

16 December 2025



Mr Joseph Swift,  
Principal Planning Officer  
Development Control  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands Road,  
Haywards Heath,  
RH16 1SS.

**Charles Collins**

E: CCollins@savills.com  
DL: +44 (0) 20 3320 8236

244-246 High Street,  
Guildford GU1 3JF  
T: +44 (0) 1483 796 840  
savills.com

Dear Joseph

**Phase 1c, Northern Arc, Burgess Hill, Land North And North West Of Burgess Hill**

**Response to Statutory Consultee Representations for Application Ref. DM/25/1986**

This letter is written in regard to the reserved matters application for Land North and Northwest of Burgess Hill which was submitted on the 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2025 for the following:

*Reserved matters application to consider access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for parcels 1.7, 1.7b, 1.8 and OS1.8 comprising: a) Eastern Neighbourhood Centre: Up to 270 residential dwellings and extra care units; commercial floorspace; the community building, the neighbourhood square, cycle and pedestrian connections, parking and associated infrastructure. b) Eastern Parkland comprising open space, multi-use games areas (MUGA), public art, green circle cycle link and associated infrastructure.*

Following the submission, a number of consultee responses have been received regarding the proposed scheme. Many have notified that they are satisfied with the proposal and raise no objection, namely Contaminated Land, Sussex Police, Street Naming and Numbering, Environment Agency, Southern Water, Burgess Hill Town Council, and the Local Flood Authority.

However, we acknowledge that several consultees have raised queries and comments regarding specific aspects of the proposed scheme. This letter has been prepared in response to those comments with the intention of providing clarification and addressing the matters raised. The following sections summarise each consultee's feedback and outline the response provided by the consultant. This letter should be read alongside technical documents prepared by the consultant team which provide further detail and justification where necessary.

We note that matters have been raised by the Design Review Panel (DRP) and Urban Design team at MSDC. The applicant is engaging with officers at MSDC on the design elements which will be covered off under a separate submission.

In addition to this covering letter, please find enclosed the following documentation and drawings that have been prepared by the consultant team for further technical details on the matter.

- Acoustics technical note, prepared by Ian Sharland;
- Highways technical note, prepared by GTA consultants;
- Revised Parking Strategy, prepared by GTA consultants; and
- Public Art Strategy, prepared by Savills Social Value Team.

## Housing Officer Comments

The Housing Officer raised concerns regarding the affordable rent Extra Care units and the shared ownership units. In response, we have extracted the key points from their comments and provided a reply to each for the benefit of the Case Officer.

Nature of the Response	Response to Comment
Lack of 1B/2P Wheelchair Accessible properties.	There are 5 2B4P wheelchair user units being delivered within the Extra Care scheme, all complying with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations Standard. This provision represents 8% of the Extra Care units delivered onsite, achieving the minimum requirement of 4% of the affordable dwellings complying with the legal requirements set out in Schedule 8, Part 2 of the Section 106 Agreement. The remainder of the extra care units are designed to comply with Part M4 (2). These can be adapted to provide additional wheelchair user units.
Lack of provision of level access showers in M4(2) Extra Care units.	The 55 Extra Care units that are compliant with Part M4(2) standards have been specifically designed to meet operational requirements of Housing 21, the registered provider that will take on delivery of the extra care element. The design offers flexibility for registered provider to adjust the units to meet user needs.
Provision of Juliette Balconies	The provision of Juliette Balconies were included on the extra care units to provide an element of external amenity space servicing occupants of the units.
Confusion as to whether the Extra Care units will be provided as affordable rent or social rent	We confirm that the units within the Extra Care scheme will be provided as Social Rent. The Planning Statement and the Design Principles Statement erroneously make reference to the extra care product as affordable rent.  The scheme will deliver net. 60 social rented units.
No reference to Extra Care without lower age limit	The legal agreement outlines a requirement that, in order to be eligible for the Affordable Extra Care Housing, the customers must be 55 years in age or older.
Suggested mix for shared ownership units	Reference had been made to the housing mix within the submitted scheme. It was noted that the offering within Phase 1c would deliver a higher proportion of smaller flatted units. The legal agreement outlines an aspiration for 50% of all units to be 1 or 2 bed flatted units.  The scheme delivers the extra care offering which had been envisaged at outline stage to be delivered as an apartment led scheme. This element should be treated separate to the conventional housing product.  With regards to the shared ownership element, the scheme comprises 12no 1 and 2 bed shared ownership units (57%). The residual offering is comprised of 2 and 3 bed dwelling houses. This represents a marginal deviation from the indicative housing mix within the legal agreement. Phase 1c comprises the Eastern Neighbourhood Centre where there is an expectation for delivery of apartment buildings. In this context it is considered that the offering is acceptable in planning terms.

	<p>The housing offering delivered on site will provide a balanced offering between flatted and dwellinghouses.</p> <p>It is noted that the Bellway Phase to the north delivered a similar offering which had been deemed to be broadly aligned with the requirements of the legal agreement. Noting that this phase of the development holds a key location within the ENC it is considered that a housing mix proposed is broadly acceptable in planning terms.</p>
Clustering requirements for affordable units	<p>Officers had made reference to the clustering of the affordable housing units with regard to the provisions under the Affordable Housing SPD. It is noted that the SPD makes reference to clusters of affordable housing units in excess of 10 units being acceptable on high density flatted schemes.</p> <p>Phase 1c will be delivered in a phased manner with Parcel 1.7 being delivered earlier in the development. Schedule 2.1 of the legal agreement outlines a requirement for the frontloading delivery of affordable housing. The majority of the affordable housing units have been delivered in Subphase 1.7, this will enable early delivery and handover of the AH units to the registered provider. This represents a significant benefit.</p> <p>The affordable housing units have been delivered in a key focal location within the heart of the development fronting onto the arrival green and the neighbourhood centre. This should be viewed as a significant tangible benefit.</p> <p>Whilst the scheme marginally exceeds the indicative clustering requirements within the legal agreement it is contended that the offering is acceptable in planning terms.</p>

## Highways

In November 25, officers at WSCC Highways department had requested additional information and clarification on matters relating to Transport and Highways considerations. These had been centred around parking standards achieved on the site, quantum and distribution of visitor parking provision and detailed layout. The transport technical note prepared by GTA provides a point by point response to WSCC Highways consultee response. The key points are addressed below:

### Parking standards

The site falls within Parking Behaviour Zone (PBZ) 1, but lies immediately adjacent to PBZ4 given the sites relationship with the edge of the settlement of Burgess Hill. The site shares locational characteristics that are more aligned with PBZ4. In the determination of the RMA's for the Bellway Phase, officers at WSCC Highways department had been minded to consider that application of standards contained in PBZ4 would be appropriate.

It is noted that in the consultation response dated October 2025 and during pre-application discussions, officers at WSCC Highways were minded to consider that application of parking standards for PBZ4 would be appropriate in this location.

The scheme as designed will deliver sufficient parking on site to align with requirements under PBZ1, with a total of 386 no. long stay parking spaces on site, augmented by 42 no. short stay spaces.

If the standards for PBZ4 are applied, the minimum parking requirement would be for 322 no. parking spaces. The scheme as designed meets and exceeds the standards for PBZ4 and the level of parking delivered on site is acceptable in planning terms.

#### Visitor parking

The scheme delivers 42 visitor parking spaces servicing the 210no. residential dwellings, which equates to 0.2 spaces per unit in line with WSCC Parking guidance.

Visitor parking is centralised around the school, community, retail and apartment buildings in the centre of the site as these are the areas most likely to have visitor parking demand. 3 visitor parking spaces have been relocated to private drives adjacent to units 248 and 238 to provide more visitor parking in Parcel 1.8.

For the extra care block all of the 31 no parking spaces are to be delivered as unallocated parking. In line with WSCC guidance there is no requirement to provide additional visitor parking for this element of the scheme.

#### Cycle Parking

WSCC Highways had raised comments concerning the location of cycle parking facilities within the public realm. Final details of the short stay cycle parking facilities for the community building and the neighbourhood centre could be secured at condition stage. The parking strategy drawing denotes the indicative location for short stay cycle parking facilities.

#### Technical layout considerations

Changes have been made to the layout of the scheme to respond to comments from WSCC Highways team. The substantive changes are set out in the Transport technical note and are summarised below:

- Widening of the road in the south east to allow for easier refuse vehicle turning; and
- Relocation of 3 visitor parking bays to the southern part of the development, provided within units 248 and 238.

Please find enclosed a technical note prepared by GTA, our transport consultant, who have provided further feedback to the comments issued by WSCC Highways and issued a revised Site Visibility Splays Plan, Refuse Vehicle Swept Paths Plan, and Fire Appliance Swept Path Analysis Plan within their document to incorporate the proposed changes.

#### **Environmental Health**

The comment from the Environmental Health Officer asks for demonstration how the ProPG hierarchy has been followed and that the mechanical ventilation is only being proposed where no other practicable acoustic solution is available. It also asks for justification for the exceedance of external noise levels in amenity areas, particularly the west elevation of Block C.

Mechanical ventilation is only being proposed for the apartment blocks in the scheme. The technical note from the acoustics consultant provides further detail of how the ProPG hierarchy has been exhausted and mechanical ventilation is the most viable option for these units. We do note, however, that TEK ventilation systems could be a suitable alternative. Since both options are considered appropriate, the final spec can be secured at condition stage.

In terms of the exceedance of noise levels in amenity areas, the WHO criteria specifies that external amenity areas should not exceed 55 dB and should preferably be designed below 50 dB. The only façade that will not meet the WHO criteria is the west elevation of Block C, reaching 58 dB. Suitable internal noise levels can be achieved through acoustic attenuation and utilisation of MVHR for ventilation purposes.

The external balconies may experience external noise levels that are marginally higher than standards required. This is reflective of the buildings location adjacent to Isaacs Lane.

However, paragraph 7.7.3.2 of BS8233:2014 indicates that locations such as balconies are important external amenity spaces for apartment blocks, and where there are minor deviances these can be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that the space will still serve benefit as external amenity space. Through application of acoustic screening, details to be secured at condition stage a suitable noise environment can be achieved. The noise environment experienced on the façade of Building C is similar, albeit marginally lower than had been assessed for the Bellway Phase to the north, which had been deemed to be acceptable.

Alongside private amenity space, the occupants of Building C have access to communal amenity space within the Arrival Green immediately to the north and within the Eastern Parkland immediately to the east of the site.

The technical note prepared by Ian Sharland outlines how the scheme has been designed in accordance with the Pro PG hierarchy and that the development is acceptable from an environmental noise perspective. For further information please refer to this technical note.

### **Historic Environment.**

The Historic Environment Consultant at WSCC provided comments regarding archaeological considerations for Phase 1c. They acknowledged that archaeological fieldwork has been completed for Parcel 1.7, but hasn't been completed for 1.8. A scheme of investigation is required for Parcel 1.8. This will be dealt with under Condition 11 on the Outline Permission which requires a WSI and archaeological field work to be completed prior to works commencing on that phase of the development.

### **Ecology**

The comments from the MSDC Ecology Consultant highlights several conditions under the Outline Application that relate to ecology matters. The table below addresses each item in turn.

<b>Nature of the Response</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
Condition 8 - Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)	The specific wording of Condition 8 outlines that a CEMP will be required as a pre-commencement action. This requirement will be dealt with prior to works commencing on site.
Condition 19 – Site-wide planting Schedule	As above, final details of the planting spec will be secured at detailed design stage. This requirement will be dealt with prior to works commencing on site.
Condition 20 – Ecological Impact Assessment	Condition 20 requires an ecological impact assessment to be submitted before any development shall take place. As agreed with Place Services a full suite of updated survey work will be undertaken prior to works commencing on site. This item is not triggered for the RM.
Condition 35 - Ancient woodland	Whilst we do acknowledge that the Bedelands Nature Reserve lies to the east of the site, the development area does not fall within the buffer zone of any sections of the ancient woodland.  The Arboricultural Impact Assessment, prepared by SJA demonstrates that the site does not lie in or is close to any ancient woodland and as such the 15m buffer zone under Condition 35 is satisfied.



## **Public Art**

In line with the requirements of Condition 51, a draft Public Art Delivery Plan has been prepared by Savills Social Value team for submission as part of this application. This document outlines the methodology to be applied by Hill and Homes England in the procurement of the Public Art Strategy for this key phase of the development.

The Delivery Plan has been developed in partnership with officers at MSDC and local stakeholders and forms the foundation for future engagement with stakeholders as the commission is delivered.

## **Summary**

We trust that the foregoing provides sufficient information and will enable the application to be progressed to determination. If you have any queries or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me or my colleagues Rob Allen ([Robert.allen@savills.com](mailto:Robert.allen@savills.com)) or Dominic Taylor ([dominic.taylor@savills.com](mailto:dominic.taylor@savills.com)) in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charlie Collins".

**Charlie Collins**  
**Head of Guildford Office and South East Planning**