

**DM/25/1434 Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling house, stables and barn buildings and the proposed development of 27 dwellings, with a new vehicular access, associated landscaping, parking, open space, and all other associated development works. Land Rear Of Chesapeake Reeds Lane Sayers Common Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9JG**

I would like the additional comments below to be taken into account with regards to the above planning application. They relate to the WSCC Highways submission which has now been loaded onto the Planning website after I made my previous submission of 22/07/2025.

Please note that my comments in my previous submission with regard to the omissions and inaccuracies in the applicant's Transport Statement, lack of visibility and risk to the road surface of the access road still stand. In addition I would make the following points.

**WSCC Highways references to the unmade MSDC Plan 2021-2039**

1 The Planning Inspector has stated that they concluded that the MSDC District Plan 2021- 2039 should be failed. This would mean that its contents are not made and therefore should not be taken into consideration in any planning applications. This includes any site allocation policies.

2 Each new planning application should therefore instead be judged on its own against the existing MSDC District Plan 2014-2031 and other national planning policies which have actually been made.

3 WSCC Highways seem at first to accept this when they states that the site '*will still need to demonstrate how sustainable/active transport can be encouraged even without the adjacent and surrounding allocated sites coming forward*' However they then goes onto quote on numerous occasions policy numbers from the unmade and failed District Plan, such as DPSC4, DPSC3 and DPSC2.

4 WSCC Highways also make comments such as '*Demonstrate a coordinated approach and collaboration with other housing allocations in the Plan within Sayers Common to deliver high-quality placemaking which supports the 20-minute neighbourhood principles.*' These were policies and concepts within the unmade and to be failed District Plan and is not in the existing made District Plan 2014-2030. WSCC therefore should not be using them as objectives or concepts for this site to meet.

5 WSCC Highways also talks of other sites that were to be allocated in the unmade Plan and how this site should take them into consideration and link up with them. They refer to these other sites as allocated but with the failure of the unmade District Plan they are not. At the time of this application there are no other major planning applications in Sayers Common under consideration by MSDC. Therefore there are no other major proposed sites in Sayers Common that need to be taken into consideration with this application.

6 Planning applications should be based on fact and evidence and cannot be based on speculation as to what other applications may or may not be made in the future. Therefore WSCC Highways should not include reference to such non existent applications when making statements and judgements concerning this application. Any such comments that are made should be discarded as being based on speculation not fact.

**Additional Points**

1 There is no mention that WSCC Highways have made a site visit as the basis for making their comments. A desktop only assessment would be unsafe for such a major development. They should therefore confirm when they made such a visit.

2 Their own proposals for the layout of the site and PROW HU11 do not take into account the drainage issues which exist. Nor do they mention any consultation with MSDC Drainage to discuss such matters. I have mentioned highway drainage issues in my previous submission and I would suggest that WSCC Highways are made aware of them so that they can consider how they will affect their highway and PROW proposals.

3 In particular, the issues regarding the spring under the proposed site access road should be looked into.



4 WSCC Highways refer to an option of cycling to Burgess Hill Station where most of the route is not on major roads, but do not advise the route to be taken. As there is no existing dedicated cycle route from Sayers Common to Burgess Hill it would be helpful if they could explain the route that they are referring to.

5 WSCC Highways also refer to the speeds obtained by the ATC surveys carried out by the applicant. However, as I mentioned in my previous submission, the data that these were based on has not been loaded onto the Planning website. The applicant refers to this data in their Transport Statement as Appendix B PIA data and without it the conclusions which they have come to with regards to speed can not be verified or confirmed.

6 With regards to the visibility of the site entrance, WSCC confirms that parked cars are an issue but do not advise if this can be resolved. Any such resolution should take into account cars parked to both the east and west of the site entrance, as mentioned in my previous submission. Neither they nor the applicant take into account the effect of the multiple other vehicle entrances onto Reeds Lane around the site entrance, and how having to be alert to all these additional vehicle movements will affect the drivers using the site entrance.

I would therefore request that WSCC Highways are made aware of the highway and PROW issues which I have raised in both this and my previous submission, when they are making comments on this application. I would also request that they confirm that their comments were based on a site visit and not just desktop information. Finally I would request that they produce a submission where the comments are based on this application alone and not on any basis of any policies or concepts that exist only in the unmade MSDC District Plan 2021-2039, which the Planning Inspector concluded as failed.

1 Kingsland Cottages, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common, Hassocks BN6 9JG