

## Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Responses

Chapter 1. District Plan - Introduction			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 54	Support: 3	Object: 42	Neutral: 9
Comments Received			
<p><b>Statutory consultees:</b> None</p> <p><b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> None</p> <p><b>Other consultee bodies:</b> <b>Sussex Wildlife Trust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft District Plan should be withdrawn until outcome of planning changes are announced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation period should be 12 weeks.</li> <li>The Public Exhibitions were limited to 2 hours on a single date for each locality. Didn't like the timescale of the exhibition with only 10 days to respond before Christmas.</li> <li>There is a need within MSDC to have management plans for monitoring planning approvals that include conditions that the applicant needs to fulfil.</li> <li>Unacceptable lack of open, transparent consultation and publicity by MSDC to alert and brief all householders about the very important implications for the future and character of villages like Crawley Down.</li> <li>So far, the process has been undemocratic and rather elitist.</li> <li>Lack of community engagement in Plan's 2 years' preparation, up to this consultation.</li> <li>Documents referred to in Appendix 2 fact checking exercise, in relation to site 688, are not available to residents, to see the data that some of the responses are based on.</li> <li>Mid Sussex should restart the process for identifying sites to be able to demonstrate 5 years supply up to 2038.</li> <li>Shouldn't progress a District Plan in times of political uncertainty.</li> <li>The three-year housing delivery test for Mid Sussex is currently 125% (500 homes); must ensure that existing allocations are delivered sustainably before adding new sites.</li> <li>Plan should be put on hold while the proposed amendments to the relevant legislation are being debated and look set to result in some major alterations to the requirements placed on MSDC?</li> <li>MSDC did not (save for one meeting just before the Plan went out) satisfactorily engage with the Parish prior to the Reg 18 consultation; nor did it hold an exhibition in Albourne Parish.</li> <li>The online questionnaire and feedback mechanism is over complicated and hard to navigate unless you have at least a few hours to spare.</li> <li>It is not sufficient to involve communities only at the Regulation 18 Stage after the decisions have been made on which sites to include.</li> </ul>			

Chapter 2. Background			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 1	Support: 0	Object: 1	Neutral: 0
Comments Received			
<p><b>Statutory consultees:</b> None</p> <p><b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> <b>South Downs National Park</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested change to the text about the South Downs National Park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other consultee bodies:</b> None</p>			

### Chapter 3. Achieving Sustainable Development

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 52	<b>Support:</b> 10	<b>Object:</b> 33	<b>Neutral:</b> 9
------------------	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### East Sussex County Council

- Public or community transport probably needs to be provided for the rural communities for the 20-minute neighbourhoods to work.

##### Homes England

- Supports 20-minute neighbourhoods as key for Brookleigh.

##### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### Brighton and Hove City Council

- Supports 20-minute neighbourhood principle.

##### Other consultee bodies:

##### CPRE Sussex

- 20-minute neighbourhood is not environmentally sustainable if using greenfield sites, need to use brownfield.

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- Welcomes the plan acknowledging the environment challenges

##### Others:

- Support actions that lead to additional cycleways and footpaths
- Need to link DPSC1: Land at Crabbet Park and DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane to public transport so Crawley and Brighton can be easily reached
- The 20-minute neighbourhood principle restricts freedom of movement and prevents privacy.
- Mid Sussex too rural in main for 20-minute neighbourhoods to work. Will only work in urban areas.
- Better public transport or community transport needed to get people living in rural areas into sustainable town centres.
- Presumptuous to presume people will not drive to a cheaper supermarket out of town.
- Funding for 20-min neighbourhoods needs to be explored.
- Cycle paths and footpaths need to be improved/more designated.
- Sustainable Development needs to be entwined within vision, objectives, policies and allocations chapters.

### Chapter 4. District Plan - Supporting Evidence

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 126	<b>Support:</b> 12	<b>Object:</b> 105	<b>Neutral:</b> 9
-------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### East Sussex County Council

- Essential that mitigation measures implemented to avoid diverted trips across border, into adjacent networks (B2112 through Ditchling).

##### Historic England

- A Heritage topic paper, assets register or heritage survey could be a useful tool to present evidence and delivery a positive heritage strategy

##### Surrey County Council

- Concerned about cumulative cross-boundary impacts (into Surrey). Consider the Local Model Validation Report to be an acceptable base model but would like some clarity on some points.

##### West Sussex County Council

- Transport evidence base work is not yet complete, further iterations ahead of Regulation 19. Require evidence of how appropriate transport strategy or highway measures can be delivered ahead of submission.

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisals and Green Infrastructure Mapping/ Ecological Network Mapping should be used in supporting the Plan.

**Others:**

- MSDC too reliant on external providers to provide infrastructure. MSDC powerless to control this.
- Site 677 (Land south of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down) should not be omitted from the plan.
- Promoting land off Silver Birches in Haywards Heath for development.
- Ambiguities and inconsistencies about DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane.
- Further clarity is needed with regards to infrastructure delivery of DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane.
- The options selected for comparison are inconsistent qualitative and too restricted in number.
- Transport modelling has proved virtually useless, at best misleading.
- Brownfield sites should be developed as a priority and build higher-density developments.
- Water facilities at maximum. Flooding an issue.
- Parking at all three stations needs to be increased significantly.
- Lack of information provided on Sustainable Communities' sites
- Traffic won't cope in the proposed locations.
- Inaccuracies in text relating to Sayers Common.
- Site Selection methodology and conclusions are wrong; criteria are fundamentally flawed.
- Plan needs to consider aerodrome safeguarding (air safety).
- Sustainability Appraisal based on out of date info.
- Insufficient waste management to cope with new housing volumes.
- The Plan shouldn't rely on Census data 2021 which was taken during the pandemic.
- The site selection process lacks a quantitative assessment of different options to demonstrate that the proposed allocations represent the most sustainable solution.
- Evidence base should be renewed and under constant review.
- Incorrect references in the HRA.
- No evidence of the Duty to Co-operate.
- Need to consider Crawley's unmet housing need.
- Unfortunate factual errors have now been incorporated into the evidence base.
- No Statement of Common Ground published.

**Chapter 5. Vision and Objectives**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 26	<b>Support:</b> 7	<b>Object:</b> 14	<b>Neutral:</b> 5
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Natural England**

- Suggested additional wording regarding biodiversity, net gain and nature recovery to reflect Environment Act 2021, Environment Plan and Environmental Improvement Plan.

**Homes England**

- 24 strategic development principles for Brookleigh align with the 3 priority themes and 15 objectives

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

**Crawley Borough Council**

- Support but "Environment" should include recognition of the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change, net zero economy

**South Downs National Park Authority**

- Suggested wording to objective 3 to broaden reference to the range of special qualities of protected and valued landscapes.

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Environmental objectives fail to reflect the ambition and urgency needed to restore the natural environment. Suggested wording to objective 3 or new objective provided.

**Others**

- Objectives haven't been uniformly applied in the housing developments
- Social element of building and maintaining communities has been ignored
- Housing demand methodology is not helpful
- Objectives not applied through the plan

**Chapter 6. District Plan Strategy**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 209	<b>Support:</b> 7	<b>Object:</b> 184	<b>Neutral:</b> 18
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**West Sussex County Council**

- Change "good public transport" to "relatively good public transport" to better describe category 1 towns.

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

**Brighton and Hove City Council**

- Support approach for identifying development potential

**Crawley Borough Council**

- Support "making effective use of land"
- Supports allowing extensions of existing settlements

**South Downs National Park Authority**

- Support protection of designated landscapes, but concerned if the NP and its setting have been considered
- Pages 33 and 34 fail to consider South Downs National Park

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Will housing targets be reconsidered after government housing target changes?
- Is the environmental evidence base supporting the local plan sufficient to confidently ensure this housing need can be delivered sustainably?
- Consider other national ecological assets alongside AONBs and High Weald - map needed

**The Woodland Trust**

- Recommends guidance on: *Residential development and trees – the importance of trees and green spaces*

**Others**

- Levelling up bill updates re non-mandatory targets should be taken at face value
- Needs calculation not realistic as 60% of MSDC is National Park or AONB
- Affordable housing targets not likely to be achieved
- Decrease development in countryside
- Site allocation doesn't consider the impacts of infrastructure needs
- Overloaded water supply and serious impact on highways A23, A2300 and A272

- Growth is not the only way to support provision of local services – strategy needed to retain and support existing services in rural communities
- New strategy for service provision where further development is not suitable
- limited growth potential at East Grinstead noted
- Not positively prepared, justified or consistent with National planning policy
- Amend to allocate developments in AONBs – developments should be limited but not excluded
- Emphasise the potential for urban renewal and redevelopment to contribute to housing supply needed
- Distribute areas of growth in and around HH and EG – areas of growth are not balanced between main towns
- Ansty is not considered an appropriate settlement for expansion but supports DPH24: Challoners, Cuckfield Road and DPH25: Land to the West of Marwick Close, Bolney Road if the development is proportional to the scale of the village
- Supports development at sustainable settlements BH, EG and HH
- More investment in infrastructure needed
- AONB and SDNP cannot be immune from development
- New developments must have infrastructure provisions - no capacity in existing towns
- Ansty is not considered an appropriate settlement for expansion
- Supports proportionate development at Cuckfield in line with the Neighbourhood Plan
- Fairer distribution of development needed
- Mention other ecological assets
- Sustainability of allocated sites
- More development on brownfield sites. Effective use of land – increasing supply in Turners Hill

## Chapter 7. Policies

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 7</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Neutral: 0</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### Historic England

- Standalone policies are not sufficient in relation to heritage risk.
- Policies should be tested against the potential risks they might have on heritage.

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- Welcomes the approach that MSDC have taken to give clarity to the policies and their status within the plan.

#### Others

- First paragraph top of page 43, change from “Mandatory” to “Advisory”.
- Non-strategic policies in the NPs must remain valid.
- Will residents be expected to fund the writing of a new Parish Plan to make it fit with the new District Plan, at a time when there are severe financial constraints?
- MSDC should have made clear what the changes were to existing policies.
- A longer plan period may be appropriate.

## Chapter 8. Sustainability

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total: 157</b>	<b>Support: 16</b>	<b>Object: 130</b>	<b>Neutral: 11</b>
-------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

## Comments Received

### Statutory Consultees:

#### Environment Agency:

- Consider updating Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and take account of other sources of flooding
- Support natural flood management and nature-based solutions
- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: Suggested wording for consistency with recently updated PPG.

#### East Sussex County Council:

- Health Impact Assessments (HIA) or screening for HIA should be supported by separate guidance and a template to provide clarity on the council's expectations. Potential to specify HIA triggers.

#### Historic England

- DPS1 Climate Change: Specific reference to protection of heritage assets should be included
- DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes: Specific reference to heritage assets in bullet (i) should be included

#### Homes England

- DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction: Support

#### Southern Water

- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: SuDs should be encouraged in minor developments (1-9 dwellings) too.

#### Southeast Water

- The Plan must do its part in addressing root causes of climate change.
- DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction: Suggest the council could be more ambitious in relation to water use, grey/rainwater harvesting.
- Supports DPS3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes and DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage
- DPS5 Water Infrastructure and Water Environment: should reference specific water target – recommend council be ambitious.

#### National Grid

- Suggest additional criteria to DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction to reference the presence of existing infrastructure in design

#### Natural England

- DPS1 Climate Change: Support
- DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction: Clarity needed on water efficiency standards are being set
- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: Suggested wording to strengthen use of natural flood management solutions
- DPS6 Health and Wellbeing: Reference could be made to NE's Green Infrastructure Framework

#### Thames Water:

- DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction: suggest amendment to ensure water efficiency and reduction of water consumption in the design of developments
- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: suggest amendment to ensure surface water does not drain to the foul sewer.

### MPs/ Local Authorities:

#### Crawley Borough Council

- DPS2 Sustainable Design and Construction: Plan should require development in Southern Water's Sussex North Water Resource Zone (WRZ) to be water neutral.

#### Wealden District Council

- Supports inclusion of sustainability chapter

### Other consultee bodies:

#### CPRE Sussex:

- The Plan/policies needs to go further to emphasis the context and importance of taking action to address climate change and securing sustainable development.
- Robust and transparent monitoring is required to support the ambition in the policies.
- Economic and social value to the countryside needs to be given more weight.

- Will the ambition in the Sustainable Economic Strategy (SES) for net zero-carbon ready homes be achieved.

**Gatwick Airport:**

- DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes: Suggested wording to reference early engagement with Gatwick Airport
- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: suggest additional wording to ensure SuDS do not give rise to increased bird strikes.

**The Woodland Trust:**

- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: suggest additional wording in support of natural flood management.

**Sussex Wildlife Trust:**

- DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes: seeks clarity that impacts extend to connection to the grid.
- DPS4 Flood Risk and Drainage: suggest additional wording in support of natural flood management.
- DPS5 Water Infrastructure and Water Environment: wording should be strengthened to include reference to biodiversity, climate change, maintenance and management commitments.

**Others:**

- Needs to align with the Sustainable Economic Strategy to build ‘net zero-ready homes’ and set out how the Plan will support achieving net zero targets and address scope 3 emissions
- Higher standards are not necessary or justified, goes against the NPPG and Written Ministerial Statement – should not go beyond national standards in Building Regulations
- Viability impacts need to be fully understood
- Lack of transparency – what the HQM standards actually mean for the development needs to be clearer – will it be net zero housing, what renewables will be integrated, will gas boilers be allowed and how water will be managed?
- Standards are not ambitious enough in water and energy – below net zero ready standard
- Require design to optimise orientation for maximising solar gain, avoid overheating and minimise heat loss
- Needs to be seeking higher standards for retrofitting existing buildings – LETI standard
- DPS3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes: Renewable energy policy should set specific measurable 5 yearly fossil fuel reduction targets and limit the scale of infrastructure in single locations

**Chapter 9. Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 195	<b>Support:</b> 19	<b>Object:</b> 169	<b>Neutral:</b> 7
-------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Environment Agency**

- DPN3 Green Infrastructure: ‘Green infrastructure’ should be changed to ‘green and blue infrastructure’.

DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery:

- Areas identified as opportunities for nature recovery should be safeguarded from development.
- Watercourses should have an 8m ecological buffer zone
- Policy should include reference to river restoration opportunities
- Provide cross reference to DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain
- DPN6 Pollution: Amend policy to include suggested statement on pollution prevention practices
- DPN10 Land Stability and Contaminated Land: Amend policy to reference “potential pathways for identified risk to receptors”

**Historic England**

- DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows: Support

**Natural England**

- DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery: amend wording suggested to provide clarification and strengthen policy
- DPN2 Biodiversity Net Gain: Amend wording suggested to strengthen policy
- DPN3 Green Infrastructure: amend wording suggested to strengthen policy via inclusion of other blue/ green infrastructure (see NE's GI Framework)
- DPN7 Noise Impacts: Amend wording suggested to include reference to natural solutions

#### **Southeast Water**

- Query the justification for the higher 20% BNG threshold for the identified significant sites. Higher BNG targets would create contradiction and complexity

#### **Southern Water**

- DPN6 Pollution: amend wording to include 'Development should not result in or be adversely affected by pollution or hazards, including air, noise, vibration, light, water, soil, odour, dust or other pollutants...'

#### **MPs/ Local Authorities:**

##### **South Downs National Park Authority**

- DPN8 Light Impacts and Dark Skies: Suggested wording to reference Park's designation as Moore's Reserve and guidance.

##### **Wealden District Council**

- Could include reference to cross boundary opportunities to connect habitats and create wider ecological networks.

#### **Other consultee bodies:**

##### **CPRE Sussex**

- New policy: Development should only be permitted when demonstrated that water and sewerage infrastructure is sufficient to avoid exacerbating unauthorised releases into water courses.
- If water pollution is continued to be dealt with in DPS5: Water Infrastructure and Water Environment, then cross reference to DPN6: Pollution is needed.
- DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery: amend wording to include Council's Ecological Network and Green Infrastructure mapping work
- Plan should set out express target for new woodland and hedgerows
- DPN6 Pollution: should be a strategic policy
- DPN7 Noise Impacts: amend wording to provide clarification
- DPN8 Light Impacts and Dark Skies: - The light pollution map could valuably be used at the site allocation stage.
- DPN9 Air Quality: amend wording to reference the hierarchy principle of avoidance *then* mitigation

##### **Gatwick Airport**

- DPN3 Green Infrastructure: Suggested to wording to reference design of infrastructure and risk of bird strike

##### **Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Would like to see a map of the ecological networks; proposed development sites should not impinge on these networks.
- Bird nest boxes should be provided on all development sites, and for Wakehams Green to require the provision of Swift bricks on a proportion of the new dwellings.
- Pet and human free areas which are set aside for nature should be included in Significant Sites (DPSC1-3).

##### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside, needs to be consistent with DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain, DPN3: Green Infrastructure, and DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows.
- DPN2 Biodiversity Net Gain: Amend policy to reference that BNG is in addition to requirements of Mitigation Hierarchy
- DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows: amend policy to include reference to "soils"

##### **The Woodland Trust**

- Supports UK's Committee in Climate Change (CCC) proposed rapid increase rate of woodland creation in tackling biodiversity and climate crisis.

- Strengthen wording with explicit reference to ancient woodland pasture and historic parkland as habitats that should be given same consideration as ancient woodland.
- Support setting greater than 10% target for BNG
- Encourage the consideration of developing a local metric for urban/ brownfield sites
- Offsite BNG should be part of a comprehensive Nature Recovery network approach.
- DPN3 Green Infrastructure: Amend wording to include reference to Local Nature Recovery Network
- DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows: Amend wording to strengthen reference to: the protection of Ancient Woodland; integration of trees into development (including minimum canopy); source of new trees; replacement trees and buffer zones.

#### Others:

- Many of the policies are supported, but text is suggested to strength the policy.
- DPN4 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows: lack of recognition of Worth Forest. Mainly mentions the Ashdown Forest in the policies.
- Worth Forest should be designated as a Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Zone.
- Worth Forest will be destroyed by Center Parcs.
- Insufficient recognition of Oldhouse Warren and Tilgate, High Beeches, Brantridge, Balcombe and Monks Forests as well. St.Leonard's (Plummers Plain, Newells, Leonards Lee, & Free Chase are under designated for wildlife interest at both national & local levels.
- Wider geographical recognition of important green infrastructure sites needed, particularly those in the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan.
- Protected species (identified by Woodland Flora and Fauna Group) are at risk from housing developments.
- Long time periods (10-20 years) are required for nature recovery on new sites
- increased pollution will be concentrated in narrow village centre streets such as Hurstpierpoint High Street
- For BNG, a management plan must be made together with enough money for long term funding before development proceeds.
- The policy should include provision for the replacement on a 1:1 basis of ash trees or other trees that are felled due to ash die-back or other disease with alternative natural species.
- The plan should set out quantitative values for “unacceptable levels of noise”
- The policy should specify warm yellow (i.e. temperature of 3000K or less) for outdoor lighting adjacent to sensitive habitats such as ancient woodland.
- DPN10 Land Stability and Contaminated Land: should prevent developments from raising the ground level if could result in reduced or blocked water flow from or into adjacent properties.
- Nature recovery and enhancement should be given further priority within DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery.
- Electric vehicles won't solve everything.
- 'off-site net gain' needs defining
- Reduce bird strike risk near Gatwick by a policy covering green and blue infrastructure.
- Add wording to DPN3: Green Infrastructure, to cover aerodrome safeguarding.
- DPN9 Air Quality: Pollution - should create emission-free zones for streets around schools.
- Protecting the Green spaces Is welcomed but it is felt this could have gone further.
- Strongly urge the Council to identify additional areas of existing green infrastructure and opportunities for enhancing and creating new green infrastructure within the plan.
- Interactive map/ DPN3 Green Infrastructure: boundary of DPSC1: Land to the West of Burgess Hill should be amended to remove the “Green Circle”.
- To achieve the objective of policy DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, Land at Ansty Farm should be reinstated

## Chapter 10. Countryside

### Number of Comments Received

**Total:** 82

**Support:** 14

**Object:** 52

**Neutral:** 16

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### Environment Agency:

- DPC3 New Homes in the Countryside: Needs to clarify that this will not be permitted if it conflicts with other policies or planning guidance

##### Historic England

- Supports, DPC2: Preventing Coalescence, DPC3: New Homes in the Countryside, DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and DPC5: Setting of the South Downs National Park

##### Southern Water

- DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside: barrier to statutory utility providers - amend wording to permit development for essential utilities infrastructure

##### Natural England

- DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Wording should be strengthened in line with paragraph 176 NPPF.
- DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC: suggested wording for clarification purposes

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### South Downs National Park Authority

- DPC5 Setting of the South Downs National Park: Support but amend for clarity and to reflect NPPF and include responsibilities MSDC have as per the section 62 duty of regard.

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### The Woodland Trust

- DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC: Supports protection of Ashdown Forest buffer zone and SANG requirements
- DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Support but add wording explicitly referring to ancient woodlands

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside: scope of this policy should go beyond intrinsic character and beauty. Ensure it doesn't conflict with DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery, DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain, DPN3: Green Infrastructure, and DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
- DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: large scale housing, industrial and leisure within AONB shouldn't be supported
- DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC: explain process being undertaken to determine whether MSDC will be providing SANGs

##### Sussex Ornithological Society

- DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Add that large-scale housing, industrial and leisure developments within the AONB will not be supported.
- DPC6 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC: Further explanation of the process undertaken to determine provision of SANGS is required.

#### Others:

##### DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside:

- Needs and sustainability of farming and forestry must be given strong weight
- More incentives for footpaths and right of way
- A map is needed to show areas being covered
- Needs strengthening
- Reference the need to use *The Cuckfield Landscape Character Assessment 2012*
- Should go further and include stronger preservation of ancient hedgerows
- Support, but agricultural development should be allowed

##### DPC2 Preventing Coalescence:

- Restrict development in local gaps

- More evidence required at planning stage
- Include a list of areas where coalescence is to be resisted
- Identification of local gaps should include land between Hurstpierpoint and settlements of Hassocks, BH and Albourne and Sayers Common
- Supports Policy DPC2: Preventing Coalescence. Should include a Local Gap between Cuckfield and Haywards Heath.
- Supports DPC2: Preventing Coalescence, but the wording of the policy impacts more on large scale developments, small scale should be included

DPC3 New Homes in the Countryside:

- Less restrictions on replacement dwellings
- Restrict replacement agricultural buildings
- Rural buildings should not be converted for at least 15 years from construction

DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:

- Restrict major developments
- Specific local housing needs and infrastructure
- More clarity is needed to demonstrate the interaction of this policy with others through the plan

DPC5 Setting of the South Downs National Park:

- NPPF coherence – amend wording

## Chapter 11. Built Environment

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 22	<b>Support:</b> 4	<b>Object:</b> 17	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### Historic England

- Chapter omits reference to archaeology
- DPB3 Conservation Areas: Support but would like further clarity on: How the plan will address heritage at risk, how the archaeology in the plan area will be managed, how environmental records and local list might assist, How Article 4 Directions may be employed to provide an additional conservation mechanism, What opportunities are there for heritage-led regeneration, What potential is there for new heritage-led tourism initiatives.

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### Crawley Borough Council

- DPB1 Character and Design: Recommend that quantitative density standards for different types of location are set out as part of this approach in order to ensure that development sites make efficient use of land.

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### Gatwick Airport

- DPB1 Character and Design: Ensure appropriate wording is used to support Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements.

##### The Woodland Trust

- DPB3 Conservation Areas: Suggest adding reference to trees

#### Others

##### DPB1 Character and Design

- Include specific reference in the policies for the LCWiP to show how this is integral to allow walking and cycling routes in and around the town.

##### DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

- Enhance wording about trees being incorporated in new development.
- DPSC3: Crabbet Park and DPH11: Land east of Borde Hill Lane, HH fail to meet the requirements on setting of Listed Buildings in this policy.
- set out more clearly how higher densities and compact forms of development may be appropriate.

## General

- Stronger requirements for dark sky implementation with recognition and wider public support identified from local groups of historic and notable buildings.
- This proposal contradicts 20-minute policy.
- Policy DPB1: Character and Design needs amending.
- The chapter omits reference to archaeology.
- Will developments of 500+ expect to have a 'mixed use element'.

## Chapter 12. Transport

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 74	<b>Support:</b> 15	<b>Object:</b> 42	<b>Neutral:</b> 17
------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### East Sussex County Council

- DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity: pg 88. Update to reflect TfSE and mention WSCC Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

##### DPT3 Active Travel:

- Explanation on what the LCWIP is is needed.
- Reference should be made to West Sussex's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP)

##### National Highways

- Measures to reduce trips and reliance on private vehicles are welcomed

##### South East Water

- Support

##### West Sussex County Council

##### DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:

- Reference to the WSTP text (paragraph 1.10)
- p88 fourth paragraph refers to "county boundaries". This should refer to "*local authority boundaries*" or more generally to "*administrative boundaries*"
- revision of text on page 88 third paragraph to "The WSTP seeks to move away from *traditional* 'predict and provide' approach which historically has focused on *large capital investment for* building capacity in the *transport* network to cater for forecast *unconstrained* traffic growth which has often led to exacerbate other impacts, such as *increased car ownership, reduced public transport use and service viability, high investment in infrastructure assets which could be utilised for other services*, health and well-being and achieving climate change mitigation."
- Add requirement to undertake and report regular monitoring of travel movements in and out of sites.
- Add objective to demonstrate how needs for external travel will be minimised. i.e provision of facilities and services.

##### DPT3 Active Travel:

- Not described strongly enough. Statement should acknowledge that users have different abilities. Cycling 5 miles and walking 10 minutes to better sell the concept

##### DPT4 Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure:

- Typo Ref third paragraph on p92 suggested amendment: "*Where feasible, higher standards for non-residential development will apply in line with Policy DPT4 below, unless or until higher standards are required nationally.*"
- Section c) non-residential requirements for EV charging differs to the standards in WSCC Guidance on Parking which do not specify a minimum charging speed, nor do they include a minimum threshold for parking where the policy applies.
- Suggest policy amended to ensure DPT4: Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure captures schemes with less than 10 parking spaces and/or footnote 10 is amended to clarify where the policy differs to the guidance.

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### Crawley Borough Council

- Support, but should refer to link to and support to Crawley's LCWIP in relation to Crabbet Park development.

### **South Downs National Park Authority**

- Additional criteria to address impacts on roads in the setting or within the National Park.

### **Other consultee bodies:**

#### **CPRE Sussex**

- DPT2 Rights of Way and Other Recreational Routes: Suggested wording to ensure accessibility
- DPT3 Active Travel: Policy should reference provision of facilities and infrastructure that facilitate accessibility to open spaces and countryside for the disabled.

#### **Gatwick Airport**

- DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity: a proportionate approach that is locationally specific is required.

#### DPT5 Off-Airport Car Parking:

- Policy should reference Airports existing Surface Access Strategy (ASAS)
- Amend as follows: *“Controlling the extent of **off** airport parking, on and off airport helps encourage the use of alternatives **sustainable transport modes** whilst ensuring sufficient parking is available to passengers and staff who have no other option.”*

#### **The Woodland Trust**

#### DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:

- Encourage policies for wildlife bridges, green corridors restoration of damaged ancient woodlands
- Strengthen to say highway improvements will be delivered before housing occupation
- Acknowledge need of improvements to A22/A264
- Add wording to encourage green infrastructure networks

#### **Others:**

#### DPT1 Placemaking and Connectivity:

- Lack of power supply for vehicle charging
- Highway improvements are needed
- Prioritise developments in areas with rail access
- Incentives for developers to provide walkability and cycling routes

#### DPT2 Rights of Way and Other Recreational Routes:

- Replace “encourage” with “required”
- New point to be inclusive of people with disabilities

#### DPT3 Active Travel:

- Cycle-hire schemes
- Include the words “safe”, “convenient” and “direct”
- Provide wheelchair accessible footpaths
- Not enough incentives for developers to comply
- BH to HH cycle path must be built prior to completion of Brookleigh secondary school
- Anticipate new forms of micro-mobility
- Financial incentive funds should contribute to bus services and cycling infrastructure.
- Upgrade rural footpaths
- “Where appropriate” open to interpretation, needs strengthening

#### DPT4 Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure:

- Ducting for future use could be extended to cover developments where parking of less than 10 spaces is required to 100% of spaces or require in all developments regardless of size
- Doesn't comply with West Sussex Guidance on Parking in New Developments

#### DPT5 Off-Airport Car Parking:

- Encourage non-road travel, improving rail and bus links to airport.
- Support but should go hand in hand with improvements to train, bus and tram links to airport

#### **General**

- Supports actions that lead to additional cycle and footpaths
- Support, but concerns over the capacity of A264

## Chapter 13. Economy

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 45	<b>Support:</b> 5	<b>Object:</b> 34	<b>Neutral:</b> 6
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### West Sussex County Council

- No reference to quantum of development is made.

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### Wealden District Council

- Policy should reference that a small stretch of the Bluebell Railway is within Wealden district.

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### Gatwick Airport

- Support that Gatwick is recognised as a major employment location and its role in economy

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- Suggested wording change to DPE9: Sustainable Tourism and Visitor Economy.

##### The Woodland Trust

- DPE9 Sustainable Tourism and Visitor Economy: Suggested inclusion of wording to include reference biodiversity

#### Other comments:

- Don't build on land prone to flooding
- What's happened with the NRR proposal for developing Burgess Hill town centre?
- Concern about lack of local employment opportunities. A car required to reach most employment options.
- Concern about traffic through Hurstpierpoint.
- Little employment opportunities planned for areas gaining most housing, particularly Sayers Common.
- Concern East Grinstead is not connected to Haywards Heath or Burgess Hill by rail.
- More detail needed on employment opportunities created by the Science & Technology Park.
- What sort of skills are needed for the area?
- Need to ensure the rural landscape and natural environment are not adversely affected.
- Actively support and assist start up companies by allowing them to have access to unused shops for a nominal rent.
- Balcombe has a defined village centre. This should be shown.
- Development proposals for new tourism accommodation and attractions should be supported if not in conflict of DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- New neighbourhood centres should be created where lots of new housing is proposed.
- Support for the extension of the Bluebell Railway.
- A site specific policy requested for Wakehurst Place.
- Large industrial warehouse units at Brighton Road, Pease Pottage (in AONB) and Bolney junction on M23 (setting of AONB) were not in accordance with this policy.
- Suggested changes to Land West of Burgess Hill to improve it.
- West Hoathly Brickworks, Sharpthorne should be looked at for employment site.

## Chapter 14. Sustainable Communities (General)

### Number of Comments Received (numbers do not include comments made against individual DPSC allocations)

<b>Total:</b> 12	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 10	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory consultees:

##### National Highways

- Where developments have long timescales, the Plan needs to be clear on what mitigation is needed and how it will be delivered
- 2039 future modelling assessments will be needed ahead of Regulation 19 consultation.
- Any strategic road network schemes need to be deliverable within highway land or land controlled by the promoter, ensure that the traffic generated by the development is accommodated, meets standards within DMRB and fully funded by confirmed sources.

#### **West Sussex County Council**

- Need for a special school site on one of the significant sites, or elsewhere in the district for circa 120 places.
- Holding objection until next stages of transport work are completed (acknowledge these are in progress)

#### **MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

#### **Other consultation bodies:**

##### **CPRE**

- Sites are incompatible with Plan's Vision

##### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Has the delivery of a cohesive ecological framework been considered?
- No mention of BNG within the policy requirements

#### **Others:**

- Two of the proposed allocations would help fulfil the housing need from the Coastal Sussex HMA
- Lack of ecological evidence
- Overreliance of the plan on the delivery of significant sites and lack of information with regard to delivery programme/trajectory

### **DPSC1: Land to the west of Burgess Hill**

#### **Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 145	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 136	<b>Neutral:</b> 7
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

#### **Comments Received**

##### **Statutory Consultees:**

##### **Environment Agency**

- Areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the site – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment needs consulting to understand future flood risk and the extent in these areas.
- Opportunities for river restoration which could contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain.

##### **Historic England**

- Potential to impact the setting of Grade II listed Sportman's Inn and North End Farm.
- Suggest policy amended to include retention and enhancement of historic landscape character

##### **Homes England**

- Proposals should be coordinated with consented Brookleigh scheme

##### **Southern Water**

- Wastewater network has limited capacity and needs reinforcement. Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping

##### **West Sussex County Council**

- Reference needed to Brick Clay (Weald) safeguarding area
- Metal recycling consultation area
- Suggested amendment to policy to include reference to Early Years and SEND at the primary school

- Location of primary school needs further consideration to avoid area of flood risk

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Gatwick Airport**

- Suggested wording added to reference the need for early engagement with Gatwick Airport

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Important biodiversity elements on the site should be referenced in the policy
- Policy (or DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocation) should reflect the need to contribute towards Local Nature Recovery.

**Woodland Trust**

- Object to the inclusion of areas of ancient woodland in the development sites.
- Insufficient buffer to ancient woodland, recommend 50m- Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) should be completed
- Suggested amendment to refer to protection of ancient woodland
- Northend Copse should be excluded from development

**Other comments:**

**Character/landscape:**

- Out of scale - harmful landscape impacts, Coalescence with Hurstpierpoint
- Loss of green field development/ agricultural land - should prioritise brownfield
- Harmful impact on historic and rural character
- Site needs to be fully masterplanned - vision document is inadequate
- Development land parcels are isolated from the main settlement of Burgess Hill
- Site area is insufficient to accommodate 1400 and associated mitigation and infrastructure

**Infrastructure:**

- Traffic impacts and highway safety concerns - Lack of alternative transport - occupants will be reliant on car
- Lack of infrastructure
- Insufficient affordable housing provision
- Flood risk

**Biodiversity/Sustainability:**

- Harmful impact on biodiversity, ancient woodland, natural environment, loss of green infrastructure and wildlife
- New housing must be built to be climate resilient and low/zero carbon
- Community energy generation and community heat networks should be planned for
- No evidence to support 20% biodiversity net gain achievable
- Ecological reports are required to assess the quality of the habitats, especially the grasslands

**General:**

- Query need and housing numbers - LURB implications
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan
- Harmful impact on air quality
- Lack of community engagement - consultation period too short and close to Christmas
- Query the development will be viable
- No information on trajectory. Question speed of housing delivery - oversaturation of Burgess Hill

**DPSC2: Land to the south of Reeds Lane**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 417	<b>Support:</b> 7	<b>Object:</b> 402	<b>Neutral:</b> 8
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Historic England**

- Policy should note potential impact on nearby protected listed buildings and setting.

## **West Sussex County Council**

- Add reference to Brick clay (Weald) safeguarding area within policy.
- Policy wording amendment; 'retain and enhance the existing PRow'
- Policy wording amendment; inclusion of secondary school provision (consistency with infrastructure requirement). Also, may need expansion land.

## **MPs/ Local Authorities:**

### **Andrew Griffith MP**

- Overdevelopment
- Long history of flooding due to inadequate sewage and waste systems.
- Reliant on cars for retail.
- Inadequate provision and access to public transport
- Local schools at capacity
- Rural lanes cannot support increased traffic
- Already pressure on GPs. Policy requirement of 'health provision' unclear.

### **Mims Davies MP**

- Overdevelopment and would exceed needed housing numbers for area.
- Out of character and outweighs size of local communities. Potential to become a dormitory town.
- Lack of and/or poor-quality infrastructure to support scale of development.
- Flood risk
- High water stress area.

## **Other consultee bodies:**

### **Gatwick Airport**

- Suggested wording added to reference the need for early engagement with Gatwick Airport

### **Sussex Ornithological Society**

- DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane, should include a strong statement emphasising importance of land west of site for birds

### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Cannot support allocation without ecological surveys.
- Drains and hedgerows provide corridors and connectivity, particularly to Ancient Woodland.
- Not immediately obvious proximity of other sites to establish cumulative impacts.

### **Woodland Trust**

- Completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) is recommended.

## **Other comments:**

### **Character/ Landscape**

- Overdevelopment.
- Coalescence with Albourne and Henfield
- Impact on the South Downs National Park
- If DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane goes ahead it should include a Green Circle like Burgess Hill (amend DPN3: Green Infrastructure)
- Loss of rural living
- This is not an urban extension.
- SW part of site ('hamlet') disconnected, isolated from rest of site; should be considered and assessed separately. Should be removed. Land has had multiple 'refusals' for development.
- Development will lead to loss enjoyment of countryside by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

### **Biodiversity**

- Loss of wildlife; including protected species and red-listed species.
- Loss of habitats and ecological networks. No indication of consultation with Woodland Flora and Fauna Group, SWT, British Trust for Ornithology, or Ecology faculty of University of Sussex.
- Fields currently provide irreplaceable hunting areas for owls

### **Sustainability/ Infrastructure**

- Development should include artificial grass for an all-year round sports facility and a gym.
- Sewage systems already cannot cope
- Lack of bus services and poor connectivity to train stations (Hassocks and Burgess Hill).

- B2118 is a rat run for lorries and speeding traffic
- Increased flood risk and drainage; impermeable clay. B2118 in Albourne floods causing hazardous driving conditions.
- Proposed access onto B2118 is high surface flood risk area
- Rural roads cannot cope with additional traffic (B2116); multiple sharp, blind corners.
- No local employment for new residents
- Lack of public transport
- GP surgeries already overstretched. Is provision realistic; can they be staffed, is a convalescent home more useful?
- Insufficient digital infrastructure
- No local school; children bussed into schools. What will happen to existing primary schools? When will the school be delivered?
- New primary school not needed; already undersubscribed.
- Nearest primary and secondary schools full
- New secondary school will bring additional congestion
- Infrastructure needs to include childcare (included in Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill)
- Size of site unlikely to support a sixth form; students will have to travel out of village
- Lack of capacity on railway network and lack of parking at stations.
- Already a water stressed area. Insufficient water supply. No reference to water neutrality.

### General

- Access point: potential for comprehensive access scheme with DPH20: Land at Coombe Farm, London Road
- No assessment of traffic impacts locally. No proper assessment of additional traffic onto A23 (north and south bound slip roads (A2300 and Muddleswood).
- Worsening of air pollution
- Site name should be changed to 'Land to the north and south of the B2116 Henfield Road Albourne'
- Council's transport studies and models don't consider smaller surrounding roads
- Area should be made safer for horse riders with routes across site and parallel with London Road
- Increased congestion through Hurstpierpoint and at Stonepound Crossroads (an AQMA), as well as Cowfold to the west
- Proposed development is contrary to the Visions and other policies within draft District Plan (i.e. 20 minute neighbourhood)
- Will contribute to climate change
- Ignores the neighbourhood plans (strategic gaps)
- Government has changed position on housing need; site not needed. Shouldn't be building beyond the local need; should be planning for 7/800 not 1,100dpa. Mid Sussex is accommodating a wholly disproportionate number of new builds.
- Site should be removed and the need spread more evenly across the District. Development should be concentrated in Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath, and other urban areas.
- Why is a spine road running parallel with Reeds Lane and a new junction proposed?
- Housing must reflect local needs; smaller properties.
- Why not incorporate employment element between established Avtrade and Kings business centre and increase housing on site
- Policy requirements and promoter's Vision Document not aligned. Masterplan provided is insufficient.
- Loss of dark skies
- Gypsy and Traveller accommodation provision should be removed; not needed

### DPSC3: Land at Crabbet Park

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 53	<b>Support:</b> 4	<b>Object:</b> 43	<b>Neutral:</b> 6
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

**Statutory Consultees:****Historic England**

- Policy should note potential to impact on nearby listed buildings and their setting.

**Natural England**

- Clarity sought on what work has been done regarding potential impacts on AONB.

**Surrey County Council**

- Series of Ordinary Watercourses on site. Development should seek opportunities to reduce causes and impacts of flooding.

**West Sussex County Council**

- Policy wording amendment; inclusion of secondary school provision (consistency with infrastructure requirement). May also need expansion land.

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Crawley Borough Council**

- Would welcome discussions on self-build; opportunities to help meet Crawley's demand
- Suggested inclusion of wording to reflect that the site is an urban extension to Crawley
- Clarity sought on infrastructure provision and proposals; consistency with other significant sites and cross boundary

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Cannot support allocation without ecological surveys.
- Watercourses, hedgerows and linear woodlands provide corridors and connectivity.
- Policy requirements fail to reflect aforementioned biodiversity elements

**Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Importance of area east of M23 for Red Listed, Schedule 1 and Section 41 species. Database of bird records provided.

**Woodland Trust**

- Completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) is recommended. A minimum 50m buffer to Ancient Woodland should be incorporated.
- Suggested wording to include protection of ancient woodland

**Other comments:****Landscape**

- Increase in density of the area, no longer countryside
- Lower housing numbers
- Conflicts with Natural Environment and green infrastructure policies

**Flood Risk**

- Flood risk around Burstow stream – drainage issues

**Biodiversity**

- Within AONB – to be saved and improved, not developed.

**Heritage**

- Potential impact on listed adjacent listed buildings

**Developability**

- Affordable housing should be 40%
- Unsuitable location

**Accessibility**

- Connectivity with Copthorne
- One road in private property
- Policy requirement to retain and enhance the existing PRow that cross this site

**Infrastructure**

- Provision of secondary school needed
- Transport infrastructure required to reduce car dependency
- Provision of retail and leisure space
- Onsite provision of sports facilities

**General**

- Include description of “urban extension” as done on DPSC1: Land to the West of Burgess Hill and DPSC2: Land to the South of Reeds Lane
- Need for allotments on site
- On site gypsy and traveller provision
- Increased noise and air pollution

## Chapter 15. Housing

### Policy DPH1: Housing

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 395	<b>Support:</b> 180	<b>Object:</b> 209	<b>Neutral:</b> 6
-------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory consultees:

None

##### MPs/Local Authorities:

##### Mims Davies MP:

- Overall housing numbers need to be robustly looked at with the forthcoming new NPPF
- Housing should avoid creating dormitory towns
- Need to balance housing growth and employment opportunities with delicate environment and keeping Mid Sussex special
- Ensure brownfield sites are utilised first to protect ecosystems, biodiversity, landscapes and farming land in rural communities.
- Mid Sussex is Serious Stress Water Area; need to joint working with water companies in relation to water supply and flooding.

##### Brighton and Hove City Council

- Current provision should not be a ceiling; should plan positively for further opportunities to help meet unmet needs of neighbours.

##### Crawley Borough Council

- Wider context of the Northern West Sussex HMA and unmet needs should be acknowledged in this section.

##### Other consultee bodies:

##### CPRE Sussex

- Plan sets excessive housing target with unnecessary and inappropriate significant rural allocations.

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- Is the proposed housing need supported by necessary environmental evidence; question ability of MSDC’s natural capital to absorb level of development.

##### Other comments:

##### General

- Harmful landscape and heritage impact
- Traffic and highway safety issues
- Insufficient infrastructure/ local services
- Not enough affordable housing
- Loss of biodiversity/ habitat
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan
- Overall number is excessive and should be challenged in line with Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill
- Spatial strategy results in disproportionate growth
- Brownfield first
- Insufficient buffer
- No detailed trajectory
- SHMA needs to be reviewed to explicitly address social housing deficit in Mid Sussex
- Standard method is flawed - based on outdated targets and inappropriate assumptions
- Windfall allowance is underestimated

- Where relevant allocations should include reference to retaining and enhancing PRow (see individual allocations)
- Plan period should be extended to 2041

### Policy DPH2: Sustainable Development – Outside the Built-up Area

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 25	<b>Support:</b> 4	<b>Object:</b> 20	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### National Trust

- Conflicts with DPC3: Land at Crabbet Park

##### Others:

- Prevent Coalescence
- Policy is unclear
- Omit developments of “fewer than 10 dwellings”
- Too restrictive – Increase “fewer than 10 dwellings” to 30
- Conflicts with DPC3: Land at Crabbet Park, DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside and DPH34: Rural Exception Sites
- Add point: And/or where the council can’t prove a 5-year housing supply
- Amend to restrict development within High Weald and AONB. i.e., not conflict with DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Amend to only allow development proportionate in site with the existing settlement
- Remove “local need” to allow developments that meet district wide needs
- Include “or where the site is previously developed land”

### Policy DPH3: Sustainable Development – Inside the Built-up Area

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 12	<b>Support:</b> 4	<b>Object:</b> 8	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### CPRE Sussex

- Prioritise redevelopment of the Martlets centre in BH
- Development of brownfield sites should be a priority

##### Others:

- Amend wording to prevent loss of existing community facilities and services.
- Plan focuses on development outside the built-up area – contrary to NPPF

### Policy DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocations

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 29	<b>Support:</b> 5	<b>Object:</b> 23	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### Environment Agency

- Include additional bullet points referring the sequential and exception tests of paragraphs 023 and 037 of the NPPF
- Amend to read: “Provide a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) / surface water drainage strategy in areas at risk from (delete - fluvial or surface water flooding from) any source (such as fluvial or surface water flooding) to inform the site layout and any appropriate mitigation, resilience and resistance measures that may be necessary. (Delete - Areas at risk of flooding should be

avoided in the first instance.) Any proposal must demonstrate that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere, and provides a betterment wherever possible (i.e. a net flood risk benefit)."

- Consider greywater recycling
- Refer to the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (CAMS).
- Developments should connect to public foul sewer as a priority

#### **Historic England**

- Rewrite: "Undertake pre-determination evaluation of potential archaeological features on the site prior to any planning application being submitted, unless it can be demonstrated that such an evaluation is not appropriate for this site"
- Add: "Respect Listed buildings, conservations areas..." including those that are undesignated
- Settings or LB and CA need to and should be conserved and enhanced

#### **Natural England**

- Consider applying same standards to other housing allocation sites, not just significant sites

#### **West Sussex County Council**

- Reference to Joint Minerals Local Plan should read: West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (July 2018, Partial Review March 2021) (JMLP).
- Make reference to Waste Local Plan
- New homes should provide suitable space for home working to reduce external travel
- Requirement to undertake and report travel plan monitoring of movements in and out of sites.

#### **MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

#### **Other consultee bodies:**

#### **Gatwick Airport**

- Requirement to engage with Gatwick Airport at an early stage on housing proposals
- Add Aerodrome Safeguarding Policy as per policy DD5 in Crawley's Local Plan
- Under Aerodrome Safeguarding Requirements add the following:
  - Impact of buildings, structures and construction equipment on Communication, Navigation & Surveillance (CNS) equipment & Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs).
  - Impacts of buildings, structures and construction equipment on Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)
  - Lighting schemes that could dazzle pilots or ATC or could be confused with aeronautical ground lighting
  - Buildings/structures in proximity to the airport that could create induced turbulence or thermal uplift from vapour plumes from flues/cooling towers.

#### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Clearer inclusion of BNG - minimum 10-20%

#### **Other comments:**

- Bullet point 3, delete "identify how the development will..."
- Include requirement of Passivhaus principles
- Repetition with other policies, needs to be simplified
- No justification for the 4\* BRE HQM
- Water consumption of 85 litres p/p against NPPG – evidence needed.
- Council should adopted requirements 85 litres per person (l/p/p) to 80 l/p/p for strategic developments, inline with Gatwick's Sub Regional Water Cycle Study.
- All new developments should achieve 100 l/p/p
- Require 11 HQM credits as a minimum for water efficiency.
- Delete policy and incorporate in specific allocation site policies instead.
- Include reference to DPH5: Batchelors Farm, Keymer Road, DPH6: Land at Brow Hill, Janes Lane, DPH7: Burgess Hill Station and DPH8: Land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead and delete reference to DPH29: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
- Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure: make clear the need to delivery BNG on each allocation
- 20% biodiversity net gain is excessive

- Make reference to DPH30: Self and Custom Build Housing, DPH31: Housing Mix and DPH32: Affordable Housing under "Significant Sites"

### Site DPH5: Batchelors Farm, Keymer Road, Burgess Hill

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 10	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 8	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### Environment Agency

- Suggested policy wording to refine policy requirement in relation to flood risk.

##### Historic England

- Suggested amended wording to strengthen and provide clarification

##### Natural England

- Ask that the water standards set for significant sites are set for all housing allocations.

##### West Sussex County Council

- Include reference to Keymer Road Brick Clay safeguarding area
- Suggest policy requirement added here, or to DPT1: Placemaking and Connectivity, for monitoring travel movements to enforce travel plan targets.
- Reference should be made to the Waste Local Plan

##### MPs/ Local Authority:

##### South Downs National Park Authority

- Additional criteria to ensure harm is avoided to the transitional landscape character of this area as part of the setting of the SDNP
- Adjacent to SA13 (site allocation DPD) – concerns over erosion of the transitional landscape character

##### Other consultee bodies:

##### Gatwick Airport

- Suggested policy wording regarding need for early engagement with Gatwick Airport.
- Amended wording suggested for bullet points under Aerodrome Safeguarding Requirements section.

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- No ecological surveys have been submitted
- Consider how nature reserve will be managed

##### Other comments:

##### Landscape

- Landscape implications - close proximity to South Downs National Park
- Coalescence

##### General

- Unsuitable number of dwellings

### Site DPH6: Land at Hillbrow, Janes Lane, Burgess Hill

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 10	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 9	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### West Sussex County Council

- Amend wording to include reference to Janes Lane Brick Clay safeguarding area

##### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys have been submitted
- Number of established trees and hedgerows

**Others:****Landscape**

- Density of development not suitable for the area

**Biodiversity**

- Against the removal of established trees
- Detrimental to the Biodiversity of the site

**Flood Risk**

- Flood Risk area

**Developability**

- Unsuitable number of dwellings

**Accessibility**

- Dangerous access- unsuitable

**Infrastructure**

- No infrastructure in place

**General**

- Name of allocation to be revised as to not be associated with Hillbrow House
- Amend boundary to incorporate of land to the east

**Site DPH7: Burgess Hill Station, Burgess Hill****Number of Comments Received****Total:** 94**Support:** 0**Object:** 94**Neutral:** 0**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Southern Water**

- Suggested amendment to ensure development is phased to align with delivery of sewerage infrastructure and to ensure access to the infrastructure is maintained

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Mims Davies MP**

- Loss of vital and scarce allotment space.
- Loss of green spaces in town centre.
- There is insufficient infrastructure, including public transport links, medical services, civic amenities and schools.
- Impact on the wide biodiversity and animal habitats.
- Area prone to flooding.
- Water constraints in area.

**Other consultee bodies:****CPRE Sussex**

- Allotment requirement should be a precondition to the grant of any future planning application.

**Sussex Wildlife Trust:**

- No ecological surveys have been submitted
- Accessibility of new allotments should avoid the need to travel by car
- Policy wording needs strengthening to reflect the loss of habitat and address need to retain features of importance such as mature trees

**Others:****Biodiversity/green space/allotments:**

- Loss of allotments which are a vital community facility - impact on wellbeing, health, food growing
- Will increase the existing deficit in allotment space in the town

- No opportunities to re-provide allotments within walking distance and plan does not include sufficient provision overall
- Allotments are not brownfield, they do not appear on the council's brownfield register
- The allotment are/ should be designated a Local Green Space
- Loss of open space
- Loss of biodiversity/ wildlife
- Impacts ancient woodland abut southern boundary

**Infrastructure:**

- Traffic and highway safety concerns
- Loss of parking
- Lack of infrastructure

**General:**

- Site Selection and Sustainability Appraisal are flawed
- Flood risk issues and subsidence likely
- Contrary to Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan policy G5.
- Housing should be allocated on the Martlets site instead
- Housing numbers no longer need to be met at planned levels

**Site DPH8: Land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total: 6</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Neutral: 1</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**West Sussex County Council**

- Add reference to Brick clay (Wadhurst) safeguarding area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Object to site; creates a significant and isolated peninsula of development

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided. Data shows priority habitats onsite, Ancient Woodland adjacent

**The Woodland Trust**

- Areas of ancient woodland should be removed from allocation. Cautionary minimum 50m buffer should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation.
- Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI)

**Other comments:**

**General**

- Should not be allowed until solution to increased congestion in East Grinstead is found

**Site DPH9: Land at Hurstwood Lane, Haywards Heath**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total: 4</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Neutral: 0</b>
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided.

**Other comments:****Landscape**

- May encourage further incursion into the countryside

**Infrastructure**

- Additional pressure on town's infrastructure; financial contributions will go to Lewes District Council
- Road safety of Fox Hill significant concern

**General**

- Fails to meet the 20-minute neighbourhood principles
- Site should be removed in favour of alternative site: Land at Colwell Farm

**Site DPH10: Land at Junction of Hurstwood Lane and Colwell Lane****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 4	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 3	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided.

**Others comments:****Infrastructure**

- Additional pressure on town's infrastructure; financial contributions will go to Lewes District Council
- Road safety of Fox Hill significant concern

**General**

- Fails to meet the 20-minute neighbourhood principles
- Site should be removed in favour of alternative site: Land at Colwell Farm

**Site DPH11: Land east of Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 134	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 129	<b>Neutral:</b> 4
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory consultees:****Environment Agency**

- Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations.
- May be opportunities for restoration/ enhancement of northern watercourse; could add to BNG

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to include reference to mineral safeguarding and consultation areas

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Mims Davies MP**

- Already taken houses at Penlands Farm
- Impact on biodiversity and habitats. Adjacent to ancient woodland and semi-natural woodland.
- Greenfield site, part of the Haywards Heath – Cuckfield strategic gap.
- High water stress area

- Insufficient infrastructure. Access roads are narrow lanes. Area prone to flooding.

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Concern with northward extension, proximity to AONB

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided. Data shows presence of priority habitat

**General**

- Erosion of rural setting
- Erosion of green barriers between Haywards Heath, Cuckfield, Lindfield and the High Weald AONB
- Impact on the AONB
- Impact on infrastructure (traffic, health, education, utilities)
- Archaeological value of the site
- Flooding
- Contrary to adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- The proposal does not accord with the 20-minute neighbourhood principles
- Promise that the land would not be developed for a period of 15 years
- Fails to meet the objectives identified in the sustainability appraisal
- SA DPD suggested no further development was required for Haywards Heath; already taken its share of development
- The plan is oversupplying housing and therefore the site is not needed
- Proposed development within Ansty & Staplefield Parish but will impact on Haywards Heath, Cuckfield and Balcombe
- Impact of biodiversity. The proposal is in contradiction with the recent money awarded to Borde Hill Gardens to promote biodiversity
- Impact of construction on neighbouring properties.
- Loss of greenfield whereas development should be directed to brownfield land

**Site DPH12: Orchards Shopping Centre, Haywards Heath**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 6	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 5	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping

**West Sussex County Council**

- Greater emphasis should be given to sustainable transport access

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- Amend policy to include positive delivery of green infrastructure

**Other comments:**

**General**

- No need for a multistorey carpark
- Site should be used for affordable housing
- Increased parking density at Orchard Shopping Centre may release other smaller car parks

## Site DPH13: Land to west of Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down

### Number of Comments Received

Total: 59

Support: 0

Object: 57

Neutral: 2

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

##### Thames Water

- Appropriate sustainable surface water strategy needs to be agreed with Lead Local Flood Authority
- Scale of development doesn't materially affect sewer network. Careful design of new network needed to avoid surcharge.
- Upgrades to wastewater network likely to be needed; joint working with promoter and MSDC needed on an infrastructure phasing plan to ensure timely delivery

##### West Sussex County Council

- Direct pedestrian and cycle access to Worth Way should be provided
- Improvements to footway on Turner's Hill Road needed, notably to the bus stop
- Severe impact at Wallage Lane and A2028 junction

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- No ecological survey has been provided. Question whether development is suitable or viable without affecting connectivity of habitat to wider landscape

##### Sussex Ornithological Society

- Within Ancient Woodlands – Full ecological assessment needed
- Increase density of houses elsewhere instead

##### The Woodland Trust

- Areas of ancient woodland should be removed from allocation. Cautionary minimum 50m buffer should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation.
- Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI)

#### Other comments:

##### Infrastructure/ Sustainability

- Lack of infrastructure
- No space in local schools
- Power cuts
- Need for developers to contribute towards The Haven Sportsfield area
- Increased traffic
- Need for walking routes

##### Flood Risk

- Incorporation of grey infrastructure – flooding risk
- Drainage issues

##### Landscape

- Loss of landscape
- Dangerous access to site
- Adjacent to ancient woodland
- Not build on local gaps
- Destruction of farmland and woodlands

##### Accessibility

- Dangerous access to site

##### General

- Density does not match demand

- Lack of community involvement in the site selection process
- Noise Pollution
- Adverse impact on economy and community
- Too many houses in Crawley Down

### Site DPH14: Hurst Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 16	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 14	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### Thames Water

- Appropriate sustainable surface water strategy needs to be agreed with Lead Local Flood Authority
- Scale of development doesn't materially affect sewer network. Careful design of new network needed to avoid surcharge.
- Need for engagement between developers and Thames Water to understand drainage requirements and anticipated loading/flow
- Upgrade delivery time shouldn't be underestimated, can be 18 months – 3 years
- Include information provided with planning application to provide assurance that water and waste matters are being addressed.

##### West Sussex County Council

- Bus waiting facilities at stops outside site need improving.

##### MPs/ Local authorities:

None

##### Other consultee bodies:

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- No comment – ecological information needed
- Status of the site unclear, aerial photographs show construction underway

##### The Woodland Trust

- Ancient Woodland – keep as buffer and create new native woodland habitats in its surroundings
- Complete ATI to comply with NPPF

##### Other comments:

##### Landscape

- Greater need for agricultural land
- Need for a 50m buffer to be maintained between development and ancient woodlands

##### Accessibility

- Schools are full
- Traffic pressures

##### Infrastructure

- Insufficient provision of infrastructure
- Need for a road traffic solution prior to delivery
- Lack of public transport

##### General

- No demand for more housing

### Site DPH15: Land rear of 2 Hurst Road, Hassocks

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 6	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 3	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference Soft sand safeguarding area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – ecological information needed

**Other comments:****Landscape**

- Keep green space buffer – danger of coalescence

**Accessibility**

- Unsuitable for development – access concerns

**Site DPH16: Land west of Kemps, Hurstpierpoint****Number of Comments Received****Total:** 73**Support:** 1**Object:** 70**Neutral:** 2**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Easement required; must be factored into layout and landscaping
- Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to include reference to mineral safeguarding area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided. Onsite habitat: trees, hedgerows and waterways; should not be compromised by development.

**Other comments:****Landscape/ Character**

- Development of the land will result in coalescence
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Loss of public open land

**Infrastructure/ Sustainability**

- Lack of appropriate infrastructure
- Site prone to flooding
- Land subject to sewage contamination
- Inadequate proposed access
- Propose access incompatible with current use the road

**General**

- Loss of biodiversity
- Insufficient affordable housing provision
- Submission from site proponent

**Site DPH17: The Paddocks, Lewes Road, Ashurst Wood****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 5	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 3	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Southern Water**

- Southern Water infrastructure crosses the site – access to be preserved
- Add a policy requirement to ensure the layout of the development be planned to ensure future access to underground infrastructure

**Wealden District Council**

- Any potential cross boundary impacts should be fully explored with Wealden DC and ESCC.
- Within 7km Ashdown Forest buffer zone – mitigation measures required

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to include reference to Ashurst Wood Brick Clay consultation area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Site within AONB
- Consider 100% affordable housing or increase density in developments elsewhere

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – ecological information needed – within High Weald AONB

**Other comments:**

None

**Site DPH18: Land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 271	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 268	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area
- Will continue to monitor position re: education provision, not currently required.

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Mims Davies MP**

- Greenfield site.
- Would double size of Bolney. New builds out of character.
- Insufficient infrastructure, including reliability. Poor sustainable transport links.
- Potential impacts on biodiversity.
- A272 already extremely busy.
- Are prone to flooding

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage.
- Clarification sought on location of country park; will there be a minimum size in policy?

**Other comments:****Landscape/ Character**

- Impacts on the village setting
- Impact on landscape and biodiversity
- Impact on heritage
- Overdevelopment/ disproportionate growth of the village
- Loss of local amenity
- Loss of historic settlement pattern
- Coalescence with the hamlet of Crosspost

**Infrastructure/ Sustainability**

- Poor public transport
- Pedestrian and cycle infrastructure is not suitable or safe to access services
- The road network in and around Bolney is at capacity and unsafe
- A272 junctions already suffer from delays and further development will add to these
- Additional development will increase traffic and car accidents on the A272
- Further development will impact on traffic through the village
- Local infrastructure such as education and health are already under pressure
- Utility companies are already unable to provide their service
- The infrastructure promoted alongside the development is not necessary in a rural location
- The site floods and development is likely to result in an overflow on existing properties
- Increased air pollution which is already high in Bolney
- Affordability issues which include affordable home

**Site DPH19: Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 17	<b>Support:</b> 3	<b>Object:</b> 14	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Environment Agency**

- Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS.

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage.
- Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common

**Other comments:****General**

- Flood risk
- The sewage infrastructure is deficient
- Impact of additional traffic on the local area

**Site DPH20: Land at Coombe Farm, London Road, Sayers Common****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 25	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 22	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Environment Agency**

- Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS.

**Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area
- Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage.
- Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common

**The Woodland Trust**

- Cautionary minimum 50m buffer to Ancient Woodland should be included. New habitat should be created around ancient woodland to reverse fragmentation.
- Recommend completion of an Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI)

**Other comments:**

**General**

- Impacts on ancient woodland
- Detrimental to biodiversity
- Flood risk
- Lack of suitable infrastructure

**Site DPH21: Land to the West of Kings Business Centre, Reeds Lane**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 15	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 14	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Environment Agency**

- Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS.

**Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area
- Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage.
- Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common

**Other comments:****Landscape/ Character**

- Loss of identity as the proposed developments would merge several villages together.

**Infrastructure/ Sustainability**

- Inadequate infrastructure.
- The increase of traffic would particularly be a problem for Hurstpierpoint High Street and Cowfold that already has an Air Quality Control area.
- Water security; need for a reservoir?
- Limited capacity for the wastewater network.
- Flooding issues. Reeds Lane often floods.
- Poor transport links in the area.
- No employment opportunities in the area.

**Biodiversity**

- Impact on wildlife habitats with rare species; onsite and Downland.

**General**

- Questions the Housing Need number.
- Contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policies.
- No pavements or street lighting pushes people towards using a car.
- Disproportionate number of new homes proposed in local area. Too much for a tier 3 settlement.
- Welcomes the inclusion of Land to the West of King Business Centre as a proposed allocation.

**Site DPH22: Land at LVS Hassocks, London Road, Sayers Common.****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 14	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 14	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****Environment Agency**

- Amend wording to avoid developing in flood risk areas; consistent with other allocations, and to include reference to integrate of SuDS.

**Southern Water**

- Amend wording to ensure occupation is phased with delivery of wastewater infrastructure
- Reinforcement of network to be funded through New Infrastructure charge; site promoters and SW will need to work together to understand development program.
- Remove policy requirement referring to wastewater treatment upgrades; not needed for this site specifically

**West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference brick clay safeguarding area
- Sustainable transport provision; coordinated approach across Sayers Common sites needed

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys provided; unable to provide comments at this stage.
- Site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in Sayers Common

**Other comments:****Landscape/ Character**

- Over development.
- Too much development for a Category 3 settlement.
- Poor public transport.

**Infrastructure/ Sustainability**

- Lack of infrastructure in area.
- Flooding issues already in the area.

- Traffic issues and Cowfold is already has an Air Quality Control area.
- The wastewater and sewerage system need reinforcements or improvements made.
- Healthcare system already struggling with the number of people

**Biodiversity**

- Damage to habitat of Roe deer and large mature oak trees.
- Impacts on ecosystem

**General**

- Government policy is changing; housing number could change.

**Site DPH23: Ham Lane Farm House, Ham Lane, Scaynes Hill**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 25	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 22	<b>Neutral:</b> 3
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**West Sussex County Council**

- CDE Waste and Aggregate Recycling Facility consultation area and close to Eastlands Farm aggregate recycling.
- Amend wording to reference Building Stone consultation area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – ecological information needed

**The Woodland Trust**

- Objects to inclusion of ancient woodlands within development sites – need for a 50m buffer
- The Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) for the area may be incomplete. Complete to comply with NPPF

**Other comments:**

**Landscape**

- Breaching of green gap between Haywards Heath and Scaynes Hill
- Overdevelopment in the area

**Heritage**

- Negative impact on character

**Developability.**

- Lack of demand

**Accessibility**

- Ham Lane is a private road – alternative access required.
- No cycling routes and public transport in place
- Heavy traffic

**Infrastructure**

- Water and sewage issues
- Flood risk
- Lack of public infrastructure and facilities
- Lack of streetlights

**Site DPH24: Challoners, Cuckfield Road, Ansty**

**Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 31	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 30	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

**Southern Water**

- Add a policy requirement to ensure the layout of the development be planned to ensure future access to underground infrastructure

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – ecological information needed

**Other comments:**

**Landscape**

- Overdevelopment

**Biodiversity**

- Ecologically sensitive area

**Heritage**

- Detrimental to the character of Ansty

**Developability**

- Uncertainty over requirement for more housing – reference to the levelling up bill
- Contrary to neighbourhood plan

**Accessibility**

- Inadequate access at Marwick Close with no footpath or streetlights

**Infrastructure**

- Lack of public transport
- Lack of infrastructure and facilities – Doctors and shops, school
- Lack of public infrastructure - water and electricity
- Traffic issues

**General**

- Loss of privacy for Marwick Drive residents

**Site DPH25: Land to the west of Marwick Close, Bolney Road, Ansty**

**Number of Comments Received**

**Total:** 25

**Support:** 1

**Object:** 22

**Neutral:** 2

**Comments Received**

**Statutory Consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

**Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – ecological information needed

**Other comments:**

**Landscape**

- Overdevelopment

**Biodiversity**

- Ecologically sensitive area

**Heritage**

- Detrimental to the character of Ansty
- Design and layout should reflect the rural character of the settlement

**Developability**

- Contrary to neighbourhood plan
- Unsustainable location

**Accessibility**

- Traffic issues
- Bolney road access A272 is dangerous

**Infrastructure**

- Lack of public transport
- Lack of infrastructure and facilities; health facilities, school

**General**

- Number of dwellings incompatible with policy requirements – DPH4: General Development Principles for Housing Allocations
- Lower density to 20dph

**Policy DPH26: Older Persons' Housing and Specialist Accommodation****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 14	<b>Support:</b> 4	<b>Object:</b> 9	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:**

None

**Other comments:**

- Clarify the 3 items under loss of older persons accommodation to describe what will happen if xii applies
- Prevent loss of older people accommodation
- Affordable older persons accommodation is required and social housing
- Provide older care accommodation within or contiguous to existing built development on a sustainable location
- Change 'contiguous' to 'adjacent' under criterion iii, iv and v
- Unable to provide affordable elder care accommodation at 30%, reduce to 25%

**Site DPH27: Land at Byanda, Hassocks****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 5	<b>Support:</b> 1	<b>Object:</b> 3	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:****West Sussex County Council**

- Amend wording to reference Soft Sand safeguarding area

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No comment – needs ecological information

**Other comments:****Developability**

- Approx. number of units required
- Unsuitable location for care home
- No guarantee site will deliver sufficient housing

**Landscape**

- Amend Built-up area to include Byanda

**General**

- Development on site previously refused on committee

Site DPH28: Land at Hyde Lodge, Handcross			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 6	Support: 0	Object: 4	Neutral: 2
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory Consultees:</b> <b>Environment Agency</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Culvert partially located within site (southeast of site). Opportunities to open up/daylight some of the culvert could be explored</li> </ul> <b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> None			
<b>Other consultee bodies:</b> <b>Sussex Wildlife Trust</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment – needs ecological information</li> </ul> <b>Sussex Ornithological Society</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within High Weald AONB</li> <li>Extends built-up area of Handcross</li> <li>Increase density of houses elsewhere instead</li> </ul>			
<b>Other comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approx. number of units required</li> <li>Ecological impact</li> <li>Additional land is needed to meet market/affordable home needs in the area and older persons' accommodation</li> </ul>			

Policy DPH29: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 7	Support: 2	Object: 4	Neutral: 1
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory Consultees:</b> <b>Environment Agency</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy amendment suggested re connection to main foul sewer</li> </ul> <b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> <b>South Downs National Park Authority</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy amendment suggested re setting of SDNP</li> </ul> <b>Wealden District Council</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for identifying provision – will continue to work collaboratively on strategic issue</li> </ul>			
<b>Other consultee bodies:</b> None			
<b>Other comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification wanted re. existing sites</li> </ul>			

Policy DPH30: Self and Custom Build Housing			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 12	Support: 1	Object: 10	Neutral: 1
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory Consultees:</b> None			
<b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> None			
<b>Other consultee bodies:</b>			

**Other comments:**

- Support the inclusion of such a policy
- Requirement too high; further evidence needed
- Other sources of demand show higher need
- Greater flexibility needed

**Policy DPH31: Housing Mix****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 26	<b>Support:</b> 3	<b>Object:</b> 22	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:****Wealden District Council**

- Supports and welcomes the opportunity to engage further with MSDC regarding the most appropriate dwelling mix for Crabbet Park

**Other consultee bodies:**

None

**Other comments:**

- Proposed mix of housing across district do not reflect needs in some rural settlements
- Strengthening needed by providing requirements for different mix, when supported by evidence.
- Housing mix should include policies on older people and disabled accommodation
- Add section to say parishes may retain specific mix requirements in neighbourhood plan
- Older people's housing requirements to not only apply to larger developments
- Guidance should be adhered to on all developments
- Should be incorporated in every development
- *Specialist housing* should be exempt from meeting requirements
- Incorporate co-living projects
- Detailed housing needs surveys are needed
- Not sufficient provision for smaller affordable homes
- Lack of low cost rest and small starter homes through the district
- Housing mix should reflect local needs at the time
- Should not be applied to dev under 10 units
- Include reference to the SHMA

**Policy DPH32: Affordable Housing****Number of Comments Received**

<b>Total:</b> 27	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 22	<b>Neutral:</b> 3
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**Comments Received****Statutory Consultees:**

None

**MPs/ Local Authorities:**

None

**Other consultee bodies:****CPRE Sussex**

- Consider a higher target through viability tests –50%
- 30% affordable housing for all sites of more than 6 units within the AONB – provision onsite
- Amend wording suggested in reference to financial contributions and delivery of *affordable* housing.

**Other comments:**

- Should be incorporated in every development
- Amend the use of "a couple" for clarity
- Policy does not provide circumstances where on-site provision is inappropriate i.e. less than 10 units
- Need for 50% affordable housing within AONB
- Provide exceptions for older care accommodation
- Allow for flexibility in forms/models of delivery
- Reduce requirements on brownfield sites
- Include provision of shared ownership
- Part iv is too vague – evidence-based specification required.
- Financial contributions prior to commencement may not be possible, flexibility required.

### Policy DPH33: First Homes

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 14	<b>Support:</b> 3	<b>Object:</b> 10	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

None

##### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

##### Other consultee bodies:

None

##### Other comments:

- Should be incorporated in every development
- What criteria was used to establish £250,000 as a threshold – it is unaffordable
- Clarification needed as to why 3 and 4 beds are included
- Provide evidence to support the viability of this approach
- 30% discount is still unaffordable for many – minimum should be 40-50%
- No demand for 1 bed first homes
- Contradictions within policy's subtext
- Provide definition for "first home exception sites"

### Policy DPH34: Rural Exception Sites

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 8	<b>Support:</b> 2	<b>Object:</b> 4	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

None

##### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

##### Other consultee bodies:

##### CPRE Sussex

- Should consider if policy is effective in delivering developments

##### Other comments:

- Suggest a minimum threshold is applied for when mix is required.
- Policy should include allowance for updated evidence on needs and supply to be provided and considered.
- First Homes and homes for social rent needed
- More should be done to encourage small affordable sites (less than 10 affordable homes) - including within AONB
- The role of Parish Councils in the identifying people entitled to apply for this housing is unclear

Policy DPH35: Dwelling Space Standards			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 5	Support: 2	Object: 3	Neutral: 0
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory consultees:</b> None <b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> None <b>Other consultee bodies:</b> None  <b>Other comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governments' internal space standards are optional – evidence needed to justify inclusion of standards in policy</li> </ul>			

Policy DPH36: Accessibility			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 9	Support: 1	Object: 8	Neutral: 0
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory Consultees:</b> None <b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> None <b>Other consultee bodies:</b> None  <b>Other comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adaptable houses do not provide on-site support, care and companionship offered by specialist developments.</li> <li>Delete: <i>The Requirement will also apply to private extra care, assisted living or other such schemes designed for frailer older people or others with disabilities and those in need of care or support services.</i></li> <li>Not enough evidence for new dwellings to comply with Building Regulations Part M4 (3). Requirement should only apply to 10 dwellings or more. Should make clear that it is subject to viability.</li> <li>Viability concerns in increasing M4(2) requirement from 20% to 100%.</li> <li>Repetition with DPH32: Affordable Housing – should be made more concise</li> <li>Housing mix should include policies on older people and disabled accommodation</li> <li>Limitation of fewer than 10 dwellings disadvantages small villages; should be applied to all developments</li> <li>Further evidence needed to justify that all new dwellings meet Part M4(2)</li> </ul>			

Sayers Common Village – General Comments			
Number of Comments Received			
Total: 101	Support: 0	Object: 99	Neutral: 2
Comments Received			
<b>Statutory Consultees:</b> None <b>MPs/ Local Authorities:</b> Andrew Griffith MP			

- Overdevelopment
- Long history of flooding due to inadequate sewage and waste systems.
- Reliant on cars for retail.
- Inadequate provision and access to public transport
- Local schools at capacity
- Rural lanes cannot support increased traffic
- Already pressure on GPs. Policy requirement of 'health provision' unclear.

#### **Horsham District Council**

- Impacts from development on infrastructure across the border should be considered

#### **Other consultee bodies:**

##### **Sussex Ornithological Society**

- Area west of Sayers Common has an ecological importance due to the presence of Nightingales, Turtle Doves and Barn Owls
- Huge expansion of village; urban sprawl.

##### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- No ecological surveys undertaken for allocations
- How are allocations taking account of other Local Plans and strategic documents i.e. Southern Water's Draft Water Resources Management Plan and potential new reservoir

#### **Other comments:**

##### **Landscape**

- Overdevelopment of Sayers Village
- Coalescence of Sayers Common, Albourne and Hurstpierpoint
- Detrimental effect on views from Devils Dyke and SDNP
- Light pollution

##### **Flood Risk**

- High Flood Risk on the area (specially Reeds Lane and London Road)
- Maintenance of streams/ponds/drainage channels – danger of flooding
- Historic groundwater flooding

##### **Biodiversity**

- Impact on wildlife
- Loss of Countryside
- Consider the advice of RSPB, SWT, CPRE and SOS to preserve the countryside

##### **Accessibility**

- Traffic along B2118 and A23 – accident prone
- Roads are too narrow to support further traffic
- Need for a comprehensive traffic study

##### **Developability**

- No mention of development in brownfield sites
- There already are a number of unsold dwellings on new housing developments
- Local need for more affordable housing
- Proposals segregated from community services and infrastructure
- Category 3 – not suitable for large developments.

##### **Infrastructure**

- Lack of Infrastructure and public transport
- Developments in Sayers Common need to provide additional infrastructure i.e medical centres and commercial facilities
- Wastewater and Sewage system issues - inadequate
- Schools are full
- Need for a bus route to Burgess Hill station

##### **General**

- Sale of arable land should not be encouraged
- Housing targets are now advisory
- Village status needs to be preserved
- Albourne Neighbourhood Plan has been ignored in particular policies ALC2 and ALC3

- Unbalanced growth, mainly concentrated in Hurstpierpoint and Sayers common
- Premature review process, wait for stability in planning processes and demographics
- Developments in Sayers Common are not consistent with National Policy
- Massive negative impact on character of village and rural lifestyle; will be turned into a town.
- Disproportionate growth
- Contrary to neighbourhood plans. Loss of local democracy.
- Requires more infrastructure and affects more rural nature than other two significant sites.
- No more capacity on rural roads through village. Development would increase congestion at High Street / B2117 junction.
- Houses may not be needed following Government's propose policy changes
- Areas regularly floods due to clay and insufficient drainage systems
- Negative impacts on biodiversity. Fragmentation of natural environment due to development. No meaningful options to realise BNG due to proximity to other settlements and neighbouring authority.
- No assurance on required and timely delivery of infrastructure needed.
- Will worsen air quality at Stonepound Crossroads with people accessing Hassocks train station.
- Need to add childcare to list of infrastructure required from new builds
- Is the 20 minute neighbourhood concept achievable or fundable in this area?
- Detrimental to the setting of the South Downs National Park
- Boundary of DPSC2: Land to the south of Reeds Lane need checking, includes private gardens.

## Burgess Hill – General Comments

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 16	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 15	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

None

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

#### Other consultee bodies:

None

#### Other comments:

##### Landscape:

- Detrimental to the landscape and rural character of the area
- Coalescence of Burgess Hill with surrounding villages and towns
- The proposals will reduce green spaces within and around burgess hill

##### Biodiversity

- Wildlife habitats must be protected

##### Developability

- Disproportionate housing allocated to Burgess Hill
- Prioritise brownfield sites within Burgess Hill
- Revitalise the town centre with 4-5 storey housing/apartments

##### Accessibility

- Need for a plan to improve movement around Burgess Hill
- Severe traffic congestion and roadworks

##### Infrastructure

- Sewage treatment facility does not have capacity for new developments
- Inadequate public transport
- Lack of infrastructure (shops, medical centres and facilities)
- One new school is not enough
- Severe pressure on fresh water supply during summer
- Insufficient parking for local residents

##### General

- Long waiting lists for allotments in the area (240), disbelief that an alternative allotment will be provided
- Need for redevelopment of the town centre of Burgess Hill (unused retail buildings and demolition sites)
- Advisory housing targets – Levelling up and regeneration bill
- Air pollution caused by traffic congestions

## Hurstpierpoint Village – General Comments

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 48	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 45	<b>Neutral:</b> 3
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory Consultees:

None

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

#### Other consultee bodies:

None

#### Other comments:

##### Landscape

- Detrimental impact on views from the countryside and SDNP
- Overdevelopment of Hurstpierpoint with 633 further homes
- Coalescence with Burgess Hill and Hassocks

##### Flood Risk

- Surface water flooding
- College Lane, Malthouse Lane and Danworth Lane flood regularly

##### Biodiversity

- Destruction of wildlife habitats
- Current developments proposals will destroy efforts of The Woodland, Flora and Fauna Group to preserve the biodiversity of the countryside

##### Heritage

- Area of historical and archaeological importance
- Character of the village will be lost
- Traffic congestions along Conservation Area
- Need to preserve the village status

##### Accessibility

- Traffic congestions at High Street
- Increase in car travel as most of the allocated sites are in areas with lack of public transport
- Lack of public footpaths and cycle routes for children travelling to school
- B2116 is a dangerous road for pedestrians and cyclists

##### Developability

- Hurstpierpoint borders the SDNP – leaving a small area which cannot take any further development
- Lack of affordable housing in the area
- Disproportional allocation for growth – half concentrated around Hurstpierpoint

##### Infrastructure

- Lack of healthcare services
- Inadequate infrastructure to facilitate the developments
- Sewage back up during heavy rain – drainage issues
- Insufficient parking around high street
- Lack of sixth form education
- No planned cycle routes
- No post office or appropriate retail

- Inappropriate timing of provisions of new schools and healthcare facilities – these need to be provided before housing completions
- Inadequate transport links

#### General

- Housing targets will no longer be mandatory
- District Plan seems to be led by demands of developers whose motivation is profit
- Overestimation of housing figures
- Local air pollution will be exacerbated
- Request for a Q&A meeting at Hurstpierpoint Village Hall
- Negative impact on High Street with further congestions

### Crawley Down – General Comments

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 4	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 4	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

None

##### MPs/ Local Authorities:

None

##### Other consultee bodies:

None

##### Other comments:

##### Landscape

- Developments in the area creating coalescence with Copthorne

##### Biodiversity

- Importance of maintaining open spaces and protecting the countryside due to a range of natural species that inhabit these spaces (i.e., deer's and bee's)

##### Flood Risk

- Surface water flooding issues - low permeability of clay soil

##### Developability

- Need for different types of accommodation, according to local demand
- Brownfield sites should be allocated before greenfield sites

##### Heritage

- New houses are being designed with disregard for the local character

##### Infrastructure

- Housing allocations of the last 13 years do not coincide with infrastructure provision
- Need for more GPs, schools and public transport – services overcrowded
- Local roads are in poor condition
- Restricted access to water provided by South East Water
- Recurrent power cuts
- Lack of local shops
- Sewage system needs to be improved

### Chapter 16. Infrastructure

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 61	<b>Support:</b> 11	<b>Object:</b> 35	<b>Neutral:</b> 15
------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------

#### Comments Received

##### Statutory Consultees:

##### Southern Water

- DPI1 Securing Infrastructure: Support early engagement to help with timely delivery

##### Sport England

- DPI5 Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities: Support.
- DPI1 Securing Infrastructure: No reference given to natural environment

#### **West Sussex County Council**

- DPI1 Securing Infrastructure: Support. Cross reference to site allocations could be made

#### **MPs/ Local Authorities:**

##### **Horsham District Council**

- Impacts from development on infrastructure across the border should be considered

#### **Other consultee bodies:**

##### **Sussex Wildlife Trust**

- DPI1 Securing Infrastructure: No reference given to natural environment
- How are allocations taking account of other Local Plans and strategic documents i.e. Southern Water's Draft Water Resources Management Plan and potential new reservoir

#### **Other comments:**

##### **General**

- Planned infrastructure provision is inadequate for additional growth
- Infrastructure should precede housing developments
- No more houses in river catchment areas until water companies resolve and repair damage
- Transport system is not integrated and public transport is generally poor. Railway network constrained by Balcombe tunnel, Viaduct and platform lengths
- Insufficient fresh water, water storage and water treatment to sustain new homes
- More allotments needed as new houses have small gardens
- Further details on "Financial contributions" against site allocations would be welcomed

##### DPI1: Securing Infrastructure

- Concerns over publishing viability appraisals; could prejudice more complex sites coming forward. Council should review position.
- Clarity sought on "timing of improvements".
- Should be made clear what infrastructure developers are expected to contribute towards. Mechanism for apportioning costs, such as CIL Regulation 122, could be used.
- Wording amendment: standard of replacement facilities include; same floorspace, volume, functionality and purpose.
- Wording regarding early engagement should be strengthened

##### DPI2: Planning Obligations

- Should only include "reasonable" costs and these should be agreed prior to Agreement
- Appendix 3 does not set out infrastructure quantity and accessibility standards as policy states.
- Should be increased annually according to inflation rate on a fixed day of the year

##### DPI3: Major Infrastructure Projects

- Policy should be split in 2 to reflect MSDC's role as decision maker and statutory consultee.
- Clarity needed for terms: "reasonably foreseeable future". "Delivery Plans" should be removed as not statutory
- Needs to take account the Gatwick Airport DCO and impacts in north of district.

##### DPI5: Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities

- Include flexibility for dual use of open space, sport and recreation facilities between schools and public.
- Support principle; Wakehurst as a major centre for science education/research also appropriate exception.
- Play studies cited in policy not found in evidence base. Policy wording should be amended to reflect that studies don't cover all types of sport (climbing).
- Countryside has its own recreational value; should be balanced when considered for new facilities.
- Should include engagement with Town/ Parish Councils (same with DPI6: Community and Cultural Facilities and Local Services)

##### DPI6: Community and Cultural Facilities and Local Services

- Community centres must be provided with larger areas of housing to avoid cultural deserts

##### DPI7: Viability

- Support open book viability assessment
- Concern over second viability review; could hinder delivery

## Chapter 17. Implementation and Monitoring

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 11	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 9	<b>Neutral:</b> 2
------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

#### Statutory consultees:

##### South East Water

- How will water efficiency be policed / monitored / measured?

#### MPs/ Local Authorities:

##### Horsham District Council

None

#### Other consultee bodies:

##### Sussex Wildlife Trust

- Would benefit from including an additional column to the table, which indicates management actions that would be taken if the target for the monitoring were not being met.
- Saved policies not marked on the interactive policies map.

#### Other comments:

##### General

- It is essential that the Council has a robust delivery plan for properly allocating the Section 106 contributions from developers.
- Saved policies in the Neighbourhood Plans could be mentioned here by a simple line to say; 'All allocations set out in the districts Neighbourhood Plans' are saved.
- Targets needs numerals defined. Don't just say 'increase'.
- A robust delivery plan needs to be included.
- 'Management actions' should be added as a table column.

## Chapter 18. Saved Policies

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 2	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 2	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

- Saved policies in the Neighbourhood Plans should be mentioned by adding a sentence.
- The saved allocations need to be mentioned in the plan and added to interactive map.

## Chapter 19. Glossary

### Comments Received

No comments

## Appendix 1: District Plan Policies - Review Status

### Comments Received

No comments

## Appendix 2: Town Centres and Primary Shopping Area Boundaries

### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 2	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 2	<b>Neutral:</b> 0
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Comments Received

- The Haywards Heath Town Centre boundary excludes estate agents and 2 car parks. Why is this?
- Why has the town centre boundary changed?

### Appendix 3: Policy DPI7: Viability supporting tables

#### Number of Comments Received

<b>Total:</b> 1	<b>Support:</b> 0	<b>Object:</b> 0	<b>Neutral:</b> 1
-----------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

#### Comments Received

Appendix 3 does not set out infrastructure quantity and accessibility standards as policy DPI2: Planning Obligations states.

### Annex 1: Overview of Policy Requirements for Housing Allocations

#### Comments Received

No comments

### District Plan - Other

#### Comments Received

- Support all comments made by Twineham Parish Council.
- The plan is too non-specific.
- MSDC isn't leading on many aspects; consequently, developers are not building houses suitable for future needs.
- Fully support CPRE's response.
- This is in general, a well researched and presented, carefully compiled document, which seeks to address the many conflicting demands and issues facing Mid Sussex.
- Stand-alone policies are not sufficient; there are areas of omission, including heritage at risk.
- The draft Local Plan is unsound.
- The Plan is not deliverable over the plan period because there is no evidence to demonstrate how the strategic allocations will be achieved.