

Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2026.

FAO Stuart Malcolm Mid Sussex District Council  
West Sussex

## Specific application note:

Application Number	DM/25/1434 – 26 Dwellings
Date Registered	Received reminder 12 December 2025
Address of Proposed Site	<b>Land rear of Chesapeake, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common</b>
Grid Reference (if known)	
Description of works:	Net 26 Dwellings

## Overview

Current Estate is at capacity in the Burgess Hill area. Housing developments in this area of Mid Sussex are rising. As such, NHS Sussex (NHS commissioning) has worked with the District Valuer and District Council on both strategic plans and more local factors.

For Burgess Hill GP's, there are circa 52,000 current registered people. The impact of new people coming to the area requires more places for GP attendances and as such the NHS is requesting financial contributions to support growth from housing.

This housing proposal is proportionately considered (aligned to all housing in Mid Sussex), to support needed infrastructure based on:

- Necessity – the additional housing impact on GP services
- Directly related – the site, house volumes and needs are assessed
- Proportionate – the housing volume is directly and proportionately fairly accounted for

## Development proposal

NHS Sussex predicts that new residents will register with Mid Sussex Health Centre. The new homes are in the catchment area of this NHS practices. The GP practice is at capacity and services this fairly large rural area.

The contribution sought and evidenced is to support resident access to GP services – and is a contribution to infrastructure; only drawn down when the obligation is triggered (and aligned to specified infrastructure).

The aim is for new infrastructure in the area – and the premises project will be either to extend (full build cost) a current site, or provision of new premises.

Additional population generated by this development will place an increased demand on existing primary healthcare services to the area. The application did not include any provision for health infrastructure on site (as this is not a strategic site) and so a contribution towards health infrastructure off-site via financial obligation is being sought.

The planning permission should not be granted Without an appropriate contribution to local health infrastructure to manage the additional load on services directly incurred as a consequence of this proposed development. **Without associated infrastructure, NHS Sussex would be unable to sustain sufficient and safe services provided in the area and would therefore have to OBJECT to the development proposal.**

NHS Sussex requests a contribution from the applicant of **£42,757** as quantifiably in the tariff section, which will be used for patient capacity increases at one or all of the GP practices which will serve the catchment population of this proposed development. **Funding requests for build costs will not be duplicated.** NHS Sussex will consider the proportional use of these funds coupled with the other Haywards Heath and area developments so as to give best benefit to patient care.

Working with Mid Sussex DC, the funds will be accessed as the projects planning phase is in place.

**The Tariff formula has been independently approved by the District Valuer**

### **Assessment & request**

NHS Sussex has undertaken an assessment of the implications of growth and the delivery of housing upon the health need of the District serving this proposed development, and in particular the major settlements in the district where new development is being directed towards. We have established that in order to maintain the current level of healthcare services, developer contributions towards the provision of capital infrastructure will be required. This information is disclosed to secure essential developer contributions and acknowledge as a fundamental requirement to the sound planning of the District.

The additional population generated by the development will inevitably place additional demand upon the existing level of health provision in the area. In the absence of developer contributions towards the provision of additional health infrastructure the additional strain placed on health resources would have a significant detrimental impact on District wide health provision.

Health utilises the legal advice outcomes and industry professional inputs from other public funded area, such as the Police service. With the direct impact of new housing and house growth plans on registered patients, the submission that follows captures the necessary, directly related and fair/reasonable contributions required that relate to the associated house build volumes. The tried and tested formula used has been in use for many years and is annually reviewed.

### **Current Primary Healthcare Provision in Haywards Heath and area.**

Primary Care services in Burgess Hill and the area are provided by a number of GP practices, funded from NHS funds for providing Primary health care.

Some sites are purpose built in prior decades and some are re-worked sites. However, all sites were set to a size (estate area) for a population that has gone above optimal or possible working remits.

The proposed development will need to have Primary Care infrastructure in place in order to care for the population increase. This contribution requested will be for the necessary infrastructure to cater for the site development at the most local GP service site(s) and encompass all the necessary components of patient need, whether at the GP practice or neighbouring service area.

This current development response relates to new housing growth.

NHS Sussex works closely with Mid Sussex District council, and as such we are continually looking at options and emerging opportunities. Our strategy is to work alongside stakeholders to deliver at scale where possible. Where this is not pragmatic for an area, then developing an existing site (building on existing great NHS services and thus optimising workforce) is another preferred option.

To clarify, Primary Care **provision** in Burgess Hill and the area is strong, but physical premises (and to some degree workforce) are required to meet the new residents in housing developments. GP's have list sizes (and catchment areas) of over 10,000 on average, and the aim is for larger scale where possible. Hence, in this instance, the plan is for developer contributions to support infrastructure. **Workforce additions have already been actioned** to support the growing population and the expectancy of s106 funds coming forward – as this is required to deliver NHS care. This is based on the housing demand in the council plan and the coming forward of developer planning requests for these new housing plots.

## **Contribution Sought and Methodology**

The funding will be a contribution of **£42,757** (estimate – based on housing mix on the tariff) for the infrastructure needs of **NHS GP service site(s)** and with a possible use at a NHS service central site if a new build follows.. **Funds will only be asked for on a proportionate level for the directly related services.**

NHS Sussex, in line with NHS services and Commissioning across England, uses a service-demand and build-cost model to estimate the likely demand of increasing populations on healthcare provision and the cost of increasing physical capacity to meet this demand.

This service-demand and build-cost model is ideal for estimating the likely impact of future residents arising from a new development on health infrastructure capacity and the cost implications this will have on the commissioner, through the need to build additional physical capacity (in the form of new/expanded GP surgeries). The model has been used by commissioners in the southeast for over 10 years and is accepted by local planning authorities across West Sussex.

Service-load data is calculated on a square-metre-per-patient basis at a factor of 0.1142sqm/person. This factor is based on the average size of typical GP practices ranging from 1 to 7 doctors, assuming 1600 patients per doctor\* (there are now many other specialist care providers/roles at GP practices).

Build-cost data has been **verified by the District Valuer Service** (last update Apr 2024) and assumes £7,000/sqm, 'sense-checked' against recent building projects in West Sussex. The cost inputs refers only to capital construction costs; the **commissioner funds the revenue cost** of running the GP practices in perpetuity including staffing costs, operational costs and medical records etc.



Occupancy data, used to calculate the number of future patients-per-dwelling, is derived from 2011 Census Data and confirmed by West Sussex County Council (last update July 2015).

Finally, the specific dwelling size and mix profile for the proposed development is input into the model to provide a bespoke and proportionate assessment of the likely impact on health infrastructure arising from the development.

The output of this model for the proposed development is an estimated population increase of 59 new residents (weighted) with a consequential additional GP surgery area requirement of 6.68m<sup>2</sup>. This equates to a direct cost of **£42,757** for additional health infrastructure capacity arising from the development. The council is requested to ensure this contribution is index-linked (housebuild index preferred) within the S106 agreement at a basis that meets house build cost growth.

[The Health Tariff is on the next page](#)

# Health Tariff

S106 Contribution to NHS/GP Community/ Provision		(Formula agreed by The District Valuer)		25/02/2026			
D&B Ref : DM/25/1434 - net 26 dwellings dwellings							
Land rear of Chesapeake, Reeds Lane							
Sayers Common							
Font in red can be adjusted							
<b>Housing Development</b>							
House Numbers (Inc Social Housing)	House Type	New Occupanc (Persons)	Surgery Area Requirement (sqm)		Infrastructure Development cost(psm)	Capital Contribution (£)	Approx Contribution per dwelling(£)
2	1 Bed	3	0	@	£6,400	£2,193	£1,097
10	2 Beds	19	2	@	£6,400	£13,887	£1,389
11	3 Beds	28	3	@	£6,400	£20,099	£1,828
3	4 Beds	9	1	@	£6,400	£6,578	£2,193
	5 Beds						
	Care Home						
		equivalent					
26	House Total	59	6.68	@	"	£42,757	
Ave Occupancy		2.25	Contribution Per Dwelling		per dwelling		
					per person		
Occupancy Assumptions (confirmed by WSCC JUL 2015)				Care home contributions are at up to 100% of 1 bed dwelling			
PER CENSUS 2011 - WSCC							
Infrastructure costs	£7,000.0	psm					
Average Sqm Per Patient	0.1142	sqm					
Average Occupancy Assumptions							
	1 Bed	1.5	Persons				
	2 Bed	1.9	Persons				
	3 Bed	2.5	Persons				
	4 Bed	3	Persons				
	5 Bed	3	Persons				
<b>Explanation</b>							
1.Build costs include basic build cost,finance,professional fees.To be amended annually.							
2.The occupancy assumptions can be amended as per the requirements of the Local Authority.							
3.The average sq metre per patient has been derived from SFA 2003/04 as below, including additional space.This can be amended to reflect the flexibility of the NHS Directions and the requirement of the CCG to provide addition clinical or service development space within a new development							
<b>1600 patients per GP</b>							
1500	sqm GIA	7	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	11200	0.1339	sq m per patient
836	sqm GIA	6	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	9600	0.0871	sq m per patient
718	sqm GIA	5	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	8000	0.0898	sq m per patient
646	sqm GIA	4	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	6400	0.1009	sq m per patient
487	sqm GIA	3	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	4800	0.1015	sq m per patient
374	sqm GIA	2	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	3200	0.1169	sq m per patient
271	sqm GIA	1	GP Practice	AVG Patient List	1600	0.1694	sq m per patient
				Average		0.1142	sq m per patient

## **Compliance with National Policy and CIL regulations**

The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations in 2010 imposed new legal tests on local planning authorities to control the use of planning obligations (including financial contributions) namely through Section 106 agreements as part of the granting of planning permission for development.

The three legal tests were laid down in Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122: “A *planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:*

### **i. Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms**

Health infrastructure is an important material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications and the Council must take into account the positive or negative impact of development proposals on health infrastructure when granting planning permission and associated section 106 agreements. There is no dedicated Government funding to cover new housing developments. Unless contributions from developments are secured, at worst there will be practices that would be forced to close as there would not be safe healthcare provision. In the least, there will be wait times (mainly driven by no estate / rooms to see patients in) would not be suitable for adequate healthcare.

Mid Sussex local plan has increasing incremental annual growth assumptions for housing development with certain strategic sites are potentially going to deliver in excess of 5,000 homes in this area over the current planning horizon.

The pace of delivery and volume of new build housing and its subsequent occupancy will have a negative impact on the availability and capacity of health infrastructure causing a strain on existing services; the required additional infrastructure will comprise: clinical rooms for consultation/examination and treatment and medical professionals (and associated support service costs and staff).

NHS Sussex seeks to include these necessary and additional works as part of the solution to estate need for Burgess Hill and area.

### **ii. Directly related**

It is indisputable that the increase in population of approximately 59 people living in the new development (with associated health needs) at GP practice or associated facility will place direct pressure on all organisations providing healthcare in the locality, in particular primary care provided by the NHS Sussex. **Put simply, without the development taking place and the subsequent population growth there would be no requirement for the additional infrastructure.**

The proposed developer contribution is therefore required to enable a proportionate increase to existing health infrastructure, to maintain its current level of service in the area.

The infrastructure highlighted and costed is specifically related to the scale of development proposed. This has been tried and tested and has District Valuer support, in terms of the value of contribution.

### **iii. Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development**

The developer contribution is to help achieve a proportionate increase in health infrastructure, thus enabling health to maintain its current level of service. Utilising a housing size as a reasonable proportion of infrastructure scale allows for fairness to all new housing developments, including the sites that are also strategic in nature.

The model uses robust evidence including local census data, build cost estimates (and actual) verified by the District Valuer Service and population projections verified by West Sussex County Council. A review of the police CIL compliance and their review of education and library compliance underlie the fair and reasonable approach of the health tariff – which is in turn in line with the other public sector areas.

## Conclusion

In summary, the contributions sought by NHS Sussex are well-evidenced, founded in adopted development plan policy and comply with the legal tests of the CIL Regulations and NPPF. The contribution will be used to provide additional capacity in primary care facilities in the vicinity of the development, directly linked to this development, to support its future residents. To reiterate, without this essential contribution, planning permission should not be granted. This current development response just related to new housing growth.

Thank you for the continued support in securing health infrastructure contributions to enable the population of Mid Sussex to have access to the health care that it needs now and for future generations.

Yours sincerely,

*S. Bate*

Simon Clavell-Bate  
B.Ed Hons, FCCA  
Head of Estates – Primary Care  
NHS Sussex