be sustainably located. The loss of the existing community facility in this instance is considered to be acceptable due to the existing facilities within the locality and the ongoing maintenance and running of the facility being unviable. The quantum of housing is also considered to be acceptable. The proposal is considered to be appropriate in relation to proposed location, land use and amount of development.
- 2.7 For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP4, DP6, DP21, DP25 and DP26 and Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan policy H1.

2.8 The NPPF states that planning should be genuinely plan-led. Paragraph 11(c) of the NPPF is clear that development proposals should be approved without delay where they are in accordance with an up-to-date Development Plan. It states further, paragraph 11(d), that where the policies most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole (the tilted balance). Footnote 8 of paragraph 11 clarifies that 'out-of-date' includes for applications the provision of housing in situations where the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

2.9 In these circumstances paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides for a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole (having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination), or specific policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development.

2.10 When undertaking the balancing exercise the following benefits, harms and neutral impacts are as follows:

In terms of the scheme's benefits, the proposal would form 6 dwellings. Socially, the provision of the new dwellings will bring about positive impacts to the local community. The construction of the development will provide local jobs and employment opportunities which is a positive impact. From an environmental view, the proposed development is sustainably located within close proximity to facilities, services and public transport. This is all positive in the planning balance.

It is not considered that the principle of the proposal would lead to any adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Whilst the proposal is for only 6 dwellings and makes a limited contribution, it would still contribute to the Council's much needed housing supply and make effective use of the land.

The neutral impacts relate to the impact on Ashdown Forest.

2.11 Paragraph 125 states in part (at criteria c) that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused. In this case substantial harm has not been demonstrated and as such substantial weight needs to be given in the planning balance to the value of developing this brownfield site. The proposed

development of this brownfield site in a built up area will ensure that para 125 c of the NPPF is met. This is positive in the planning balance.

- 2.12 Due to the nature of this permission in principle application 'location, land use and amount of development' are the only matters that are within the scope of the determination of this application. Issues such as design/character, highways and parking, neighbouring amenity, impact on conservation area, flood risk and drainage, biodiversity and sustainable design are to be considered at a technical details consent stage, and as such they are not considered to contribute to the planning balance exercise. In this instance it is considered that the location, land use and amount of development is acceptable due to the site being within the built up area of Hurstpierpoint and in a sustainable location.
- 2.13 In weighing up these issues, when taken together, and in the absence of any adverse impacts it is not considered there are adverse impacts of the development which would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal in principle.
- 2.14 As such it is considered that the planning balance falls significantly in favour of granting planning permission in principle and it should be approved as per the recommendation A below. Planning permission in principle should therefore be granted.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that planning permission in principle be approved subject to the conditions outlined at Appendix A.

4.0 Summary of Representations

- 4.1 5 third-party letters of representation have been received in respect of this application. 3 letters were received which raised objection to the proposal, the reasons for their objections have been summarised below:
- Lack of information submitted with the application,
 - Number of dwellings excessive for the site,
 - Overdevelopment impact on character of area,
 - Nature and scale of proposed works significantly alter the character of the building and surrounding environment,
 - Significant noise and disturbance during construction and post construction,
 - Noise levels and impact on quality of life of neighbours,
 - Overbearing impact,
 - Impact on highways safety,
 - Overlooking to neighbouring properties, and
 - Impact on parks in surrounding area.
- 4.2 One letter of representation has been received neither supporting or objecting to the proposal but queries what the proposal plans are.

4.3 One letter of representation has been received neither supporting or objecting to the proposal but raises concern over overlooking and impact on privacy. It also states too many dwellings are proposed and impact on parking.

5.0 Summary of Consultees

MSDC Land Contamination

No comment.

MSDC Street Naming and Numbering

Recommend informative.

MSDC Conservation Officer

Less than substantial harm due to impact on character and appearance of Conservation Area, in terms of change of use, potential loss of building, intensity of use, and impact on appearance of existing building if retained. Contrary to policy DP35 of the District Plan.

MSDC Corporate Estates

Correct sale process has been undertaken and application to remove ACV has been submitted.

WSCC Local Highways Authority

No objection.

WSCC Section 106 Team

Advice of potential S106 contributions.

Southern Water

Insufficient information.

6.0 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council Observations

The committee recommend MSDC should refuse permission.

The committee is concerned that significant statements in the applicant's planning statement are factually incorrect: The committee refutes the suggestion that the previous owners went to great lengths to identify an appropriate purchaser for the Methodist Church: no evidence of any formal marketing has been seen or evidenced in the year between closure in 2023 and auction in 2025.

The Parish Council was interested in acquiring the building for the benefit of the local community but found the previous owners unwilling to engage, to the extent that the Parish Council and its appointed surveyor was initially unable to view the building. Access to the building was not granted until it was placed into auction in 2025. This is not in accordance with Criteria 1 of Policy DP25 which supports the retention and reuse of community facilities.

The Parish Council made a competitive offer for the Methodist Church that was not much dissimilar to the final auction selling price.

The application correctly states that the church has not been in use by community groups since December 2023, but the reason for this was because all community groups were evicted at that point in time by the previous owner.

The Parish Council successfully took steps to have the building listed as an asset of community value in response to significant interest and direct approaches from community groups in the parish.

The application lists 10 other local facilities for community groups. Only two of which are actually located within the village and in walking distance of residents. The remaining eight are located in different towns and villages, most of which are a significant car journey away from Hurstpierpoint, with no direct public transport links available to those locations.

The village has a shortfall of community venues of this size and type, with demonstrable demand (see above re community asset listing).

Should MSDC be minded to give permission to this application, the Committee would support the dwellings in principle, on the proviso that there are two off-street parking spaces allocated per dwelling. On-street parking should be prohibited due to the current lack of on-street parking availability and resultant parking challenges on this road and surrounding areas. Following the recent death of a cyclist on Cuckfield Road directly outside the Methodist Church (February 2024) the committee has concerns about public safety, particularly in respect to access on and off a busy road with reduced visibility due to on-street parking. Consideration should also be given to the existing bus stop at the location.

7.0 Introduction

7.1 The application seeks Permission in Principle for six dwellings at Former Methodist Church Hall 42 Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint BN6 9SA.

7.2 The application is before members as in accordance with the Council's Constitution a Planning Chairman and the relevant Ward Members were consulted on the application and it was requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

8.0 Relevant Planning History

No relevant history.

9.0 Site and Surroundings

9.1 The site is located within the Hurstpierpoint built up area boundary and the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. There are areas of risk of flooding from surface water within the site.

9.2 Residential properties are located to the north, south, east and west of the site. Cuckfield Road is located to the west of the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in its nature with a variety of external materials used.

9.3 The application site has a site area of some 0.1 hectares and consists of a church building, a number of single storey building used incidentally to the main building and a parking area. The site would be accessed through an existing access to the west of the site from Cuckfield Road. The existing boundary treatment surrounding the site consists of a mixture of brick walls measuring some 1.0 metres in height and closed board fences and hedgerows measuring some 1.8 metres in height. The main building was previously used as a church building and the submitted documents state that it has not been used as such since 2023. The existing main building is considered to be of a contemporary church design which is characterised by bare brown brick walls, brown clay roof tiles, white uPVC window and door frames and grey metal door frames.

10.0 Application Details

10.1 The application seeks Permission in Principle for six dwellings at Former Methodist Church Hall 42 Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint.

10.2 Due to the type of application limited information has been provided. However, a location plan has been submitted showing the red line of the application site including the existing access from Cuckfield Road to the west of the site.

11.0 Legal Framework and List of Policies

11.1 Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

11.2 Specifically Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,*
- b) And local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and*
- c) Any other material considerations.'*

11.3 Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

11.4 The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

11.5 Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published.

- 11.6 Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.
- 11.7 National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

- 11.8 The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on the 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP4 – Housing

DP6 - Settlement Hierarchy

DP17 - Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

DP21 – Transport

DP25 – Community Facilities and Local Services

DP26 - Character and Design

DP27 – Dwelling Space Standards

DP35 – Conservation Area

DP39 – Sustainable Design and Construction

DP41 – Flood Risk and Drainage

Site Allocation DPD

- 11.9 The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031. There are not relevant policies.

The Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan

- 11.10 The Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 19th March 2018.

Relevant policy:

H1 – Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common New Housing Development.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Submission Draft (Regulation 19)

- 11.11 The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the policies in the draft

District Plan and as such, only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPB3 – Conservation Areas
DPT3 - Active and Sustainable Travel
DPH1 - Housing
DPH3 - Sustainable Development – Inside the Built-up Area
DPH11 - Dwelling Space Standards

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

- 11.12 The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

- 11.13 The NPPF sets out the government's policy in order to ensure that the planning system contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 sets out the three overarching objectives to sustainable development, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives). The three objectives are economic, social and environmental.
- 11.14 Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states *'these objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in this Framework; they are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.'*
- 11.15 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out that for both plan-making and decision-taking, the presumption in favour of sustainable development should apply.
- 11.16 Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states;

'The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.'

11.17 Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states;

'Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'

11.18 With specific reference to decision-taking paragraph 48 states that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Design Guide

Ministerial Statement and Design Guide

11.19 On 1 October 2019 the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government made a statement relating to design. The thrust of the statement was that the Government was seeking to improve the quality of design and drive up the quality of new homes. The Government also published a National Design Guide, which is a material planning consideration.

11.20 The National Design Guide provides guidance on what the Government considers to be good design and provides examples of good practice. It notes that social, economic and environmental change will influence the planning, design and construction of new homes and places.

12.0 Assessment

12.1 Issued in support of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Guidance on Permission in Principle (published 28 July 2017 updated March 2019) sets out matters within the scope of a decision, which are limited to: 'location, land use and amount of development' (NPPG Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 58-012-20180615).

12.2 The application should take into consideration issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters; other matters should be considered at the technical details stage. A decision on whether to grant a permission in principle must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the NPPF and National Guidance, which indicate otherwise.

12.3 This means that matters such as impact on heritage assets, siting, design, scale, accessibility, impact on neighbouring occupiers, impact on trees, biodiversity, flood risk and drainage cannot be considered at this stage. They would however be considered at the technical details stage instead.

12.4 The application as submitted contains a location plan denoting the extent of the application site along with an application form and a planning statement. These state the application proposes the creation of six dwellings. The planning statement

states that the proposed units would likely be provided through the conversion of the existing building.

- 12.5 Taking each of the matters for consideration in order:

Location

- 12.6 The application site is designated as being within the built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint as defined by the District Plan. As the proposed development is within the built-up area of Hurstpierpoint, the principle of additional windfall housing development is considered acceptable under Policy DP6 of the District Plan which states:

'Development will be permitted within towns and villages with defined built-up area boundaries. Any infilling and redevelopment will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate nature and scale (with particular regard to DP26: Character and Design), and not cause harm to the character and function of the settlement.'

- 12.7 Policy Hurst H1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan refers to new housing development and states in part that:

'To meet the future needs in the Neighbourhood Plan Area new housing development will be supported in areas which:

(a) Enhance the existing settlement pattern of the village;

(b) In Hurstpierpoint, can also provide significant areas of parkland adjacent to the built zones, to be owned and managed by the local community;'

- 12.8 It is considered that as the site is adjacent to existing residential properties, that the proposal would enhance the existing settlement pattern of the village.
- 12.9 The principle of development is therefore deemed acceptable in relation to location; matters relating to the above criteria will in part form consideration of 'amount of development' below. However more detailed assessment of matters such as materials, amenity space and neighbouring properties amenities would be considered at the technical details consent stage should permission in principle be approved.
- 12.10 As per planning legislation, a decision must be made in accordance with the development plan unless there are any material planning considerations which indicate otherwise.
- 12.11 The policies contained within the NPPF are material considerations which should be taken into account in the determination of this application. This is confirmed within paragraph 231 of the NPPF.
- 12.12 Paragraph 232 clarifies that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 12.13 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and states;

'For decision-taking this means;

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development policies, or the policies which are most important for the determining the application are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless;

i. The application of policies within this Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing development proposed; or

ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.'

- 12.14 Footnote 7 of paragraph 11(i) clarifies that the policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) and relate to habitats sites (and those and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets and other heritage assets of archaeological interest; and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.
- 12.15 Footnote 8 of paragraph 11 clarifies that for applications involving the provision of housing, in situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year land supply of delivery housing sites (with an appropriate buffer) or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery of housing has been substantially below (less than 75%) of the housing requirement for the last three years, then relevant policies for the supply of housing should be considered out-of-date.
- 12.16 Having regard to the above, while the Council has performed excellently in respect of the Housing Delivery Test, a new standard method formula was published alongside the NPPF which gives Mid Sussex a significantly higher housing requirement than the current District Plan. As a result, and having regard for the need for an appropriate buffer, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites as per the requirements of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.
- 12.17 In light of the above, this development needs to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. If a development is found to be sustainable, that would weigh heavily in favour of granting permission in the paragraph 11(d) balance. If however, the development is not found to be sustainable, that is not the end of the matter; the Local Planning Authority still need to go through the weighing up process between the positive benefits of the scheme against any harm that may be caused, having particular regard for the key policies indicated in paragraph 11(d)(ii).
- 12.18 As part of this process, the weight to be given to development plan policies will need to be assessed against the degree of conformity with the NPPF.

- 12.19 Policies DP4 (Housing), DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy H1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan are relevant to this application. These policies are considered to be policies relating to the supply of housing and as such can be considered to be out-of-date, having regard to the NPPF tests. As such, these policies can be given limited weight in the determination of the application.
- 12.20 Therefore, the key test that must be undertaken when assessing this application is as set out within para 11(d) of the NPPF.
- 12.21 The site falls within Flood Zone 1 but is subject to surface water flooding. Details concerning how the site would be drained if it were to be developed is a matter which would be considered at the technical matters stage.
- 12.22 The sustainability of a site is a consideration. The NPPF recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable travel solutions will vary between urban and rural area, however it also encourages development to be focused on locations that limits the need for travel as set out with paragraph 115 of the NPPF. This aligns with the aims of Policy DP21 of the MSDP. As policy DP21 accords with the aims of the NPPF, it can be afforded full weight. The site is located within the Hurstpierpoint built up area boundary with good access to public transport links. A bus stop is located on Cuckfield Road adjacent to the site and Hurstpierpoint High Street is located some 250 metres to the south of the site which is accessed through a well-lit pavement adjacent to Cuckfield Road. As such any future occupiers would not be highly reliant on the use of motor vehicles to access local services and that these could be accessed through sustainable means.
- 12.23 Due to the location of the site being within the built up area of Hurstpierpoint, the principle of development is therefore deemed to be acceptable in relation to location and complies with policies DP4, DP6 and DP21 of the District Plan and policy H1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.

Land use

- 12.24 As set out above the site is located within a sustainable location within the built-up area of Hurstpierpoint. The site currently consists of a community facility as defined within policy DP25 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. This states:
- ‘Where proposals involve the loss of a community facility, (including those facilities where the loss would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs locally) evidence will need to be provided that demonstrates:*
- that the use is no longer viable; or*
 - that there is an existing duplicate facility in the locality which can accommodate the impact of the loss of the facility; or*
 - that a replacement facility will be provided in the locality.’*
- 12.25 The site has previously been listed as an Asset of Community Value (ACV). The Council’s Corporate Estates team have confirmed that the process to de-register the site as an ACV has been followed and that the site is no longer considered to be an ACV.
- 12.26 The submitted planning statement states that the site initially stopped being used as a community building in December 2023 and that this was due to a dwindling congregation which due to the scale of the building made its ongoing running and maintenance unviable. Since then, the building has been unoccupied. It states that

the building was listed for sale in accordance with the ACV process and that whilst the Parish Council were an interested party in that sale, they were unable to purchase the property. The property was then put up for auction on two separate occasions where it was purchased on the second occasion by the applicant.

- 12.27 The submitted planning statement sets out that there are a number of existing community buildings within the surrounding area with two of these being within the Hurstpierpoint built up area boundary. Whilst the lawful use of the site is as a community building the application site has not been used as a community building since December 2023.
- 12.28 Whilst the loss of the community facility is regrettable, it is considered that it has been evidenced that the use of the building as a community facility is no longer viable and that there are duplicate facilities in the locality which can accommodate the impact of the loss of the facility. The proposed land use for residential purposes is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle and complies with policy DP25 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.
- 12.29 The Parish Council have recommended refusal of the proposal due to its non-compliance with policy DP25 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the loss the community facility, lack of community facilities within the surrounding area and that the marketing of the site was insufficient. These comments are noted however given the above assessment the loss of the existing use is considered to be acceptable and the proposed land use is acceptable in principle. The Council's Corporate Estates team have confirmed that the correct process has been undertaken to delist the site as an ACV.

Amount of development

- 12.30 In relation to amount of development and in the absence of specific national guidance that would undermine this approach, consideration will be given to matters which could render the proposal for six dwellings on the site unacceptable in principle.
- 12.31 In the absence of supporting information, the Local Planning Authority and relevant consultees have drawn on the resources available at the time of the application in order to inform their consideration of these matters.
- 12.32 In relation to the size and shape of the plot and its possibility to accommodate six dwellings, Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*

- *protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- *does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP27);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- *take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'*

- 12.33 Details of the scale, design and relationship with neighbouring properties are matters reserved for the technical details consent stage. The submitted planning statement advises that the proposal will look to accommodate the proposed six dwellings within the existing built form.
- 12.34 The existing site is significantly larger than the residential sites within the surrounding area. There are several large-scale buildings within Hurstpierpoint that have either been converted or had consent granted to be converted to multiple smaller residential units. The application sites relationship with neighbouring properties and the intention to provide the proposed units within the existing built form are considered to be constraining features of the site, however given the scale of the site and the relatively significant scale of the existing building it is considered that the site could potentially accommodate six residential units. Matters of design, appearance, scale, parking and impact on amenities of nearby residents would fall to be properly considered as part of the technical detail consent stage. It should also be noted that the Local Highways Authority have at this stage raised no objection to the principle of the development.
- 12.35 Taking into account, the above it is considered that the proposed quantum of dwelling to be provided could potentially be accommodated on the site in principle and as such the proposal could comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.
- 12.36 A number of representation letters have been received which object to the proposal due to the number of units proposed representing overdevelopment of the site. Whilst these comments are noted, given the above assessment the application site is considered to be able to accommodate the proposed six dwellings in principle. Details of siting, character and scale of the proposed development will be properly assessed in the technical detail consent stage.

Ashdown Forest

- 12.37 Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations'), the competent authority - in this case, Mid Sussex District Council - has a duty to ensure that any plans or projects that they regulate (including plan making and determining planning applications) will have no adverse effect on the integrity of a European site of nature conservation importance. The

European site of focus is the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

12.38 The potential effects of development on Ashdown Forest were assessed during the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. This process identified likely significant effects on the Ashdown Forest SPA from recreational disturbance and on the Ashdown Forest SAC from atmospheric pollution.

12.39 A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed development.

Recreational disturbance

12.40 Increased recreational activity arising from new residential development and related population growth is likely to disturb the protected near-ground and ground nesting birds on Ashdown Forest.

12.41 In accordance with advice from Natural England, the HRA for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, and as detailed in District Plan Policy DP17, mitigation measures are necessary to counteract the effects of a potential increase in recreational pressure and are required for developments resulting in a net increase in dwellings within a 7km zone of influence around the Ashdown Forest SPA. A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation approach has been developed. This mitigation approach has been agreed with Natural England.

12.42 The proposed development is outside the 7km zone of influence and as such, mitigation is not required.

Atmospheric pollution

12.43 Increased traffic emissions as a consequence of new development may result in atmospheric pollution on Ashdown Forest. The main pollutant effects of interest are acid deposition and eutrophication by nitrogen deposition. High levels of nitrogen may detrimentally affect the composition of an ecosystem and lead to loss of species.

12.44 The proposed development was modelled in the Mid Sussex Transport Study as a windfall development such that its potential effects are incorporated into the overall results of the transport model, which indicates there would not be an overall impact on Ashdown Forest. Additionally, based on analysis of Census 2011 data, the proposed development is not likely to generate travel to work journeys across Ashdown Forest. This means that there is not considered to be a significant in combination effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC by this development proposal.

Conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment

12.45 The Habitats Regulations Assessment concludes that there would be no likely significant effects, alone or in combination, on the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC from the proposed development.

12.46 No mitigation is required in relation to the Ashdown Forest SPA or SAC.

- 12.47 A full HRA (that is, the appropriate assessment stage that ascertains the effect on integrity of the European site) of the proposed development is not required.

Other Matters

- 12.48 A number of representation letters have raised concerns due to the limited details of the proposed development being submitted. Due to the type of application an application form and a plan identifying the land to which the application relates is required to be submitted and sufficient information has been provided to meet the requirements of this type of application.
- 12.49 Objections have been received due to the impact on the character of the area, impact on neighbouring properties amenities during the construction of the development and post-construction, overbearing impact, overlooking, impact on highways safety and impact on parking within the surrounding area. The Parish Council have also objected due to highways safety issues. Due to the nature of this application these issues cannot be considered at this stage but would be dealt with at the technical details consent stage.
- 12.50 The Council's Conservation Officer has identified less than substantial harm due to impact on character and appearance of Conservation Area. Due to the nature of this application the impact on the Conservation Area cannot be considered at this stage but would be dealt with at the technical details consent stage.
- 12.51 Southern Water have stated that insufficient information has been provided for them to comment on the application. Flood risk and drainage issues would also be dealt with at the technical details consent stage.

13.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 13.1 Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.
- 13.2 For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP4, DP6, DP21, DP25 and DP26 and Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan policy H1.
- 13.3 The application site is located within built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint and is considered to be sustainably located. The loss of the existing community facility in this instance is considered to be acceptable due to the existing facilities within the locality and the ongoing maintenance and running of the facility being unviable. The quantum of housing is also considered to be acceptable. The proposal is considered to be appropriate in relation to proposed location, land use and amount of development.
- 13.4 As a result, it is considered that the application complies with the development plan when read as a whole. This is not the end point as planning law requires that 'where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the

development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.

- 13.5 As the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, it follows that the relevant policies for the supply of housing from the development plan are out-of-date (footnote 8 of paragraph 11 NPPF). As such, reduced weight should be given to these policies.
- 13.6 In these circumstances paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides for a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole (having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination), or specific policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development.
- 13.7 When undertaking the balancing exercise the following benefits, harms and neutral impacts are as follows:
- In terms of the scheme's benefits, the proposal would form 6 dwellings. Socially, the provision of the new dwellings will bring about positive impacts to the local community. The construction of the development will provide local jobs and employment opportunities which is a positive impact. From an environmental view, the proposed development is sustainably located within close proximity to facilities, services and public transport. This is all positive in the planning balance.
- It is not considered that the principle of the proposal would lead to any adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Whilst the proposal is for only 6 dwellings and makes a limited contribution, it would still contribute to the Council's much needed housing supply and make effective use of the land.
- The neutral impacts relate to the impact on Ashdown Forest.
- 13.8 Paragraph 125 states in part (at criteria c) that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused. In this case substantial harm has not been demonstrated and as such substantial weight needs to be given in the planning balance to the value of developing this brownfield site. The proposed development of this brownfield site in a built up area will ensure that para 125 c of the NPPF is met. This is positive in the planning balance.
- 13.9 Due to the nature of this application issues such as design and character, highways and parking, neighbouring amenity, impact on conservation area, flood risk and drainage, biodiversity and sustainable design are to be considered at a technical details consent stage and as such they are not considered to contribute to the planning balance exercise.
- 13.10 In weighing up these issues, when taken together, it is not considered that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

- 13.11 In these circumstances the NPPF states that permission should be granted, and this is a material consideration of sufficient weight to overcome the proposal's conflict with the development plan.
- 13.12 There are no other material considerations that would alter the above planning balance. In the absence of any adverse impacts, it is considered that the planning balance falls significantly in favour of granting planning permission in principle.

APPENDIX A – RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Informatives

1. It is suggested that as part of the technical consent application that the following information is provided:
 - a. Location Plan,
 - b. Block Plan,
 - c. Existing and Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations, Roof Plans, Sections and Street Scene (All to identifiable scales),
 - d. Biodiversity Net Gain information in accordance with The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024 and the Environment Act 2021,
 - e. Flood Risk Assessment,
 - f. Foul Sewage and Surface Water Drainage Assessment,
 - g. Heritage Statement,
 - h. Planning Obligation Instruction Form,
 - i. Planning Statement,
 - j. Sustainability and Energy Statement,
 - k. Proposed Vehicular Access Arrangements,
 - l. Parking and Turning Details, and
 - m. Secure and Covered Cycle Storage Details.
2. In accordance with Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans Referred to in Consideration of this Application

The following plans and documents were considered when making the above decision:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Submitted Date
Location Plan	P.01		07.04.2025

APPENDIX B – CONSULTATIONS

MSDC Contaminated Land

Having examined the data at our disposal concerning this site, I have not encountered any indications or information suggesting that the land in question might be contaminated.

Therefore, based on the mapping data currently available, I do not have any specific comments regarding the possibility of contaminated land.

However, it is important to note that the absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence, and the developer should be aware there may still be potential risks or hazards associated with the land that are not apparent from the available data.

MSDC Street Naming and Numbering

Please can you ensure that the street naming and numbering informative is added to any decision notice granting approval in respect of the planning applications listed below as these applications will require address allocation if approved. Thank you.

Informative (Info29)

The proposed development will require formal address allocation. You are advised to contact the Council's Street Naming and Numbering Officer before work starts on site. Details of fees and advice for developers can be found at www.midsussex.gov.uk/streetnaming or by phone on 01444 477175.

Planning applications requiring SNN informative

MSDC Conservation Officer

The proposed development site is the former Methodist Church Hall located to the eastern side of Cuckfield Road within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The current proposal is for the development of up to 6 dwellings on the site across a floorspace of up to 1000 square metres.

Due in part to the relative isolation of the area prior to the development of improved road, and later rail, transport during the 18th and 19th centuries, Sussex has a long tradition of non-conformist religion, which is witnessed by the survival of chapel buildings belonging to various denominations in many local settlements, including several within Hurstpierpoint. The significance of these buildings within the village, both in terms of its history and street scene, is noted within the adopted Conservation Area Character Appraisal at p. 11 'Nonconformist Hurstpierpoint'.

Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area Appraisal

The Chapel in question was only quite recently included within the Conservation Area, when the boundary was reviewed and several extensions made in 2018. The adopted appraisal justifies the relevant extension northwards along Cuckfield Road as follows:

‘St Christopher’s house is dated 1898 and has four spectacular stacks of ornate brick chimneypots as well as decorative hopper heads to the downpipes. This is followed by several attractive Victorian and Edwardian houses with strong architecture, then the Methodist church. The Victorian and Edwardian houses retain many original features such as Palladian window surrounds.

The boundary of the Conservation Area on Cuckfield Road at present excludes this historic cluster of buildings including the old bakery and Methodist Chapel, as well as a mix of Victorian and Edwardian properties including St Christopher’s which are attractive and characterful, and retain many original features. Most front gardens are planted with hedges and trees which soften the street scene.

The long straight road is the main northern approach to Hurstpierpoint, and looking south allows glimpses of the landmark church steeple in the distance. It is a key gateway into the village centre, and is lined by attractive and characterful buildings. A boundary adjustment would help safeguard the special character of this part of the village.’

Historical map regression suggests that the Chapel dates from the early 20th century, and retains some of its original features, although it has a later extension to the front. It is a prominent building in the street scene, and is of some character, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. It is worth noting that the revised boundary extends specifically to include the church at its northernmost point, which is a recognition of the value of the building in this respect. The building is also a historical focus of the local community, which is recognised in its previous designation as an asset of communal value. The Chapel closed in 2023.

In this context, there would be in an in principle objection to the loss of the existing building in terms of adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, it is noted that the submitted planning statements suggests that the new dwellings would ‘likely be provided through the conversion of the existing buildings on the site’. I also note that this statement suggests that matters of heritage and design will not be considered by the applicant at this stage, but will be reserved for a possible further technical details consent application - I am assuming that as I have been consulted on the current application these matters can in fact to some extent at least be taken into consideration as part of the current proposal.

In my opinion, the proposal raises a number of potential concerns in terms of the impact on the Conservation Area:

- The proposed change of use of the building would result in the loss of a community facility (specifically the church hall) which is clearly valued by local residents, and has been a focus of local activity for worship and other purposes for over 100 years. Notwithstanding the applicant’s point that the immediately surrounding area is largely residential in nature, the loss of this facility will have an adverse impact on the vitality of the area, which will detract from its character.
- The applicant appears unwilling to commit themselves as to whether the existing building would be retained as part of the detailed proposals. The loss of the existing

building would be damaging to the character and appearance of the street scene and of the Conservation Area, for the reasons set out above.

- Based on the very limited information in front of us regarding the floor plan of the existing building, I find it difficult to envisage how the chapel could be converted to create up to 6 new residential units without adverse impact to its external appearance. The existing spaces within the building, including the large volume of the church hall, and the existing elevational treatment including the sweeping roofs and the disposition of the fenestration (which appears to be almost entirely at ground floor, with the exception of the front facing gable), do not appear conducive to this intensive a use without extensive alterations, including to the exterior. Such extensive alterations are likely to detract from the character and appearance of the building and its contribution to the Conservation Area.

For these reasons it is my opinion that the current proposal, based on the limited detail in front of us, raises significant concerns in terms of the potential impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, both in terms of the change of use in itself, the potential (which is not ruled out by the applicant) for the loss of the existing building, and of the proposed intensity of that use, and likely associated impact on the appearance of the existing building if retained. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 which states that: 'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it.' In terms of the NPPF it is difficult to assign a level of harm without a fully detailed proposal, but I would expect this to fall within the less than substantial range, such that paragraph 215 will apply.

MSDC Corporate Estates

I can confirm that the vendors and purchasers followed the correct process for the sale of this property and that an application to remove the ACV listing has been submitted as the attached emails.

WSCC Highways

This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals.

This application seeks Permission in Principle for a development of up to six residential dwellings. The site is located on Cuckfield Road, a C-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph in this location.

As per the application type, details have not been provided in regards to dwelling size (number of bedrooms), vehicle access or parking provision. At Technical Details Consent stage, the LHA would expect details to be provided demonstrating proposed vehicular access arrangements to the site, sufficient space for parking and turning of vehicles in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards. Sufficient secure and covered cycle storage should also be demonstrated, to encourage sustainable transport methods and reduce the reliance upon the private car.

As outlined above, the LHA is limited in its ability to comment on an application for permission in principle. In principle, the LHA would not raise any objections to an application at this site, subject to the submission of sufficient information at Technical Details Stage.

WSCC Section 106 Team

S106 Contributions Sought

Education
Libraries
Total Access Demand

Without prejudice to the informal representations of the County Council in respect of the above planning proposal, I am writing to advise you as to the likely requirements for contributions towards the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, other than highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

The CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended by the CIL amendment Regulations 2019) came into force on 1st September 2019 and clarify that an authority collecting contributions through the use of S106 agreements may now lawfully charge a fee for monitoring the planning obligations they contain. From 1st April 2025 West Sussex County Council will increase the S106 monitoring fee to £270 per trigger, per year of monitoring. Financial triggers are monitored for an average of three years and will therefore produce a fee of £810 per trigger, with non-financial triggers taking around six years to fulfil and therefore costing £1620.

The proposal falls within the Mid Sussex District and the contributions comply with the provisions of Mid Sussex District Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document-Development Infrastructure and Contributions July 2018.

The planning obligation formulae below are understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2019*.

The advice is as follows:

1. School Infrastructure Contribution

1.1 The Director for Children and Young People's Services advises that it appears that at present primary/secondary schools within the catchment area of the proposal currently would not have spare capacity and would not be able to accommodate the children generated by the assumed potential residential development from this proposal. Accordingly, contributions would need to be requested. However, the situation will be monitored and further advice on all of the main education sectors, (i.e. Primary/Secondary/Further Secondary) should be sought if this planning application is to be progressed.

1.2 Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings, but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the education catchment area; the County Council's adopted floorspace standard for education provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional education floorspace. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal

Agreement in order that the school infrastructure contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the School Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

(Cost Multiplier (Primary) x TPR = Primary Education Contribution) + (Cost Multiplier (Secondary) x TPR = Secondary Education Contribution) + (Cost Multiplier (Further Secondary) x TPR = Further Secondary Education Contribution) = Education Contribution where:

Note: x = “multiplied by ...”

Cost Multiplier = For allocated sites means Faithful and Gould costs produced in ‘Developer Contributions Exercise Order of Estimates – Education Infrastructure’, December 2021 (Rev 1).

For Windfall Sites means Department for Education (DfE) scorecard figures

Total Places Required (number of school places the Development will generate) = Average Child Product (ACP) x Year Groups

ACP = The estimated additional number of school age children likely to be generated by the Development calculated by reference to the total number of Housing Units/Dwellings, less any allowance for affordable dwellings (which for Mid Sussex District is 33% for social rented/affordable rent but for all other forms of affordable tenure no discount is applied], as approved by a subsequent reserved matters planning application. WSCC use the latest published county wide occupancy rates from the census statistics published by the Office for National Statistics. The current occupancy rates are given below as a guideline only:

		Dwelling Size	Occupancy
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.5	1.3
2 bed	=	1.9	1.9
3 bed	=	2.5	2.4
4+ bed	=	3.0	2.8

To determine an overall population increase the following factors are applied.

There are 13 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for houses and 8 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for flats (2021 Census data).

Year Groups = There are 7 year groups for Primary (years R to 6) and 5 for Secondary (years 7 to 11). For Sixth Form there are two year groups (years 12 and 13) but a factor of 0.54 is applied to the TPR figure as this is the average percentage of year 11 school leavers who continue into Sixth Form education in West Sussex.

- 1.3 The primary education contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional facilities at St. Lawrence CofE Primary School, or another primary school in the planning area of Hassocks should this be more suitable at the time that the contribution is made.
- 1.4 The secondary education contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional facilities at Downlands Community School, or another secondary school in the planning area of Hassocks should this be more suitable at the time that the contribution is made.

2. Library Infrastructure Contribution

- 2.1 The County Librarian advises that the proposed development would be within the area served by Hurstpierpoint Library and that the library would not currently be able to adequately serve the additional needs that the development would generate.

However, a scheme is approved to provide additional floorspace at the library. In the circumstances, a financial contribution towards the approved scheme would be required in respect of the extra demands for library services that would be generated by the proposed development.

2.2 Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development; the County Council's adopted floorspace standard for library provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional library floorspace. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the library contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the Libraries Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

$L \times AP = \text{Libraries Infrastructure Contribution}$ where:

Note: x = multiplied by.

AP (Additional Persons) = The estimated number of additional persons generated by the Development calculated by reference to the total number of Housing Units/Dwellings, as approved by a subsequent reserve matters planning application.

Using the latest published occupancy rates from census statistics published by the Office for National Statistics with the current occupancy rates given as a guideline:

Dwelling Size	Occupancy	
	House	Flat
1 bed	= 1.5	1.3
2 bed	= 1.9	1.9
3 bed	= 2.5	2.4
4+ bed	= 3.0	2.8

L = Extra library space in sqm. per 1,000 population x the library cost multiplier (which currently for the financial year 2025/2026 are [30/35 sq.m] and £6,621 per sqm respectively).

- 2.3 The contribution generated by this proposal shall be spent on providing additional facilities at Hurstpierpoint Library.

3. Transport (TAD) Contribution

- 3.1 The Total Access Demand Contribution will be calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:

Total Access Demand Contribution = Sustainable Access Contribution + Infrastructure Contribution, where:

Sustainable Access Contribution = (C – D) x E, where:

C (Total Access) = (A (number of dwellings) x B (Occupancy per dwelling)) using the latest published occupancy rates from census statistics published by the Office for National Statistics with the current occupancy rates given as a guideline:

Dwelling Size	Occupancy	
	House	Flat
1 bed	= 1.5	1.3
2 bed	= 1.9	1.9
3 bed	= 2.5	2.4
4 bed	= 3.0	2.8

D = Parking Spaces provided by the residential development element of the Proposed Development

E = Standard multiplier of £864

Infrastructure Contribution = D x F, where:

D = Parking Spaces provided by the residential development element of the Proposed Development

F = Standard multiplier of £1,730

- 3.2 The contribution generated by this proposal shall be spent on active travel improvements in Hurstpierpoint which improve sustainable movement between the development and local infrastructure.

General points

Please ensure that the applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, either size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional County Council services should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

All contributions will be index linked from the date of this consultation response to the date the contributions become due.

Appropriate occupancy rates using the latest available Census data will be used.

Should you require further general information or assistance in relation to the requirements for contributions towards the provision of County Council service infrastructure please contact, in the first instance, the Planning Applications Team officer, named above.

Where the developer intends to keep some of the estate roads private we will require provisions in any s106 agreement to ensure that they are properly built, never offered for adoption and that a certificate from a suitably qualified professional is provided confirming their construction standard.

Any payment required for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in respect of the proposed development is due either on the commencement of development or receipt of a TRO application to the County Council, whichever is the earlier.

Where land is to be transferred to the County Council as part of the development (e.g. a school site) that we will require the developer to provide CAD drawings of the site to aid design/layout and to ensure that there is no accidental encroachment by either the developer or WSCC.

Southern Water

Thank you for your correspondence. Please see our comments below regarding the above planning consultation application.

Development Site is not within Southern Water's Supply Area

The development site is not located within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply services. Please contact the relevant statutory undertaker.

Insufficient Information provided

Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul/surface water drainage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.