

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS  
2017 SCREENING MATRIX**

1. CASE DETAILS			
<b>Case Reference</b>		<b>Brief description of the project / development</b>	Proposed Development of Land at LVS Hassocks, London Road, Sayers Common, comprising demolition of existing school buildings, bar the chapel, and the development of part of Land at LVS Hassocks so as to accommodate a new SEN School with associated access, car parking, landscaping and drainage works; and the development of part of land at LVS Hassocks so as to accommodate up to 210 dwellinghouses (including affordable housing) with associated access, car parking, landscaping, play areas, informal outdoor space and drainage works.
<b>Appellant</b>	Wates Developments Limited		
<b>LPA</b>	Mid Sussex District Council		
2. EIA DETAILS			
<b>Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations?</b>			No
<b>If YES, which description of development (THEN GO TO Q4)</b>			
<b>Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?</b>			Yes
<b>If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?</b>			The proposed development falls within category 10 of Schedule 2, 'Infrastructure Projects', sub-section (b) 'Urban Development Projects'.
<b>Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?</b>			The site is not within a 'sensitive area'. The South Downs National Park is over 2km the south of the site.
<b>If YES, which area?</b>			
<b>Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?</b>			Yes
<b>If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?</b>			The development proposes more than 150 dwellings on a site that exceeds 5 hectares in total
3. LPA/SOS SCREENING			
<b>Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued)</b>			No
<b>If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?</b>			
<b>If yes, is the SO/SD positive?</b>			
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
<b>Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?</b>			No

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>  Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>  Is a significant effect likely, having regard particularly to the magnitude and spatial extent (including population size affected), nature, intensity and complexity, probability, expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact and the possibility to effectively reduce the impact? If the finding of no significant effect is <b>reliant on specific features or measures</b> of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment <b>these should be identified in bold.</b>
--------------------------------------	--	--

## 5. NATURAL RESOURCES

<b>5.1</b> Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	Localised ground raising will be required to facilitate level build platforms / appropriate gradients to the proposed roads.	No	The physical changes are limited and not such as to have significant effects.
<b>5.2</b> Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources above or below ground such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No	The Site falls within an area identified in the West Sussex Joint Minerals Plan (WSJMP) as safeguarded for brick clay. The WSJMP also recognises that this mineral resource covers a broad extent of West Sussex and that the resource is in relative low demand. This is borne out by the fact that West Sussex has a NPPF compliant level of supply of brick clay with a permitted supply sufficient to meet the demand for the next 25 years based on historical trend data.  The mineral resources found on site are already significantly sterilised by the presence of existing residential properties and a SEN school within 250m of the site, rights of way and mature landscape features such as tree lines and hedgerows	No	

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
	<p>These same constraints would also restrict any potential to undertake prior extraction on the site before any development was undertaken. The permanent loss of the remaining small parcel of safeguarded land would not have a material effect upon the long-term supply of brick clay within West Sussex.</p> <p>Considering all of the above factors it is considered that the proposed development will not have an unacceptable affect upon the safeguarded mineral resources found beneath the site and would comply with Policy M9 of the WSJMP.</p>	
<p><b>5.3</b> Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Following an Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resources Assessment the whole site has been classified as grade 3b and/or non-agricultural land. As such it does not fall within the definition of Best and Most Versatile (B&amp;MV) agricultural land in the Agricultural Land Classification. As such, and as no commercial farm relies on the site for its viability, the loss of the site to an alternative use would have no significant impact on an existing farm holding.</p> <p>That said a detailed Agricultural Land Assessment will be submitted with any future application</p> <p>The site encompasses a number of mature trees. Most are located within the existing hedgerows/ along field boundaries. An Arboricultural Implications Report (AIR), based on the survey data and an impacts assessment of the relevant parameters,</p>	<p>No</p>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>highway and masterplans will be submitted with the future application.</p> <p>The intention is that the proposed development retains the majority of the existing trees and hedgerows within the open space network, provides adequate space between them and proposed built forms and provides for their protection and integration into the new landscape. In addition, further tree and hedgerow planting, and positive management is proposed to promote their continued ecological function, as part of a comprehensive landscape strategy for the site.</p> <p>There are no statutory designated ecological sites within or nearby to the boundary of the development and therefore, the site does not fall into an ecologically designated 'sensitive area', within the definition of 'sensitive areas' in the EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p>The proposals are not likely to have significant effects on the environment through the use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity to require an EIA.</p>	
<b>6. WASTE</b>		
<b>6.1</b> Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	No Whilst the proposed development will result in the generation of household waste, once occupied, the level of waste will be minimal and the proposed development will include measures to try and encourage recycling - details of these measures will be set out in the

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
				Design and Access Statement to be submitted as part of any future planning application
<b>7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES</b>				
<b>7.1</b> Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	No		No	
<b>7.2</b> Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?		<p>Yes and No</p> <p>A - The construction period could generate noise</p> <p>B - Street lighting will be kept to the minimum</p>		<p>A - This would be short term, and, as a result of mitigation and avoidance measures, in the form of a code of construction practice, will not be significant. In this context it should be noted that Wates are members of the Considerate Contractors Group and will submit a Code of Construction Practice prior to any development commencing. This and other planning conditions will ensure that appropriate measures are in place to keep any potential nuisance to a minimum and to prevent any pollution.</p> <p>B - This can be controlled by condition which can also ensure lighting is directional, low lux and ecologically friendly</p>
<b>7.3</b> Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No		No	Documents will be submitted with the planning application to demonstrate that the proposed development will not lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater etc
<b>7.4</b> Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?	No	Not that we are aware	No	

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<b>8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>		
<b>8.1</b> Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?	<p>No</p> <p>The proposals will not result in significant effects on the environment through the risk of major accidents, and/or disasters relevant the development concerned including those caused by Climate Change, in accordance with scientific knowledge.</p> <p>The proposed surface water drainage modelling has an allowance for predicted future climate change in accordance with current best practice.</p>	<p>No</p>
<b>8.2</b> Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution)	<p>No</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the potential for a higher than average number of accidents either during construction or when in operation.</p> <p>The proposal includes off-site improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure (details to be discussed and agreed with WSCC) with the aim to reduce vehicle speeds and provide a safer environment for all users, and any alterations to the highway will be subject to independent road safety auditing consistent with the adopted WSCC Road Safety Audit policy</p>	<p>No</p>
<b>9. WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>9.1</b> Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	<p>Yes</p> <p>On-site water features comprise two ponds located close to the LVS Hassocks school buildings, and drainage ditches along the access road and along the field boundary to the north of the school.</p> <p>Within the wider area, a large pond is located off the southeast corner of the site.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Surface water discharge from the site will be limited to that of the pre-development low return period greenfield runoff rate, thus ensuring there is no increase in post-development peak discharge flow rates. In order to manage the flow, SuDS features such as surface water attenuation areas and swales (designed to accommodate all storms up</p>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>An Ordinary Watercourse runs along the southern site boundary, and another Ordinary Watercourse commences at the western site boundary. These two watercourses flow in a westerly direction converging to the west of the site.</p> <p>The nearest Main River is Herrings Stream, approximately 650m east of the site. This watercourse was classified as 'poor' ecological quality and 'did not require assessment' for chemical quality under the latest Water Framework Directive (WFD) water quality classifications. However, the site does not fall within the catchment of this watercourse (or within the catchment of any other WFD watercourses).</p>	<p>to and including the 1 in 100-year event + 45% climate change) will be utilised.</p> <p>The two existing pond features will be retained and if possible be utilised to provide surface water attenuation.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be produced to support the application and will include details of any mitigation measures required to ensure there is no increase in flood risk associated with the development.</p> <p>Potential impacts on water quality during construction will be managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>Pre-development consultation has been undertaken with Southern Water to establish whether there is sufficient capacity within the foul sewer network. In a letter dated 24 December 2024, Southern Water confirmed that there is currently capacity to accommodate a foul flow of 1.81 l/s for the development at manhole reference TQ26187501 in the existing site entrance.</p>

## 10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)

<b>10.1</b> Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, or any non-designated / non-classified areas which are important or sensitive for reasons of their terrestrial, avian and marine	Yes	No statutory ecological designations are located within or bounding the site. The nearest statutory designation is Wolstonbury Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is located approximately 4.5km to the south-east of the site. The SSSI comprises a mixture of chalk grassland and deciduous woodland which	No	All designations are well separated from the site and would not be subject to significant effects under the proposed development.
---	-----	--	----	---



<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<p>ecological value, located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project? (e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other water-bodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, undesignated nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local))).</p>	<p>support a diverse range of species, including Sheep's Fescue, Bee Orchid, Fly Orchid and Round Headed Rampion. The next nearest statutory designation is Bedelands Farm Local Nature Reserve (LNR), located approximately 5.1km to the north-east of the site. The LNR supports wildflower grassland, grazed meadows, wetlands, ancient hedgerows and woodland.</p> <p>The nearest European designation is Castle Hill Special Area Conservation (SAC) located approximately 15.1km to the south-east of the site. Castle Hill is designated for its semi-natural dry grassland and supports the priority habitat type "orchid rich sites", with species including Early Spider Orchid and Burnt Orchid.</p> <p>A Designated Road Verge is located approximately 1.2km to the north-east of the site. Otherwise, no other non-statutory designations are located within 2km of the site.</p> <p>No areas of Ancient Woodland are located within or adjacent to the site, with the closest area located approximately 0.4km to the south.</p>	
<p><b>10.2</b> Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The site contains habitats that form important ecological features, namely ponds, orchards, hedgerows, mature trees and woodland.</p> <p>The site also supports a number of rare, notable or protected species including Great Crested Newts, bats and reptiles.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Habitats</p> <p>The habitats of elevated importance are largely retained and buffered within the masterplan. Where small areas of habitat loss are required, such as hedgerow removal for access, these losses can readily be compensated for via enhancement and new planting within the remainder of the site. As such, subject to appropriate safeguarding measures and where required compensatory measures, there will be</p>



<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
			<p>no significant effect on habitats under the proposals.</p> <p>Fauna The site does support a number of rare, notable or protected species that have the potential to be adversely affected by the proposals. However, all of the potential faunal constraints can be addressed via appropriate mitigation and compensation measures. These are likely to include acquiring a European Protected Species licence for bats and a District Level Licence led by NatureSpace in regard to Great Crested Newt; the provision of a sensitive lighting strategy to safeguard the foraging and commuting habitats for bats; and habitat manipulation in regard to reptiles. Habitat creation within the proposed areas of open space, and subsequent management of existing and new habitats will have a positive effect on local wildlife, including bats, reptiles, Great Crested Newt and birds. Therefore, no significant adverse effect is likely to be experienced by any rare, notable or protected species under the proposal.</p>
<b>11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>			
<b>11.1</b> Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by	Yes	<p>The site is not designated for landscape or landscape-related reasons.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park is located approximately 2.5km to the south-east of the site and the High Weald National Landscape lies at approximately 3.3km north of the site.</p> <p>Public bridleway 9Hu extends through the site, east to west, along the access track and public footpath 10Hu is located immediately north of the site.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The loss of pastoral farmland and school grounds to new housing would result in substantial landscape effects on the land itself. However, as the site is already influenced by the existing school, settlement edge of Sayers Common and B2118, susceptibility of these receptors is slightly reduced. The retention of mature hedgerows and trees, and the provision of further planting across the site would also ensure that the new housing is successfully</p>

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
the project? <sup>1</sup> Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	The mature hedgerows and trees on the site boundary and within the site create a strong sense of enclosure. Proposals would largely retain this mature landscape structure and sense of enclosure	integrated into its mature landscape setting. This will reduce the level of effects on the landscape beyond the site and its immediate context to below significant. A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) will be carried out in accordance with best practice guidelines (Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA, 3rd edition, 2013). This will identify and quantify the impacts of the proposed development on the landscape receptors, according to their sensitivity. Landscape receptors will include the individual site features, perceptual and aesthetic qualities and the overall character of the site within the context of published character assessments. The LVA will conclude that, in accordance with the various studies which have been prepared by the Council in the lead up to its allocation, the site does have the ability to accommodate the proposed change without significant residual adverse effects in EIA terms.

<sup>1</sup> See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas.

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<p><b>11.2</b> Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)</p>	Yes	<p>The site is enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees which would be primarily retained and further enhanced where necessary. The site is then further contained to the south and east by the existing settlement of Sayers Common and road network.</p> <p>To reflect this context and limit visual effects, the proposed housing is focused in the central, southern and eastern extents of the site.</p> <p>As a result, the visibility of the proposed new homes would be limited to receptors within and close to the site such as; users of the PRowS within the vicinity of the site, in particular bridleway 9Hu and footpath 10Hu, residents in the northern extent of Sayers Common, and walkers, cyclists vehicle users on the B2118. These visual effects would reduce overtime as the proposed planting establishes and further contains visual effects.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) will be carried out in accordance with best practice guidelines (Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA, 3rd edition, 2013). This will identify/quantify the impacts of the proposed development on the landscape and visual resource including impacts on landscape character and views towards the site from a range of receptors, according to their sensitivity, including residents and recreational users of public rights of way. The LVIA will demonstrate that the majority of visual receptors have their current views contained by either the mature vegetation, existing settlements or undulating landform. This existing vegetation will be primarily retained and enhanced, and further planting would be proposed throughout the site. Whilst there will be major/moderate and negative effects for the users of the bridleway within the site itself, these effects will be highly localised and mitigation within the Site will present enhancements to the bridleway and open space network, and positive elements into the views. Effects on visual receptors within the South Downs National Park and High Weald National Landscape will be negligible.</p>
<b>12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY</b>			
<p><b>12.1</b> Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts</p>	Yes	<p>The site does not lie within a defined Archaeological Notification. There are no HER sites or finds recorded within the site. The site is considered to have a high potential for the remains of 19th century farm buildings of low (local) significance and for evidence related to Post-Medieval and modern agricultural activity of low/no (Local/Negligible) significance. A</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Archaeological remains of high significance are not expected within the site. The loss of archaeological remains of lesser significance can be mitigated via a programme of archaeological work secured by a suitably worded planning condition.</p>

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).		<p>low/uncertain archaeological potential is identified for all other periods. Place Services confirmed that any archaeological requirements can be secured following the grant of planning permission via a suitably worded condition.</p> <p>There are 17no. designated heritage assets within 1km of the Site, the nearest of which is the Grade II Listed Kingcott, a c.17th-century dwellings situated on the western side of the B2118 c.85m from the Site at its closest point</p>	<p>Assessment has concluded that due to a lack of visual connections, spatial relationships and historic connections, that the site does not form part of the 'setting' of designated heritage assets within the surrounds of the Site that contributes to its overall heritage significance. Furthermore, proposed building is offset from the boundary of the Site in areas closest to the nearest Listed Building, Grade II Listed Kingcott.</p>
<b>13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS</b>			
<b>13.1</b> Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<p>Bridleway 9Hu runs east – west across the site from the B2118 in the east to Twineham Lane in the west.</p> <p>The Bridleway is currently used for access to LVS. As part of the development proposals, access to LVS will be provided via the new spine road and the Bridleway will no longer be used to provide access to LVS. The Bridleway will be retained and enhanced to serve recreational uses as well as an alternative route for sustainable modes of access to the proposed development.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Bridleway 9Hu will be retained on its current alignment.</p> <p>Following the implementation of the new spine road serving the site, the Bridleway will no longer be used for vehicular access to LVS and, consistent with the requirements of the site policies contained in DPSC7, the Bridleway will be enhanced in accordance with a scheme of works to be agreed with the Council.</p>
<b>13.2</b> Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	MSDC's Local Plan modelling of the allocation (together with other MSDC allocations) is presented in the Stage 6 Mid Sussex Transport Strategy (MSTS). It is ongoing and developing a suitable mitigation strategy for those	<p>No</p> <p>This will be demonstrated using junction modelling within a Transport Assessment. This will scrutinise junction operation at greater depth. It is expected to find that the local highway network, with identified mitigation, has</p>

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
		junctions where MSDC deem increases in congestion sufficient to warrant them.		capacity to accommodate additional development traffic.
<b>14. LAND USE</b>				
<b>14.1</b> Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? E.g. housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	The site has residential dwellings abutting it to the south and east, on the opposite side of the B2118. There is also a caravan park (Hickstead Park) to the northeast of the site, separated by an area of agricultural land, and there are further employment uses and Hickstead Showground to the north and east of the site	No	The proposed development has been designed to respect the privacy and amenity of adjacent residents
<b>14.2</b> Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No		No	
<b>15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE</b>				
<b>15.1</b> Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic conditions, e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?	No		No	
<b>16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>				
<b>16.1</b> Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No	The Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 – 2039 – Submission Draft Version (Dec 2023) looks to allocate the site for the development of 210 homes and a replacement SEN School. It is however acknowledged that the site is one of five sites allocated in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 – 2039 by way of proposed policies DPSC 3-7, which cumulatively propose	No	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>approximately 2,543 additional dwellings and associated facilities in Sayers Common.</p> <p>Having regard to the above Leading Counsel's advice was sought as to whether any Environmental Impact Assessment accompanying any planning application submitted by Wates would need to consider the wider sites allocated in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 – 2039 – Submission Draft Version by way of proposed policies DPSC3-6 in terms of the wider cumulative impacts under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which apply the relevant EU Directive into English law. Said advice confirmed that in considering whether the proposal should be screened on its own or cumulatively with the wider allocations Counsel was the view that the screening opinion should only consider the proposal which falls within Policy DPSC7 for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) Policies DPSC3-7 need careful scrutiny because it is noteworthy that the plan in identifying a series of sites, includes them as 5 distinct allocations expressed not in one policy, and that the LPA has determined they should form separate and independent policies in the emerging development plan which indicates a degree of independence in terms of implementation.</p> <p>b) Policy DPSC 7 is a stand-alone allocation. The sole requirement of policy is that it "demonstrates a coordinated approach and collaboration with the other housing allocations in the Plan within Sayers Common to deliver high quality placemaking which supports the 20-minute neighbourhood principles, with direct enhanced active/sustainable travel connections,</p>	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>and includes the enabling the viability of new public transport services” but that is the extent of relationship expressed in policy. There is no phasing indicated, or any other physical connection sought or required.</p> <p>c) It is also relevant that the NPPG expressly states that each application or request for a screening opinion should be considered on its own merits .</p> <p>d) The NPPG goes on to say that an application should not be considered in isolation if, in reality it is an integral part of a more substantial development (Judgement in R v Swale BC ex parte RSPB [1991] 1 PLR 6.</p> <p>e) In other cases, it is appropriate to establish whether each of the proposed developments could proceed independently – R (Candlish) v Hastings Borough Council [2005] All ER (D) 178 and Baker v BANES Council [2009] All ER 169.</p> <p>f) Therefore, in this case it is clear that the development is not part of a more substantial development although it is part of a more comprehensive range of allocations, but there is a distinction, and an important one, between a development and a series of allocations in counsels my judgment.</p> <p>g) Additionally, it is clear that the proposed development by Wates of the LVS site can proceed independently and has no physical dependency on any of the other allocated sites.</p> <p>h) For those reasons and in accordance with the guidance in the NPPG counsel was of the view that the proposal should be screened on its own and there was no requirement in law or policy for it to be screened in combination</p>	



<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
	<p>with the other 4 allocations in the emerging Local Plan for Sayers Common.</p> <p>In the context of the above we note that whilst the planned growth in Sayers Common has been assessed cumulatively in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, and that the Plan is supported by a transport evidence base which assesses the cumulative impact of planned development using the Mid Sussex District Transport Model and develops a strategy for mitigating the effects of cumulative traffic impacts, the Statement of Common Ground entered into between MSDC and the promotes of DPSC3 – 7 in July 2024 acknowledges that the submission of the planning applications for DPSC4 – 7 may be ahead of the adoption of the Local Plan and that said SoCG does not place any restriction on those sites coming forward independently of each other and/or DPSC3.</p> <p>To this end we note that Antler have submitted an application for 27 dwellings and associated works on Land Rear of Chesapeake, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common - DM/25/1434 (DPSC4) refers; that Welbeck have submitted an outline application with all matters reserved except for access, for comprising 'a residential development of up to 210 dwellings (Use Class C3); with associated access; landscaping; amenity space; drainage and associated works' on land at Coombe Farm, Sayers Common – DM/25/2661 (DPSC5) refers; and that Reside have submitted an application for screening for 80 dwellings and associated works on West of</p>	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>King Business Centre, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common - DM/25/2637 (DPSC6) refers.</p> <p>Furthermore whilst policy DPH2 of the Submission Draft Local Plan allows for the expansion of settlement outside the defined built up area boundaries in certain circumstances, and policy DPH1 provides for a windfall allowance within the overall housing supply, such that further development – albeit of an unknown quantity and location could take place in Sayers Common over the plan period, this is only likely to be small scale and unlikely to lead to any significant cumulative effects being identified.</p> <p>Likewise, whilst small scale development has occurred of late in the village this too is such that when coupled with the proposed development there would not be any significant cumulative environmental, economic or social effects.</p> <p>Given the above and whilst we note and acknowledge that planned development could cumulatively impact on the local highway network/local infrastructure, a Transport Assessment and Infrastructure Statement will be submitted with any future application to address these points i.e. demonstrate that the existing highway network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development, without any significant adverse effects; and that the impact of the proposed development on local infrastructure can be accommodated</p>	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	<p>through improvements to existing facilities, via S106 contributions or direct works . Likewise, whilst potential cumulative construction effects could occur if another scheme came forward in Sayers Common at the same time as that planned for at LVS Hassocks, it is not likely that there would be any cumulative effects in terms of construction. To this end, it is expected that the delivery of the wider strategic site would be phased, and that this would reduce the potential for overlap of construction phases. Nevertheless, any construction activities would be subject to control through a Construction Traffic Management Plan, enabling impacts to be managed and, where necessary, mitigated to alleviate any potential cumulative impacts. Similarly, it is unlikely that any other environmental matters would materially be affected by any other development in close proximity to the site as each application would look to mitigate its effects and be assessed having regard to other recent developments by the Council.</p> <p>These points aside, the development of the land at LVS Hassocks, can be undertaken independently of the other sites currently being promoted in Sayers Common in terms of land ownership and infrastructure, with no significant cumulative environmental impacts.</p>	
<b>17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS</b>		
<b>17.1</b> Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? <sup>2</sup>	No	No

<sup>2</sup> The Regulations require consideration of the transboundary nature of the impact. Due to the England's geographical location the vast majority of TCPA cases are unlikely to result in transboundary impacts.

---

## 18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

We are of the opinion that the impact of the scale of development proposed will be restricted to matters of local interest and will not result in any significant effects upon the environment. Consequently, the proposed development does not amount to EIA development and an EIA is not justified in this instance. We acknowledge that certain assessments will need to accompany the planning submission to assist the council in their determination of the planning application.

To this end we can confirm that in addition to the planning application drawings and Design and Access Statement, any future application will be accompanied by a Planning Statement, Transport Assessment, Stage 1 Safety Audit, Travel Plan Statement, Flood Risk Assessment and Associated Drainage Strategy, Infrastructure Statement, Ecological Impact Assessment (which will include details of the associated surveys), Arboricultural Impact Report, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Indicative Landscape Strategy, Outline Landscape Management Plan, Desk Top Archaeological Appraisal; Built Heritage Statement, Minerals report, Agricultural Land Impact Assessment, Statement of Community Involvement, Sustainability Statement, Affordable Housing Statement, and draft Heads of Terms of a S106 Agreement.

## 19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	Yes
--	-----

Is it necessary to issue a SD?	No
--------------------------------	----

Is an ES required?	No
--------------------	----

## 20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)

### OUTCOME

Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
--	-------------	--

<u>Not</u> likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	✓
--	-----------------	---

More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	
--	----------------------	--

## 21. REASON FOR SCREENING

For transparency.

NAME	Judith Ashton	
DATE	27 <sup>th</sup> October 2025	