

From: Charlotte Tate <charlotte.tate@bidwells.co.uk>
Sent: 25 August 2026 08:40:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/1477 - New NPPF Response

Good morning Andy,

Hope you are well and no doubt you are also taking some time to get your head around the NPPF changes.

We thought it might be useful to set out what we considered to be the most important updates with regard to the application in Bolney.

Firstly, our arguments against the previous version of the NPPF outlined that as the housing policies were 'out of date', then these should be afforded limited weight in the planning balance. We are aware that the new NPPF has removed the 'out of date' policy position with regard to the tilted balance, so this means that these arguments are no longer valid. Notwithstanding this, we note that the presumption in favour of development still remains (and has been strengthened) and we would still conclude the benefits of the proposed development would outweigh any harm, regardless of whether the housing policies are considered to be out of date or not.

More importantly, from our review of the new NPPF, we understand that the position set out under the new Policy S5 (Principle of development outside settlements) is very favourable for the proposals. The policy sets out that only certain forms of development should be approved outside of settlements, with criteria set out on a list from a. to j. We understand that the following points on the list are applicable to our Site.

e. Limited infilling within groups of houses;

j. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need ((including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test), and where development would:

i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure;

The policy goes on to state *'these should be approved, unless the benefit of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision making policies in the Framework'*. We therefore consider this to be a significant shift in our favour as it has already been concluded that the benefits of the scheme outweighed any harms when we undertook our planning balance exercise and therefore, in the case of S5 e. and S5 j. we also consider that there would not be any adverse effects that would substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposals.

We trust the above helps but please do let us know if there are any more queries.

Many thanks,
Charlotte

Charlotte Tate MRTPI
Principal Planner

Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire. CB2 9LD
M: 07385 668564 | bidwells.co.uk



Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership trading as Bidwells, is registered in England & Wales (registered number OC344553). The registered head office is Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge, CB2 9LD, where a list of members is available for inspection.

To read our full disclaimer please click [here](#) To read our Privacy Notice please click [here](#)
