



The Hurstpierpoint Society

*For the public benefit to protect and conserve the natural
and built environment of Hurstpierpoint and the surrounding area*

The Hurstpierpoint Society Registered Charity No. 263520

Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
	Section A Infrastructure, Transport and policies.....	6
2	Infrastructure provision and delivery certainty by site	6
3	Transport and Traffic	12
4	Water, Drainage and Sewerage, and Climate Change.....	16
	Section B Main Modifications to Delivery mechanisms and Viability	20
5	Delivery mechanisms and viability	20
	Section C Improvements, Recommendations and Conclusions	22
6	What has genuinely improved?	22
7	Recommendations.....	22
8	Conclusions.....	23

Appendix 1	Number of properties within Albourne, Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common	24
Appendix 2	Local Masterplan Projects	25
	<i>Bolnore Village</i>	25
	<i>Brookleigh, Burgess Hill</i>	27
Appendix 3	WSCC Decision re the secondary school at Brookleigh <i>WSCC Officer Non-Key Decision Record, 18 November 2025</i>	28
Appendix 4	Abridged Met Office Climate Change UK	31

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Hurstpierpoint Society has contributed substantively throughout the preparation and examination of this Plan. At each stage we have sought to provide objective evidence rather than simply express opposition to development. Where important questions have remained unresolved, the Society and neighbouring community organisations have also committed their own resources to obtaining independent evidence to assist the examination of the Plan and its local consequences.
- 1.2 We have approached the MM in the same way: not by repeating our previous representations, but by asking what has changed, what has improved, and whether the infrastructure necessary to support the scale of development now proposed is actually secured.
- 1.3 The well-established High Street traffic issues are examined further in the Traffic & Transport Assessment prepared for Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council, Albourne Parish Council, Twineham Parish Council, Hurstpierpoint Society and WILD (Watchdog for Intrusive Local Development). This independent work was commissioned and funded by the local communities directly affected by the proposed developments, to provide evidence on matters where significant questions remain. Due to its community links, it is referred to as the **Community Transport Assessment (CTA)** in this response.
- 1.4 This response to the Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Schedule of Main Modifications July 2026 follows on from our 'Regulation 18' and the 'Regulation 19' responses. As the MM show an extension of the Plan period to 2040 throughout document DP2a, this is reflected in this response.
- 1.5 All responses relate to the **MM sites** below, unless otherwise stated:

Policy Ref	Site	Parish / area
MM60	Land east and west of Malthouse Lane, Burgess Hill	Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common / Hassocks ¹
MM72	Land east of College Lane, Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint
MM73	South of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint
MM74	Land north of Willow Way and Talbot Mead, Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint
MM75	Land south of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint
MM76	Land northeast of Hurstpierpoint	Hurstpierpoint
MM79	Land north of Henfield Road, Albourne	Albourne
MM80	Grange View House, London Road, Albourne	Albourne
MM81	Phase 1 Swallows Yard, London Road, Albourne	Albourne
MM82	Land east of London Road, Albourne	Albourne
MM92	West House Farm, Henfield Road, Sayers Common	Albourne ²
MM93	Land east of Avtrade, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common	Sayers Common
MM94	Land at Kingsland Lodge, London Road, Sayers Common	Sayers Common

¹ Shown as Burgess Hill but located in Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks

² Shown as Sayers Common but located in Albourne

- 1.6 Each individual site has its own planning constraints, including all these sites being within Local Gaps protected by Policy DPC2: Preventing Coalescence. The purpose of that policy is to enable settlements to retain their separate identity and character and to prevent coalescence. However, considered cumulatively with the sites already proposed at Regulation 19 stage, the developments would remove the remaining physical separation between Albourne and Sayers Common, while the additional **MM sites** around Hurstpierpoint would further erode the gaps which maintain the village's separation from neighbouring settlements.
- 1.7 It is also important to remember that each of these sites, together with those already considered at Regulation 19 stage, would be slotted into existing villages:

Settlement	Already in the submitted Plan	Added by these modifications	Total
Hurstpierpoint	DPSC1 (1,350); DPA12 Land west of Kemps (90)	MM72–MM76 (419)	1,859
Hurstpierpoint/Hassocks		MM60 (750)	750
Albourne	—	MM79–MM82 (326) MM92 (325)	651
Sayers Common	DPSC3 (2,000 total); DPSC4 (26); DPSC5 (210); DPSC6 (80); DPSC7 (210)	MM93–MM94 (150)	2,676
Total			5,936

- 1.8 The new housing is approximately 145% of the entire existing housing stock of the three villages combined (see Appendix 1).
- 1.9 When considered together, these produce significant cumulative impacts, which have not been adequately assessed.
- 1.10 Therefore, this is a strategic review of the cumulative effects of developing the additional sites across the area of Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne, together with the proposed modifications in Document DP2a relating to this area, as shown below:

Modification	District Plan policy	Page in Response
MM2	DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction	18
MM4	DPS4: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	16
MM12	DPN9: Air Quality	16
MM17	DPT1: Placemaking and connectivity	11,12,13,14,16,21,22
MM19	DPT3: Active and Sustainable Travel	15
MM36	DPSC GEN Significant Site Requirements	9, 12, 20
MM37	Vision and Growth at Sayers Common ³	9
MM38	DPSC1: Land west of Burgess Hill DPSC3: Land to the south of Reeds Lane Sayers Common	9, 10, 12

³ **MM37** incorrectly refers to sites **MM92**, **MM93** and **MM94** as **MM91**, **MM92**, and **MM93**

Modification	District Plan policy	Page in Response
MM39	DPSC1, DPSC5, DPSC6, DPSC7, - sewerage infrastructure	9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 22
MM42	DPSC1: Land West of Burgess Hill / North of Hurstpierpoint- amend criterion	9, 14
MM44	DPSC3: Land south of Reeds Lane, Sayers Common -amend criterion	9, 14, 22
MM45	DPSC4: Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View – Amend yield	10
MM46	DPSC5: Land at Coombe Farm – Amend criteria	10
MM47	DPSC6: Land to the west of Kings Business Centre – Amend yield	10
MM48	DPSC7: Land at LVS Hassocks – Amend yield	10
MM49	DPSC1, DPSC3, DPSC5, DPA12 – Layout and design	10
MM50	DPSC1, DPSC3, DPSC5 – Amend built up boundaries	9, 10
MM95	DPI1: Infrastructure Provision	20, 22
MM96	DPI2: Planning Obligations	20
MM99	DPI7: Water and Wastewater Infrastructure	19
MM100	DPI8: Viability	12, 21, 22

1.11 The issues are also considered in the context of the NPPF and District Plan policies.

2 Infrastructure provision and delivery certainty by site

- 2.1 Our main concern relates to the numbers proposed for the areas in and around the villages of Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne, especially the provision of infrastructure for the proposed developments in the context of the impact on existing infrastructure and the impact on the quality of life for residents.
- 2.2 National guidelines to identify infrastructure provision and proposed mitigations are in the **National Planning Policy Framework**, (NPPF) (September 2023*):

**(This is the version used in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 – 2039 Regulation 18 and 19 documents; the period is now extended to 2040 but continues to use the September 2023 version of the NPPF)*

20. *Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for:*

a) housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;

b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);

c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and

d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.

28. *Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment and setting out other development management policies.*

34. *Plans should set out the contributions expected from development. This should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure (such as that needed for education, health, transport, flood and water management, green and digital infrastructure). Such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan.*

- 2.3 In the Schedule of Main Modifications (July 2026) there are instances where the infrastructure promises may not be delivered and do not meet the requirements of the NPPF.
- 2.4 For the purpose of assessing the degree of delivery certainty, the Society has grouped the commitments into four broad categories. Running through the Schedule, every infrastructure commitment attached to our three villages falls into one of four grades. They look similar on the page but not the same in practice:

Grade 1 — Infrastructure expressly required to be provided as part of the development.

A named facility or item, which the allocation requires to be provided on or as part of the development. The degree of delivery certainty will depend on the relevant phasing/occupation mechanism.

Grade 2 — Land or space is secured, but delivery of the facility depends on others

The developer gives up a field. Somebody else - West Sussex County Council, the NHS, the Parish - must then find the capital to build on it, staff it and run it. If that money never appears, the field sits empty and the policy has still been complied with in full. This is the single most important distinction in the whole document.

Grade 3 — Financial contributions towards the provision of a thing.

A sum of money, of unstated size, paid into a pot, towards a facility that is not located, not costed, not designed and not scheduled. “Towards” is doing enormous work: a contribution towards a health centre is discharged but where, how much, when or what precise facility? Nothing in the Schedule identifies where any of it is to be spent.

Grade 4 — Have regard to / where appropriate / potential for.

Wording which requires consideration, or identifies an opportunity, but does not itself secure delivery of the infrastructure concerned.

- 2.5 Almost everything promised to Hurstpierpoint, Albourne and Sayers Common in these modifications sits in Grades 2, 3 and 4. (see tables below).

The site allocations – what is actually secured?

- 2.6 In the table below, the third column is what a developer is obliged to provide. The fourth column is everything else – unlocated, uncosted, unscheduled.

Modification	Site and yield	What a developer is obliged to provide	“Financial contributions towards the provision of..”
MM60	Land east and west of Malthouse Lane, Burgess Hill, though actually situated in Hurstpierpoint (about 73%) and Hassocks (about 27%) – 750 homes	A multi-functional local neighbourhood centre with flexible retail, cultural and health facilities to support the community; Sustainable transport and access; Green and blue ‘living links’; Access to areas of green space; play area; outdoor sports; parks & gardens	None listed
MM72	Land east of College Lane, Hurstpierpoint — 75 homes	Green space; play area	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station

Modification	Site and yield	What a developer is obliged to provide	“Financial contributions towards the provision of..”
MM73	South of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint — 9 homes	<i>Nothing</i>	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station; Play area
MM74	Land north of Willow Way & Talbot Mead, Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint — 150 homes	Green space; play area	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station
MM75	Land south of Hurst Wickham Barn, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint — 35 homes	Green space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station; Play area
MM76	Land north-east of Hurstpierpoint — 150 homes	Green space; play area; trim trail skate park	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station
MM79	Land north of Henfield Road, Albourne — 20 homes	Green space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station; Play area
MM80	Grange View House, London Road, Albourne — 10 homes	<i>Nothing</i>	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station; Play area
MM81	Phase 1, Swallows Yard, London Road, Albourne — 46 homes	Green space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station; Play area
MM82	Land east of London Road, Albourne — 250 homes	Green space; outdoor sports; play area; parks & gardens; flexible-use community building	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Improvements at Hassocks Station
MM92	West House Farm, Henfield Road, Albourne— 325 homes NB Shown as Sayers Common in DP2a	Green space; play area; outdoor sports; parks & gardens	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Improvements at Hassocks Station

Modification	Site and yield	What a developer is obliged to provide	“Financial contributions towards the provision of..”
MM93	Land east of Avtrade, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common — 75 homes	Green space; play area	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station
MM94	Land at Kingsland Lodge, London Road, Sayers Common — 75 homes	Green space; play area	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station

2.7 Obviously, this needs to be considered in terms of what will be provided by the sites DPSC3 – 7 and DPA12.

Site ref. and MM refs	Site and yield	What a developer is obliged to provide	“Financial contributions towards the provision of..”
DPSC1 MM38 MM39 MM42 MM49 MM50	Land to the West of Burgess Hill /North of Hurstpierpoint – 1,350 homes	Grade 1 — will be built: – Self-service library – Neighbourhood centre — retail, leisure and workspace – Local Community Infrastructure including allotments, public realm, public rights of way, cycle tracks – Extra Care housing provision – Play area – Other outdoor provision including a MUGA – Informal outdoor space including community orchards Grade 2 — land or space only: – MM38 Land for education provision and associated 2FE Primary School with Special support Centre and land for the provision of a full-day care nursery for Early Years	Improvements at Burgess Hill Station; SEND School; Community buildings, where need not met on-site; Health; Emergency services; Outdoor sports, where need not met on-site <i>Provision of: Sustainable transport measures and provision; Highways works; Foul water infrastructure and pumping station(s); Sewerage network upgrades</i>
DPSC3 MM36 MM37 MM38 MM44 MM49 MM50	Land to the South of Reeds Lane, Sayers Common - 2,000 homes	Grade 1 — will be built: – Self-service library – Community building – Local Community Infrastructure including allotments, public realm, public seating, public rights of way and cycle tracks – Community facilities – Leisure – Extra Care housing provision – Play area – Other outdoor sport provision – Informal outdoor space	Improvements at Hassocks Station; Emergency services; Health; Outdoor sports, where need not met on-site; Sustainable Transport measures and provision; Highways improvements; Wastewater Treatment Works <i>In the Sustainable Communities sites (Chapter 15), DPSC3's infrastructure box has no “Provision of” heading. Highways, sustainable transport and the wastewater treatment works are all financial contributions</i>

Site ref. and MM refs	Site and yield	What a developer is obliged to provide	“Financial contributions towards the provision of..”
		– New terminal pumping station Grade 2 — land or space only: -MM38 Land for education provision with associated all-through school, 3FE Primary and 4FE (expandable to 6FE) Secondary, with Early Years and Special Support Centre – Space for the provision of full-day care nursery	
DPSC4 MM45	Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common – 26 homes (was 33)	Grade 1 — will be built: – Natural, semi-natural and amenity green space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Play area; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station <i>Provision of: Sustainable transport measures; Highway works</i>
DPSC5 MM39 MM46 MM49 MM50	Land at Coombe Farm, London Road, Sayers Common – 210 homes	Grade 1 — will be built – Informal outdoor space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Play area; Improvements at Hassocks Station <i>Provision of: Sustainable transport measures; Highway works; Sewerage network upgrades</i>
DPSC6 MM39 MM47	Land to the West of Kings Business Centre, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common – 80 homes (was 100)	Grade 1 — will be built: – Natural, semi-natural and amenity green space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Play area; Parks and Gardens; Improvements at Hassocks Station <i>Provision of: Highway improvements; Sustainable transport measures; Sewerage network upgrades</i>
DPSC7 MM39 MM48	Land at LVS Hassocks, London Road, Sayers Common -210 homes (was 200)	Grade 1 — will be built: – Informal outdoor space – Relocation of the SEND school	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports; Play area; Improvements at Hassocks Station <i>Provision of: Sustainable transport measures; Highway works; Sewerage network upgrades</i>
DPA12 MM49	Land west of Kemps, Hurstpierpoint – 90 homes	Grade 1 — will be built: – Play area – Informal outdoor space	Sustainable Transport; Education; Library; Community buildings; Local Community Infrastructure; Emergency services; Health; Other outdoor provision; Outdoor sports [no contribution towards Improvements at Hassocks Station — the only allocation in the three villages without one] <i>Provision of: Sustainable transport measures; Highway works; Sewerage network upgrades</i>

2.8 It is important to note that:

- The DPSC1 and DPSC3 policies do not themselves secure the construction and opening of a school; they secure land for educational facilities.
- None of the allocations above secures the opening and staffing of additional GP consulting capacity.
- The only infrastructure secured on most of the new main modification sites amounts to green space and play areas.
- “Improvements at Hassocks Station” appears on sites **MM72-76**, **MM79-82**, **MM92-94**. It also appears in the original sites; DPSC4-7 but not at DPA12 – is this an oversight? No scheme is identified, no cost, no date, and it is in another parish. Meanwhile no contribution line anywhere in the Schedule is earmarked for Hurstpierpoint High Street, one of the roads that traffic from these allocations will use to reach that station.

2.9 In **MM72-76**, **MM79-82** and **MM92-94**, “Highway works” and “Sustainable transport measures” are listed under “Provision of” - the strongest heading in the box - yet neither is defined anywhere.

2.10 **MM60**'s 750 homes (shown in Burgess Hill but actually in Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks) and DPSC1's 1,350 homes sit together on the Cuckfield Road, Malthouse Lane and Danworth Lane network between Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill, with **MM74**'s further 150 homes in the same corridor. The society has identified no assessment in the evidence base of their combined effect on the B2116 through the village of Hurstpierpoint.

2.11 “Education” is a cash line, repeated across the sites, except for DPSC1 and DPSC3 where land is provided, and is the whole problem in miniature. Some 1,070 homes across the Hurstpierpoint and Albourne **MM sites** would generate additional demand for school places. The money goes to West Sussex County Council to spend where it judges best, which may not be here.

2.12 Experience at other strategic developments demonstrates why this distinction matters. At both Bolnore Village and Brookleigh (in Burgess Hill), masterplanning did not in itself ensure that all originally anticipated infrastructure was delivered at the time or in the form anticipated. See Appendix 1 and 2.

2.13 The list below identifies five major concerns, in order of seriousness:

1. **Every new local allocation in the main modifications, except site MM60, offers cash “towards” infrastructure that is never located.** The sites **MM72-MM76**, **MM79-MM82**, **MM92-MM94** totalling 1,220 homes, potentially nearly 3,000 new residents (using approximately 2.4 persons per dwelling), have an identical undefined shopping list. When this is considered in terms of all the existing proposed sites in the villages, together with the sites proposed on the southern edge of Burgess Hill but lying within our local Parishes, including site **MM60**, this increases the number of new homes located in our area to 5,936. Potentially this is over 14,000 new residents.
2. **Junction improvements are pushed to 2037 onwards and made contingent on monitoring — and only the Strategic Road Network is in scope (MM17).** The High Street is nowhere in that sentence.
3. **The site-specific requirement to phase occupation against sewerage delivery is deleted from four allocations at Sayers Common and north of Hurstpierpoint (MM39).** It is replaced by a district-wide policy in which Grampian conditions “may” be imposed “where necessary”.

4. The **Masterplan, Design Code and Infrastructure Delivery Strategy** may be given a materially less prescriptive relationship to individual planning applications (**MM36**), while the Masterplan-before-application requirement acquires an “unless otherwise agreed” exception.
5. A full viability architecture (**MM100**) allows infrastructure contributions to be reduced at application stage, with recovery deferred to a review at 75% of sales - **and MM17** already declares the transport schemes “within the tolerance” of the viability assessment.

Policy-level modifications carrying delivery risk

Education

- 2.14 **MM38 — DPSC1 (north of Hurstpierpoint) and DPSC3 (Sayers Common)** The education entry in both infrastructure tables is expressed as “Land for education provision and associated... Primary School”. This is Grade 2. The developer transfers a field, but the allocation itself does not secure construction and opening of the school by an identified occupation trigger.
- 2.15 Whether a school is then built, and when, depends on the County Council’s capital programme and on pupil-yield forecasts made years later. If those forecasts change, provision may be deferred - as the experience at Brookleigh demonstrates.

Sewerage

- 2.16 **MM39** - The sewerage promises stay in, while the locks go. DPSC1 keeps “Foul water infrastructure and pumping station(s)” and “Sewerage network upgrades”; DPSC5, DPSC6 and DPSC7 all keep “Sewerage network upgrades”. But - MM39 deletes from each of them the criterion that made occupation contingent on delivery.

3 Transport and Traffic

- 3.1 National guidelines to identify traffic movement problems and proposed mitigations are in the **National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF)** (September 2023), as set out below.

With regards to sustainable travel NPPF states:

104 *Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:*

a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;

b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;

c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;

d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and

e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

105 *The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of*

transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

3.2 When considering Development proposals:

110 *In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

(d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

111 *Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*

3.3 Our concern is whether the evidence demonstrates that the cumulative transport effects of the proposed growth have been identified and can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.

3.4 The SYSTRA document Scenario 7 Modelling and Results Technical Note (T18) continues to refer to home working trip rate reduction and distance base trip reductions between 2019 and 2025, together with junction analyses. However, the data from the Hurstpierpoint Society Assessment in 2024 and the more recent **Community Transport Assessment carried out in May 2026**⁴ by the local community - Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council, Albourne Parish Council, Twineham Parish Council, Hurstpierpoint Society and WILD - demonstrate that current levels of traffic are already causing congestion, without adding to this. The SYSTRA document is still offering a monitor and manage approach, as before.

3.5 In **MM17** — DPT1: Placemaking and Connectivity, there is new supporting text:

...it is acknowledged that there is less clarity around the need for physical junction improvements on the Strategic Road Network. The position from National Highways, however, is that if the physical junction improvements are required, the requirement is expected to be at the back end of the plan period (2037 onwards).

And:

All the identified schemes are within the tolerance for infrastructure contributions that's accounted for in the viability assessment. The monitor and manage approach will ensure that we know whether the active travel measures and sustainable transport measures are delivering at the anticipated rate, or exceeding performance, so that the physical junction improvements aren't needed...

⁴ Community Transport Assessment was **updated in August 2026** to take account of the **MM sites** and further information being added to the Evidence Library

3.6 Three separate problems are identified here:

- **Deferral.** Junction improvements arrive at the back end of the plan period, by which time the great majority of the nearly 6,000 homes will be occupied. The mitigation could therefore follow substantial occupation of the allocated development rather than precede its impacts.
- **Contingency.** The improvements are made conditional on active travel measures failing to perform. The Council's stated aspiration is that they "aren't needed" but the modification does not explain how their timely delivery would be secured if monitoring subsequently demonstrates that they are.
- **Scope.** Every word of this is about the Strategic Road Network — the A23, A2300 and M23. Hurstpierpoint High Street is a local distributor road and falls entirely outside it. The **CTA** records some 6,500 a day travelling through the High Street at the east of the roundabout over the 7 days, with mean speeds held well below the limit through the constrained sections but 85th percentile figures of 22.4mph eastbound and 23.2mph westbound, both above the limit. There were 513 vehicles classed as heavy traffic (3.5 tonnes and above including buses), a day recorded.

3.7 **MM17 — DPT1 policy criterion 1 (amended wording)**

...shall provide a Transport Assessment/Statement, Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan to identify appropriate mitigation measures to manage demand and minimise the need for new and improved transport infrastructure as part of the monitor and manage process...

The stated purpose of the Transport Assessment is now to **minimise the need for new transport infrastructure**, but a Transport Assessment should identify what is required to make a development acceptable; not directed towards demonstrating that less is required.

3.8 **MM42 — DPSC1: the Sayers Common to Burgess Hill active travel route (amended wording)**

a) Linking to Burgess Hill town centre, with potential to support delivery of a shared route with other allocated sites at Sayers Common (potential route shown at Appendix 3), Provision of an active travel route within the site from Cuckfield Road in the west to Jane Murray Way in the east, to link up with the wider Sayers Common to Burgess Hill active travel route (potential route shown at Appendix 3).

Here the only firm obligation created is a route **within the site**. The strategic east–west active travel link between Sayers Common and Burgess Hill – an important part of the strategy for reducing reliance on car journeys through surrounding settlements - is shown as a dotted line on an appendix, but the policy wording here does not secure delivery of that wider inter-settlement link, nor does it provide certainty that the link will be substantively used.

3.9 **MM44 — DPSC3, criterion 11**

*The treatment of movement within and outside the site, outlining how any impacts will be mitigated, **particularly at Hurstpierpoint High Street, Twineham Lane and Truslers Hill Lane***

This is a welcome change and the only explicit acknowledgement in the entire Schedule that development at Sayers Common will affect Hurstpierpoint High Street. But it is only a requirement to

demonstrate through the masterplan how impacts will be mitigated. It creates no obligation to fund or build anything. There is no corresponding line in DPSC3's infrastructure table for High Street mitigation, no scheme, no trigger and no sum. As drafted, it is a paragraph in a document, not a scheme on the ground.

- 3.10 The need for a wider assessment was specifically identified by the Inspector following the Examination hearings. In his Post Hearing Letter (IDJB-12, 24 March 2026), he stated that the Plan should take a more holistic approach to the masterplanning of all the Sayers Common sites, including how the sites work together, infrastructure delivery, movement and impacts within and outside the sites, and mitigation. He specifically identified Hurstpierpoint High Street and stated that its consideration would need to go beyond the scope of MS-13, which was largely concerned with junction capacity.

3.11 **MM19 — DPT3, criterion 2**

Where appropriate and feasible, exploiting opportunities to improve active travel connections between settlements

Again, words not a scheme and applied to precisely the inter-settlement connections our villages depend on.

- 3.12 The **Sayers Common Holistic Movement Strategy (S7) July 2026**, prepared by Berkeley Latimer, identifies the issue with congestion in Hurstpierpoint High Street and states (page 14):

Following growth, the Sayers Common Sustainable Community will naturally redraw local patterns of movement. It would become a settlement of some c. 6,750 people with key services such as health, a primary school, and a secondary school sized to meet not only its own needs but also wider local needs. It would also have new employment space and other job-generating uses, including new community uses, in addition to those such uses already located there. By altering the local balance of services, it would have its own 'gravitational pull': drawing in those living in the settlement and within its hinterland to access services and use its amenities.

But then adds:

...if not properly planned to encourage trips internally between the new and existing settlement, it could result in wider impacts that compound known movement issues

- 3.13 One solution in this Holistic Movement Strategy is to improve public transport links by “enhancements to the 273 bus service providing a more frequent connection to Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks”, with the “potential for the 100A service with buses encompassing Sayers Common, Burgess Hill, Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint and Albourne”
- 3.14 However, the **CTA** identifies buses as one of the main contributors to congestion in Hurstpierpoint High Street due to their length and width.
- 3.15 As they endeavour to negotiate the narrow carriage way and the traffic priority system, this leads to significant tailbacks and, on occasion minor collisions. Currently the Metrobus 273 offers an hourly service through Hurstpierpoint, which is 2 buses travelling in opposite directions each hour. Each increase in hourly frequency is an additional 2 buses in the High Street. Adding an enhancement to the 100A service would add more buses. These are in addition to the Compass bus service 33 which runs an hourly service i.e. 2 buses in the High Street each hour, and the more frequent Compass bus service 33A, which is the school bus to and from Hassocks during school arrival and departing times.

- 3.16 If you take this in conjunction with the waste collection service on Wednesdays – up to 4 waste lorries, the numerous delivery vans for online services, and the delivery lorries supplying local businesses, then increasing large-vehicle movements through a carriageway whose geometry already causes opposing vehicles to wait, cannot simply be assumed to constitute mitigation without assessing its effect on the High Street.
- 3.17 No scheme for the High Street is proposed anywhere in the Plan. Our only protection is indirect - improve the A23 and Hickstead junctions so that drivers use the strategic route rather than cutting through the village. **MM17** now defers any mitigation and makes it conditional. The effect may also run the other way: leave the A23 junctions unimproved while thousands of homes are occupied, and the strategic route becomes the congested one - which is precisely what pushes drivers onto village roads.
- 3.18 The **CTA** states at paragraph 7. 8 that “it is not possible to state the routes that might be taken by this traffic from the reports submitted for each of the planning applications” and finds that DPSC3–DPSC7 together may add around 1,000 trips in the morning and evening peaks, with each site assessed individually rather than cumulatively. This raises the question of whether the cumulative effects required to be considered under NPPF’s paragraphs 110 and 111, have been adequately demonstrated. There are no estimates available for the cumulative effect of the existing DPSC sites and the **MM sites** in Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne.
- 3.19 We are not asking the Inspector to prefer our number to theirs; we are pointing out that the routing work has not been done, by anyone, for a cluster of allocations that would be built and occupied together.

MM12 — DPN9: Air Quality

- 3.20 The Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC receive a bespoke, mandatory mitigation regime: development likely to increase traffic must demonstrate that impacts have been considered, and where adverse effects cannot be avoided, “mitigation... will be required”. However, The Stonepound Crossroads at Hassocks (previously an AQMA) - the junction likely to receive additional Hurstpierpoint to/from Hassocks station related traffic from a number of these allocations - receives a descriptive paragraph noting that nitrogen dioxide has fallen since 2012.
- 3.21 However, the SYSTRA document Scenario 7 Modelling and Results Technical Note (T18) states on p21:

This junction has been carried over from Scenario 6, where it was flagged as severe, but due to geographic boundaries of the junction being very constrained, it was not deemed a junction that could be considered for mitigation.

The junction is forecast to worsen from the previous Scenario 6 hotspot analysis. Table 8 shows the change in V/C (RFC) and Delay between Sc6 and Sc7 vs their respective references cases.

Have the cumulative traffic and air-quality implications been adequately assessed and is monitoring required?

4 Water, Drainage and Sewerage, and Climate Change

NPPF Planning for climate change

153. *Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change,*

water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.

154. *New development should be planned for in ways that:*

a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure;

Planning and flood risk

160. *Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.*

Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

- 4.1 Whilst many of these requirements are considered in the Plan and with reference to NPPF para 20, there are still instances giving concern, and many locations in our area experience surface water flooding. The Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment assesses eighteen proposed allocation sites. It covers DPSC1 and DPSC3 to DPSC7 ,and DPA12 but no further cumulative assessment has been undertaken that includes any of the **MM sites** subject to this response.
- 4.2 This is particularly relevant as National Planning Practice Guidance Flood Risk and Coastal Change states that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should “assess the cumulative impact that land use changes and development in the area will have on flood risk” and should inform the Sustainability Appraisal and the identification of land for development.
- 4.3 The guidance also promotes an integrated approach to flood risk management, including water storage, supply, demand, wastewater and flood risk to enable sustainable and climate-resilient development.
- 4.4 **MM4 — DPS4: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage**

Sustainable Drainage has been amended to say:

Development proposals should assess surface water drainage in accordance with national policy and guidance. Development proposals should incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to manage surface water drainage and to provide multiple benefits.

Several of the sites drain into the watercourses running through the villages. Each carry a “consider the watercourse...in the site drainage strategy ” as a site policy requirement but the cumulative effect of several sites running into the same water course is not considered. Areas near to these sites have recorded surface water flooding, often due to the topography of the surrounding area, and UK winters are getting wetter on average due to human-induced climate change.

- 4.5 The [Metoffice article - Climate Change in the UK](#)⁵, using UK climate projections, highlights the effects of climate change:

Frequent and intense rainfall will cause an increase in flooding, which we will need to adapt to. We have all seen the devastation caused by flooding and how it can impact our lives.

Considering how we manage our land, where we build our homes and how best to defend against flooding will be critical in the years to come.

The same article projects that rainfall intensity could increase by up to 20% in summer and 25% in winter, with rainfall exceeding 30mm per hour occurring twice as often by 2070 as in 1990. (See Appendix 4)

- 4.6 It is concerning that the Sustainability Appraisal: Main Modifications Report (July 2026) shows major negative flooding and surface water impact at site MM60, and minor impact at sites MM72, MM73, MM76 and MM93, yet it is not clear how those adverse effects have been addressed cumulatively.
- 4.7 The use of SuDS is recommended to deal with surface flooding yet residents at the newest development in Hurstpierpoint – at Idenhurst/Bramble Park and adjacent to site **MM76** – have reported surface water flooding. That local experience reinforces the need to demonstrate how the cumulative drainage effects of the proposed allocations will remain manageable over the lifetime of the development, including under projected climate conditions.

Sustainable Design and Construction.

- 4.8 **MM2 substantially amends DPS2** with regard to climate change mitigation. All sites in the Sustainability Appraisal show a negative impact in terms of Energy and Waste, though it is not clear why sites **MM60**, MM74, and MM76 show a major negative impact whilst the remainder show a minor negative impact, except that they are larger sites. All the additional sites should be considered as part of the larger cumulative impact not in isolation.
- 4.9 The Sustainability Appraisal also categorises water resources as a minor impact for all the additional sites. This is not considered an issue despite the recent spell of very hot, dry weather, which is consistent with the hotter, drier summers projected as the climate changes and an indication of future weather patterns. (Metoffice article - Climate Change in the UK)
- 4.10 The District Plan Regulation 19 version refers to the 2020 Gatwick Sub Region Water Cycle Study, which highlights severe water stress across the Southeast and helps to establish requirements for high water-efficiency standards in new housing. **MM2** has removed the specific reference to the Gatwick Sub Region Water Cycle Study, including the water consumption limit, to replace it with:

Sustainable water consumption rates can be achieved through incorporation of measures to reduce water use and reuse water including:

- *Water efficient fittings and appliances*
- *Rainwater harvesting, including incorporation of rainwater butts*
- *Greywater recycling*

⁵ Article using UK weather projections

- 4.11 Whilst this has the benefit of removing a specific quantity set at a specific point in time, which may change in the future, it is much broader wording and open to interpretation. This offers little confidence to residents concerned with water resources.
- 4.12 Overall, the Society is concerned that, although negative environmental effects are identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, it is not clear that their cumulative significance across this concentration of allocations has been adequately addressed when weighed against the identified social and economic benefits.

Sewerage

- 4.13 **MM39 sees the deletion of sewerage phasing from one allocation in Hurstpierpoint (shown in Burgess Hill) and three allocations in Sayers Common:**
- DPSC1, criterion 11 — “Phase occupation of development to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure...”
 - DPSC5 (Coombe Farm), criterion 7 — same requirement
 - DPSC6 (west of Kings Business Centre), criterion 6 — same requirement
 - DPSC7 (LVS Hassocks), criterion 5 — same requirement
- 4.14 This may be considered as covered in DPI7 because **MM99** inserts an equivalent sentence into the district-wide policy DPI7 but why was the site-specific criteria removed and does the district-wide mechanism give the equivalent certainty?
- 4.15 A general sentence in a district-wide policy is weighed in the balance against everything else, including housing delivery targets and viability. And the enforcement mechanism in **MM99** is:

Where necessary, Grampian conditions may be imposed on planning permissions to prevent the occupation of development until necessary works relating to sewerage have been implemented

The shortcomings of our sewerage capacity are well documented and the use of the words “Where necessary” and “may” do not provide the same certainty that occupation will be prevented until necessary sewerage improvements have been delivered. The Society asks that the site-specific criteria be reinstated.

Section B Main Modifications to Delivery mechanisms and Viability

5 Delivery mechanisms and viability

5.1 MM36 — DPSC GEN: Significant Site Requirements

*Progress in accordance with an allocation-wide Masterplan (incorporating a Movement Strategy), Design Code, Infrastructure Delivery Strategy and Phasing Plan... Each planning application should be determined in accordance with / **with regard to** these documents*

The Masterplan should be submitted and approved in advance of any planning application, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority

There are two risks associated with these changes. If “with regard to” is the new text, then the Masterplan, Design Code, Infrastructure Delivery Strategy and Phasing Plan would carry a materially less prescriptive relationship to individual planning applications. That risks materially weakening the masterplanning approach on which DPSC3 depends. And “unless otherwise agreed” permits the first applications to come forward before the Masterplan exists - which creates a risk that housing applications could (and have done for sites DPSC4-7) come forward before the allocation-wide masterplanning and infrastructure framework is settled.

- 5.2 The Infrastructure Delivery Strategy is required to “demonstrate how the infrastructure will be delivered in a *timely manner*”. Timely is not a trigger. This should link to occupation triggers - no more than “N” dwellings occupied before the school, the surgery capacity and the identified highway works are delivered.

5.3 MM95 — DPI1: Infrastructure Provision

This modification contains the best drafting in the whole Schedule:

Significant sites will be viewed as a single strategic development and should accord with a site-wide Infrastructure Delivery Strategy... The strategy should specify the infrastructure to be provided, the financial and/or in-kind contributions required, the methodology used to calculate those contributions, and arrangements for their fair apportionment between contributing sites and their phasing alongside housing delivery

- 5.4 Unfortunately, it applies only to Significant Sites: DPSC1, DPSC2 and DPSC3. It does not apply to the twelve new local allocations (**MM72-76**, **MM79-82** and **MM92-94**) should they proceed, nor to **MM60** (in the surrounding area), nor to DPSC4–DPSC7. So, 1,220 homes within the three villages, plus 750 at site **MM60** - plus a further 526 at DPSC4–7 — are outside it.

- 5.5 We ask that the same requirement be applied to any sites in Sayers Common, Albourne and Hurstpierpoint as a cluster, because that is how their impacts will be felt.

5.6 MM96 — DPI2: Planning Obligations

“Provision of, or financial contribution towards the provision of infrastructure such as travel and transport, education, health, community facilities, open space, sport and recreational facilities and leisure, green infrastructure, and emergency services”

This is the parent policy for every one of those site tables on pp7-10. The “provision of, or financial contribution towards” gives the option, and “such as” makes the list indicative. It is drafted to give the Council flexibility, which is understandable — but it does not itself **identify the specific infrastructure ultimately to be provided or funded for each allocation**.

5.7 **MM100 — DPI8: Viability**

This is a genuinely improved policy. It requires the developer to pay for the Council's consultant, gives little weight to non-RICS-compliant submissions, and publishes appraisals on the planning register.

Where reductions in infrastructure contributions and/or affordable housing provision are agreed on viability grounds at planning application stage the District Council will include the estimated gross development value and build costs at this stage in a planning obligation, together with details of the required Advanced Stage Viability Review

Advanced Stage Viability Reviews... will take place on the sale/letting of 75% of the market residential units

5.8 **However:**

- **The Plan expressly contemplates infrastructure being under-delivered on viability grounds and provides the machinery for it.**
- **Recovery comes at 75% of sales /lettings** - that is, years after the school place, the appointment at the surgery and the junction capacity were actually needed. Money recovered at that stage does not remedy any period during which infrastructure need has already arisen, but provision has not been made.
- **Any surplus recovered is split 60/40 in the Council's favour, with the Council's share applied "towards infrastructure contributions and/or off-site affordable housing provision"** - again unlocated. If the viability assumptions prove incorrect, **MM100** expressly provides a mechanism through which infrastructure contributions and/or affordable housing provision may be reduced at application stage.

5.9 If **MM100** is read alongside **MM17's** assertion that "all the identified schemes are within the tolerance for infrastructure contributions that's accounted for in the viability assessment", the shape of the risk is clear: the viability assessment is the gate through which all of this passes, and it has already been set at a level that assumes the transport schemes are affordable. If that assumption proves incorrect—**MM100** provides a mechanism through which infrastructure contributions and/or affordable housing provision may be reduced at application stage.

Section C Improvements, Recommendations and Conclusions

6 What has genuinely improved?

The following modifications have made improvements to the Plan:

1. **MM95** introduces the site-wide Infrastructure Delivery Strategy with a stated methodology and apportionment — the right instrument but applied too narrowly.
2. **MM100** requires developers to fund the Council's viability consultant and publishes appraisals on the planning register.
3. **MM44** names Hurstpierpoint High Street in DPSC3's policy for the first time.
4. **MM82** secures a flexible-use community building at Land east of London Road, Albourne — the only one of the new local allocations **MM72-MM76**, **MM79-MM82** and **MM92-MM94**, to secure a community building of any kind.

7 Recommendations

However, we ask that the following improvements be looked at:

1. **Extend MM95's Infrastructure Delivery Strategy requirement** to the Sayers Common / Albourne / Hurstpierpoint allocations, treated as a single cluster, so that contributions are calculated on a stated methodology, apportioned between sites and phased against housing delivery, especially if the additional sites in the MM proceed.
2. **Locate the contributions.** Each "financial contributions towards the provision of" entry should name the facility, the settlement and, where known, the receiving body. If a contribution to "Education" is intended for a school in Burgess Hill, or Hassocks, or Hurstpierpoint, the Schedule should say so, then residents and the examination can see what infrastructure each contribution is intended to support.
3. **Reinstate the site-specific sewerage phasing criteria** deleted by **MM39** from DPSC1, DPSC5, DPSC6 and DPSC7.
4. **Add a Hurstpierpoint High Street mitigation line to DPSC3's infrastructure table**, with an occupation-linked trigger. The Community Transport Assessment evidence supports this.
5. **Publish and test the viability assessment** underlying **MM17's** statement that all identified transport schemes are "within the tolerance for infrastructure contributions". This would be consistent with the greater transparency now introduced by **MM100**.
6. **Extend the MM44 movement wording across all the sites in Sayers Common and Albourne** so that it binds all the sites in this area and require queue-length surveys at Hurstpierpoint High Street and at the A23 junctions with the B2118 and B2117 before the DPSC3 masterplan is approved rather than after occupation begins.
7. **Require a cumulative air quality assessment at the Stonepound Crossroads**, the former AQMA, reflecting the cumulative traffic associated with the proposed allocations and T18's conclusion that the junction is forecast to worsen and is too geographically constrained for mitigation.

8 Conclusions

1. Hurstpierpoint Society accepts that there is a shortage of housing in Mid Sussex. However, we are concerned that the cumulative effects of accommodating the level of growth proposed across Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne have not been adequately assessed. This concern is not new. The Inspector's Post Hearing letter (IDJB-12, 24 March 2026) required the Plan to take a more holistic approach to the Sayers Common sites, including how they work together, infrastructure delivery, movement and impacts within and outside the sites, and mitigation.
2. In particular, the necessary work has not been done to demonstrate how the existing infrastructure will accommodate this cumulative growth. This includes the High Street in Hurstpierpoint and the additional journeys that will be generated in order to access schools, health facilities and other community infrastructure. Infrastructure improvements are identified for future delivery but in many cases, there remains no certainty as to precisely what will be delivered, or where it will be delivered, or when it will be delivered.
3. In the case of the High Street, this is particularly concerning because its physical constraints severely limit what mitigation can realistically be achieved. Furthermore, some measures intended to promote sustainable travel may themselves add to the congestion rather than relieving it. The Society can find no identified scheme which demonstrates how the cumulative impact on the High Street will be mitigated.
4. A similar cumulative question arises in relation to flood risk and climate change. National Planning Practice Guidance requires Strategic Flood Risk Assessments to consider the cumulative impact of land-use change and development and promotes an integrated, catchment-based approach to water supply, wastewater and flood risk. The additional **MM sites** were not included in the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Given the concentration of development proposed, the identified surface-water impacts and projected increases in rainfall intensity, the Society considers that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the cumulative effects have been assessed for the lifetime of the development.
5. This response has deliberately not looked at the planning constraints for each of the new individual **MM sites** in this area but has concentrated on the overall cumulative impact if these were to proceed. However, these green field sites around Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne are in the local gaps designed to prevent coalescence and the loss of amenity of nearby settlements. Building on these would progressively erode those gaps and alter the distinctive characteristics of the individual villages, increasing the risk of settlement coalescence.
6. For the reasons set out in this response, the Society does not consider that the identified Main Modifications, especially the new sites, have demonstrated that the cumulative development proposed for Hurstpierpoint, Sayers Common and Albourne can be supported by the necessary infrastructure and mitigation with sufficient certainty. In particular, the Society does not consider that the subsequent work has fully addressed the more holistic assessment required by the Inspector and national policy. We therefore ask the Inspector to consider whether the relevant modifications satisfy the tests of soundness in NPPF paragraph 35, in particular whether they are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Appendix 1

Number of properties within Albourne, Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common

Provided by Mid Sussex District Council 28th August 2026

Electoral Area	Properties	% of Total	Void Properties	Void % of Props
Albourne Parish Council				
LB - Albourne	286	100%	21	7%
Albourne Parish Council	286	8%	21	7%
Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council				
LA - Sayers Common	626	18%	89	14%
MA - Hurstpierpoint	1,379	40%	94	7%
MB - Hurstpierpoint	1,458	42%	118	8%
Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council	3,463	92%	301	9%
Report Total	3,749		322	
Total Across 3 Parishes	4,071 Dwellings			

Appendix 2

Local Masterplan Projects

Bolnore Village

Bolnore Village is a master-planned village, located to the south-west of Haywards Heath, West Sussex. It was originally allocated for development in the 1995 Haywards Heath Local Plan and represents one of the largest residential expansions in our area.

It was designed across the 150-acre site to mimic a traditional English village that evolved naturally over centuries. Construction spanned across multiple phases from the early 2000s until its completion around 2019, expanding from an initial 800 proposed units to approximately 1,200 homes.

Planning & Phasing History

1995–1998: The "South West Sector" of Haywards Heath was allocated for development in 1995. Outline planning permission (CD/29/98) was granted in the late 1990s for the first three phases of housing, recreational open spaces, and an outer relief road.

2006–2008 Planning Inquiry: Further expansions (Phases 4 and 5) triggered a massive three-month public planning inquiry in 2006. Local opposition focused heavily on protecting the surrounding ancient woodland (like Reading Wood) and determining the adequacy of affordable housing contributions. The Secretary of State eventually approved the extension in January 2008.

Stalling and Financial Viability: Around 2010, implementation of Phase 4 temporarily stalled due to economic unviability, forcing developers to seek planning relief regarding affordable housing ratios and infrastructure contributions to ensure development could proceed.

Infrastructure & Community Assets

Bolnore Village was built from scratch on greenfield land, with extensive physical and community infrastructure that had to be integrated via planning obligations (Section 106 agreements):

Haywards Heath Relief Road (A272): Crucial to the project's planning approval was the provision of the final stages of the town's bypass. The southern outer relief road was designed to divert traffic away from the congested town centre. The broader bypass project eventually fully opened in 2014.

Bolnore Village Primary School: This was part of the original Masterplan but in 2006, WSCC stated there were not enough children to warrant building a school. This was not well received by families moving into the new housing development as there was no local school and children had to travel to about 20 different surrounding schools. The Bolnore School Group was formed by parents to challenge the decision and, under new government rules requiring local authorities to put new schools out to competitive tender, the parent group submitted their own proposal. In 2008, the Council approved the parent led bid to build an innovative eco-school set within regenerating local woodland on land released by MSDC.

The school originally opened in temporary spaces in September 2009, formally opening as a parent-promoted, one-form entry school in September 2010, expanding year on year to a full capacity 2FE all through primary school.

The Woodside Community Centre: There were planning issues with early delivery delays and funding disputes with developers. The Planning Officer report for 09/02062(COND) outlines some of the problems:

“The one single element that remains unresolved is the provision of a community building. Land is available within the village square for a facility, but Crest have been unable to secure a planning permission for a mixed used (community facility with residential over) building. The last application was considered in 2007, but was withdrawn prior to determination due to officer concerns.”

Details of this report include:

“In addition to the clauses relating to the completion of stage 5 of HHRR, the Undertaking also makes reference to the payment of £100,000 for community facilities. One of the main issues within the existing village itself are the lack of facilities, particularly a community building. While there is a site allocated, Crest have been unable to achieve a mixed planning permission for the site. Given the current situation, officers have taken the view that achieving the transfer of the community site over to the Council, with a lump sum payment, will enable other groups (HH Town Council, Residents Association) to seek external funding to achieve a building that the community requires on the site within a reasonable time.”

The purpose-built community hub eventually opened in 2014 and is managed by a local charity partnership on land leased from the Mid Sussex District Council.

Environmental & Drainage Infrastructure: The infrastructure features heavily integrated sustainable drainage systems, including four distinct balancing ponds to prevent flooding, alongside dedicated wildlife infrastructure such as dormice rope bridges, badger tunnels, and newt fencing.

Estate Governance & Management Splitting

One of the unique infrastructure legacies of Bolnore Village is its split civic management system:

- **Phases 1–3 ("Old Bolnore"):** Commencing in 2006, residents exercised a unique covenant in their property deeds to overthrow the developer's default management company. They established the **Bolnore Village Community Interest Company (BVCIC)**, a resident-led non-profit organisation that oversees the communal spaces, landscaping, and apartment blocks via an appointed manager.
- **Phases 4–5 ("New Bolnore"):** These phases remain under separate, commercial estate management structures, though ongoing community efforts have aimed to unify the entire village under the BVCIC banner for maximum cohesion.
- **Public Highways:** major roads and footpaths within the village have been formally adopted by the West Sussex County Council for ongoing public maintenance.

Brookleigh, Burgess Hill

Brookleigh, originally known as the Northern Arc, is the 3,500-home Brookleigh development north of Burgess Hill. It stalled for years due to fragmented land ownership but in 2018, Homes England acquired the 165-hectare site to act as master developer, securing outline planning consent in October 2019 and later rebranding the project as Brookleigh

Key Planning Milestones

- 2018: Homes England purchases the core agricultural land to resolve stalled ownership and steer an infrastructure-first masterplan with AECOM.
- October 2019: Mid Sussex District Council grants unanimous outline planning approval (DM/18/5114) for 3,500 homes, schools, and employment spaces.
- Late 2022: The project is officially renamed Brookleigh (Brook for local watercourses, Leigh for woodland clearings) to signify the transition from ground prep to home building.
- 2021–2026: Major housebuilders including Countryside Properties, Bellway, and Hill roll out reserved matters applications and start phased construction.
- Link Roads & Bridges: Delivery prioritised strategic connectivity via the Eastern and Western Bridge and Link Roads tying into the A2300 and A273, alongside a central spine road spanning the site.
- Active Travel: The masterplan incorporates the "Green Circle," upgrading local public rights of way (like Freeks Lane) into continuous shared bridleways, cycle paths, and pedestrian routes.
- Utilities & Environment: Features sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) to handle flood risk alongside mandatory 23%+ biodiversity net gains and high-speed digital ducting.
- Education & Leisure: Plans include neighbourhood hubs, the Arc Centre for Outdoor Sports, and a net-zero carbon primary school approved by the district council, though secondary school facility rollouts have faced localised county funding pauses.

These are all progressing as planned except for the construction of the secondary school at Brookleigh (originally named Bedelands Academy). This has been officially paused by West Sussex County Council due to lower-than-anticipated demand for student places and an agreement has been reached for the 2026/27 academic year for an additional three bulge classes for 90 pupils to be accommodated at The Burgess Hill Academy from September 2026. See Appendix 2.

The Reasons for the Delay

- Falling Demand Forecasts: WSCC stated that a slowing local housing market and falling birth rates meant the immediate student numbers initially projected for the Northern Arc did not materialise to justify building the school.
- Escalating Costs: Prior to the pause, the project had seen substantial budget issues. The procurement process had to be restarted after estimated costs ballooned to £74 million due to high inflation and complex site topography (including a steep drop in levels across the allocated plot).

Appendix 3

WSCC Decision re the secondary school at Brookleigh

Officer Non-Key Decision Record

**Key decision: No
Unrestricted**

Change of Scope for allocation of S106 funding to accommodate bulge classes at The Burgess Hill Academy

Decision Date: 18 November 2025

Decision taken by: Andrew Edwards, Assistant Director (Property and Assets)

Report Author: Mandy Saunders, Team Manager – Capital Projects, Planning & Statutory Compliance

Electoral division: Hassocks and Burgess Hill South

1 Summary of decision

A new secondary school, Bedelands Academy, is planned for Burgess Hill and was originally expected to be delivered by September 2027. In September 2024 the allocation of £960,000, from received S106 funds was [approved](#), to enable the delivery of a temporary Bedelands Academy, sited at The Burgess Hill Academy, providing 120 pupil places from September 2026 until the new Bedelands school was completed.

Due to lower than anticipated projections for secondary age pupil places the delivery of the new Bedelands Academy has currently been paused, pending review. There is still a need for additional secondary places in this part of Mid-Sussex though and the intention is to deliver these through creation of bulge classes at The Burgess Hill Academy.

The Assistant Director (Property and Assets) has approved the change in scope for the remodelling works at The Burgess Hill Academy, using the £960k previously allocated received S106 funding to support up to an additional 90 pupils from September 2026. Expenditure will continue to be monitored as the project progresses and adjustments will be sought if necessary to keep within the cost envelope.

2 Reasons for the Decision

Due to the pause in delivery of the new 6 form entry Bedelands Academy, creation of a temporary school at The Burgess Hill Academy is no longer required. However, there is still a need for additional secondary age pupil places in the Burgess Hill area.

It is proposed that this need will be met by The Burgess Hill Academy supporting up to 3 bulge classes as the school has capacity for increased pupil numbers. The scope of the project at the school that was outlined in the previous decision [OKD24](#)

[\(24/25\)](#) therefore needs to alter to reflect the change from creation of a temporary school to delivering bulge classes.

The £960k received S106 monies, that was approved for allocation to create the temporary school, is funding that the S106 agreement sets out should be spent on education infrastructure at The Burgess Hill Academy. Therefore, delivery of the bulge classes is a suitable use of these monies

The revised scope of the works to enable the bulge classes to be supported will involve undertaking appropriate remodelling of the school in phases. Phase 1 is due for completion by April 2026 and will focus on increasing the capacity of and upgrading the changing rooms and toilets and increasing the IT facilities in the library. Phase 2 will be identified subject to available funding and in collaboration with the school and Academy Trust, but is likely to focus on creating an additional food technology room and refurbishing a science laboratory.

3 Other options considered and rejected

The creation of bulge classes at other schools in the Mid-Sussex area to take additional pupils was considered and rejected as set out in decision OKD24(24/25), due to the fact that places are predominantly required in the Burgess Hill area.

The Burgess Hill Academy was originally identified to host the temporary school, therefore it is a logical progression for the Academy to host the bulge classes as they have capacity.

4 Member Interests

None.

5 Appendices

None.

6 Background Papers

None.

Appendix 4

Abridged Met Office Climate Change UK *Circa Late 2022*

Full text:

<https://weather.metoffice.gov.uk/climate-change/climate-change-in-the-uk>
(late2022)

Abridged text:

Climate change is a global issue, with global impacts. But how will climate change affect us in the UK? And when? Have we already seen some impacts, and what will the UK climate be like in the future?

It's important to remember that by reducing emissions, we can avoid some of the changes we'll talk about in this article.

Modelling climate change is a very complex and important part of what we do. You can read more about how we do this at the end of this article, in climate change models.

The climate in the UK

The UK has a temperate maritime climate. In general, that means that we have a cool and mild climate, with changeable weather.

We all know the weather here can change quickly. It's not unusual for us to see many different weather conditions in one day.

Lots of different factors influence our weather. Warmer tropical air meets colder arctic air in the air mass above us. This is what causes the large changes in weather we experience and fuels our more severe storms.

So, how will climate change impact this? Will it change the weather we experience in the UK? If so, what sort of changes could we see? And how could that change our lives?

How will climate change affect the UK?

Across the UK, we expect to see:

Warmer and wetter winters

Hotter and drier summers

More frequent and intense weather extremes

Climate change will make these conditions more likely. The UK's weather will continue to be variable, but we will see more of this type of weather.

In the future, we will still see a lot of the weather we experience today. The difference, though, is that the intensity of some weather types will change.

You may have heard of Spanish plumes, which bring hot conditions in the summer. We could see these become more intense, creating even hotter summer weather. But Spanish plumes could also bring more intense downpours during summer thunderstorms.

More rainfall could happen in winter storms, too. While the temperatures may be milder, winters will tend to be wetter, with more potential for flooding.

How will climate change affect your local area?

In 2020, we worked with the BBC to create a new way of visualising climate change in the UK.

This local climate change visualisation tool lets you explore climate projections in your local area. You can also compare these projections to the previous weather records in the region.

The tool uses different Met Office datasets to create this new look at climate change. Climate data and records come from the National Climate Information Centre (NCIC). Projections are from the latest UK Climate Projections, using the UKCP Regional (12km) data.

Compared to our climate in 1990, by 2070 we project:

Winters are between 1 and 4.5°C warmer

Winters are up to 30% wetter

Summers are between 1 and 6°C warmer

Summers are up to 60% drier, depending on the region

Hot summer days are between 4 and 7°C warmer

We base these changes on the RCP8.5 high emissions scenario, where the world continues to create high levels of emissions.

These changes would bring lots of real-world impacts, which will affect our lives.

Increased rainfall and risk of flooding

In the future, we project the intensity of rain will increase. When we talk about intensity, we mean how heavy rainfall is when it occurs. In the summer, this could increase by up to 20%. In winter, it could increase by up to 25%.

Hourly rainfall exceeding 30mm per hour is a threshold used by the Met Office and the Environment Agency Flood Forecasting Centre to issue flash flood alerts. By 2070, we project we will meet this threshold twice as often as we did in 1990.

A greater risk of flooding will have large impacts, both on the environment and in our daily lives.

Quite simply, if we do not reduce emissions, this is a very real, potential future for our climate.

When will climate change affect the UK?

Change is already happening. Some variables, such as heavy rainfall, will take time before increases are clear, beyond natural variability.

It's important to remember that there are ranges of possible change. We can provide information on the probability that something will happen, but it isn't guaranteed.

The further into the future we look, the more likely we are to see record hot temperatures or heavy rainfall events. This is more likely if we consider a high emissions scenario. That doesn't mean we won't experience cold events; they will just occur less frequently.

Has the UK's climate already changed?

We know that the UK has already warmed by 1°C since around the 1950s. We can see this in observations from our land-based weather stations. There are a lot of other ways we observe this change:

Increased temperature in coastal seas around the UK

Less frost and snow

Longer and more frequent warm and hot spells

Shorter and less frequent cold spells

Breaking many high temperature records

Effects of climate change in the UK

We've talked about how climate change might affect our climate and weather, with some very real and direct impacts.

More extreme heat, for example, will be a risk to public health. More frequent heatwaves will put people at risk, particularly older people.

Frequent and intense rainfall will cause an increase in flooding, which we will need to adapt to. We have all seen the devastation caused by flooding and how it can impact our lives.

Considering how we manage our land, where we build our homes and how best to defend against flooding will be critical in the years to come.

Already, the Government has pledged £5.2 billion for new flood and coastal defences by 2027. This money is part of the plan for a green industrial revolution, announced in November 2020.

Climate change will impact farming, too. Some crops may be easier to grow, and the growing season will expand. More droughts, though, will disrupt the growing season. Some of crops we grow today may not be suited to higher temperatures, too.

This year, we've already seen plenty of extreme weather events.

Some of the things we've seen include:

Wettest February on record, which brought Storms Ciara and Dennis

The sunniest spring on record

626 hours of bright sunshine

The previous record was 555 in 1948

Driest May on record for England

The third hottest day on record (37.8°C)

The wettest day on record in the UK overall, on 3 October

Climate record trends

We can also see trends, with recent years bringing lots of extremes: 7 of the last 10 summers (2011-2020) have reached a temperature of 34°C. Before this, just 7 of the previous 50 summers (1961-2010) reached 34°C. 6 of the 10 wettest years on record have been since 1998

These records are not a definite sign of things to come. We also can't say that climate change caused them, but it does make them more likely.

The UK climate in 2070

Projections deal in probability, rather than definite outcomes. However, we can summarise some of the possible changes we've talked about so far.

Summer - Compared to the climate in 1990:

Summers are between 1 and 6°C warmer

Summers are up to 60% drier, depending on the region

The average hottest summer day is between 4 and 7°C warmer

The chance of exceeding 30°C for two days or more is sixteen times more likely in the south

The chance of exceeding 40°C is similar to the chance of exceeding 32°C in 1990

Intensity of rain increases by up to 20%

Days when rainfall exceeds 30mm per hour happen twice more often

Winter

Winters are between 1 and 4.5°C warmer

Winters are up to 30% wetter

Intensity of rain increases by up to 25%

Local model

The local model provides 12 alternate views but at even higher 2.2km resolution. This is the same resolution typically used for weather forecasting.

This is the first time that national climate scenarios have been available in this detail. It provides new national capability in assessing changes at local scales and for hourly extremes.

By using the local model, we can see things in much greater detail. It helps us see changes in local weather extremes, including:

Heavy summer downpours

Severe wind gusts

Hail

Lightning

Temperature extremes over cities