

Consultation Statement for the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan



March 2014

Contents

Page

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Background	2
3.	Chronology of Public Consultation	4
4.	Thematic Summary of Key Issues raised by Stakeholders	11
5.	Public Exhibition (October 2012)	13
6.	Preparing the Draft NP (November 2012 - February 2013)	15
7.	Regulation 14 Consultation	16
8.	Paragraph 15(2)(d) - Consideration of Main issues.	27
9.	Summary	40

Appendices

Appendix 1	Where We Live, How Should We Plan For The Future Leaflet, January 2012
Appendix 2	Where We Live, How Should We Plan For The Future Questionnaire, January 2012
Appendix 3	Future Housing, How Much And Where, Leaflet, March 2012
Appendix 4	Future Housing, How Much And Where, Questionnaire, March 2012
Appendix 5	Public Exhibition Questionnaire, October 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This report has been prepared by DOWSETTMAYHEW Planning Partnership for, and on behalf of, Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council (HSCPC). It is in support of their preparation of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish 2031 Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.2. As part of the formal submission of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Examination, there is a requirement for a Consultation Statement to be submitted in order to comply with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 1.3. This Consultation Statement provides a full summary of all responses received as part of the consultation undertaken in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. It also includes a chronological summary of consultations undertaken in the lead up to the Regulation 14 consultation. This illustrates the level of public engagement undertaken at every stage of the process and how stakeholder consultation positively helped shape the NP.
- 1.4. This statement has been prepared in order to illustrate compliance with Regulation 14 & 15. Section 2 provides a summary of the legislative requirements of this Consultation Statement and background to the Parish Council's consultation process. Section 3 summarises the consultation feedback from stakeholders during the early consultation Stages. Section 4 then provides a thematic overview of the issues raised. Section 5 summarises the consultation responses to a public exhibition. Section 6 summarises the preparation of the Consultation Draft NP. Section 7 then sets out the feedback in response to this (Regulation 14) consultation process. Section 8 then describes how the issues raised in response were addressed and NP policies amended. Section 9 then provides a summary.
- 1.5. The aim throughout the preparation of the NP has been to ensure widespread public and stakeholder engagement, to ensure that as far as possible, the NP responded to the wishes, ideas and concerns of the local community and other stakeholders.
- 1.6. This statement has been prepared in accordance with, and cognisant of Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 637, The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 1.7. For the purposes of this report, please note the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is also used to refer to Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, requires the submission of a Consultation Statement to the Local Planning Authority to explain the process that has been followed in liaising and consulting with local residents and stakeholders in the preparation of the NP:
- 2.2. Regulation 15(2) states that the consultation statement means a document which:
- (a) *Contains details of the people and bodies consulted about the Proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan;*
 - (b) *Explains how they were consulted;*
 - (c) *Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by those consulted; and*
 - (d) *Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.*
- 2.3. This statement summarises all those who were consulted as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation, detailing how they were consulted and summarising the responses received. Each draft policy of the NP is assessed in terms of the comments received from consultees. If policies have been amended as a result of feedback, the reasoning for this is noted. If the policies remain, a justification is also provided.
- 2.4. This formal process relates to the Regulation 14 consultation and the legal requirement to fulfil this stage. Another purpose of this statement is to provide a greater level of detail about the public consultation which has been undertaken to front load the preparation of the NP leading up to the Regulation 14 consultation exercise.
- 2.5. HSCPC have sought to ensure that at every stage of the production of the NP, local residents, businesses and interest groups have been actively consulted and their views sought. This process began prior to the production of the NP and dates back to 2010 with the production of Parish Plans.
- 2.6. The process has canvassed a wide range of stakeholders and the NP has been shaped to meet the aims of local residents and respond to key themes and objectives of the local area. The NP has been mindful of the Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Local Plan (MSLP), District Plan (MSDP) and the NPPF, but has not shackled local opinion and ideas.
- 2.7. Information has been made widely available and people have been encouraged to formally respond. Information has been published by way of mail drops to all local residents, e-mails to those providing contact details, updates on the HSCPC website and notice boards, monthly working party meetings, public meetings on key topic areas, public exhibitions, information in parish newsletter, questionnaires and stakeholder meetings.
- 2.8. HSCPC have also sought to liaise closely with MSDC, the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) and Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to ensure that the appropriate steps were being followed.

- 2.9. Background baseline data has been methodically gathered, to ensure that key constraints and opportunities were understood about the Parish and wider area. A Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was prepared as part of the early consultation process. The SA (incorporating requirements of the Sustainable Environmental Assessment) was then prepared in tandem with the draft NP policies to ensure that at every stage the most sustainable options were sought and has been routinely updated.
- 2.10. The NP, which was prepared for the Regulation 14 Consultation, was a very 'local' document. It was prepared, informed and considered by local stakeholders at every stage of preparation. As this statement will illustrate, the NP covers local issues and responds to local concerns and ideas. The NP is a document that sought to achieve local ownership through the consultation process and provide an aspirational platform for local issues to be positively advanced by policies within the NP.

3. CHRONOLOGY OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

3.1. This section provides a chronological overview of the consultation stages undertaken by HSCPC prior to the formation of the NP. The majority of this consultation engagement was conducted between Mid 2010 until late 2012.

Parish Plan Process Mid 2010 - October 2011.

3.2. It is of note that prior to the decision to undertake an NP, HSCPC had already undertaken surveys and public consultation events during the preparation of their Parish Plans. This engagement was undertaken in 2010 and 2011 as part of works to prepare a, 'Community Life' Plan and 'Village Development' Plan.

3.3. These two plans covered very similar issues and topics to those taken forwards in the NP and therefore there was a good level of local understanding by Parish Councillors of important local issues, whilst local stakeholders were also actively engaged in planning and development issues.

3.4. The public engagement included a questionnaire distributed to all properties within the Parish, in May 2010 and a 'We Want Your Views' questionnaire sent to 48 local interest groups. A public meeting was then held in late May 2010 to consider comments received.

3.5. Draft Parish Plans were then drawn up and these were subject to public consultation in May 2011. The issues were discussed at another public meeting in late May 2011, with all consultation responses requested from local stakeholders by early June 2011. The Draft Parish Plans were then published in late June 2011.

3.6. Both documents covered a range of housing, social, environmental and economic issues, as well as issues such as design, highways and infrastructure. The work in preparing the Parish Plans accordingly provided HSCPC with an overview of issues of importance to local residents and objectives that any future NP might need to address.

3.7. On 13 October 2011, it was agreed at a Parish meeting to postpone work on the Parish Plans and focus on the development of an NP.

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Process October 2011 - January 2012

3.8. In light of the decision to formally embark on the preparation of an NP, the Parish Council resolved to form a dedicated working party of 6-8 Councillors, who would seek early engagement with local residents, businesses and interest groups about key issues, objective and ideas.

3.9. The working party agreed to meet monthly and provide a regular platform to discuss progress and issues. The meetings were limited to members of the working party, but all minutes of the meetings were released via the Parish website.

3.10. The working party was tasked with liaising with MSDC, neighbouring Parishes, the SDNPA, West Sussex County Council (WSCC), DCLG, developers, land owners and other interested parties.

3.11. It was agreed that information should be regularly disseminated in the Parish newsletter. This is distributed to all addresses in the Parish, local businesses, and with copies available in local shops and pubs. It was agreed that the Parish website should carry the same information. Parish notice boards would be used and if possible a database of e-mail addresses collected for mail shots.

- 3.12. From the experience with the Parish Plan preparation, the working party agreed that public consultation would form an essential element of the background process, for developing ideas and strategies. In December 2011, it was agreed that consultation with stakeholders should begin in 2012.
- 3.13. HSCPC were one of the first Parishes in Sussex to resolve to undertake an NP. They were given front runner status and provided with a bursary to start public engagement and the preparation of the NP. They were also guided by MSDC and DCLG as an understanding of the process evolved.

Consultation Methodology

- 3.14. The consultation process included the distribution of leaflets on different topic areas and questionnaires. It included public meetings and discussions with the option to leave feedback. Meetings were also held with key stakeholders, interest groups and developers. Information was regularly distributed on Parish newsletters and at Parish noticeboards. All information was also contained on the Parish website.
- 3.15. When leaflets, questionnaires and Parish newsletters were distributed, this was directly to over 2,500 households in the Parish. They were also sent to 173 local business and 48 local interest groups. Parish newsletters were left in local shops, pubs and at Hurstpierpoint village library.
- 3.16. Where necessary, details were also sent to neighbouring Parish/Town Councils. This was generally via e-mails to Parish/Town Clerks.
- 3.17. Feedback to consultation was requested through the submission of filled out questionnaire. These could be posted or e-mailed to the Parish Council. Comments and questionnaire could also be left at public meetings/exhibitions.
- 3.18. Meeting and exhibitions took the form of presentations, followed by discussions and feedback groups. Those attending were able to ask questions of Parish Councillors and discuss issues in small groups.
- 3.19. Stakeholder meetings were generally closed events.
- 3.20. All of the consultation stages were undertaken following this methodology, unless otherwise specified.

'Where We Live' Leaflet & Questionnaire (January 2012)

- 3.21. The leaflet was designed as an introduction to the NP process and set out a broad overview of the key issues on which residents input was to be sought. The draft Parish vision and objectives were informed by the work undertaken on the Parish Plans.
- 3.22. The leaflet was seeking contributions from local residents on:
- An Overall Vision for the Parish;
 - Housing;
 - Countryside & Economy; and
 - The Neighbourhood Plan.

- 3.23. The leaflet set out a suggested Parish Vision, “*We want to keep the village-feel of our community, and keep it a thriving and attractive Parish, a desirable place to live, work and visit. Our aim is to maintain, and where possible, improve the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of our area and the quality of life for all, now and in the future.*”
- 3.24. It also set out a list of outline objectives:
- Keeping the village feel and sense of place;
 - Protecting and enhancing the environment;
 - Promoting economic vitality;
 - Ensuring cohesion and safe communities; and
 - Supporting healthy lifestyles.
- 3.25. The leaflet provided the address, and e-mail address of where comments could be sent and also provided details of dedicated meetings to be held at Hurstpierpoint Village Centre, for each of the topic areas.
- 3.26. The Questionnaire asked the following questions:
- What do you think of the suggested Parish vision?
 - What do you think about the NP objectives?
 - What things make our area special and should be kept?
 - What things would make our area a better place to live?
 - Any other comments?
- 3.27. The questionnaire also sought to collect names and addresses of respondents so that they could be directly contacted about progress of the NP via e-mail.
- 3.28. The leaflet was used to advertise dedicated public meetings that were to be arranged for each of the key topic areas (vision for the future, housing, countryside & economics, and the NP).
- 3.29. A copy of the leaflet is contained at Appendix 1, and a copy of the questionnaire at Appendix 2.
- Public Meeting - Scoping issues of the Neighbourhood Plan (20 February 2012).
Summary of Key Points*
- 3.30. The scoping issues meeting was the first public meeting and was held on 20 February 2012 at the Village Centre. It was attended by 48 local residents and sought to establish an overarching vision, key objectives and an early indication of key topic areas important to stakeholders.
- 3.31. Overall the meeting confirmed that HSCPC decision to base the consultation work on the issues already identified as important by local residents, as part of the Parish Plan was the correct approach. The Parish vision and key strategic aims were broadly welcomed. The desire to keep a ‘village feel’ was very popular with attendees.
- ‘Future Housing - How much, and where’ Leaflet & Questionnaire (March 2012)
Summary of Key Points*
- 3.32. From initial feedback to the NP process, it became apparent that the issue of new housing was a key interest area. There had also been a number of high profile housing applications locally in

previous years and the public interest in these had been high. The 'Future Housing' leaflet therefore sought to set a series of questions about housing in the Parish.

- 3.33. It outlined a brief overview about MSDC preparation of the draft MSDP and what housing numbers MSDC might need to deliver in the future. The leaflet clarified that the Localism Act now provided local people with a greater say on important issues such as housing allocations and an NP could allocate land for housing, where the old Parish Plans could not.
- 3.34. The leaflet summarised a series of key question areas. An overview response was provided for each question to provide a working example of the type of comments the Parish was seeking to understand.
- 3.35. The leaflet was clear that housing issues related to all three settlements within the Parish and the countryside in-between.
- 3.36. The Questionnaire and Leaflet asked the following questions.
- How many houses should be built in the next 20 years?
 - Should we be providing more 'affordable' homes for rent? If so, how many?
 - What styles of homes should we build in the future?
 - What size houses should we be building for the future? Should we be building more flats, or single person homes?
 - What should be the maximum number of houses built each year?
 - Which larger sites would be suitable? Which smaller sites would be suitable?
 - What 'brownfield' or redevelopment site are there for housing?
 - Is our attitude to building in the countryside the right one?
- 3.37. A copy of the leaflet is contained at Appendix 3, and a copy of the questionnaire at Appendix 4.

*Public Meeting - Housing (26 March 2012)
Summary of Key Points.*

- 3.38. The meeting was held on 26 March 2012 at the Village Centre. It was attended by 76 local residents and sought to establish an understanding of important housing matters. This included the amount and location of new houses, how it was to be spread throughout the Parish, what strategic sites might be considered to deliver housing and what village specific issues might need to be addressed to ensure that housing was delivered in a sustainable manner. Other issues such as tenure and design were also discussed and comments sought.
- 3.39. It was clear from the meeting that housing was a very emotive issue and that this had been driven by a perceived lack of local input on new housing schemes approved in the Parish and the threat of other pending schemes. A number of attendees did not want to see any new housing in the Parish, whilst others only wanted to see affordable housing for existing locals. Others were keen to see new housing to facilitate young people staying in the Parish and for economic growth.
- 3.40. Parish Councillors explained that under a MSDC 'fair share' approach, the Parish would need to find space for some new housing, otherwise the issue of new housing sites would be retained by MSDC and the Parish would have a limited say. From these discussions it was agreed to move

forwards with a 'fair share' amount of housing, whilst further information relating to need and base line data was collected.

Public Meeting - Countryside & Heritage (23 April 2012)

Summary of Key Points.

- 3.41. The third public meeting was held on 23 April February 2012 at the Village Centre. It was attended by 36 local residents and sought to establish important issues about the Countryside and Heritage issues.
- 3.42. The meeting had initially been advertised as Countryside & Economics. It became clear early on in the process from the initial Scoping Meeting on 20 February 2012, and in comments received to the 'Where We Live' questionnaire, that stakeholders had more limited interest in economic issues.
- 3.43. There had been a poor response from local businesses, despite all known local businesses being directly contacted about the NP process. It was therefore decided that the previously scheduled Countryside and Economics meeting, would better cover stakeholder interest areas if it were amended to Countryside and Heritage.
- 3.44. Stakeholders clearly valued the quality of Hurstpierpoint's three conservation area. It was felt that these should be reviewed in due course to see if they could be extended or improved. Works to improve the High Street retail environment, which includes a conservation areas, would also improve the quality of the area.
- 3.45. It was felt that the villagescapes of both Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common warranted protecting in terms of settlement identity. Ensuring that development did not merge the villages with neighbouring settlements was a popular theme.
- 3.46. There was a desire to protect the countryside and look to enhance flora and fauna. Many of the submitted comments related to specific ecological habitats such as individual ponds or meadows.
- 3.47. On more strategic matters, improving public access to the countryside and ensuring that land is used for food production were popular themes. It was felt that woodland should be protected and managed.

Public Meeting - The Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (15 May 2012)

Summary of Key Points

- 3.48. The fourth meeting was organised to coincide with the Annual Parish Meeting on 15 May 2012. It was attended by 62 local residents. Having undertaken 4 months of public consultation HSCPC now had a good understanding of keys issues which would need to be addressed by the NP. Through discussions with MSDC, they were also aware of the likely amount of housing that the Parish might need to allocate through 'fair share'.
- 3.49. During the initial consultation stage, MSDC had written to all local Parish Council's identifying an approximate amount of housing that rural Parishes would need to accommodate as part of the emerging MSDP. This was raised at the meeting and discussed by those attending. As a result of this it was agreed that a document setting out potential development sites should be produced.

Neighbourhood Plan, Future Housing Document (June 2012)

Summary of Document.

- 3.50. The document was produced for public comment on 18 June 2012. It listed all 24 sites that had been identified for consideration for housing and then provided 5 sites in Hurstpierpoint village that HSCPC recommended as their preferred options. Their preferred options were based on initial feedback and baseline research undertaken by the working party. The base line data was explored and constraints assessed and fed into the selection of preferred options sites.
- 3.51. The original 'long' list of 24 sites was based on those that had been identified by MSDC in their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The NP working party reviewed these and then sought to identify any other sites that might have been missed. This requested sites to be submitted by developers and land owners.
- 3.52. Once the sites were known, the NP working party then reviewed these to look for the most suitable and sustainable sites to deliver new housing.
- 3.53. The document confirmed that on a strict MSDC fair share basis, the housing target would be 160 new dwellings in the Parish up to 2031. This number was not used as a correct or accurate housing requirement, but was used as a starting point and basis for the process.
- 3.54. Comments were to be sought on each of the preferred sites at an NP exhibition in October 2012. Stakeholders would be able to discuss the merits of the site and consider issues such as numbers, tenure and design. It was agreed to approach developers to discuss development issues.

Other Meetings with Stakeholders (July & August 2012)

- 3.55. During July and August, the NP working group sought to meet with a number of stakeholders who had shown an interest in becoming more involved in the NP process. These included the Woodland Flora and Fauna Group, Hassocks Parish Council, Hurstpierpoint Society and Hurstpierpoint College. A group of interested local residents from Iden Hurst, Hurstpierpoint, were also invited to discuss potential housing allocations near their properties.
- 3.56. All these interest groups were invited to meetings with the NP working group where they were able to discuss and feedback to Parish Councillors information about key topic areas. The meetings were closed, but minuted.

Summary of Meetings

- 3.57. The five stakeholders groups all had particular areas of interest that they wished to discuss with HSCPC NP working group.
- 3.58. The Hurstpierpoint Society attended a meeting at the Parish Hall on 27 July 2012 and had a particular interest in conservation area and listed building issues, as well as an interest in general design issues and the location of new houses. They were keen to ensure that conservation areas were reviewed.

- 3.59. The Woodland Flora and Fauna Group attended a meeting at the Parish Hall on 2 August 2012. They had a particular interest in countryside, woodland, ecology and open space issues. As a result of these, they were also interested in potential development within the countryside, protection of the countryside and enhancements to the natural environment.
- 3.60. Hassocks Parish Council attended a meeting at the Parish Hall on 2 August 2012. As a neighbouring authority, directly abutting much of the eastern boundary of HSCPC, they were keen to understand how much housing might be sought and where it would be located. They were particularly interested in issues of coalescence between the villages of Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks.
- 3.61. Representatives of Hurstpierpoint College attended a meeting at the Parish Hall on 16 August 2012. The College is a private school located to the north of Hurst Wickham. They were keen to understand what role they might play in the NP process, what it may mean for future development of the site and parking issues, which were a perceived problem near the College.
- 3.62. Residents from Iden Hurst attended a meeting at the Parish Hall on 29 August 2012. They opposed the short listing of land near their properties for development. If the site was formally allocated in the NP, they would prefer to see access through Chalkers Lane and not Iden Hurst. They also wanted woodland near the site to be protected from future development.

Stakeholder Meetings with Landowners (May 2012 to April 2013)

- 3.63. Following refinements to the housing list the NP working group invited developers and land owners to come and present their ideas for development. Representatives of the 5 preferred sites all attended meetings. However, representatives of sites not on the preferred list were also able to send comments to the working group to promote other sites for consideration.
- 3.64. Meetings took place between Village Development Plc, Rydon Homes, Thakeham Homes, Glenbeigh Developments and Woodcock Holdings Ltd. Cascade Housing also had a meeting regarding affordable housing in the Parish.
- 3.65. The meetings provided an opportunity for developers to present ideas about densities, infrastructure, benefits of developing specific sites and any constraints that might need to be considered.

4. THEMATIC SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS

4.1. This section summarises the key themes and main topic areas raised in response to the consultation exercises undertaken prior to the Public Exhibition.

4.2. The key visions, objectives and topic areas were confirmed as:-

- **Vision**

The proposed vision was well received by stakeholders. It was similar to the one previously promoted with the Parish Plan. It was clear that retaining a village feel was a core vision that stakeholders wanted.

- **Objectives/Themes**

It was clear from the feedback that there was a desire to protect settlement identity and prevent coalescence with neighbouring villages. This applied to both Sayers Common and Hurstpierpoint. Concerns about the number of school places locally and the pressure that might occur with new houses was also considered to be important. Congestion in the centre of Hurstpierpoint and traffic issues in other parts of the Parish were also a key concern and aims to deal with this were strongly supported.

Strategic Objectives garnered less discussion. There was a general consensus that these reflected the vision and objectives. The Parish Council also explained that these needed to accord with the aims of the NPPF and emerging policy in the existing MSLP & draft MSDP.

- **Countryside, Wildlife & Environment**

The importance of agriculture and protecting the countryside was an important issue to local residents. There was concern about new housing developments, but an understanding that some countryside would need to be allocated. The careful buffering of any new developments would be important, as well as protecting important ecological sites and the creation of new habitats. The most valued agricultural land and landscapes needed to be protected.

- **Housing**

The most discussed topic area. Varied and mixed views were expressed but there was a clear understanding forged during the process that new housing was inevitable and the need was to positively plan for development. Local residents concluded that this ensured the decision about location and overall amount would not be taken out of the hands of locals. Stakeholders felt it was sensible to follow MSDC 'fair share' methodology, but review different growth scenarios to assess overall need.

- **Community**

There was strong support for improving and developing existing outdoor play space and sports facilities. It was also clear that residents felt this could be best achieved through housing developments. There was concern about the lack of facilities in Sayers Common, Goddards Green being engulfed by the Burgess Hill expansion, and traffic impacting on those using the village centre in Hurstpierpoint.

- **Economy**

One of the less commented on topic areas. There was an acknowledgement of a need to work with Burgess Hill Town Council to assist with their expansion plans, whilst seeking the best solution for local residents. Other areas of employment space should also be protected. Improvements should be made to the village centre of Hurstpierpoint. Hurstpierpoint College should be recognised as an important local business.

- **Flooding**

Local residents in Sayers Common raised a number of concerns about surface water flooding and drainage problems. There was a concern about how new development might undermine this if the issue was not resolved.

- **Transport & Highways**

There was popular support for the idea of 'quiet lanes' designations and looking to deal with congestion in various parts of the Parish. This included looking for a new parking area to serve the centre of Hurstpierpoint and at potential parking restrictions elsewhere. Many residents were concerned about a lack of bus services to more rural areas, whilst congestion in the centre of Hurstpierpoint was also considered problematic.

- **Hurstpierpoint Village**

Residents in the village of Hurstpierpoint were particularly concerned about the location and quantity of new housing, the impact on school places, highways and the design and appearance of new housing. There was concern about development leading to coalescence with the neighbouring village of Hassocks and development impacting negatively on Hurst Wickham and the Hurstpierpoint Village conservations areas.

In terms of housing numbers, there was a desire to retain a village feel and also protect important countryside around the village.

Residents wanted traffic and parking issues for the High Street addressed and look at ways of encouraging more people to shop and use services in the village. Sports provision and facilities for the young were also highlighted as other areas that policy should be formulated to cover.

- **Sayers Common**

Residents in Sayers Common were particularly concerned about drainage and surface water flooding issues in the village. There was a concern that unless underlying issues relating to these were addressed as part of any new development, new houses would put an undue pressure on existing. Concerns about the amount of housing in relation to the overall size of the village, lack of services and poor bus service were raised.

- **Goddards Green**

Residents in Goddards Green were particularly concerned about an expansion of the neighbouring town, Burgess Hill, into the Parish, and how this would impact on residents. The expansion of Burgess Hill (Northern Arc) was earmarked for education, recreation, business and housing. Residents were keen to ensure that development did not undermine the rural character and sought to ensure open space uses near the main hamlet such as sports recreation.

5. PUBLIC EXHIBITION (OCTOBER 2012)

- 5.1. Following the initial stakeholder engagement, summarised in Section 3, a public exhibition was arranged, to exhibit all the baseline data and information gathered and set out the 'working' key aims and objectives. A shortlist of preferred housing sites was also presented.
- 5.2. The exhibitions were held between Friday 12 and Monday 15 October 2012 at the Village Centre in Hurstpierpoint and on Friday 19 and Saturday 20 October 2012 at Christ Church Hall, Sayers Common.
- 5.3. Over the course of 4 days, some 520 local residents attended and over 400 questionnaire responses submitted. 98.6% of respondents agreed with the draft Parish Vision. A copy of the exhibition questionnaire is contained at Appendix 5.

Summary of Exhibition

- 5.4. The exhibition questionnaire set out 27 questions about planning issues in the Parish. The questions were specific and aimed at topics areas which had been identified as important through earlier stakeholder engagement. Views on the housing sites identified in the Future Housing Document were also sought. Questionnaires asked respondents whether they agreed, disagreed, or were unsure about the 27 questions set.
- 5.5. Issues regarding housing and location of housing were again popular subjects. Whilst there was not universal support for the amount and location of new housing, the majority of respondents preferred sites in the Future Housing Document.
- 5.6. 50.8% of respondents supported that a provisional site at Chalkers Lane might provide 60-65 dwelling. 33.6% of respondents agreed that the Little Park site was capable of delivering 140 new dwellings, with 39.1% unsure. 48.2% of respondents felt that Highfield Drive could deliver 17 units. The support for development of Little Park and Highfield Drive was increased to 51.6%, when open space provision was included as part of the development. Overall 44.8% of respondents felt around 220 houses would be appropriate for the Parish, with 31% opposing this level. 67.7% of respondents felt housing should be delivered in Sayers Common only after drainage infrastructure improvements to the village.
- 5.7. The need to boost affordable housing was also deemed important, but there was an acceptance that delivering too much affordable housing might make schemes unviable. It was felt that recent developments had not catered for local residents, or elderly residents. Respondents gave mixed feedback on whether housing should be for local people. There was an understanding that the mechanism to achieve this could be difficult.
- 5.8. 57% of respondents agreed that an affordable housing contribution of 30% on sites with over 6 dwellings was appropriate. 84.3% wanted there to be single storey housing designed for people with limited mobility and 69.5% agreed that average housing density should be around 10 per acre.
- 5.9. Issues previously raised about protection of the countryside and prevention of coalescence remained popular key local objectives. Tied into this was improving access to open space and protection of flora and fauna.

- 5.10. 87.1% of respondents agreed that the countryside should be protected. 96.1% agreed that existing areas of countryside between built-up areas should be protected. 84.4% of respondents agreed that 40 acres of countryside public open space and 15 acres of managed woodland should be provided. Community sports facilities were considered preferable at Goddards Green with 56% of respondents agreeing this.
- 5.11. Plans surrounding the Junior School (St Lawrence) capacity were also discussed. A majority of local residents felt that a proposal for off site sports, to allow the school to develop some its own land for more buildings, was a sensible approach. This was agreed by 76% of respondents. School representatives attending did not think this was appropriate and so resisted the idea.
- 5.12. The amount of traffic and parking issues in Hurstpierpoint was a popular topic. Particular problems were identified in Hurst Wickham, Cuckfield Road and the High Street. Residents were concerned about parking for the village centre and how the current parking impacted on the free flow of traffic. A popular topic was finding an alternative parking solution.
- 5.13. 87.3% of respondents agreed with the Cuckfield Road proposals, 81.1% with College Lane proposal and 82.1% to finding a new car park for Hurstpierpoint village centre. 91.7% of respondents were in favour of improving the Hurstpierpoint village centre retail environment, including traffic controls and improving the pedestrian environment. There was also a strong agreement that traffic generated by the Burgess Hill expansion should be kept away from Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common. Overall 83.6% of respondents agreed with this.
- 5.14. Draft Proposals Maps which detailed outline development sites for housing, business and recreation were also provided for all three main settlements. 58.4% of respondents agreed with the Hurstpierpoint map, 70.6% with the Sayers Common map and 42.9% with the Goddards Green map.

6. PREPARING THE DRAFT NP (NOVEMBER 2012 - FEBRUARY 2013)

- 6.1. The next step following the public exhibition was to formally agree the preferred housing sites and number of houses to be delivered. A draft 'first' version of the HSCPC NP could then be prepared.
- 6.2. The most discussed issue with the public consultation process had been housing and the overall number allocated and location. There were connected issues relating to countryside protection, provision of open space and tenure.
- 6.3. Initially the Parish Council had followed a fair share approach as suggested by MSDC. This was a total amount of around 160. As the process developed, the physical size of available sites and densities could be considered. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which was being developed in tandem with draft policies was able to assess different options for housing numbers based on different projections for need in the Parish.
- 6.4. By the time of the exhibition, it was clear that a figure of around 220 units, based on economic growth, provided a more robust growth scenario and reflected the size of potential sites in Hurstpierpoint. This is why the exhibition questionnaire contained a question about a higher number of houses than had been consulted on in earlier discussions.
- 6.5. Discussions were also undertaken with MSDC Housing Department to gain an understanding of local housing needs surveys conducted by the LPA to inform emerging policy in the MSDP. From this the affordable housing need for the area was better understood. This revealed that there was a need for 218 affordable rented properties within the Parish for people with a local connection.
- 6.6. The SA tested the sustainability of different levels of housing delivery. This included some 120, 160, 240 or 325. The option for 120 dwellings would have allowed for zero economic growth, the 160 for a fair share, 240 for 3% GDV per annum growth, whilst the 325 allowed for growth based on ONS housing assessment for Mid Sussex wide growth.
- 6.7. The 240, which was very similar to the 220 consulted on was found to be the most sustainable option having regard to a range of economic, social and environmental indicators. 240 new dwellings, also provided a well balanced delivery of houses in Hurstpierpoint on preferred housing site and for reasonable growth (30 - 40 new dwellings) in Sayers Common.
- 6.8. The aim for 240 was then refined in light of a need to show flexibility, plan positively and seek to provide a good level of affordable housing. A range of 230-255 new homes was therefore chosen to be delivered in the parish over the plan period.
- 6.9. Given the main objective and the key issues raised by stakeholders, it was agreed that the NP should be divided up into Countryside, Amenity, Housing, Economic and Transport policies. This would ensure specific topic areas would respond to the overall vision and key aims. The summary of responses from the public exhibition was then used to form the basis for workable policy areas.

7. REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

- 7.1. In light of public and stakeholder consultation, collation of thematic issues and associated analysis, the Consultation Draft of the NP was prepared and published for consultation between 8 April 2013 and 20 May 2013. This comprised the formal Regulation 14 Consultation.
- 7.2. Set out below, and in accordance with Regulation 15(2)(a), (b) and (c), are the details of those who were consulted, an explanation of how they were consulted, and a summary of the main issues raised by the consultees.

15(2)(a) Details Of The People And Bodies Consulted About The Proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 7.3. All those who provided contact details during the earlier public consultation were contacted directly. The remainder of the Parish were contacted through the Parish newsletter.
- 7.4. HSCPC then worked with MSDC and the SDNPA to contact all statutory consultee's, interested bodies and neighbouring authorities.
- 7.5. The following were contacted directly by the Parish Council from a contact list provided by MSDC :
- Albourne Parish Council,
 - Bolney Parish Council,
 - Brighton & Hove City Council,
 - Burgess Hill Town Council,
 - Cuckfield Parish Council,
 - Ansty & Staplefield Parish Council,
 - Fulking Parish Council,
 - Hassocks Parish Council,
 - Haywards Heath Town Council,
 - Lindfield Rural Parish Council,
 - Newtimber Parish Council,
 - Poynings Parish Council,
 - Pyecombe Parish Council,
 - Slaugham Parish Council,
 - Twineham Parish Council,
 - BT,
 - Cable & Wireless,
 - Energis Communication,
 - English Heritage,
 - Environment Agency,
 - Highways Agency,
 - Homes & Communities Agency,
 - Mid Sussex District Council,
 - MONO Consultants,
 - National Grid,
 - Natural England,

- Network Rail,
- Npower,
- RPS Planning,
- South Downs National Park,
- South East Coast NHS,
- South East Water,
- Southern Gas Network,
- Thames Water,
- The Coal Authority,
- UK Power, and
- West Sussex County Council.

15(2)(b) How Were They Consulted?

- 7.5. Copies of the Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan were held at the Village Centre and library in Hurstpierpoint village. Copies were also sent to MSDC and the SDNPA. Details were posted on the HSCPC website and put up on village notice boards.
- 7.6. Those who had provided e-mail addresses during the course of previous public engagement were e-mailed directly about the draft NP. They were provided with an electronic link to the NP and the consultation period.
- 7.7. All households in the Parish were sent copies of the Parish newsletter which advertised the consultation period and advised how to make comments. The newsletter was specifically timed to coincide with the consultation process. The newsletter was also sent to all businesses in the Parish and copies were available at a number of pubs, shop and the library.
- 7.8. The statutory bodies were all contacted via e-mail, with an electronic link to the documents and details of the consultation period.

15(2)(c) Summary Of Main Issues And Concerns Raised By Those Consulted.

- 7.9. The following is a list of the key issues and concerns raised by each individual respondent to the Regulation 14 consultation. The responses are split between comments received from public bodies, local resident/local interest groups and developers/agents.

- **Responses from Public Bodies**

1) Department of Communities and Local Government

- Comments passed as informal advice.
- Policies should be mapped.
- Re-wording of some policies required.
- Need to differentiate between policies that promote something and policies that look to investigate possibilities. Some current policies are not planning based, but aspirational aims.
- Need to focus on local distinctiveness.
- Policies C1 & C2 don't add anything.

- Policy C6 need to define inappropriate development.
- Policy A1 potentially unrealistic.
- Policy A4 is unclear.
- Policy H2, the phrase 'necessary capacity' is unclear.
- Policy H3, no reference made to identified smaller housing sites.
- Housing policies should list infrastructure and background work that might be required.
- Policy H8 repeats guidance in draft MSDP.
- Policy H9 is unrequired.
- Policy H1- should reference Lifetime Homes standard. No definition of a small dwelling.
- A number of the Transport policies are not planning policies.

2) Environment Agency

- Pleased to see that housing allocations have been directed to areas of lowest flood risk.
- Support the inclusion of policy H2.

3) West Sussex County Council

- Do not have sufficient resources to comment on individual plans.

4) The Coal Authority

- Have no further interest in the proposal.

5) West Sussex Better Connected

- Encourage early discussions with developers to ensure all developments are planned with broadband.
- Support the inclusion of policies aimed at delivering broadband.

6) Mid Sussex District Council

- Generally support the allocation of the Burgess Hill Northern Arc.
- Policy E1 notes the sustainable employment transport benefits of the Northern Arc. Consider that the business park must be an integral part of this development.
- The community and sports centre will also be of benefit to the Parish.
- The Northern Arc geographical allocation matches that of the emerging MSDP. However, the uses do not concur with those in the emerging MSDP.
- Potential conflict between specific land uses in the District Plan (DP8) and allocations in the NP (A3 & E1) and should be addressed. The NP should reflect policy DP8.
- Support strategic gaps, but are concerned there is a lack of robust evidence to support policy C3.
- Would be happy to support the review of Conservation Areas, as per C5. Works would take place with Mid Sussex to review the allocations and this should be reflected in the policy.
- The whole plan needs to be clearly related to the NPPF.

7) South Downs National Park Authority

- Suggest some language changes and duplication of information.
- Some policies are not relevant.
- Schedule of Evidence should include the SDNPA State of the National Park report.
- Policy E1 needs to be mapped.
- Policy E5 needs to make reference to the SDNP statutory purpose as traffic impacts are not the only concerns.
- Policy T1 is not a policy.
- Policy T7 should encourage identification of a specific site.

8) Natural England

- Comments made on the sustainability appraisal.
- Objective 1 should consider both the number and scale of developments that protect and enhance natural beauty, not undermine it.
- Footpath condition may provide limited useful intelligence.
- Indicators relating to Ancient Woodland might be onerous to monitor.
- Indicators under objective 3 are just references to sources.
- Consideration should be given to potential BAP within the district in the absence of any designated habitat areas.

• Responses from Local Residents and Local Interest Groups

9) Mr T Lank

- Correction to wording at Para's 3.6, 5.3 and 7.1.
- The initial housing for Hurstpierpoint (excluding Sayers Common) was 130-160. The current figure is a considerable increase. Why accept more when the District target remains unchanged?

10) Mrs R M Thomas

- Support the inclusion of Local Gaps. Development of land to the north of 31 College Lane would be inappropriate and causes coalescence with Hassocks.
- New Way Lane should be included in the quiet lanes policy.
- It is positive that a review of the Conservation Areas be undertaken.
- The three proposals relating to Goddard's Green will have a significant negative impact on sustainability objectives, most notably, Environmental ones, specifically 9 & 13.
- If housing is approved at College Lane prior to the adoption of the NP, then policies H1, H7 & H8 should be reviewed.

11) Mrs J Lowman

- New Way Lane should be included in the quiet lanes policy.

12) Mr K Jemmett

- The number of houses should be kept to a maximum of 180. New areas should be limited in size and contained a mixture of housing.
- There needs to be appropriate infrastructure provisions installed, particularly sewerage.
- The delivery of housing needs to be evenly spread, with no more than one half in the next 5 years.
- Greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.
- Highway safety and parking should be a key area of concern.
- Encouragement of retail facilities in the north of the village of Hurstpierpoint.

13) Mrs M Jemmett

- No clarification as to why there has been an increase to the amount of allocated housing, from 120-160, to 230-255. Housing should be kept to a maximum of 200.
- The Parish Vision is to retain a village feel, it should actually be that a village is retained.
- New housing will result in shortages of places at St Lawrence Primary school and Downlands Community Secondary School.
- There will be other infrastructure issues with Medical Centre and Sewerage capacity.
- Highway capacity along the High Street is problematic and further housing will exacerbate this.
- Greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.
- Investment should be made in the north of the village of Hurstpierpoint where the majority of housing is proposed.

14) Ms D Collins

- No clarification as to why there has been an increase to the amount of allocated housing, from 120-160, to 230-255. Housing should be kept to a maximum of 200.
- The Parish Vision is to retain a village feel, it should actually be that a village is retained.
- New housing will result in shortages of places at St Lawrence Primary school and Downlands Community Secondary School.
- There will be other infrastructure issues with Medical Centre and Sewerage capacity.
- Highway capacity along the High Street is problematic and further housing will exacerbate this.
- Greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.
- Investment should be made in the north of the village of Hurstpierpoint where the majority of housing is proposed.

15) Dr & Mrs S J Orebi Gann

- The NP is coherent and easy to read.
- Traffic and parking proposals need careful consideration.

- Local gap between Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks is welcomed.
- Object to Area 15 identified in the LA as having moderate capacity for change, as this appears inconsistent with the local gap designation.

16) Protect Hurst Group

- Question whether Para 3.5 will include preventing the spread of hard surfaces on site.
- Policy A1 should reference policy H5, as well as policy H4.
- Lighting in Hurst Wickham CA should be replaced to be more in keeping, suggest this is looked at jointly with WSCC.
- Wording in policy H5 should reflect that in H4(h) regarding open space provision.

17) Ms J Owen & Mr M Hudson

- Para 4.4 is not needed as the Hurst Meadows idea is covered in Para 4.1.
- The Draft LA should not be included in the NP.
- Areas 15 & 16 of the LA have the wrong designations and 16 is outside the Parish.
- Recreation space along College Lane, Para 4.4, should be removed as local residents would prefer to retain open countryside.

18) Mr K Birtles

- Generally support the vision and objectives.
- Support policies C1, C3, H1, T2 & T4.
- Hope that a review of existing CA's can be undertaken in a timely manner.
- Support Para 3.5.
- Concerned about Para 4.4 and provision of recreation space near Hurstpierpoint College. Attracting more vehicles to the lane will conflict policy T4.
- Potential typing error contained at Para 7.1.
- Regarding the LA, character area 16 is outside the Parish. Area 15 is inside but given less weight in terms of protection.

19) Ms K Harries

- Concern about the area of land off of College Lane, being noted in the LA as only being of moderate landscape value.
- The area in question is inappropriate for development and would conflict with policy C3.
- Concerned about policy H5. There is insufficient space for new houses and will result in a loss of open space around Hurst Wickham CA. It will also result in higher traffic and pedestrian levels.

20) Mr I & Mrs C Holmes

- No clarification as to why there has been an increase to the amount of allocated housing, from 120-160, to 230-255. Housing should be kept to a maximum of 200.

- The Parish Vision is to retain a village feel, it should actually be that a village is retained.
- New housing will result in shortages of places at St Lawrence Primary school and Downlands Community Secondary School.
- There will be other infrastructure issues with Medical Centre and Sewerage capacity.
- Highway capacity along the High Street is problematic and further housing will exacerbate this.
- Greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.
- Investment should be made in the north of the village of Hurstpierpoint where the majority of housing is proposed.

21) Ms J Baker

- No clarification as to why there has been an increase to the amount of allocated housing, from 120-160, to 230-255. Housing should be kept to a maximum of 200.
- The Parish Vision is to retain a village feel, it should actually be that a village is retained.
- New housing will result in shortages of places at St Lawrence Primary school and Downlands Community Secondary School.
- There will be other infrastructure issues with Medical Centre and Sewerage capacity.
- Highway capacity along the High Street is problematic and further housing will exacerbate this.
- Greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.
- Investment should be made in the north of the village of Hurstpierpoint where the majority of housing is proposed.

22) Ms H Needham

- Access for the proposed housing at Little Park, policy H4, would be through Iden Hurst, which would be unsatisfactory. It is a narrow residential road. It should be via Chalkers Lane.
- Parking to cater for the school and health centre needs careful assessment. These will cause two extra pinch points in the High Street.

23) Mr S Henson

- Object to any development along College Lane.
- Development here would conflict with policy C3.
- It would impact on rural views.
- Also object to proposed recreation facility along College Lane (policy A1).

24) Ms L Williams

- Concern that the big policies in the NP revolve around successful outcome of developments relating to policies H4 & H5.

- **Responses from Developers/Agents**

- *25) Woodcocks Holding Limited*

- No specific comments are raised, but an appeal statement, relating to a Public Inquiry regarding a housing development at Sayers Common has been submitted as a representation. This included an assessment of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
 - The proposed housing figure for the Parish should be revised upwards sharply, to ensure that it covers a 20 year period.
 - If Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish is to accommodate a more significant proportion of the Districts future housing then developments at the settlements of Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common seem likely.
 - Agree that congestion levels in the High Street, Conservation Area and setting of Hurstpierpoint College, National Park Boundary and need to prevent settlement coalescence are all constraints to development in the village of Hurstpierpoint.
 - Constraints to development in Sayers Common are not considered to be restrictive.
 - Sayers Common is considered accessible by bus and cycle and is near to services not available in the village.
 - Issues relating to surface water drainage problems are resolvable and should not prevent development taking place.
 - There is a known housing need in the Parish - 45 households with connections needed in Sayers Common and 214 in Hurstpierpoint.
 - Sayers Common could accept up to 120 houses.

- *26) Barton Willmore*

- Support policy E1 for 20 ha business park in the north of the Parish near Goddard's Green.
 - An application to build out this development will be submitted in late May 2013 and will be deliverable in 2 years.
 - Half the site could be provided now, with the remainder of the site developed in the coming years.

- *27) Thakeham Homes Ltd*

- Support the proactive position the Parish Council have adopted in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
 - It is considered inappropriate for the NP to be based on the MSDLP 2004. As the replacement plan is not adopted then no weight should be put on this. Consider it is premature to advance the NP on this basis.
 - Policy C3 conflicts with policy DP9 in the MSDP 2013. Objection raised to land at the rear of 31 College Lane being included in the policy to prevent coalescence.
 - Housing figures in the NP can only be found sound once the proposed housing in the MSDP has been assessed. The MSDP figures are subject to a large level of objection and makes the NP process uncertain.

- The housing requirements in the NP are based on Mid Sussex research. Thakeham have produced a separate report by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) to independently assess need.
- The methods used to assess future housing need in the NP are flawed and do not take account of projected household growth.
- The housing figure also failed to take into account migratory pressures.
- Based on NLP figures, Mid Sussex should be looking at 12,400 to 17,600 new dwellings which would require some 700 to 1,500 within Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish.
- A figure of under 700 would not meet the likely minimum estimates of migration led pressures.
- Policy H1 should be amended to require at least 700 new homes.
- Policy H2 is considered unjustified.
- Policy H4, which allocates development at Little Park is objected to on the basis of landscape implications. The area was assessed by the Parish commissioned Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as having: substantial sensitivity, moderate landscape value and low landscape capacity.
- There are five other character areas within the LVIA which are identified as having medium/high landscape capacity, including Area 15, land north of 31 College Lane.
- Policy H4 would also have a detrimental impact on the ancient woodland in the centre of the village. It would change its character to a copse in the village and from a copse at the transition between the village and countryside.
- On a previous application (12/04141/OUT) objections relating to the impact of development on this copse from a housing development, was objected to by MSDC Tree & Landscape Officer and WSCC Ecologist.
- There are also access issues to the site which have previously been objected to by WSCC Highway's Authority.
- The allocation at H4 is unsustainable and alternative sites should be considered.
- Object to policy H5 and the allocation of Highfield Drive.
- The site at H5 is close to a number of Heritage Assets, including Hurst Wickham Conservation Area (CA) and historic buildings at Little Park Farm.
- A housing site at Highfield Drive which was dismissed at appeal (2160683). The Inspector identified that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of Hurst Wickham CA. The open countryside contributes to the setting of the CA and historic development pattern. The Inspector also considered that the loss of open land was an overriding factor, giving rise to to a significant impact on the CA.
- The allocation of policy H6 and Chalkers Lane is questioned, as previously MSDC had considered the site to be undeliverable. In allocating it, the Parish Council must be certain that it will come forwards in due course.
- Policy H8 is unnecessary and repeats advice contained in MSDC DP28.

- The site at the rear of 31 College Lane should be included as a development site. It is preferable in terms of constraints and more deliverable than other allocations identified, specifically policy H4, H5 & H6.

28) Clifford Dann

- The LA commissioned by the Parish is inaccurate, in that of the 27 Areas identified, Area 16 is outside of the Parish and Area 15 reappraised inline with the needs of the Parish.
- The LA is only draft and so can be amended prior to adoption.

29) Rydon Homes

- The requirement for policy C3 is acknowledged.
- Policies H4 & H5 provide a positive way to deliver needed homes on well contained sites, buffered by robust landscaping, the setting of the village and the surrounding countryside.
- Support local gaps which will prevent incremental coalescence and threaten the historical pattern of small and medium sized villages.
- Support policy C7 and consider this well addressed through policy H4.
- Support policy A1. Policy A1 should also make reference to policy H5.
- Policies A2 & A4 should reference policy H6 as their implementations are closely linked.
- It is noted that the MSDP 2004 is out of date that the MSDP is at an early stage. It also envisages less housing than the old South East Plan.
- The MSDP fails to have regard to housing needs in neighbouring areas of Crawley and Brighton and may fail the duty to cooperate. Given this, the requirements of policy H1 may need to be revisited.
- The village of Hurstpierpoint is an important rural service centre and less car dependent than Sayers Common.
- The allocation of new housing should be considered a minimum and if there are appropriate sustainable extensions available to meet a figure higher than 230-255 then there should be a degree of flexibility inline with a 'floor not ceiling' approach.
- Support policies H4 & H5. Houses would be in a sustainable location and well contained.

30) Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd

- Raise a concern about the allocation of land at Goddard's Green for prescriptive land uses, when this would be premature with regards to the MSDP.
- The draft policy DP8 in the MSDP conflicts with policy A3. DP8 allocates a site in Goddard's Green for employment and this is allocated for recreations in the A3.
- This highlights the problems with bringing forwards an NP in the absence of a District level plan.
- Prescribing land uses in the NP may prejudice the delivery of the North Arc development which is currently evolving.

- Discussions between stake holder groups and St Paul's College, Burgess Hill, would suggest that the allocation in policy A3 would be better catered to the north of the A2300, where it would have a greater functional relationship with the school. The policy should be flexible and allow an allocation either to the north or south of the A2300.
- Broadly support policy H1, but it should be amended to reflect that some housing might come forwards in the Northern Arc that falls within the Parish. If this housing were to come forwards it might breach the suggested limits of 230-255 new homes. The policy needs to be flexible to allow all permutations of the Northern Arc to be realised.
- Gleeson object to Map 5 designation. The Northern Arc should be shown within the extent of the Neighbourhood Plan area. The designation for 'future development' is confusing.
- The robustness of the plan will be enhanced if the plan simply designates the Burgess Hill Northern Arc with the proposed built up area boundary of Map 5.
- Failure to deliver or delay the Northern Arc could result in high levels of unplanned housing across Mid Sussex. Whilst a NP will be a material consideration for any housing development, the failure to secure a five year housing land supply could trigger the provisions of Para 49 of the NPPF.

8. PARAGRAPH 15(2)(d) - CONSIDERATION OF MAIN ISSUES.

- 8.1. Paragraph 15(2)(d) requires the Consultation Statement to describe how the issues and concerns raised as part of the Regulation 14 consultation have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NP. This is detailed below.
- 8.2. In order to accurately assess and reflect on the consultation comments received whilst also being able to compare and contrast conflicting viewpoints, a summary of the responses to each of the NP policies has been prepared. There is then commentary about how these concerns have been considered and where relevant, changes made to the applicable policy and supporting text.
- 8.3. It is of note that as a result of the consultation process a number of policies have been reworded, others have been rationalised to create new policies. This has not created new policy areas but has been undertaken for soundness.
- 8.4. There has been re-ordering of some policies in the Housing section of the NP. Where this occurs, responses are summarised by reference to the old policy numbers, then a section relating to the new policy number is provided together with an explanation of any changes.
- 8.5. A number of policies have also been amended to become Parish "aims". This is principally where policies were not considered to directly relate to development and land use planning and were aspirational aims. The requirements of NPPF paragraph 17, which seeks development plans to be "a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency", has been considered. It was felt reasonable to more clearly differentiate between policies and aims. Where this has occurred, the reasoning is noted.

Policy C1

- 8.5. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1) and (18). Consultee (1) felt the policy didn't add anything, whilst Consultee (18) supported its inclusion. The policy has been amended to be more precise. There are also additional clauses to reflect district policies and now reads:

"Development, including formal sports and recreation areas, will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the areas outside the built-up boundaries on the Policies Maps, where:

It is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, or some other use which has to be located in the countryside;

It maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the Parish area;

It is supported by a specific policy reference elsewhere in this Plan".

- 8.6. The policy was assessed by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), was found to be the most sustainable option and is in accordance with NPPF requirements. It is retained.

Policy C2

- 8.7. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (1), who felt it didn't add anything. Following the consultation process closing, Consultee (7) contacted the Parish Council to request further changes. It was therefore considered reasonable to agree to this request. Additional text was added

to ensure that the purposes of the National Park were understood and linked to Government guidance. The policy now reads:

“Any development that lies within the South Downs National Park shall ensure that the two purposes of National Park designations are achieved. The purposes set out in the Environment Act 1995 are to:

- Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park; and*
- Promote the opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the National Park’s special qualities by the public.*
- In pursuing these purposes there is a duty on the National Park Authority and other public bodies to:*
- Seek to Foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities within the National Park.*
- Development in the Parish that contributes to the setting of the South Downs National Park will only be permitted where it enhances and does not detract from the National Park’s visual qualities and essential characteristics”.*

8.8. The SA found the policy to be sustainable and help to achieve the aims of the majority of objectives in a positive manner (only objectives 7 & 9 were found to be neutral). Given this and the input from Consultee (7) the policy is to be retained, as amended.

Policy C3

8.9. This policy was commented on by Consultees (6), (11), (29), (18), (19) and (23). The latter two appear to be in relation to objections to a specific development that was being considered by MSDC at the time of the NP consultation. Although the policy was not mentioned directly, the issue of settlement coalescence was acknowledged by Consultees (10) & (25).

8.10. There was both support and objections raised to the policy’s inclusion, whilst others acknowledged the need for such a policy without proffering an opinion for or against. Consultee (6) supported the policy, but felt there was a lack of robust evidence to support it.

8.11. As a result of these comments, all the gaps were reviewed and the proposed gap between Goddards Green and Hickstead was dropped. A gap was identified between Hurstpierpoint and Albourne as this clearly separates settlements. The gaps were deemed to comply with a number of NP objectives and the overarching Parish Vision to retain a village feel.

8.12. Consultee (27) objected to the policy due to the gap between Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint. They considered it to conflict with draft MSDP policy DC9. Policy C3 is in general conformity with the MSLP policy C2 and also with draft MSDP policy DC9. The policy is supported by a strong evidence base, notably the LVIA. The NPPF is also clear that local character and distinctiveness are key planning issues. It was also deemed the most sustainable option in terms of meeting a number of key objectives.

8.13. The need was acknowledged by Consultee (29) and supported by Consultees (10), (18), (19) and (23).

- 8.14. The policy does not prevent development around villages, providing that there is no unacceptable loss of gaps and settlement identity. Local character and distinctiveness are key policy aims.
- 8.15. Given the sustainability benefits of the policy, it is to be retained. The policy wording has also been amended in response to feedback to:

“Development will be permitted in the countryside provided that it does not individually or cumulatively result in the coalescence and loss of separate identity of neighbouring settlements. Local Gaps are set between the following settlements:

- *Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks,*
- *Sayers Common and Albourne,*
- *Hurstpierpoint and Albourne*
- *Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill.”*

Policy C4

- 8.16. Consultees (10) & (11) felt that the policy should be extended to include New Way Lane. This is supported. New Way Lane is considered to be a rural lane to which the aim should reasonably cover.
- 8.17. In reviewing the nature of this policy, it was agreed that it was an aspirational one and not a land use planning position. It therefore is to be amended to an ‘aim’.

Policy C5

- 8.18. The policy was commented on by Consultee (6) who stated they were happy to work with the Parish Council on reviewing the existing conservation areas. They suggested the policy should be amended to reflect this. The policy inclusion was supported by Consultee (10).
- 8.19. A further policy requirement has been added to ensure that it linked to other policy aims within the NP and to reflect the rural locations of the Langton Lane and Hurst Wickham Conservation Areas.
- 8.20. The policy wording has been amended to reflect comments from Consultee (6) and now reads:

“(1)The Local Planning Authority shall be encouraged to review the existing Conservation Areas of Langton Lane, High Street, and Hurst Wickham, for possible modification and extension.

(2) New development in the countryside adjacent to Conservation Areas will be permitted where it does not conflict with other countryside policies and where the setting of the areas are not harmed.”

Policy C6

- 8.21. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1) & (16). Consultee (1) felt the policy needed to define inappropriate development and (16) queried whether the policy would prevent the spread of hardstanding at the site.
- 8.22. As a result of the comments from Consultee (1) the wording of the policy has been amended to better define inappropriate development. Restraint on hardstanding has not been included, as this was considered to be unduly restrictive and lacked a higher tier policy basis.

8.23. The policy now reads:

“Development will be permitted within the policy area of Hurstpierpoint College where:

- It does not detract from the special architectural character and appearance of the existing collection of buildings and their setting in the landscape.*
- It complies with the requirements of Policy C1 - Conserving and enhancing character.*
- It enhances the role of the College as a school and local employer.*
- It does not detract from the visual setting of the college campus in the surrounding countryside.”*

Policy C7

8.24. The policy was only directly commented on by Consultee (29) who supported the policy in conjunction with policy H4 (now changed to policy H3).

8.25. There are no changes proposed.

Policy A1

8.26. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1), (29), (16) & (23). Consultee (1) felt the policy was unrealistic, whilst (23) objected to its inclusion. The policy is being maintained as it meets a number of NP objectives, is consistent with the NPPF and was supported by the SA as an appropriate policy.

8.27. Consultees (29) and (16) noted that the policy should include a reference to policy H5, as well as H4 (both now covered by H3 & H7). This is considered to be an appropriate amendment and the wording of the policy has been accordingly changed.

Policy A2

8.28. This was commented on by Consultees (29), (17), (18) & (23). (29) Supported the policy but felt it should reference policy H5. The other three objected to the policy on highway grounds and preference for open countryside.

8.29. The policy is not amended as it is felt that the policy should be a standalone one and required in order to ensure it achieves compliance with objectives of promoting healthy communities (Section 8 of the NPPF), regardless of other policies. The policy is positively worded and considered an appropriate use for the site.

Policy A3

8.30. The policy was commented on directly by Consultees (6) & (30). Both felt that the allocation should be less specific so that it did not prejudice the delivery of the Burgess Hill Northern Arc development, which is in a state of iteration. The policy was indirectly commented on by Consultee (10) who commented on all policies in Goddard's Green and was concerned about the impact on the Parish, but did not elaborate on this.

8.31. Consultee (6) was pleased that the geographical area of the Northern Arc matches that in the MSDP, but stated that the policy should reflect draft policy DP8 of the MSDP.

- 8.32. Consultee (30) questioned the whole NP process as a result of this policy, which they saw as not conforming with draft policy DP8. They contend that the NP cannot be brought forwards until the MSDP has been adopted. They warn that non-compliance could jeopardise the whole Northern Arc development. The policy should be amended to allow for an allocation, allowing sports recreation development both to the north and south of the A2300.
- 8.33. The policy remains unchanged. It was carefully formulated in consultation with MSDC and fully cognisant of the draft MSDP. DCLG have also confirmed that the NP does not need to be delayed whilst the MSDP is completed and adopted. The policy is in general conformity with policy DP8 and also conforms with other policies in the MSDP, such as DP22 & DP23.
- 8.34. The policy was subject to a rigorous SA testing process and was deemed the most sustainable, meeting the most NP objectives. The policy is positively worded and is part of a wider allocation for a large amount of development in Goddard's Green, along with policy E1 and a potential waste site being considered by WSCC. The policy would be in accordance with other policies in the NP, notably policy C1.

Policy A4

- 8.35. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1) and (29). Consultee (1) felt the policy was unclear and (29) felt it should reference policy H6. The policy is considered specific and positively identifies the site for recreation. The policy remains unchanged.

Policy A5

- 8.36. No comments received. Policy unchanged.

Housing Section

- 8.37. There have been a number of changes to the housing section, with policy number changes and some re-working of policies. There has also been a change to the proposed number of dwellings allocated in the NP
- 8.38. The proposed number of dwellings in the Parish has been increased from 230-255 in the consultation draft, to 282-292 in the submission version. This reflects the recent planning permission approved at Chalkers Lane for the same site area identified in the Consultation Draft NP, but at a higher density, delivering an overall greater number of units. The allocations at Highfield Drive, Little Park and in Sayers Common remain unaltered.
- 8.39. A number of policies have also been reworked. This has not created new policy areas, but helped the narrative and policy flow and presentation of the NP.
- 8.40. Former policy H1 has been split into new policies H3 & H4. Former policy H2 has been renumbered new policy H5. Former policy H3 has been renumbered new policy H6. Former policies H4, H5, H6 & H7 have been amalgamated into new policies H1, H2, H3, H4 & H7. This is summarised in the Table below.

Policy Number of Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan	Policy Number of Submission NP
H1	H3 and H4
H2	H5
H3	H6
H4, H5, H6, H7	H1, H2, H3, H4, H7

8.41. Some additional text has been added to Paragraph 5.1. This provides further context on housing numbers and issues, such as secondary school place numbers, which are to be considered with increased housing projections.

8.42. The remainder of the housing policies remained unaltered.

New policy H1 (Hurstpierpoint: new housing development) now reads:

8.43. *“To meet the future needs in and around the Parish, new housing development will be permitted in areas which:*

- (a) positively enhance the existing settlement pattern of the village.*
- (b) can also provide significant areas of parkland adjacent to the built zones, to be owned and managed by the local community.*
- (c) do not harm the countryside around and approaching the Conservation Areas of the village.*
- (d) do not harm the countryside around and approaching the campus of Hurstpierpoint College.*
- (e) do not contribute to any coalescence between the village and the built-up area of Hassocks.”*

8.44. The new policy now provides clear guidance for development within the village of Hurstpierpoint. This had previously relied on general guidance in H4, H5 & H6 for the development of allocated sites in the village. The policy is precise and meets the aims of other policies.

Policy H1 (Now H3 & H4)

8.45. The following Consultees felt the housing allocation was too low, (27), (29) & (30). Consultees (29) & (14) felt that the policy required more flexibility to potentially allow for more housing, whilst (27) felt that the allocation should be amended to at least 700 homes.

8.46. The following Consultees , (9), (12), (13), (14), (20) & (21), were concerned about the amount of housing proposed or questioned why it had be raised from the initial draft. Upper limits of between 180 and 200 were proposed.

8.47. The policy was also indirectly commented on by Consultee (25). They contended that the Parish might have more housing pressure brought to bear as a result of the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area and SDNP.

48. Consultee (1) felt the policy should reference the Lifetime Homes standard. Consultee (10) felt the policy would need to be reviewed if housing applications in the Parish were approved prior to adoption.
- 8.49. Those objecting to the amount of housing as being too high, have not clarified why the level should be lower than the one set other than identifying MSDC equal share. There was no evidence provided that suggested the figure was unsustainable, but appears to relate to general concerns about the amount of development in the Parish.
- 8.50. Consultee (27) has raised a number of objections to the proposal. These are based around concerns about the amount of housing proposed by MSDC in their MSDP. They have produced an independent needs assessment by Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners, which suggested a need for some 700-1,500 within the Parish.
- 8.51. This number is not supported. It is considered that the amount of housing proposed has been formulated in the absence of any considerations of social or environmental constraints. The provision of a larger number of dwelling has be found unsustainable by the SA. It would also fail to meet with aims of other policies in the NP, specifically those that seek protection of the countryside, SDNP, settlement identity and delivery of infrastructure. Likewise, it could have negative impacts on social objectives and the key Parish Vision of retaining a 'village feel'.
- 8.52. The policy is in general conformity with the draft MSDP and was formulated in consultation with MSDC. On MSDC's 'fair-share' requirement for new housing in rural Parishes, the overall figure could have been lower, but being positive and supporting sustainable development and future needs of the Parish, a higher figure was preferred. This reflects the desire to support sustainable economic growth whilst meeting other policies aims as well as environmental and social objectives.
- 8.53. The overall housing number has changed following the Regulation 14 consultation as a result of the subsequent grant of planning for housing (Chalkers Lane), a preferred housing site, but at a higher density. The remaining allocation remains unaltered. This higher number has been assessed by the SA and remains a sustainable option. The number is also broadly inline with the economic growth projections of the Parish originally used to provide a template for housing numbers.

New Policy H3 (Hurstpierpoint allocated sites) now reads:

- 8.54. *"The following sites are allocated for new housing in Hurstpierpoint:*
- (1) Highfield Drive (ref HP01) 17 houses.*
 - (2) Chalkers Lane (north) (ref: HP14) 38 houses.*
 - (3) Chalkers Lane (south) (ref: HP15) 57 houses.*
 - (4) Little Park (ref: HP07 & 08) 140 houses."*
- 8.55. The policy has been amended to reflect planning permission granted for Chalkers Lane sites since publication of the Consultation Draft NP. It is otherwise unaltered. Previously the policy provided an overall number for the whole Parish (former policy H1), with individual sites then listed in former polices H4, H5 & H6, which included development requirements.

- 8.56. These development requirements now form part of new policy H7. The new Policy H3 is solely to detail the allocated sites and housing numbers. This gives a clearer and more logical layout.

The new Policy H4 (Sayers Common housing sites) now reads:

- 8.57. *“New housing at Sayers Common will be permitted once the existing drainage infrastructure issues have been resolved to remove incidence of localised flooding. Within the Plan period the village will accommodate 30 to 40 new homes. A review and appraisal of deliverable housing site will be undertaken at an early stage in the Plan period.”*
- 8.58. The policy reflects the housing numbers previously set out in old policy H7. It commits to new development, but acknowledges that sites have not yet been identified due to infrastructure issues in the village, notably drainage and surface water flooding.
- 8.59. The policy rationalises advice previously set out in former policy H7. More general development guidance applicable to all new housing developments is contained in new policy H7. The policy ensures that housing will be delivered in Sayers Common, in due course, subject to addressing the sustainability issues for the village.

Policy H2 (Now H5)

- 8.60. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1), (2), (27), (12), (13), (20) & (21). Consultee (1) felt the phasing was unclear, whilst (2) supported its inclusion. (27) felt that the policy was unjustified. Consultees (12), (13), (20) & (21) noted the importance of ensuring there was appropriate infrastructure improvements, including medical provisions, school places and sewerage.
- 8.61. The policy is supported by Consultee (2) who acknowledged the need for essential infrastructure to cater for new development. This is particularly an issue with surface water drainage issues in Sayers Common. The policy encourages positively the sustainable delivery of homes. It has been renumbered as H5, but is not altered. The policy was supported by the SA conclusions and remains unchanged.

Policy H3 (Now H6)

- 8.62. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (1). In relation to the lack of small sites identified, which would be allowed by Policy H9. The Village Design Statement is ostensibly a guide to local character and design. The lack of guidance for smaller unallocated sites is not considered a weakness.
- 8.63. The policy would ensure that new developments are carefully designed to reflect local character and ensure that new developments are appropriate for their settlement and location. The NPPF is clear that design is an important issue (Chapter 7) and therefore it is reasonable to include guidance on local distinctiveness.
- 8.64. The policy is renumbered but remains unchanged.

Policy H4 (Now H1 H3 & H7)

- 8.65. The policy was commented on by Consultees (27), (29), (16), (22) & (24), all raising different issues.

- 8.66. Consultee (27) objects to the allocation on the basis of landscape sensitivity and ecological sensitivities. They felt the allocation was unsustainable and that there were more sustainable options. A site to the north of 31 College Lane, is suggested as an alternative preferable site. This Consultee had an application lodged with MSDC for the development of the site north of 31 College Lane at the time of the consultation response.
- 8.67. Consultee (29) considered the policy is a positive way to deliver the homes required by the Parish on a well contained site and supported by policy C7. Consultee (16) felt the policy should reflect open space provision. Consultee (22) considers the proposed access is unsatisfactory and should be via Chalkers Lane. Consultee (24) felt all big policies revolved around the successful outcome of this policy and former policy H5.
- 8.68. The site was rigorously assessed in the SA and was considered the most sustainable option, able to deliver the most objectives. The College Lane site is considered less sustainable and would not comply with other policies in the NP.
- 8.69. The site is now covered by the new allocations policy H3 and detailed guidance about new development in policy H7.

Policy H5 (Now H1 H3 & H7)

- 8.70. The policy was commented on by Consultees (27), (29), (16), (19) & (24). The responses were similar to those provided in response to old policy H4.
- 8.71. Consultee (17) objected to the allocation as having a detrimental impact on various heritage assets in proximity to the site. Consultee (29) supported the allocation and found it sustainable and well contained. Consultees (16) & (24) repeated the comments made about policy H4. Consultee (19) felt there was insufficient space for new houses and the allocation would result in a loss of open space.
- 8.72. The site was rigorously assessed in the SA and considered the most sustainable option and able to deliver the most NP objectives. It is a small allocation for a limited number of dwellings and would be a well contained site.
- 8.73. The site is now covered by the new allocations policy H3 and detailed guidance about new development in H7.

Policy H6 (Now H1 H3 & H7)

- 8.74. The policy was commented on by Consultees (27) & (29). Consultee (27) questioned the deliverability of the development and (29) felt that it should cross reference policies A2 & A4.
- 8.75. The policy already cross references A2 & A4 and the site was carefully assessed as deliverable prior to its inclusion.
- 8.76. The site is now covered by the new allocations policy H3 and detailed guidance about new development in H7 and has been amended to reflect planning permissions already approved at the site.

Policy H7 (Now H2, H4 & H7)

- 8.77. This policy was indirectly commented on by Consultee (25). The comments passed were primarily produced in relation to an appeal scheme, but were formally submitted as a consultation response.

They contend that there is a number of constraints on development in Hurstpierpoint. There are less in Sayers Common and the village is a sustainable location. Surface water drainage issues are resolvable and there is a high housing need in the parish. Sayers Common could achieve up to 120 houses.

- 8.78. Sayers Common has very limited facilities and new houses would be heavily reliant on car use. The village is a less sustainable location than Hurstpierpoint and should accordingly have a lower housing allocation. The allocation reflects the need for new housing in the village and locally specific issues raised in the SA.
- 8.79. A site specific allocation was avoided, but the policy is positively prepared, subject to infrastructure. The policy has been amended to commit to an early review of the NP, following adoption.
- 8.80. Housing development in Sayers Common is now covered by the requirements of new policy H2 (as detailed above), new policy H4 and the detailed guidance of new policy H7.

New Policy H2 (Sayers Common: new housing developments) now reads:

- 8.81. *“To meet the future needs in and around the Parish new housing development will be permitted in areas which:*

- (a) positively enhance the existing settlement pattern of the villages.*
- (b) can enhance the flood and drainage management in the village.”*

- 8.84. The policy is largely a reworking of guidance previously contained in policy H7. However, it provides a less prescriptive policy basis and rationalises the key guidance. It also reflects the policy approach taken for new housing in Hurstpierpoint. It would be supported by guidance in new policy H7.

- 8.85. The policy is worded positively and ensures key issues relating to development in Sayers Common are covered. This would support other policy aims and provide a more robust policy position.

New policy H7 (Housing sites infrastructure and environmental impact assessment) now reads:

- 8.86. *“All new housing developments shall be assessed for the following and have corresponding financial contributions towards the cost, and/or contributions of land, and/or amelioration systems included in the development:*

- a) the provision of a satisfactory access point or points to the site for motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.*
- b) the preparation and submission of an up to date Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to include the consideration of the cumulative impact of traffic and the provision of any necessary off site transport improvements.*
- c) the provision of a comprehensive package of highway and footpath improvements, for vehicular, pedestrian and cycling uses, serving the local area.*
- d) the retention and protection of significant landscape features within the site and along the sites boundaries.*

e) an ecological survey to be carried out and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures to be undertaken.

f) the provision of adequate surface water and foul water drainage capacity.

g) the provision of, or financial contribution towards, community facilities and the provision of public open space.

h) the provision of parkland areas, to be owned and managed by the local community.”

8.87. This guidance had previously be split into a site specific policy basis in former policies H4, H5, H6 & H7. This revised approach rationalises the key issues and prevents unnecessary repetition. It therefore complies with the findings of the SA in terms of the former policies’ sustainability, in a rationalised manner.

Policy H8 (Unchanged)

8.88. The policy was commented on by Consultees (1) & (27) who both noted that the policy was not required and repeated guidance in the MSDP.

8.89. MSDC appraised the requirements for affordable housing in their draft MSDP. Their evidence base found that a levy of 30% on developments of 4 or more dwellings was acceptable, with contributions for schemes under 4 units. The split would be 75% rented and 25% intermediate. This largely repeated advice contained in their Housing Strategy 2009-2014 document, although this levied the requirements on schemes of 15 or more dwellings.

8.90. The policy is considered to be in general conformity with adopted MSLP and emerging MSDP policy. It was assessed by the SA to be sustainable and is accordingly retained.

Policy H9 (Unchanged)

8.91. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (1). They noted that the policy does not identify any specific sites. Supporting text suggests up to 5 sites, for up to 6 dwellings each, might be found. The aim of the policy is not to allocate sites, but acknowledge smaller housing sites might be able to deliver houses and that these should be in keeping and reflective of local character.

8.92. The policy remains unchanged and is in accordance with Paragraph 48 of the NPPF which allows for the inclusion of windfall sites.

Policy H10 (Unchanged)

8.93. No comments received. The NPPF supports the provision of a range of high quality dwellings and the policy is retained and unchanged.

Policy E1

8.94. The policy was commented on by Consultees (6), (7) & (26). Consultee (6) supports the allocation but is concerned about the conflict with MSDP policy DP9. Consultee (7) felt that the policy should be mapped and (26) welcomed the allocation.

8.95. The allocation is in general conformity with MSLP policies C2 & E1, E2, E3 & E5 and in accordance with MSDP policies DP2 & DP8. The policy is positively worded and was considered carefully with MSDC when the NP was being prepared. The policy achieves a number of sustainability objectives and was positively tested by the SA.

Policies E2, E3 (Aim) & E4

- 8.96. No comments received about any of these policies. Policies E2 & E4 remain unchanged.
- 8.97. In reviewing all policies it was decided that E3 was aspirational and should be altered to become an aim. The improvement of the village centre of Hurstpierpoint is a key issue.

Policy E5

- 8.98. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (7), who felt that the proposal needed to reflect the statutory purposes of the SDNP. The policy has been reworded to reflect this.

Transport Section

- 8.99. In reviewing the policies in the transport section it was decided that all of them should be altered to Parish aims. It was clear from the consultation process that highway issues were of key importance to stakeholders. However, whilst acknowledging that these were important aims, they nevertheless were not sufficiently tied to land use planning and development.
- 8.100. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes it clear that development plans should provide “a *practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.*” Most of the transport policies would not meet this requirement and whilst they remain an important priority for the Parish Council, should be relabelled as aims.

Policy T1

- 8.101. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (7), who did not consider it to be a policy position. The policy is considered relevant and is retained as an aim.

Policy T2

- 8.102. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (18) who supported the inclusion. It is retained but as an aim.

Policy T3

- 8.103. No comments received. It is retained, but as an aim.

Policy T4

- 8.104. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (18) who supported the inclusion. It is retained, but as an aim.

Policy T5 & T6

- 8.105. No comments received. It is retained, but as an aim.

Policy T7

- 8.106. The policy was only commented on by Consultee (7) who felt that a location for parking should be mapped. No site has been located for the parking, but the proposal is a positive one that seeks to resolve a locally specific issue. It is retained, but as an aim.

Policy T8

- 8.107. No comments received. It is retained, but as an aim.

9. SUMMARY

- 9.1. The above information confirms that the NP consultation process was undertaken in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and specifically Part 5, Paragraph 15 (1) & (2).
- 9.2. This document clearly sets out how and who were consulted as part of the NP consultation process. It summarises all 30 consultee responses received as part of the Regulation 14 consultation. Consultee comments are then clearly assessed against each individual policy contained in the NP.
- 9.3. A thorough assessment of the comments has been made and where necessary policy requirements or wordings have been amended in response to the comments received. Where policies have not been changed as a result of comments, justification for this is given.
- 9.4. Aside from the requirements of Paragraph 15 (1) & (2), the document also clearly shows that stakeholder and public engagement has been the backbone of the NP process. This started with work on the Parish Plans in 2010 and continued seamlessly into the NP. The stakeholder engagement has included local residents, local business, land owners, prospective developers, neighbouring authorities and local interest groups.
- 9.5. This document confirms that the NP has been the subject of robust consultation and comments from interested parties assessed. The NP should now proceed to formal assessment.