

# **RURAL ISSUES BACKGROUND PAPER**

## **CONSULTATION DRAFT**

**JULY 2008**

## Executive Summary

The Rural Issues Background Paper Consultation Draft has been prepared as part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework to help inform the policies contained within the emerging Core Strategy that will guide and shape the District, including the villages and wider rural part of the District over the Plan period up to 2026. The Pre-Submission Core Strategy proposes that 1,000 dwellings are allocated to the rural areas of the District and the Paper sets out a proposed development strategy. The Paper has been written with full consideration of current Government guidance and with preliminary consultation work with the District's Parish Councils.

Although the District's villages and small settlements are diverse in character, they face many similar challenges. The Core Strategy's vision is to ensure that the varied character and outstanding natural environment of the District's rural areas is maintained whilst remaining a viable place to live and work. The provision of rural services and facilities and affordable housing for local people are key issues.

Each village has been considered and their service roles have been categorised. The potential growth potential of each settlement has been identified on the basis of:

- The role of the settlement as a service centre;
- Shared services between settlements;
- The presence of a built up area boundary;
- Environmental constraints;
- Accessibility; and
- Identified affordable housing need.

The hierarchy identifies four broad levels of growth potential as follows:

### **Growth Potential** (100 dwellings and above)

Crawley Down, Cuckfield, Hassocks and Keymer, Hurstpierpoint and Lindfield (Lindfield dependent on the Core Strategy strategic development coming forward)

### **Intermediate Growth Potential** (between 30 and 100 dwellings)

Albourne, Ashurst Wood, Balcombe, Copthorne, Handcross, Sayers Common and Turners Hill

### **Limited Growth Potential** (between 15 and 30 dwellings)

Ardingly, Bolney, Horsted Keynes, Pease Pottage, Sharpthorne, West Hoathly and Scaynes Hill

### **Restricted Growth Potential** (development only to meet identified need and restricted to rural exception sites)

Ansty, Staplefield, Fulking, Newtimber, Poyning, Pyecombe, Slaughtam, Twineham and Warninglid.

The Paper also looks at rural retail and employment provision and suggests preferred locations for the development of retail and employment uses.

Further evidence including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the results of the consultation will be used to inform and update the findings of the Rural Issues Background Paper.

The District Council is inviting views from the Parish Councils together with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers as part of this consultation. A number of key questions are included in the document to aid responses. These questions are not intended to be exhaustive and responses may be made on any aspect of the Paper. The consultation period is not a statutory process but will last for an extended period of nine-weeks to allow full input by all interested parties and to allow Parish Councils to consider the Paper, as many parishes do not meet in August. The consultation period will commence on the 7<sup>th</sup> July 2008 and any comments should be sent to the Planning Policy Team by 5pm on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2008 either by e-mail at [ldfconsultation@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:ldfconsultation@midsussex.gov.uk) or posted to:

Planning Policy  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands  
Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
RH16 1SS

Any queries should be directed to Planning Policy officers on (01444) 477455.

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Rural Issues Background Paper Consultation Draft has been prepared as part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework to help inform the policies contained within the emerging Core Strategy that will guide and shape the District, including the villages and wider rural part of the District over the next 18 years to 2026. This Paper does not assess or allocate individual sites for development.
- 1.2 The Paper has been written in the light of current Government guidance and with preliminary consultation work with the District's Parish Councils. A Rural Issues Workshop was held in September 2007 to inform the Parish Councils of the Core Strategy and the aims of the Background Paper, and by a series of follow up meetings with all the District's Parish Councils. This Draft has been published to allow further and wider consultation on its content.
- 1.3 The Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document sets out the strategy for Mid Sussex up to 2026, and identifies broad locations for housing, business and retail requirements. The Strategy proposes to focus major housing, business and retail development within and around the District's three main towns. A smaller proportion of development within and around the District's villages is proposed to help meet the needs of existing communities particularly through the provision of affordable housing and support for existing services.
- 1.4 The Pre-Submission Core Strategy proposes that 1,000 dwellings are allocated to the rural areas of the District (that is, outside of the three main towns of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath). It was suggested that this should primarily be provided in and around the larger villages to meet the needs of both these villages and the surrounding communities. Some development would also be directed towards the smaller villages, to meet the needs of these individual villages and surrounding rural area. The Core Strategy proposes a similar approach for necessary retail development in the District.
- 1.5 Current Government guidance (see section 5) emphasises that planning policies should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of development for communities in rural areas. Local planning authorities should be aware of the circumstances, needs and priorities of the rural communities and businesses in their area, and of the interdependence between urban and rural areas. This Paper considers all these factors in the formation of a rural strategy for the plan period, and considers other issues that have arisen. The Paper sets out the criteria used to identify the villages that act as local service centres, and can accommodate significant growth, and those where more limited development to meet local needs may be appropriate.
- 1.6 The Paper commences by setting out the context and the methodology, including a brief review of relevant Government guidelines. The Paper then sets out the criteria used to identify the villages that act as local service centres, and can accommodate significant growth, and those where more limited development to meet local needs may be appropriate. Appendices include the detailed background information including service centre classification and needs matrices.
- 1.7 The publication of this Consultation Draft Paper encourages input from a wide range of stakeholders including infrastructure and service providers. A series of questions are proposed throughout the Paper for consideration although this should not preclude the identification of other issues. The consultation will build upon the public consultation already held for the Pre-submission Core Strategy.

- 1.8 The consultation period is not a statutory process but will last for an extended period of nine-weeks to allow full input by all interested parties and to allow Parish Councils to consider the Paper, as many parishes do not meet in August. The consultation period will commence on the 7<sup>th</sup> July 2008 and any comments should be sent to the Planning Policy Team by 5pm on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

## **2 Context**

- 2.1 The rural area of the Mid Sussex District is defined as the area outside of the built up areas of the District's three main towns, Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath.
- 2.2 Mid Sussex is classed as a predominantly rural district<sup>1</sup>. Beyond the urban areas of the District's three main towns, it is mostly made up of a number of villages and hamlets set in attractive countryside, much of which is designated as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and to the south of the District, within the proposed South Downs National Park.
- 2.3 Although the District's villages and hamlet are diverse in character, they face many similar challenges. The Core Strategy's<sup>2</sup> vision is that the varied character and outstanding natural environment of the District's rural areas should be maintained, whilst remaining a viable place to live and work. The provision of rural services, facilities and affordable housing for local people are key issues.
- 2.4 The population of Mid Sussex is fairly dispersed with approximately 60% of the population living within the District's three main towns and the remaining 40% within its rural area. Table 2 in Appendix 2 sets out population for individual villages in more detail based on population data from the 2001 census, the latest available data<sup>3</sup> at a village level. This indicates that there is a wide variation and a grouping of population size of the District's rural settlements<sup>4</sup>, with a small number of villages with a relatively large population (3,000+ persons), a similar number between 1,000 and 3,000 persons and a larger number of settlements below 1,000 persons.

## **3 Methodology**

- 3.1 The key components of the methodology used in the production of the Background Paper include:
- (i) Review of Government guidance including relevant Planning Policy Statements and the draft South East Plan (see section 5);
  - (ii) Review of other relevant literature including the Mid Sussex Sustainability Hierarchy of Settlements, Common Housing Register and the West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme.
  - (iii) A 'Rural Issues Workshop' to inform the Parish Councils of the Core Strategy and the Background Paper and to foster a better understanding of the challenges and issues that the District faces.

---

<sup>1</sup> DEFRA urban/rural classification

<sup>2</sup> Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document

<sup>3</sup> Population estimates are based on Census 'Super Output Areas' that 'best fit' settlement boundaries.

<sup>4</sup> The word 'settlement' as used in this paper is a generic term for existing towns, villages and hamlets', and does not imply the creation of a new settlement.

- (iv) Review of Parish Plans where available, plus a series of individual meetings with Parish Councils and further consultation with key stakeholders to help determine local issues and needs;
- (v) Study of the key services, opportunities and needs in the District's villages;
- (vi) Analysis of key sustainability indicators;
- (vii) Assessment of constraints identified through both desktop studies and site visits;
- (viii) Consideration of representations made during Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document consultation<sup>5</sup>.

## 4 Evidence base and initial preparation

### Background

4.1 In September 2004, a new planning system was introduced under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. For the first time, planning has been given the statutory objective to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In its document 'Securing the Future - UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy ' (March 2005), the government sets out five shared principles for achieving sustainable development:

- Living within environmental limits
- Ensuring a Strong, healthy and just society
- Achieving a sustainable economy
- Promoting good governance
- Using sound science responsibly

4.2 In February 2005, the Government issued Planning Policy Statement 1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development' which states that sustainable development should be pursued in an integrated manner in line with the principles as set out by the UK strategy. It highlights that local planning authorities should ensure that development plans promote outcomes in which environmental, economic and social objectives are achieved together over time<sup>6</sup>.

### Applying sustainability to the Mid Sussex Local Development Framework

4.3 In preparing its new Local Development Documents, the Council must ensure that all development is in accordance with the principles of sustainable development and planning guidance and has due regard to the emerging South East Plan. Government Guidance contained within Planning Policy Statements PPS1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development', PPS3: 'Housing', PPS6: 'Planning for Town Centres', PPS7: 'Sustainable Development in rural areas' and PPG13: 'Transport' all require development to be in accordance with the most sustainable option. Guidance contained within these Statements indirectly encourages the principle of a settlement hierarchy approach to guide new development where development is focused around existing centres.

4.4 The rural strategy proposed in this Paper has evolved from the concept of the Council's 'Sustainable Hierarchy of Settlements' Technical Paper published in December 2005. The Technical Paper proposed the classification of settlements based primarily on population size and a review of their social facilities, economic opportunities and environmental constraints as a guide to the appropriate level of development. It was considered that this hierarchy should be developed further to take account of recent research<sup>7</sup> and Government guidance.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> This will be incorporated into the final Paper.

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 13 (i)

<sup>7</sup> Countryside Agency

<sup>8</sup> PPS 3 Paragraph 38

This suggests that regard must also be had to the function a village serves in relation to other settlements. These factors include where people living within villages actually go to access services and facilities and where they work in relation to where they live. This allows a better understanding to develop over the level of interaction and functionality between a village and neighbouring towns and villages. This may indicate that some villages depend heavily upon one or more towns or villages for services and employment, whilst other villages may be more self reliant, with the potential that the latter villages could be more sustainable than first thought.

- 4.5 The rural strategy also considers the identified needs of villages, which Government guidance suggests should be taken into consideration when looking at potential development in rural settlements that are not designated as local service centres. In addition, an assessment of local constraints is also considered to ensure that the strategy takes into account deliverability issues.
- 4.6 Together, these elements have formed the proposed strategy for the distribution of development in the District's rural areas. It is considered that the proposed strategy allows for a more comprehensive and flexible approach to allocating development within the District's rural area than the use of a strict settlement hierarchy in isolation. For instance, the needs of a small village for community facilities or affordable housing could see growth directed towards that village to meet those needs. In contrast, a larger village may not be able to take significant growth due to constraints such as being located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

#### Pre-Submission Core Strategy

- 4.7 The Rural Issues Background Paper has been prepared as part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework to help inform the policies of the emerging Core Strategy but is also in turn shaped by the aims and objectives of the emerging Core Strategy.
- 4.8 The Pre-Submission Core Strategy sets out a vision of how the District will look in 2026 if it is successful. This states that:

#### The Vision

*“Mid Sussex in 2026 will remain a desirable place in which to live, work and visit and will continue to offer a high quality of life within a thriving and attractive area. The character of the built and natural environment will be protected and enhanced, with clear gaps retained between the settlements. The infrastructure of the District will be significantly improved, particularly transport links, as will services and facilities for residents, workers and visitors, first class cultural and sporting facilities will be in place. New development will be energy and water efficient and the District's overall carbon footprint will be significantly lower than now. Sufficient new homes will have been built to ensure good quality living accommodation to meet the requirements of the South East Plan. Employment and housing growth will have been balanced to reduce the need for commuting journeys. The District's three town centres will have been improved and will be vibrant attractive areas, better equipped to serve their surrounding communities and to compete successfully with larger regional centres”.*

4.9 In paragraph 2.6 of the Pre-submission Core Strategy the District Council sets out what it expects to see by 2026. Of particular reference to the rural areas are the following bullet points:

- “The existing settlement pattern retained, where new development in and around the towns and villages has enhanced their distinctive character and retained clear gaps between the settlements;
- Attractive, sustainable villages with a range of local facilities to serve local needs, to include local shops, a primary school, local medical facilities and a village hall;
- A vibrant rural area, where the protection of the landscape and biodiversity habitats is combined with support for the rural economy and the livelihoods of the agricultural community and others who manage the countryside;
- New development that has encouraged a diverse and inclusive community, that provides for a mix of income groups, takes account of the existing, aging population and ensures that young families are able to live in the District to be near their extended family support network or job opportunities;
- Improved bus services in terms of routes and frequency, throughout the District, to, from and within the towns and villages.
- New and improved facilities for cyclists enabling safely made journeys between home and the town or village centres, schools, employment areas and leisure and community facilities;
- Service infrastructure, such as water provision, sewage disposal, gas and electricity provision would have kept pace with the demands of new commercial and residential development; and
- The District would have reduced its carbon footprint, with all new development using sustainable construction methods, and progressing towards a target of zero carbon emissions”.

4.10 As set out in paragraphs 1.3 - 1.4 of this Paper, the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document proposes to focus the majority of new development within and around the District’s three main towns. A proportion of the District’s housing requirements (approximately 1,000 dwellings) are proposed within and around the District’s villages to help meet the needs of existing communities, particularly through the provision of affordable housing and support for existing services.

4.11 The locational principles that the Pre-Submission Core Strategy suggests<sup>9</sup> follows a hierarchical approach. This is repeated below:

**Category 1 (Preferred location for major housing development to meet regional targets and the needs of the town and surrounding villages)**

**Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath**

**Category 2 (Location for housing development to meet the needs of the larger individual villages and surrounding communities, and to contribute to meeting regional targets)**

**Settlements to be determined through the work on the Rural Issues Background Paper**

**Category 3 (Location for housing development to meet the needs of the individual villages and rural hinterland)**

**Settlements to be determined through the work on the Rural Issues Background Paper**

**Category 4 (Housing development only permitted in exceptional circumstances)**

**Settlements to be determined through the work on the Rural Issues Background Paper and the open countryside.**

4.12 The Pre-Submission Core Strategy also proposes a similar approach for necessary retail development. This is repeated below:

**To have a policy that encourages the development of retail uses, taking account of the following retail hierarchy:**

**Category 1 (Preferred location for major retail uses to serve the town and surrounding villages)**

**Town centres of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath**

**Category 2 (Preferred location for retail uses to meet the needs of the larger individual communities and their surrounding communities)**

**Settlements to be determined through the work on the Rural Issues Background Paper**

**Category 3 (Preferred location for retail uses to serve the needs of the individual villages and rural hinterland)**

**Settlements to be determined through the work on the Rural Issues Background Paper**

4.13 Of particular relevance to the Core Strategy is the delivery of rural housing, particularly affordable rural housing. Rural housing is delivered through two distinct planning routes - allocated and windfall housing sites, which deliver a mix of open market housing and an element of affordable housing, and rural exception sites, which provide 100% affordable housing. The Housing Needs Survey of 2004 indicated a significant need for affordable housing (approximately 550 per annum), and the provision of such accommodation is a Council Priority. The Pre-Submission Core Strategy proposes that the current threshold for providing affordable homes on site is reduced from 15 dwellings to 6, and the provision increased from 30% to 35% (with commuted sums from all developments of 1-5 dwellings).

---

<sup>9</sup> Core Policy 1 – page 19

## 5 Policy Context

- 5.1 The following section outlines current Government planning guidance, which is in principle, supportive of the hierarchy approach as it assumes that it is more sustainable to locate development where it can benefit from better accessibility to existing infrastructure and facilities.
- 5.2 Government planning guidance encourages a hierarchical approach to the distribution of development, with most being directed toward local service centres. However, it also allows for a more flexible approach to development in rural areas where there is an identified local need and where it can maintain and enhance the sustainability of villages. This takes into account the relationship between villages and how settlements function rather than assessing service provision in isolation.

This section sets out the planning policy context at national and regional level:

### PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

- 5.3 This sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system and states that planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of both urban and rural development.
- 5.4 PPS1 says that plans should set a clear vision for the future pattern of development, focusing development in existing centres to promote their vitality and viability, social inclusion and more sustainable patterns of development. Such development should make the fullest use of public transport<sup>10</sup> whilst also ensuring that the needs and problems of individual communities are addressed.<sup>11</sup>
- 5.5 PPS1 also identifies a number of key issues to be addressed through the preparation of Development Plan Documents including sustainable economic growth, urban and rural regeneration which meets the needs of local communities, efficient use of land, the promotion of communities and their diverse needs, the identification of land supply for various uses and improved accessibility with reduced reliance on the car. The supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1: Planning and Climate Change does not discourage new development but reinforces and clarifies the need for new developments to be located in areas that encourage transport options other than private car use (for example public transport, walking and cycling). This may lead to less development being brought forward in *some* unsuitable rural locations. Moreover, the PPS makes clear, that when considering the need to secure affordable housing opportunities in rural areas to meet the needs of local people, planning authorities should recognise that an otherwise acceptable site may not be readily accessible by means of travel other than the private car.

### PPS3: Housing

- 5.6 This outlines the key principles for housing delivery and underlines that housing in rural areas should be well designed and of high quality that encourages the creation and maintenance of sustainable rural communities by:
  - Providing a sufficient quantity and mix of housing, both market and affordable, taking into account need and demand, tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas<sup>12</sup>;

---

<sup>10</sup> PPS1: Paragraph 27

<sup>11</sup> PPS1 – paragraph 32.

<sup>12</sup> PPS3 Paragraph 10

- Setting lower site-size thresholds (than the indicative national minimum threshold of 15) above which affordable housing can be sought where economically viable and practicable<sup>13</sup>;
- Setting different proportions of affordable housing to be sought, for different site size thresholds in the plan area, where viable and practicable<sup>14</sup>;
- Using the rural exceptions site policy to allocate or release small sites solely for affordable housing, within and adjoining small rural communities, which may not otherwise be released for housing. Such sites should be used to provide affordable housing to meet local community needs in perpetuity<sup>15</sup> (See Appendix 1 for more information on Rural Exceptions sites and for a definition of affordable housing).

5.7 PPS3 considers local needs and the relationship between settlements in rural areas to ensure that growth is distributed in a way that supports informal social support networks, assists people to live near their work and key services, minimise environmental impact and where possible, encourage environmental benefits<sup>16</sup>. This approach to development encourages a fuller assessment of how settlements function rather than just looking at service provision and could inform how new infrastructure is provided between different but well related communities where it is not possible or practical to make provision in every settlement.

#### PPS6: Planning for Town Centres

5.8 This encourages development to be focused in existing centres and in the rural areas to support local service centres to help enhance their vitality and viability. In addition, PPS6 encourages policies that seek to protect existing facilities and promote new ones accordingly and requires Local Planning Authorities to define a network and a hierarchy of centres each performing their appropriate role to meet the needs of their catchments<sup>17</sup>.

#### PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

5.9 PPS7 states that, away from larger urban areas, most new development should be located in or near to local service centres where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together<sup>18</sup>. PPS7 also requires that most developments, which are likely to generate large numbers of trips, should be located next to towns or other service centres that are accessible by public transport.

5.10 PPS7 also sets out policies for allowing some limited development in, or next to, rural settlements that are not designated as local service centres, in order to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities. In particular, authorities should be supportive of small-scale development of this nature where it provides the most sustainable option in villages that are remote from, and have poor public transport links with, service centres<sup>19</sup>. It should be noted that PPS7 discourages new building in the open countryside away from existing settlements.<sup>20</sup>

5.11 For economic development, PPS7 sets out that planning documents should identify suitable sites for future economic development, particularly in rural areas where there is a need for

---

<sup>13</sup> PPS3 Paragraph 29

<sup>14</sup> PPS3 Paragraph 29

<sup>15</sup> PPS3 Paragraph 30

<sup>16</sup> PPS3 Paragraph 38

<sup>17</sup> PPS6 Paragraph 2.1

<sup>18</sup> PPS7 Paragraph 3

<sup>19</sup> PPS7 Paragraph 4

<sup>20</sup> PPS7 Paragraph 1 (iv)

employment creation and economic regeneration and set out their criteria for permitting economic development in different locations, including the future expansion of business premises, to facilitate healthy and diverse economic activity in rural areas.

- 5.12 PPS7 states that people who live or work in rural areas should have reasonable access to a range of services and facilities and that local planning authorities should facilitate and plan for accessible new services and facilities, particularly where planning permission is granted for new developments where settlements or the population of their rural catchments, are expanding; or where there is an identified need for new or expanded services to strengthen the role of a particular local service centre<sup>21</sup>.
- 5.13 Much of the Mid Sussex District is designated as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty<sup>22</sup>. However, guidance also supports suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these designated areas and their communities, including the provision of adequate housing to meet identified local needs.
- 5.14 An important part of the Rural Issues Background Paper is the distribution of future development within the rural areas of the District. Government guidance contained within PPS7 states that planning authorities should focus most new development in or near to local service centres but importantly, does not define them and it is therefore for the local planning authority to identify them. PPS7 defines<sup>23</sup> local service centres as “a country town, a single large village or a group of villages”. This statement underlines that the relationship between the towns and villages and between groups of villages in terms of services and facilities provision should also be considered within the overall context of sustainability. Section 6 details the process undertaken to identify service centres within Mid Sussex.

#### Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) - South East Plan

- 5.15 The draft South East Plan states that, in determining appropriate locations for development in the rural area, new housing should be in sustainable locations, which have the necessary infrastructure, services and community provision, or where this provision is planned. Housing developments should generally be in locations that are, or can be, well served by a choice of transport modes, with higher densities in and near locations well served by public transport. The Plan also promotes a flexible approach to development in rural areas stating that some housing development will be needed in order to meet identified social or economic needs and provision should be set out in policies in Local Development Documents.
- 5.16 The Plan states that planning documents will need to ensure that there is an adequate quantity and high quality of employment land to meet the current and future requirements of the local economy and highlights the importance of supporting economic diversity through the promotion of small and medium sized businesses in rural areas. In addition, it highlights that planning documents should be supportive of the agricultural, horticultural and forestry industries and rural economic diversification and non-land based business proposals in towns and villages or on farm sites where applications show positive benefits.

---

<sup>21</sup> PPS7 Paragraph 5

<sup>22</sup> PPS7 Paragraph 21

<sup>23</sup> PPS7: Paragraph 3

## Other Documents

### Community Strategy

- 5.17 The Community Strategy (January 2004) is an overarching document that was prepared in conjunction with the Mid Sussex Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) to address the issues and needs facing the communities of Mid Sussex. It is important that the Rural Issues Background Paper as part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework recognises and helps to address the issues set out in the Strategy.
- 5.18 The Community Strategy states that villages in Mid Sussex should continue to support mixed communities with access to a wide range of services, to ensure that new development in the District is sustainable and the necessary infrastructure is provided at an early stage and protect and enhance the local rural and urban environments. The Strategy states that the LSP partners will aim to support small-scale development in villages and encourage mixed-use development in villages including continuing to develop affordable housing on rural exception sites to enable local people to continue to live in the villages they were born in, and to ensure that those villages have the teachers or other workers they need to maintain their social and economic fabric. The Community Strategy is due to be superseded by the Sustainable Communities Strategy in autumn 2008.

### Parish Plans

- 5.19 The Parish Plan process enables Parish Councils, in consultation with their local communities, to establish the key priorities and future actions for each area. Ten Parish Councils in Mid Sussex have completed Plans with many actions already underway, and four are currently in preparation. This leaves a further seven Parish Councils that are not involved in the Plan process.
- 5.20 The priorities identified for each Parish are varied, although there are some commonalities such as the provision of affordable housing, improved public transport and crime reduction. Priorities such as delivering affordable housing and maintaining and enhancing the services available in rural areas can be directly influenced by policies in the Core Strategy and these identified priorities in the available Parish Plans have been used to inform the preparation of this Background Paper. Although some Parish Plans have been updated, it is important that they are reviewed regularly to reflect any change in circumstances and priorities in order for them to be used to inform planning policies and the provision of rural services.

### Housing Needs Surveys

- 5.21 The Council has a District-wide Housing Needs Survey (2004), which demonstrates that the area has a significant need for affordable homes. In addition, a number of parishes are undertaking parish level Housing Needs surveys to investigate the level of local need for affordable housing and to gauge local opinion and suggest sites regarding the development of affordable housing for local people. Parish level Housing Needs Surveys are normally conducted on behalf of the Parish Councils by Action in Rural Sussex<sup>24</sup>. The findings of completed housing needs surveys will inform the Rural Issues Background Paper including the level of local need from within the Parish, the makeup and tenure of those in need. However, it should be noted that the majority of Parishes within the District have not undertaken surveys. Where this is the case, the District Council will look to other sources of information regarding the level of affordable housing need within the villages, in particular the Common Housing Register and information garnered at the Rural Issues Workshop and the follow up meetings with individual Parishes.

---

<sup>24</sup> Action in Rural Sussex is a registered charity. See [www.ruralsussex.org.uk](http://www.ruralsussex.org.uk)

### Strategic Housing Market Assessment

- 5.22 The purpose of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is to provide an evidence base to inform the development of planning policies and housing strategies. The Council is currently undertaking a Strategic Housing Market Assessment jointly with other local authorities in West Sussex which will provide evidence on the nature and influence of the housing market, the required proportion of open market and affordable housing, the mix of housing needed in terms of size and type, and the proportion of tenure types required - i.e. owner occupied, rented (private or subsidised), and shared ownership.

### Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

- 5.23 The Council is required to produce a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment by national planning policy. The Assessment will provide an indication of the capacity of the District to accommodate housing development on both previously developed (brownfield) sites and greenfield sites as part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework. The findings of the Assessment will help to inform future housing allocation documents by highlighting the availability of deliverable and developable sites within the District and will help in the overall development strategy of the District's villages. It may also be possible to use the SHLAA to justify some level of allowance in the Core Strategy for development on unallocated sites. It is important to note that the Assessment is a background paper and it is not a statement of Council policy and it does not allocate land.

### Planning Policy Statement 17 Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- 5.24 Open space, sports and leisure provision is key in achieving sustainable communities and Government guidance encourages all Local Authorities to undertake local assessments of need and audits of open space, sport and recreation provision. The main purpose of carrying out these local assessments is to ensure that there is adequate provision of accessible, high quality greenspaces and sport and recreation facilities to meet the needs of local communities and visitors. By carrying out these assessments, Local Authorities can set locally specific standards of provision. These will replace the longstanding national standards originally produced by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) - commonly referred to as the '6 Acre Standard'.
- 5.25 The Council engaged nationally renowned consultants Kit Campbell Associates to undertake the assessment, which commenced in late 2004. The study found that most of the rural Parish Councils are generally of the view that the quantity or amount of most forms of provision in their areas is "about right". The forms of provision that parishes are most critical of are green spaces in housing areas, village greens, play areas for 8-12 years olds, supervised adventure play areas, grass sports pitches and teenage facilities. The Study sets out the current provision of open space, sport and recreation, across the District and identifies where improvements to, or additional facilities to meet required standards.

## 6 Policy context in practice

6.1 The Rural Issues Background Paper needs to reflect the overall national policy context, the aims and objectives and findings of these other documents and evidence from other sources including research and have particular regard to:

- The villages which act as local service centres for the surrounding area, and could potentially offer a suitable location for accommodating some of the future growth requirements of Mid Sussex<sup>25</sup>;
- The villages where there is an identified development need, for example for affordable or a certain type of housing, to support business or to bolster service provision;
- The villages where development could support the viability of local services to continue or expand;
- The identification of the relationships between settlements and whether there are “groups” of villages which are interlinked in terms of social networks and ‘sharing’ of employment and services;
- The identification of those villages in need of retail development that could help meet their potential to function as a local service centre, meeting the existing or future needs of their own communities, other settlements and the surrounding rural area.

---

<sup>25</sup> Subject to constraints – see paragraph 8.51

## 7 Identifying Local Service Centres in Mid Sussex

- 7.1 As Government guidance does not define local service centres, for the purposes of this assessment, they are villages that have a wide enough range of services to fulfil the day-to-day needs of local residents, surrounding villages and rural areas.
- 7.2 In order to identify local service centres within Mid Sussex, information was gathered on the District's rural settlements, which were then tested against set criteria. The decision on what services to assess and include in order to identify local service centres was made following a review of relevant literature and other local authority settlement hierarchies/ strategies to identify good practice.

### Assessing service provision

- 7.3 All the rural settlements within Mid Sussex were assessed for the current level of services and facilities provided. These facilities and services were given a weighted score depending on:
- how frequently rural residents use existing services and facilities;
  - comments from the Parish Councils about the services and facilities that they would like to access, but were not currently available in their community<sup>26</sup>; and
  - the contribution they make, or could make, towards an accessible and sustainable village.
- 7.4 Services and facilities such as a bank, convenience store, health centre/GP facility, dispensary, post office, pre/primary school, community hall, a public house, a petrol station and a rail station, a good provision of public transport and a significant provision of local employment opportunities<sup>27</sup> within 5km were scored highest (5 points). Other services and facilities such as a good provision of formal recreational facilities, a library, secondary schools, places of worship, traffic free cycle routes to the nearest town/local service centre and a cash machine were scored next highest (3 points). Other facilities, whilst playing an important role are scored lower such as allotments and dentists (1 point). The availability of broadband was not scored, as this is now available District-wide.
- 7.5 The functional relationship between villages is recognised. This is based on the criterion that a village can be deemed to share certain key services (listed under the service centre criteria below) with another village or a main town if it is within a 5km (approximately 3 miles) distance threshold which represents a 5-minute drive at 40mph, deemed a safe speed for most rural roads. If a village does not provide a service or facility and a village within its 5km threshold does, then the village may still qualify as a service centre if it shares sufficient key services. The suggested 'distance threshold' is based on pragmatic assumptions regarding service use in the rural areas which recognises that the car is by far the most widely used and convenient method of travel for accessing services outside of the immediate community as is intended to be a broad and flexible guide to the distance which people *in general* will be willing to travel by car to access more locally available services if they represent a preferable alternative to travelling further afield.

### Outreach Services

- 7.6 It is granted that some of the settlements are more sustainable in terms of service provision than is readily assessable. Villages are more likely to use home delivery and Internet

---

<sup>26</sup> Based on information in the West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme Evidence Baseline 2008-2010 (February 2008 - compiled by Action in Rural Sussex).

<sup>27</sup> Employment opportunities within 5 km of the settlement

services than urban counterparts<sup>28</sup> as well as benefiting from mobile village delivery services and this for instance can greatly increase accessibility to services without the need to travel. The use of the Internet for all types of shopping is expected to continue to grow for the foreseeable future<sup>29</sup>.

### Ranking of service provision

7.7 All the villages within Mid Sussex were assessed. A score of 100 represents a settlement that provides all the services and facilities listed in the criteria detailed in paragraph 7.4.

**Table 1 – Ranking of services and facilities in rural settlements**

| Village             | Score (/100) |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Hassocks and Keymer | 100          |
| Cuckfield           | 89           |
| Hurstpierpoint      | 88           |
| Copthorne           | 81           |
| Crawley Down        | 81           |
| Lindfield           | 78           |
| Balcombe            | 76           |
| Handcross           | 72           |
| Ashurst Wood        | 67           |
| Turners Hill        | 64           |
| Ardingly            | 59           |
| Bolney              | 56           |
| West Hoathly        | 55           |
| Scaynes Hill        | 53           |
| Horsted Keynes      | 45           |
| Albourne            | 38           |
| Staplefield         | 38           |
| Pease Pottage       | 31           |
| Ansty               | 29           |
| Sharpthorne         | 27           |
| Warninglid          | 27           |
| Sayers Common       | 24           |
| Poynings            | 21           |
| Pyecombe            | 20           |
| Fulking             | 18           |
| Twineham            | 15           |
| Slaugham            | 14           |
| Newtimber           | 3            |

7.8 The ranking of services detailed in Table 1 demonstrates the wide variation in service and facilities provision across the District's villages and shows that some villages are very well provided with the remainder split between two larger groups with either a fair provision of

<sup>28</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>29</sup> Internet Trends for Business and Consumers – CBI/Google 2006

services or little / almost no services. The full range of criteria used for the detailed analysis of each of the settlements is included in Appendix 7.

**Question 1 – Does the ranking system give the correct weighting to services and facilities? Do any services need to be scored higher/lower? Are there any important local services and facilities missing?**

7.9 In terms of identifying service centres, analysis of the services data summarised in Tables 1 demonstrates that there are three groupings of villages that can be identified and classified. These are the villages that fulfil a role as local service centres with a relatively higher provision of services; those with some degree of services that perform a limited service centre role and; those with very little or no service provision that do not fulfil a role as a service centre. The assessment of a village's ability to meet this role is primarily service based, as whilst the villages with the larger populations tend to have the widest provision of services, there is not always a distinct relationship between a village's service provision and its population.

7.10 The analysis and considerations above have been taken into account and the following broad categories of settlement are proposed.

- Local Service Centres
- Limited Local Service Centres
- Other Villages and Small Settlements

#### **Local Service Centres**

7.11 The criteria that Local Service Centres are assessed against are services and facilities that rural residents identify as needing to access on a frequent basis and the contribution that these services and facilities make towards a self-sustaining and sustainable village. The relationship between villages within the 5km distance threshold for villages to share services is acknowledged, although the assessment allows only one criterion to be shared.

To qualify as a Local Service Centre, a village must have the following:

- 5 or more retail uses<sup>30</sup> including at least a post office, banking facilities (bank and/or cash point) and a convenience store.
- Pre-school facilities, infant/primary school
- Significant local employment opportunities within 5km
- A village hall/ community centre
- Health centre / GP facilities and a dispensary
- A place of worship
- Good provision of recreational facilities<sup>31</sup>
- A public house

**Question 2 – Are the criteria for identifying local service centres correct? Should other criteria be included as part of the identification of local service centres?**

---

<sup>30</sup> Class A1 as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and its subsequent amendments

<sup>31</sup> Good provision of recreational facilities includes the existence of at least one play area and a playing pitch, and in some cases a sports pavilion / changing facilities.

7.12 Following these criteria, the villages identified as Local Service Centres within Mid Sussex are:

- **Ashurst Wood**
- **Copthorne**
- **Crawley Down**
- **Cuckfield**
- **Handcross**
- **Hassocks**
- **Hurstpierpoint**
- **Lindfield**

7.13 **Ashurst Wood** has retained a number of shops and services. It has close links across the District boundary to Forest Row and is approximately 1.5 kilometres from East Grinstead. Although it does not have a health centre or dispensary, it benefits from having this service in close proximity, which is available at Forest Row and East Grinstead. Ashurst Wood has a play area, playing pitch and a sports pavilion / changing facilities.

7.14 **Copthorne** has retained a number of shops and services and meets all the criteria. Crawley is approximately 5km away and provides a significant proportion of employment provision, which is an important factor in its role as a local service centre. Copthorne has a play area and a playing pitch. The requirement for some improvements to the quality and number of leisure facilities existing in Copthorne has been identified.

7.15 **Crawley Down** has retained a number of shops and services and meets all the criteria. It has significant local employment opportunities and is also approximately 5km from East Grinstead, which provides further employment opportunities. Crawley Down has a play area, playing pitch and a sports pavilion / changing facilities. A skate park is also currently under construction.

7.16 **Cuckfield** had retained a number of shops and services and meets all the criteria. Cuckfield has a play area and a playing pitch.

7.16 **Handcross** has retained a number of shops and services and meets all the criteria. It exhibits a good provision of retail outlets offering both specialist and day-to-day goods. Handcross also has significant local employment opportunities. Handcross has a play area, playing pitch and a sports pavilion / changing facilities.

7.17 **Hassocks** has a significant range of services and facilities and meets all the criteria. Hassocks has a play area, playing pitch and a sports pavilion / changing facilities.

7.18 **Hurstpierpoint** has a significant range of services and facilities and meets all the criteria. It also shares services with Hassocks and Burgess Hill. Hurstpierpoint has a play area and a playing pitch.

7.19 **Lindfield** has a significant range of services and facilities and meets all the criteria and has close links with Haywards Heath. Lindfield has a play area and a playing pitch.

## Limited Local Service Centres

7.20 The role of Limited Local Service Centres is more restricted than for Local Service Centres and caters for more basic and local need. The functional relationship between villages is acknowledged and a village that fails to meet all the criteria may still qualify as a Limited Local Service Centre if it shares the key services listed in the criteria with other villages. Here, the 5km distance threshold is applied, as villages with fewer services are likely to share services with another settlement that is located within a convenient distance rather than travel further afield into a nearby town although this criterion allows only a maximum of two key services (listed below) to be shared.

To qualify as a Limited Local Service Centre, a village must have the following:

- At least 1 or more retail uses with at least 1 convenience store
- An Infant/primary school
- A village hall/ community centre
- A place of worship
- A public house

**Question 3 – Are the criteria for identifying Limited Local Service Centres correct including the ‘sharing of services’? Should other criteria be included as part of the identification of Limited Local Service Centres?**

Following these criteria, Limited Local Service Centres within Mid Sussex are:

- **Ardingly**
- **Balcombe**
- **Bolney**
- **Horsted Keynes**
- **Scaynes Hill**
- **Turners Hill**
- **West Hoathly**

Following these criteria, the following are also classified as Limited Local Service Centres because they share services with neighbouring settlements:

- **Albourne**
- **Ansty**
- **Sayers Common**
- **Sharpthorne**
- **Staplefield**

7.21 **Albourne** meets most of the criteria and benefits with having a school located in the village but does not have a shop or a public house. However, it is in close proximity to Sayers Common where there is a public house and Hurstpierpoint where all these facilities are available. Albourne also has good links with the local road network and the A23. There is a village hall, which is important to its identification as a Limited Local Service Centre, good school provision and public transport links.

- 7.22 **Ansty** meets most of the criteria including benefiting from a convenience store located at the Garage but does not have a school. However, schooling facilities are available in Cuckfield, which is approximately 2km away.
- 7.23 **Ardingly** meets all the criteria. Improvements to Hapstead Hall are currently underway to enhance the flexibility of the use of the hall and its accessibility. The hall is well used by all sectors of the community and is a significant contribution to the village role as a limited service centre. The village has a variety of shops and services available including a post office and a public house.
- 7.24 **Balcombe** has a good provision of retail units in particular the post office and general store. The village also has a doctor's surgery and benefits from having a railway station on the London to Brighton mainline, which are additional assets in its role as a limited service centre. Tennis facilities in Balcombe are open to non-members.
- 7.25 **Bolney** meets all the criteria. The school is an important facility for Bolney. The potential provision of a new village hall is currently being examined which would include a wide range of new facilities. There are a variety of shops and services in Bolney including a post office and convenience store.
- 7.26 **Horsted Keynes** meets the above criteria. The village also has benefits from having a post office over and above the criteria for a Limited Local Service Centre such. The Crown public house is in the process of being re-built following the fire, which will be a re-established asset to the village.
- 7.27 **Sayers Common** does not have a shop or a school. However, there is a school at Albourne and retail services at Hurstpierpoint, both within the 5km threshold. The other criteria have been met and the village benefits from the village hall that provides good accommodation for public and civic events.
- 7.28 **Sharpthorne** meets most of the criteria but does not have a school. However, this facility is available in nearby West Hoathly.
- 7.29 **Staplefield** does not have any retail facilities but there are retail facilities at Handcross approximately 2km away.
- 7.30 **Turners Hill** meets all the criteria. The Ark is a good example of a well-used community building.
- 7.31 **West Hoathly** meets all the criteria for a Limited Local Service Centre.

### **Other villages and smaller settlements**

7.32 This category contains all the other villages and smaller settlements within the District that do not meet the criteria as either a Local Service Centre or a Limited Service Centre. These villages may still be suitable for accommodating growth although this will be more limited than for Service Centres and will be based on local need.

- **Fulking**
- **Newtimber**
- **Pease Pottage**
- **Poynings**
- **Pyecombe**
- **Slaugham**
- **Twineham**
- **Warninglid**

7.33 **Fulking** has very limited services but benefits from a church, a public house and a small village hall which doubles up as a pre-school facility during weekdays. However, it does not have any retail facilities or a school and neither of these is available within the 5km threshold.

7.34 **Newtimber** does not benefit from any facilities other than a church.

7.35 **Pease Pottage** has limited services. While a new community centre is being planned and there are two public houses the level of service provision would not be sufficient for Pease Pottage to be considered even as a Limited Local Service Centre. Some services that it benefits from are based at the nearby service station but this is not located within the village itself.

7.36 **Poynings** has very limited services but benefits from a public house, a village hall that doubles up as a pre-school and a church. However, it does not have any retail facilities or a school and neither of these is available within the 5km threshold.

7.37 **Pyecombe** has very limited services but benefits from a public house and a church. Although Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint are within the 5km threshold, more than 2 of the key service criteria would need to be shared.

7.38 **Slaugham** has a public house and a church but does not have any other services. Although Handcross is nearby, more than 2 of the key service criteria would need to be shared.

7.39 **Twineham** benefits from a village school and a church but does not have any other services. Although several surrounding villages are within the 5km threshold, more than 2 of the key service criteria would need to be shared.

7.40 **Warninglid** has very limited services but does have a public house and a village hall. Although Bolney is within the 5km threshold, more than 2 of the key services criteria would need to be shared.

## 8 Growth potential

- 8.1 To determine appropriate levels of growth for the District's settlements, it is proposed that, in addition to the level of service provision, **accessibility, identified needs and opportunities**, are prime considerations. A settlement's growth potential is a combination of all these factors checked by its constraints. For example, a village with good service provision and accessibility for instance, cannot be classified as having good growth potential if there is limited prospect of expansion due to, for example, a lack of suitable and deliverable sites and / or constraints from flooding and/or due to ecological reasons. However, a village not meeting Service Centre criteria may still have a case for growth potential, if there is an overriding locally identified need.
- 8.2 A set of criteria for assessing growth potential has been developed and four levels of growth potential have been identified which reflect the opportunities and constraints within each of the District's villages. These are:
- Villages with **growth potential** suitable for housing allocations totalling 100+ dwellings over the plan period.
  - Villages with **intermediate growth potential** suitable for housing allocations of totalling at least 30 but no more than 100 dwellings over the plan period.
  - Villages with **limited growth potential** suitable for housing allocation totalling at least 15 but no more than 30 dwellings over the plan period.
  - Villages with **restricted growth potential** suitable for rural exception site allocations only.
- 8.3 An important consideration throughout the formation of the rural settlement strategy is that the scale and timing of growth over the plan period is appropriate to the villages identified for potential growth. The proposed growth potential levels need to consider current allocations and recent development rates for each settlement.

**Question 4 – Are the broad criteria for establishing growth potential correct? Should alternative or additional criteria be applied?**

### Accessibility - working and living patterns

- 8.4 Research<sup>32</sup> shows that the lives of rural residents are characterised by high levels of mobility and a dispersal of activities and have different patterns of services use and employment patterns from their urban counterparts. Village residents primarily choose their residence for quality of life reasons and then connect up the other aspects of their lives to suit with high usage of the car<sup>33</sup> and their lives are characterised by high levels of mobility. The influence of urban neighbours on rural residents is significant although the nature and scale of these roles will vary from village to village.
- 8.5 A number of barriers exist within the rural areas to accessing services that vary by location<sup>34</sup>. One of the main barriers is a lack of private transport such as the car, which is the most commonly used method<sup>35</sup> to access services that are not readily available within the immediate area. This particularly affects older people and lower income households who

---

<sup>32</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>33</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>34</sup> West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme Evidence Baseline 2008-2010 (February 2008 - compiled by Action in Rural Sussex).

<sup>35</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004, West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme Evidence Baseline 2008-2010 (February 2008 - compiled by Action in Rural Sussex).

may not have access to the car and the problem is exacerbated in areas with poor access to public transport and limited local services.

- 8.6 Villages with existing services and facilities and/or good public transport links clearly encourage higher levels of and more sustainable access to these services than those settlements without either. These villages are more able to support a diverse rural community, as villages with good access to services will help to support those who cannot afford to or are unable use the car. The issue of service and employment access is therefore an important consideration in the formation of a development strategy. To inform the assessment of growth potential, it is important to have an understanding of the level of accessibility to nearby towns and train stations to reflect commuter patterns to places of work and the likely use of and sharing of services between the villages and the main towns.
- 8.7 Gauging the accessibility of each settlement is important in order to understand how sustainably a village is functioning and this is judged in terms of service availability for public transport and a distance threshold for the car. It should be noted when looking at levels of accessibility, research indicates<sup>36</sup> that the more isolated rural villages may display higher levels of self containment than that villages located closer to larger urban areas and therefore more sustainable patterns of living and working, and may also have a disproportionately better range of services in terms of their size and population. In addition, remoter villages that share functional relationships with surrounding villages may denote that some of these villages that individually have limited services may be equally or indeed a more sustainable option than other villages in terms of development potential.

#### Service use

- 8.8 Whilst it is beyond the scope of this Paper to gain a detailed recording of each individual settlement's pattern of service use, the Paper has attempted to gain an understanding of how the District's villages function in terms of access to services. Existing available research on retail use for the District's three main towns<sup>37</sup> and for service use in the rural areas indicates that the vast majority of people tend to use private transport to access services that are not within their community<sup>38</sup>. In addition, the majority of rural residents do not perceive they have problems accessing services therefore their service use patterns essentially indicates use preference<sup>39</sup>. These are also views commonly cited during our meetings with the Parish Councils in Mid Sussex.

#### Travel to work

- 8.9 Studies have shown that in rural areas, journeys to work are longer than for most services and the range of destinations more dispersed. In addition, there a higher proportion of home working takes place within areas more remote from towns and this is the case for Mid Sussex (see Appendix 3 Table 3). Data for journey to work information from the 2001 Census is available and this was examined to determine key travel patterns to and from the villages as well as looking at levels of working at home.
- 8.10 Travel to work data gives a good indication of the level of self-containment of a settlement and the level of accessibility to places of employment by public transport when read in conjunction with public transport service information.

---

<sup>36</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>37</sup> Mid Sussex District Council Retail Study 2006

<sup>38</sup> West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme Evidence Baseline 2008-2010 (February 2008 - compiled by Action in Rural Sussex), The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>39</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

#### Distance travelled to place of employment

- 8.11 Travel to work information shows that the proportion of home working is higher in the villages than the towns. A higher proportion of working at home is generally displayed in those settlements where local employment opportunities are more restrictive than those with more local employment opportunities. Working at home is also prevalent in settlements that are more remote from local service centres and the towns and conversely generally lower in those settlements closer to the main towns and the local service centres where public transport links and distances are more favourable. This suggests that working at home is either a necessity due to accessibility issues or a preferential lifestyle choice. Settlements with particularly high levels of home working include Warninglid, Twineham, Ansty, Pyecombe, Poynings, Slaugham, Staplefield, Bolney and Fulking.
- 8.12 In line with recent research<sup>40</sup>, many of the District's villages have an overall level of self-containment in travel to work terms similar to the District's towns (working within 2km of home or at home). Again, these villages tend to be the more remote villages. Settlements with particularly high levels of self-containment in employment terms<sup>41</sup> include Staplefield, Slaugham, Ardingly, Twineham, Ansty, Turners Hill, Pyecombe, Poynings, Bolney and West Hoathly.
- 8.13 Whilst the rural areas display proportionately high levels of home working and in some settlements high levels of self-containment, people in the rural areas generally travel more outside of the immediate area for employment than their town based counterparts as overall, locally based employment opportunities are more restricted. Generally, the rural settlements that are based closer to the towns have a higher proportion of those who travel less than 5km to work than those that are more remote which shows a reliance of the District's towns for employment.
- 8.14 The travel to work information suggests that consideration should be given to the issue of home working and live/work units when allocating housing to the rural areas. This is particularly important in the villages that are more remote and have more restricted local employment opportunities to encourage sustainability and self-containment with regard to employment opportunities. In addition, consideration should also be given to policies supporting employment provision in the rural areas.

A breakdown of the travel to work information is given in Appendix 3.

#### Method used to travel to place of employment summary

- 8.15 The rural areas demonstrate high usage of the car as the main method used to travel to work when compared to the Districts towns and much lower use of the train (other than in the villages in close proximity to the towns), similar levels of bus usage and cycling to work and much lower levels of walking.
- 8.16 The travel to work information demonstrates that car usage averages around 70% compared to 63% for the towns and as high as almost 77% for Crawley Down and Turners Hill and 75% for Copthorne and Worth. Train usage averages at slightly lower levels when compared to urban areas. However, there is higher usage in the villages in close proximity to the towns such as Cuckfield and Lindfield and in Hassocks (which has a station) compared with the more isolated villages. Certain areas demonstrate higher than average levels of bus usage such as Ashurstwood and Crawley Down/Turners Hill. Although the level varies, the amount

---

<sup>40</sup> The Role of Rural Settlements as Service Centres – Countryside Agency 2004

<sup>41</sup> Although Ashurstwood and Lindfield display high levels of working within 2km, this is likely to be due in part to their immediate proximity to East Grinstead and Haywards Heath respectively

of people walking to work is generally much lower in the rural areas, which reflects the longer distances that people generally have to travel to work in these areas due to more limited employment opportunities. The level of cycling to work is generally the same with the towns ranging from 1.2% to 2.5% and the villages ranging from 0.9% to 2.1%.

#### Place of work summary

- 8.17 The travel to work information demonstrates that there are high levels of commuting to London with a high percentage of rail use (as the main method used) throughout the District. In the rural areas, train use levels are particularly high and the dominant method used in the areas that are in close proximity to where the stations are located with for instance Cuckfield, Lindfield, Ardingly and unsurprisingly Hassocks displaying high levels of trains use whilst in the areas further away from the stations the split between train and car use is fairly equal.
- 8.18 Crawley is a common destination for place of work for the rural areas of the District with high levels in the north and more central parts of the District, in particular, those areas in close proximity such as Copthorne and Worth, Crawley Down and Turners Hill and Ardingly. The car is by far the dominant method used to travel into Crawley with higher bus usage levels limited to those areas in close proximity. Brighton is also a common destination for place of work but the higher levels are concentrated to the southern parts of the District. Car use is again the dominant method used but train use levels are generally higher than those demonstrated for Crawley.
- 8.19 The rural areas demonstrate fairly strong commuting patterns to the District's towns although this is heavily dependant on the proximity of the town and the relative distance of other employment centres such as Crawley and Brighton. The settlements in close proximity to the main towns displaying the highest travel to work to the nearest town are Ashurst Wood (East Grinstead), Crawley Down and Turners Hill (East Grinstead), Cuckfield (Haywards Heath), Hassocks (Burgess Hill) and Lindfield (Haywards Heath). All these areas display higher levels of public transport use (and other sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling), which suggests that accessibility to these places of work is an important factor for these people. For the rural parts of the District, Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill are the strongest centres of local employment outside of the immediate area throughout the District.

#### Summary

- 8.20 Available data on service use and travel to work information for the District supports existing research on service use and employment patterns for rural residents. There is evidence of different patterns of employment and service use with residents travelling further afield for employment opportunities but also a heavy reliance on the District's towns by the villages, for employment and also for shopping. The car is heavily relied upon as the main method used to access these services although higher levels of public transport usage are demonstrated in villages in close proximity to the towns and railway stations. The more isolated villages tend to display higher levels of work at home than those settlements in close proximity to or with good accessibility to employment opportunities.

## Identified Needs and Opportunities

- 8.21 An essential part of assessing the growth potential of the District's villages is to identify the needs of individual settlements, which can often be related to the opportunities that development can bring. To gain a better understanding of the District's villages, a full review of all available parish plans and information gained through the PPG17 Open Space Assessment and Parish Survey was undertaken and supplemented by subsequent meetings with twenty of the District's twenty-one Parish Councils. A summary of the main needs and issues is set out in the following section with further information detailed in the growth potential write-ups in section 9. A table setting out all the identified needs and opportunities is detailed in Appendix 8. This work will be supplemented by the results of further consultation with key stakeholders such as service and infrastructure providers.
- 8.22 It should be noted that the list of needs and opportunities identified in the process of writing this Paper is by no means exhaustive and represents a reflection of the current priorities of representative bodies and those responsible for providing key services for the rural areas. It is granted that these needs may change over time particularly given the length of the plan period. In addition, it is recognised by many of the Parish Councils that many of these needs represent a 'wish-list' and that it may be very difficult to meet them for instance due to overriding constraints or that development of an appropriate scale may not realistically provide the additional demand necessary to improve the level of services such as public transport provision. Funding from sources other than development may be available for many of the identified needs (e.g. Lottery funding).

### Housing

- 8.23 Research has demonstrated that the provision of rural housing, including affordable rural housing can help support the health and vitality of rural communities by supporting local services and facilities<sup>42</sup>, particularly for example, those more at risk of shifting demand such as transport and dedicated outlets such as village shops<sup>43</sup> and that a lack of affordable housing in rural communities is believed to be the most important issue threatening the viability of rural communities<sup>44</sup>. This is an important consideration in the development strategy as the continuance of rural services to all sectors of the community (particularly to maintain access) and the enhancement of sustainable rural communities is an underlying goal of the Community Strategy and the emerging Core Strategy and the allocation of development towards certain villages will help support this.
- 8.24 The attractiveness of rural areas results in many people aspiring to live within a rural setting. The result is that the price of rural housing tends to be higher and less affordable than housing in more urban areas. Research<sup>45</sup> has shown that the house price situation tends to mean that the only people financially able to move into many rural areas of the country are those that are wealthy retirees, those in professional occupations or those willing to commute to jobs elsewhere. In addition, this means that those involved in the changing population tend to be those best placed to cope with the impact that these changes have on the provision of services located within the rural areas as they have the means to overcome the barriers such as travelling distances that others have not.

---

<sup>42</sup> Report of the Rural Advocate 2007, Rural Services Network 2008

<sup>43</sup> West Sussex Rural Access to Services Programme Evidence Baseline 2008-2010 (February 2008 - compiled by Action in Rural Sussex).

<sup>44</sup> Regional Housing Strategy 2006

<sup>45</sup> West Sussex: Rural Access to Services 2008 – 2010, Rural Affordable Housing Strategy for Mid Sussex March 2007

- 8.25 Nationally, the shortage of affordable and suitable rural housing (both private and social) is causing problems within rural areas as local people are forced to move out of the communities they have grown up in or remain in unsuitable accommodation such as living with parents in over crowded conditions, unable to afford a property to buy or rent on local incomes<sup>46</sup>. The shortage of affordable housing is particularly acute in Mid Sussex where affordable housing comprises 11% of the total housing stock compared to a national average of 19%. In addition, in the three main towns of Mid Sussex, 14.2% of households live in affordable housing compared to 8.5% in the rural areas<sup>47</sup>. The District Council has a target that 20 affordable homes should be delivered each year either through a proportion of market housing development, or rural exception site development.
- 8.26 Not all Parish Councils considered that there was an identified need for housing development in their areas, although in general the need for affordable housing in rural areas was recognised by the majority. It was considered that smaller, family homes and starter homes are required throughout the rural villages and smaller settlements to enable younger people to be retained in an area that is becoming increasingly difficult to afford, particularly for younger people.
- 8.27 Smaller market housing suitable for elderly residents were identified as a requirement to enable larger homes, currently occupied by some older people (too large for their needs), to be released which in turn reduces the number of smaller dwellings being extended, reducing the small housing stock available. Enabling young families to afford homes in rural areas would allow for the diversification of the rural population and help maintain local businesses, shops and services that may otherwise have been rendered unviable. The increased numbers of children living in rural settlements could also support local schools.
- 8.28 Some Parish Councils identified a preference for exception sites in the delivery of affordable housing due to the requirement for the dwellings to be allocated to local people in perpetuity. No Parishes however were able to identify sites, which could be promoted as suitable for 100% rural affordable housing. The Mid Sussex District Council Housing Enabling Team and the Rural Housing Enabler from Action in Rural Sussex are following through the parish Housing Need Surveys and the sites identified by this process. Planning Officers from Development Control have been involved in site appraisals to look at the suitability of sites in relation to planning terms.
- 8.29 In residential developments the proportion of affordable housing being promoted in the Core Strategy is 35%. It was generally agreed by Parish Councils that this proportion is about right. There was concern particularly from Parish Councils containing smaller settlements that a higher proportion of affordable housing could render sites unviable due to the smaller numbers of dwellings that could come forward on smaller sites. A higher proportion could be considered in the rural areas but this should be on a site-by-site basis.
- 8.30 There was unanimous support for the revision of the affordable housing allocation scheme to afford local people priority in the allocation of affordable housing. It was considered that this is likely to generate greater support for development in rural areas if the affordable element could be released for locally identified needs.
- 8.31 In principle, the Parish Councils generally supported the provision of key worker housing as long as people who worked in the locality would occupy it. It was noted by many that schoolteachers in particular had to travel significant distances to work in the District.

Public and community transport / sustainable transport

---

<sup>46</sup> See Report of the Rural Advocate 2007

<sup>47</sup> Mid Sussex District Council Common Housing Register – April 2006.

- 8.32 The issue of public transport in the rural areas of the District received much attention in our discussions with the Parish Councils. Concerns were raised over both the frequency and service times of the bus network that often makes their use an unrealistic alternative to the car. However, it is recognised that it would be a big step for the service providers to provide more services without a guarantee of increased usage and that the Parish Councils could do more to promote current services. In addition, in the areas where there are community transport schemes available, these are proving popular and may need to be expanded. The demands for public/community transport schemes can be expected to grow in the rural areas over the plan period as the population is ageing (more so than the urban areas of the District).
- 8.33 It was generally felt that bus services could be improved in rural areas, especially at peak commuter times of day and in the evenings. It was also considered that the improvements to the bus service would not be forthcoming unless the current services are more regularly used. It was felt, particularly by more remote rural Parish Councils that while public transport improvements would be welcomed in theory, it is necessary for residents to use a car day-to-day to commute to work or to access shops and services provided in larger settlements or villages. Rural residents would be more likely to access more than one service in one car journey and it may not be the case that improvements to public transport would mean greater custom from rural residents.
- 8.34 A number of parishes highlighted the need for safe cycle routes linking the villages to nearby towns to allow safe and realistic alternatives to using the car both into and out of the village. It was acknowledged however, that rural roads are often unsuitable for widening to accommodate cycle paths due to the historic hedged boundaries and narrow roads and many recognised the difficulty in providing the facility on the ground. Some Parish Councils suggested the consideration of Quiet Lanes where cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders have priority over motor vehicles on rural roads. Improvements to the network of public rights of way which would benefit recreational cyclists was supported, however due to the nature of the landscape in Mid Sussex, these routes could not realistically be used by cyclists for commuting.

#### Traffic Management and Parking

- 8.35 Parking, congestion and road safety are issues that all Parishes are concerned with in particular the levels of development proposed by the South East Plan through the Core Strategy would result in increased pressure on already congested rural roads. Parking on rural roads particularly at busy times was an issue raised by many parish councils, especially those that contain smaller settlements. Many of the Parishes expressed a desire for better car parking facilities in the village to improve safety and provide support for the retail facilities. However, it was widely agreed that the provision of car parking facilities is very difficult to provide for due to a lack of suitable sites. It was mentioned that any new development in rural areas should provide sufficient on site parking so the on-street parking situation is not made worse.
- 8.36 The speed of traffic passing through rural settlements was an issue of concern for many Parish Councils. This was of particular concern at peak times and the beginning and the end of the school day, which had implications for child safety. The need for traffic management solutions was a strong theme to emerge through the Parish meetings. Many of the Parish Councils felt that available sources of funding from Strategic developments should assist with village traffic management schemes as well as from potential developments built within the villages themselves.

#### Community Facilities

- 8.37 A number of Parishes highlighted the need for new or improved community halls. The role of the community hall, particularly the newer ones with Parish Council offices and a wider range of facilities, were highlighted as acting as a hub for village activities and playing a central role to village life. There were a number of rural community facilities such as parish halls that were meeting community needs, however many required refurbishment, maintenance and in some cases a new building. The Parish Councils generally felt that flexibility of space was important in community facilities in order to meet a variety of community needs. This was particularly important for those Parishes that utilise ancillary church rooms or older buildings to hold meetings, clubs or events. Maintenance and heating could be improved in some of the smaller village halls.
- 8.38 The requirement for providing youth facilities was expressed in around half of the Parishes with a range of means identified to meet them. In some Parishes it was not clear how these needs would be met, in others it included new / improved youth club facilities and outdoor multi-use play areas. It was generally agreed that these needs might change over time with passing trends.

#### Education

- 8.39 There was a general perception that rural schools, whether operating at capacity or not, should be supported by improving population diversity in rural areas by retaining and / or attracting young families. This may be through new development or potentially the reconfiguration of the existing stock (see above). The ability of young families to afford housing in the rural areas has an impact on the school rolls. If starter or family homes in rural areas are not secured, then this could have a detrimental impact on the viability of rural schools. It was recognised that some schools may require some expansion if development is forthcoming.

#### Health Facilities

- 8.40 It was generally considered that there are healthcare facilities available in a network around the District from new, larger capacity healthcare facilities to GP practices and mobile doctors around the smaller settlements. The Parish Councils that contain larger settlements, it was felt, are well provided for at this time, however the residents of the smaller rural settlements were more likely to need to travel further a-field. It was also acknowledged that this was acceptable for non-urgent appointments as it could be combined with a shopping trip or commute to work, however those in more remote rural areas, particularly with limited accessibility, would find it more difficult to access healthcare facilities. It was raised by a number of parishes that mobile healthcare provision is good in theory, although there needs to be appropriate accommodation within which to hold consultations and examinations and security for the medical supplies.

#### The Rural Economy

- 8.41 There was general support for live/work units in the rural areas as a substitute for providing land for formal employment floorspace. There was a feeling that working from home was relatively popular in the rural settlements which was attributed to the improvements to technology and broadband cover in the rural areas, and the desirability of living in the countryside and rural settlements for professional people who start new business or become self employed. The need for a proportion of new village developments to include live/work units was expressed by a number of the Parish Councils. Information from the 2001 Census indicates that the rural areas have a higher proportion of 'work at home' than their urban counterparts and this seems to be a growing trend with 'one person' office based and trade businesses.

- 8.42 There was general support for the conversion of unused agricultural buildings for employment use to enable the rural economy to diversify, provide opportunities for the employment of local people and relieve pressure for employment floorspace in small settlements where suitable premises are uncommon.
- 8.43 It was suggested that the protection of rural retail units particularly from residential development pressure could help local businesses and shops remain open. It was also acknowledged that development in the rural settlements might improve the viability of local shops and services.

#### Leisure

- 8.44 The general perception of the Parish Councils was that youth facilities were lacking. It was considered that provision for younger children however was better than that for teenagers, which was recognised as being inadequate across the rural parts of the District particularly noted in the northern area. This was an issue that some Parishes intended to include in their village surveys to gather the opinion of the local communities on the adequacy of rural leisure facilities. It was also widely thought by Parish Councils that instead of providing new facilities, improving old ones or providing greater flexibility of existing buildings would better meet the needs of young people. Some parishes suggested that the lack of teenage leisure facilities in the rural parts of the district had a direct impact on the levels of crime and disturbance. Appendices 8 and 9 set out the current levels of leisure provision in accordance with the PPS17 Assessment and subsequent Parish Council consultation. It must be noted that the viability of providing any additional or improved leisure facilities has not been taken in to account here. A further assessment would be required to ensure the deliverability of the additional facilities stated.

#### Infrastructure and Flooding

- 8.45 Transport infrastructure was raised as a particular issue by the majority of the Parish Councils due to the narrow rural roads and their experience that the existing road systems cannot accommodate the existing levels of traffic. Water and sewage infrastructure was also a concern for many Parish Councils particularly if new development were programmed.

#### Phasing

- 8.46 It was generally agreed that phasing development in the rural areas would be most appropriate in order for infrastructure requirements to be delivered. Some villages have received developments relatively recently and have yet to 'bed in' and their impacts on the existing infrastructure and that delivered as part of the development had yet to be experienced.

#### Character

- 8.47 All Parish Councils agreed that any development within the rural area must respect the character and design of the settlement where it is proposed. High quality design, layout and materials are imperative to achieve this.

#### Demographic information

- 8.48 An important factor when identifying needs is to analyse available demographic data. The demographic information for the District has been obtained from the 2001 Census and sets out the age structure of the District's town and parish wards and allows an overall analysis to be made for the District as a whole and comparisons to be made against county, regional and national figures. The figures generated through this analysis show that there are marked

differences between the individual parish wards and that the information from the meetings held with the Parish Councils has generally supported the data findings.

8.49 The information obtained demonstrates that the rural areas of Mid Sussex have a higher average percentage of 5-15 year olds than the District, county, regional and national average. However, the rural areas also have a lower average percentage of 0-4, 16-24 and 25-44 year olds than District, county, regional and national averages. In addition, the rural areas also show higher average percentages of 45-64 year olds, 65-74 years olds and persons of 75 years and above. Although some care should be taken in the interpretation of these figures, particularly as they date from 2001, they do demonstrate that the population structure of the rural areas is generally older than the District as a whole and that given the higher percentages in the older age-ranges, the average age is likely to be increasing. These figures reflect the general pattern of change identified within West Sussex<sup>48</sup> for an increasing proportion of older people (particularly in rural areas) combined with a declining proportion of younger people.

8.50 The figures highlight trends at both ends of the age-range that over the long term of the plan period need to be taken into account. The needs of the older generations are very important given the District's increasingly ageing population and in the rural areas, this will lead to an increased demand for suitable housing and health and social services support which will be complicated by those unable to travel under their own means. A lack of suitable housing for older persons may restrict their ability to remain within their community and as already demonstrated in some areas, could lead to family sized housing being held onto by older residents and thereby increasing the demand for this type of accommodation and fuelling house price increases. The figures also points towards the need to support younger persons, particularly those of the 16-24 and 25-44 age groups where employment is an issue and attempts are made to get onto the property ladder.

A breakdown of the demographic information for the District is given in Appendix 4.

## **Constraints**

8.51 When assessing the growth potential of the District's settlements, it is important to consider a number of constraints that can limit development. Approximately 60% of Mid Sussex is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and there are a number of other designations, which reflect the outstanding nature conservations, landscape, and built heritage value of the District.

8.52 Some of the designations considered to place a severe constraint on a settlement's potential for growth due to their inappropriateness for development are:

- SSSI and SNCI;
- Local Nature Reserves;
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI);
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments;
- Agricultural land classified as Grade 1 or 2 quality;
- Flood risk areas (identified in the Mid Sussex Strategic Flood Risk as within Flood Zone 3);
- Ancient Woodland;
- Areas of open space identified as being of 'high value' in the Council's PPG17 Assessment (2006);

---

<sup>48</sup> See West Sussex: Rural Access to Services 2008 - 2010

8.53 In addition to these designations, the findings of the Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment (2007) and the impact on the District's built heritage should be taken into account.

8.54 Settlements that are wholly within the AONB are constrained by this designation and the impact of any new peripheral residential development would need to be carefully considered and based on identified local need. For settlements that are partly constrained by the AONB designation, consideration should be given to whether suitable sites are available outside this designation and if unavailable, growth should be based upon locally identified needs.

#### Phasing

8.55 The release of sites could be controlled in order to ensure that existing public infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate them. In some instances it may be appropriate for phasing any development if there are identified infrastructure requirements that need to be in place prior to the commencement of development. It may also be the case that development proposals in the villages have received recent planning approval or are currently underway, such as Mackie Avenue in Hassocks. The impact of such development on the infrastructure within villages will be evident once the dwellings are occupied and a requirement for any additional facilities could be more fully investigated once the developments are occupied and had an opportunity to establish. Several factors need to be taken into account within the phasing of development, including:

- Site clearance;
- Minimising disruption to local residents and businesses;
- Health and safety;
- Road and car parking needs;
- Water and sewage infrastructure;
- Healthcare and community services;
- Formal recreation space;
- Schools;
- Utilities and other service provision; and
- Highways and transport infrastructure provision.

The Council's Local Development Scheme sets out that the preparation for a Rural Areas Development Plan Document (DPD) will begin in mid 2010 and adoption of this document is expected by mid 2013. This DPD will allocate sites for development in the rural areas on the basis of the evidence and settlement hierarchy that will be complete in the final Rural Issues Background Paper. It is therefore considered that phasing development in the rural areas would not be required across the board as the adoption date will already be part of the way through the Core Strategy timetable. It may be appropriate however that development in some villages is phased to enable existing allocations to be delivered in the Small Scale Housing Development Plan Document, and in Lindfield if the option for a strategic allocation is progressed.

The analysis and considerations above have been taken into account. The following section details the proposed growth potential categories.

## 9 Proposed growth potential categories

### 9.1 Villages with growth potential

The following criteria have been developed to indicate which villages are suitable to potentially accommodate growth:

- (a) The settlement must be a Local Service Centre.
- (b) The settlement must have a peak hour public transport service to significant employment opportunities<sup>49</sup> and a frequent public transport service to the nearest town<sup>50</sup>.
- (c) The settlement must be suitable for allocation(s) for development (infill/redevelopment/peripheral growth) totalling at least 100 dwellings according to the policy criteria contained within the emerging Core Strategy including being suitable for the provision of necessary infrastructure requirements such as schools, sewerage, health, leisure and subject to landscape and environmental designations.
- (d) The settlement must have a built up area boundary.

**PLEASE NOTE: The environmental capacity of the villages listed will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (see paragraph 5.23). The housing needs of the villages will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (see paragraph 5.22). The results of the consultation will also be used to assess the infrastructure capacity/potential of these villages to accommodate growth before finalisation of the settlement strategy.**

**Question 5 – Are the criteria for establishing villages with growth potential correct? Should alternative or additional criteria be applied? Should there be a cap on the maximum level of development in the villages with growth potential? If so, how should this be defined?**

9.2 The growth potential of these villages equates to their capacity to accommodate at least 100 dwellings. This is taking into consideration the environmental constraints, designations accessibility and sustainability criteria that restrict opportunities for growth.

The settlements with growth potential have been identified as:

9.3 **Crawley Down** - The north west of the village is constrained by areas of woodland. The western edge of the village is constrained by the B2028 and areas of Ancient Woodland. The south-eastern side of the village is constrained by Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and Ancient Woodland. However, potential exists for development at Crawley Down although this is likely to be at the lower end of the scale. The Common Housing Register and the Parish Council both identify that Crawley Down exhibits significant affordable housing need, and it would take 5 years for those in need to be housed within the current affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. The Parish Council identified a particular requirement for starter family homes (as part of Worth Parish). Improvements to the transport infrastructure were also considered important.

---

<sup>49</sup> Bus service to nearest local town and/or railway station (at least an hourly service)

<sup>50</sup> At least a two-hourly service

- 9.4 **Cuckfield** – Cuckfield is constrained by the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north and partially on the western boundary with areas of Ancient Woodland. The southern boundary is marked by the church, allotments and Warden Park School. An element of phasing should be considered for any future development of Cuckfield to allow existing Local Plan and Small Scale Housing allocations to become established. The Common Housing Register highlights the need for affordable housing in Cuckfield, indicating that it would take 5.5 years for those in need to be housed with the current affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. A brief summary of the Housing Needs Survey undertaken by Cuckfield Parish Council can be found in Appendix 1. The issue of affordability was discussed at the recent Parish Meeting, and the need for starter homes and more elderly residents was highlighted.
- 9.5 **Hassocks and Keymer** – The north boundary of the village is partially constrained by a flood risk area, an existing Local Plan and Small Scale Housing allocation and it is considered that further development at this location would encourage coalescence with Burgess Hill. The eastern and southern boundaries are constrained by the proposed National Park boundary, patches of Ancient Woodland and a Flood Risk Area. The eastern boundary also abuts the District boundary with Lewes. The western boundary is constrained by the A273 and a recreation ground. It is also considered that development at this location would encourage coalescence with Hurstpierpoint. The area beyond the village boundary of Hassocks is significantly environmentally constrained, so it is considered that any significant development opportunities at Hassocks will be through infill and previously developed (brownfield) land allocations. At the follow up meeting with the Parish Council, the potential of a widespread village centre redevelopment including the creation of a village square and new library facilities was discussed. Hassocks has also recently seen the commencement of development at the Mackie Avenue site and in addition it has significant outstanding housing allocations and therefore an element of phasing should be considered for future development. The Common Housing Register identifies a significant need for affordable housing at Hassocks with 126 households on the register that would take 4 years to accommodate given the current affordable housing stock and current vacancy rates. The Parish Council recognises this need and consider the possibility of a higher proportion of affordable housing on developments meeting the affordable housing threshold may be necessary.
- 9.6 **Hurstpierpoint** – The northern boundary of Hurstpierpoint is constrained by areas of Ancient Woodland. The eastern boundary does not have any national designations but it is considered that development at this location could contribute to the coalescence with Hassocks. The southern boundary is largely constrained by the proposed National Park boundary. The Local Plan allocation at Orchard Way is nearing completion but it is considered that it may be necessary to allow for an element of phasing allowing this development to become established. There is fairly significant affordable housing need in the Parish as identified in the Common Housing Register with 82 households identified as being in need register that would take 3 years to accommodate given the current affordable housing stock and current vacancy rates. The affordability of housing in the village was also an issue discussed at the recent Parish meeting. The Parish Council considers that improvements to the transport infrastructure will be required if any further development is to take place in the village. The Parish Council also highlighted the importance of close and meaningful partnership working to enable development of a layout, design and scale that is in keeping with the character of the village.
- 9.7 **Lindfield** – The south-western boundary of Lindfield adjoins the town of Haywards Heath. There are patches of Ancient Woodland beyond the northern boundary of the village. The Pre-submission Core Strategy proposes a strategic development option on the edge of the eastern built up area of Lindfield / Haywards Heath and a rural allocation for housing in Lindfield would be dependent upon whether the strategic development at this location comes forward. There is a significant need for affordable housing as identified in the Common

Housing Register with 97 households identified as being in need register that would take 6 years to accommodate given the current affordable housing stock and current vacancy rates. The Parish Council considers that there is a particular need for starter family homes and that any allocation would need to be carefully balanced to ensure that it was on a scale suitable to meet the needs of the local community and character of the existing settlement.

## 9.8 Villages with intermediate growth potential

The settlements under this category have been identified as having intermediate growth potential and may consist of Local or Limited Local Service Centres. Accessibility is an important requirement for these settlements to be classified as suitable for intermediate growth as it may be relied upon to access services not immediately available in the settlements.

The following criteria have been developed to indicate which villages are suitable to potentially accommodate intermediate levels of growth:

- (a) The settlement must be a Local or Limited Local Service Centre
- (b) The settlement must have a peak weekday bus service to place of work or a public transport interchange (7-9 am) and a frequent bus service during the day.
- (c) The settlement must be suitable for allocation(s) for development (infill/redevelopment/peripheral growth) totalling at least 30 dwellings and up to 100 dwellings according to the policy criteria contained within the emerging Core Strategy including being suitable for the provision of necessary infrastructure requirements such as schools, sewerage, health, leisure and subject to landscape and environmental designations.
- (d) The settlement must have a built up area boundary
- (e) Development at settlements within AONB will be limited to that necessary to meet local need

**PLEASE NOTE: The environmental capacity of the villages listed will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (see paragraph 5.23). The housing needs of the villages will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (see paragraph 5.22). The results of the consultation will also be used to assess the infrastructure capacity/potential of these villages to accommodate growth before finalisation of the settlement strategy.**

**Question 6 – Are the criteria for establishing villages with intermediate growth potential correct? Should alternative or additional criteria be applied?**

- 9.9 The growth potential of these villages equates to their capacity to accommodate at least 30 dwellings and up to a maximum of 100 dwellings. The level of growth at each village will take into consideration the environmental constraints, designations, accessibility and sustainability criteria.

The settlements with intermediate growth potential have been identified as:

- 9.10 **Albourne** –There is a significant affordable housing need in Albourne and the Common Housing Register shows that it would take approximately 10 years to meet the needs of those in affordable housing need within the current stock and vacancy rates. There is identified need for an improved community hall, which could be delivered through future development.

Albourne shares shops and services with Hurstpierpoint, and there could be scope for a retail element in a development of this size to allow the village to become more self-sufficient. The village is not constrained by any national designations, which suggests that it has potential to accommodate a level of development closer to the higher end of the scale.

- 9.11 **Ashurst Wood** – Ashurst Wood is defined as a local service centre but is wholly within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and development will therefore be restricted to local needs. The village is also constrained by the areas of Ancient Woodland surrounding the village and the District boundary to the north. Ashurst Wood has a significant affordable housing need as identified in the Common Housing Register and it would take approximately 11 years for those in need to be accommodated with the existing stock at current vacancy rates. A brief summary of the Housing Needs Survey undertaken by Ashurst Wood Parish Council can be found in Appendix 1. Despite these high levels of need, due to the environmental constraints, it is likely that the level of development at Ashurst Wood would be at the lower end of the scale.
- 9.12 **Balcombe** – Balcombe is wholly within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and development will therefore be restricted to local needs. The village is also constrained by areas of woodland and Ancient Woodland surrounding the village. The Common Housing Register indicates a significant affordable housing need and that it would take seven years to house those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. Despite these high levels of need, due to the environmental constraints, it is likely that the level of development would be at the lower end of the scale.
- 9.13 **Copthorne** – Meets all the criteria for having growth potential but has many environmental constraints to development. Its northern boundary marks the District boundary with Tandridge. To the south it is constrained by the A264. The western boundary is constrained by large areas of flood risk, which extend into the existing built up area boundary. There are also large tracts of woodland including areas of Ancient Woodland. The eastern side is constrained by common land and road infrastructure and the south-eastern section has SNCI designations. The Common Housing Register identifies that it would take 9 years to house those in need within the existing affordable housing stock of 69 dwellings. The Parish Council also identifies a requirement for starter family homes (as part of Worth Parish). Despite these high levels of need, due to the environmental constraints, it is likely that the level of development at Copthorne would be at the lower end of the scale.
- 9.14 **Handcross** – Handcross meets all the criteria for growth potential although public transport services are limited. The village is constrained due to its location wholly within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty together with patches of woodland and Ancient Woodland surrounding the village. Handcross is also constrained by the A23, which bisects the village into two main sections from north to south and abuts the western edge of the village. Slaugham Parish Council suggested a number of development options for Handcross in particular to provide affordable housing and to facilitate the development of a new village hall and sports pavilion and identified that employment floorspace could be considered as part of one of these options. Given the support of the Parish Council and the need for affordable housing, it is likely that development at this location would be from the mid to the higher end of the scale. The Common Housing Register identifies that it would take 3.5 years to house those in need with the existing affordable housing stock of 109 dwellings. The Parish Council identified a requirement for mixed types of housing to meet a variety of housing needs in the village.
- 9.15 **Sayers Common** – Sayers Common has an area of Ancient Woodland to the south east of the village, and the A23 runs parallel on the eastern side. The village has a fairly high level of affordable housing need and the Common Housing Register shows that it would take approximately 3 years to meet the affordable housing need with the current stock and vacancy rates. There is also an identified need for a replacement community hall, which

could be delivered through future development. The village meets all the criteria for growth potential although it does share some of its services with Albourne and Hurstpierpoint. Although it is partly constrained by Ancient Woodland, the village does not have any other national designations, which suggests that it has potential to accommodate a level of development closer to the higher end of the scale. In addition, future development could generate sufficient demand for a local shop to become a viable proposition to create a more distinct village centre and allow the village to become more self-sufficient.

9.16 **Turners Hill** – The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty adjoins the southern part of the village while the northern part of the village is not constrained by national designations. The Common Housing Register identifies that it would take 4.5 years to house all those in need with the current stock and vacancy rates. The Parish Council identified a number of options for the development of Turners Hill to meet these and other identified needs which suggests that the village could accommodate development around the mid to higher end of the scale.

#### 9.17 Villages with limited growth potential

The settlements under this category have been identified as having limited growth potential. Where an identified need for growth has been identified, the criteria allows for the inclusion of settlements that would otherwise not meet all the requirements. This is to facilitate the supporting of rural services in line with Government guidance as set out in PPS7. These needs have been identified through meetings with the Parish Councils and a review of Parish Plans, Housing Needs Surveys and the Common Housing Needs Register.

The following criteria have been developed to indicate which villages are suitable to potentially accommodate limited growth:

- a) The settlement must be a Limited Local Service Centre
- b) The settlement must have a frequent public transport service to a nearby town or local service centre unless there is an overriding locally identified need for an allocation of housing to address these needs and support key local services and facilities.
- c) The settlement must be suitable for allocation(s) (infill/redevelopment/peripheral growth) for development totalling from 15 to 30 dwellings according to the policy criteria contained within the emerging Core Strategy including being suitable for the provision of necessary infrastructure requirements such as schools, sewerage, health, leisure and subject to landscape and environmental designations.
- d) The settlement must have a built up area boundary

**PLEASE NOTE: The environmental capacity of the villages listed will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (see paragraph 5.23). The housing needs of the villages will be further informed by the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (see paragraph 5.22). The results of the consultation will also be used to assess the infrastructure capacity/potential of these villages to accommodate growth before finalisation of the settlement strategy.**

**Question 7 – Are the criteria for establishing villages with restricted growth potential correct? Should alternative or additional criteria be applied?**

9.18 The growth potential of these villages equates to their capacity to accommodate at least 15 dwellings and up to a maximum of 30 dwellings. The level of growth at each village will take into consideration the environmental constraints, designations, accessibility and sustainability criteria.

The settlements with limited growth potential have been identified as:

9.19 **Ardingly** - The village is constrained due to its location wholly within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and development will therefore be restricted to local needs. In addition, there are patches of Ancient Woodland surrounding the village and the South of England Showground constrains development to the north. The Common Housing Register indicates that it would take 7.5 years to house all those in need with the existing affordable housing stock and taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. The village does not have a peak hour bus service, but meets all the identified criteria and does exhibit significant need for affordable housing. The Housing Needs Survey undertaken by Ardingly Parish Council can be found in Appendix 1. Given these high levels of need, it is considered that the village could accommodate a level of growth towards the higher end of the scale.

9.20 **Bolney** – The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty constrains the northern and north-eastern boundaries of the village. The A23 runs to the east of the village. The Common Housing Register indicates that there is a significant housing need in Bolney. While Bolney has poor transport links and fairly limited services, the Common Housing Register indicates that it would take 7.5 years to house all those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. The Parish Council have identified that this need is particularly required for young families and the elderly. It is therefore proposed that the village could accommodate a level of growth to the higher end of the scale.

9.21 **Horsted Keynes** – Horsted Keynes is wholly constrained by the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas of Ancient Woodland. Horsted Keynes has poor transport links and fairly limited services. The Common Housing Register indicates that it would take 2.5 years to house all those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. A brief summary of the Housing Needs Survey undertaken by Horsted Keynes Parish Council can be found in Appendix 1. The Parish Council have identified that this need is particularly required for young families and the elderly.

9.22 **Pease Pottage** – The southern part of the village is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and constrains the southern, and part of the western boundary together with areas of Ancient Woodland. The land to the north of, but not adjacent to the built up area boundary, is also within the AONB and further constrained by an area of Ancient Woodland. The Common Housing Register indicates a very high level of demand for affordable housing, but this does not include the affordable housing element of the development of the Local Plan allocation at Hemsleys Nursery.

9.23 **Sharpthorne** - Sharpthorne is wholly constrained by the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas of Ancient Woodland. The Common Housing Register indicates that it would take 4 years to house all those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates. The Parish Council considers that this need is particularly required as small family homes and elderly persons housing.

9.24 **West Hoathly** - West Hoathly is wholly constrained by the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas of Ancient Woodland. The village does not have a peak weekday bus service but meets all the identified criteria. The Common Housing Register indicates that the village has a high level of housing need and it would take 13 years to house all those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy

rates. The Parish Council considers that this need is particularly required as small family homes and elderly persons housing.

9.25 **Scaynes Hill** – The village is significantly constrained by Ancient Woodland to the northwest and south of the built up area boundary. There is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance to the north of the village and the housing need is comparatively low. The Common Housing Register indicates that it would take 1 year to house all those in need within the existing affordable housing stock taking in to consideration current vacancy rates.

#### 9.26 **Villages with restricted growth potential**

The settlements within this category have been identified as having little potential for development and do not meet the criteria for growth potential. Schemes should be limited to rural exception sites to meet local needs.

Settlements within this category are:

9.27 **Ansty** – Ansty is classified as a Limited Local Service Centre but has very restricted public transport. The Common Housing Register has not identified any need for affordable housing within Ansty although a Housing Needs Survey undertaken by the Parish Council in 2005 highlighted that respondents felt a need for affordable housing in the parish. The Parish Council is aware that there are restricted development options for the village.

9.28 **Staplefield** – Staplefield is classified as a Limited Local Service Centre but does not have a built up area boundary and is wholly within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Common Housing Register has not identified any need for affordable housing within Staplefield although a Housing Needs Survey undertaken by the Parish Council in 2005 highlighted that respondents felt there is a need for affordable housing in the parish.

9.29 None of the following villages within this category meet the criteria for growth potential. Many of the villages have little or no public transport and very few services or shared services.

**Fulking**

**Newtimber**

**Poynings**

**Pyecombe**

**Slaugham**

**Twineham**

**Warninglid**

9.30 This Paper suggests that the Locational Principles for New Homes as set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is amended to reflect the findings of this Paper with an additional Category to the proposed settlement hierarchy. The additional category details the villages that require growth to meet both their needs and to support and possibly enhance their service centre role to support the surrounding communities. The proposed amended settlement hierarchy is reproduced below:

**Category 1 (Preferred location for major housing development to meet regional targets and the needs of the town and surrounding villages)**

**Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath**

**Category 2 (Location for housing development to meet the needs of the larger individual villages and surrounding communities, and to contribute to meeting regional targets)**

**Crawley Down, Cuckfield, Hassocks and Keymer, Hurstpierpoint, Lindfield (Lindfield subject to Strategic Development allocation)**

**Category 3 (Location for housing development to meet the needs of the individual villages and surrounding communities)**

**Albourne, Ashurst Wood, Balcombe, Copthorne, Handcross, Sayers Common, Turners Hill**

**Category 4 (Location for housing development to meet the needs of the individual villages and rural hinterland)**

**Ardingly, Bolney, Horsted Keynes, Pease Pottage, Sharpthorne, West Hoathly, Scaynes Hill,**

**Category 5 (Housing development only permitted in exceptional circumstances)**

**Fulking, Newtimber, Poynings, Pyecombe, Slaugham, Twineham, Warninglid**

## 10 Retail

- 10.1 The Core Strategy sets out a hierarchical approach to retail development within the District over the plan period setting out that the preferred location for retail development is within the town centres of the three main towns. In the rural areas, the Strategy proposes that the larger villages (acting as Local Service Centres) should provide necessary retail development to meet the needs of both the village and their surrounding communities and that the smaller villages provide retail development limited to meet the individual needs of the village and surrounding rural hinterland.
- 10.2 In looking at retaining development within the rural areas, it is recognised that there will always be a reliance on the towns to meet main food shopping needs and comparison goods shopping that the most rural areas simply cannot provide and that any further retail development should be concerned with meeting the everyday needs of the villages and surrounding rural hinterland to support the District's rural economy and promote self-sufficiency and more sustainable patterns of living.

### Local service centres

- 10.3 The recently completed Mid Sussex Retail Study recognised Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint as the principal village centres within the District, providing access to local facilities and 'everyday' requirements for their own village and surrounding area. The Study recommended that the vitality and viability of Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint should be maintained over the forthcoming LDF period and although there was no need to plan for new development (up to 2016) at these locations, a reinforcement of Policy S7 of the Local Plan (2004) which seeks to maintain the range and availability of local shopping facilities should be undertaken. At the Parish follow up meetings, Hassocks Parish Council identified that the village centre would benefit from the creation of a village square to enhance both its attractiveness and vitality and to provide an area for farmer's market and public events. In addition, the Parish Council identified the redevelopment of the station as having potential for a mixed-use development including a residential, employment and retail. The possibility of allocating these areas for future development including retail uses will be a complex issue but merits further exploration.
- 10.4 Cuckfield and Lindfield have distinctive retail areas and a wide range of retail facilities that are classed by the Background Paper as Local Service Centres and seem to be meeting the needs of local people and surrounding communities although both have suffered from some closures in recent times. Neither Parish Council has identified the requirement for further retail facilities within the respective villages and the retention of day-to-day services such as grocery stores received particular support from Lindfield Parish Council. It is therefore proposed that a similar 'maintain and protect' approach as for Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint should be employed. The Background Paper proposes that Cuckfield and Lindfield are both suitable for levels growth of at least 100 dwellings over the plan period (Lindfield is subject to the strategic development proposals within the Pre-Submission Core Strategy) and that this level of development should help to maintain these services and facilities together with a reinforced protection policy. Importantly, both Parish Councils highlighted the possibility of improving existing parking arrangements to help support the shops.
- 10.5 Crawley Down and Copthorne have a relatively good range of retail facilities and are classed by the Background Paper as Local Service Centres. The Core Strategy proposes that further retail development should be encouraged at these settlements. The Background Paper proposes that both settlements are suitable for higher levels of growth (at least 100 dwellings at Crawley Down and up to 100 dwellings at Copthorne over the plan period) and that given this level of growth (including existing commitments at Crawley Down), and the size of both of these settlements, there is scope for the retail facilities to be

improved. However, it is recognised that the provision of suitable sites to accommodate further retail growth within the village centres is limited and that this is an issue that will require further exploration.

- 10.6 Ashurst Wood is classed as a Local Service Centre and has a relatively good range of services and facilities. It is not proposed to allocate a significant amount of development at this settlement due to its location within the High Weald AONB and whilst supporting existing facilities it is unlikely that the level of allocation proposed will generate the need for further retail facilities.
- 10.7 Handcross acts as a Local Service Centre and has a relatively good range of retail facilities and is supported by a good level of passing trade. The Parish Council did not identify the loss of retail facilities as a particular issue and instead highlighted the need for a decent provision of car parking to support the shops by providing a convenient and safe facility for passing trade. The Background Paper does not propose a significant amount of development at this settlement due to its location within the High Weald AONB and whilst supporting existing facilities it is unlikely that the level of allocation proposed will generate the need for further services on top of the good range already provided.

#### Other villages

- 10.8 Albourne is classed as a Limited Local Service Centre as a result of community and pre-school/ school facilities although it shares retail services with nearby Hurstpierpoint. The Background Paper proposes a fairly significant amount of development at Albourne over the plan period and this presents the opportunity to consider the provision of a retail facility (such as a convenience store) as part of this development or elsewhere at the village to improve access to retail services and strengthen the role that Albourne presents as a Limited Local Service Centre.
- 10.9 Sayers Common is classed as a Limited Local Service Centre as a result of its community facilities although it shares retail services with Hurstpierpoint and schooling facilities with nearby Albourne. The Background Paper proposes a fairly significant amount of development at Sayers Common over the plan period and this presents the opportunity to consider the provision of a retail facility (such as a convenience store) as part of this development or elsewhere in the village to improve access to retail services and strengthen the role that Sayers Common presents as a Limited Local Service Centre.
- 10.10 Bolney is classed as a Limited Local Service Centre and has some retail facilities including a (restricted hours) post office but there is concern that in future years this could be lost. The Parish Council discussed the potential to incorporate a new shop into an allocated development (although the location in terms of its relationship with the village centre would need to be considered).
- 10.11 Scaynes Hill has limited retail facilities and the Parish Council has discussed the possibility of resurrecting the post office as an important hub of community life (although initial attempts at finding a venue is proving difficult).

#### Summary of other issues

- 10.12 During the series of follow up meetings with the Parish Councils, the need for further retail development was not widely considered as an identified need. However, car-parking facilities to support existing village facilities was a frequent issue. It was recognised by many of the Parish Councils that the villages rely on people who use the car to access them and that many of the villages rely on passing trade and that adequate facilities should exist that provide a safe and convenient facility and in some cases, as an alternative to using the town centres where parking is more readily available. However, it is also

recognised that finding suitable sites within close proximity to existing facilities is a particularly difficult issue. Ardingly, Balcombe, Slaugham, Horsted Keynes and Lindfield Parish Councils highlighted this need.

- 10.13 It is proposed that given the importance of retail services to the rural area, the Council should pursue to reinforce current Local Plan Policy S7 for the rural areas (reproduced below):

*“S7 In order to maintain the range and availability of local shopping facilities changes of use from Class A1 shop use to other uses will be resisted in the villages and in neighbourhood centres. In exceptional circumstances, where the retail use is shown to be no longer viable, a change of use to Class A2 financial and professional services, A3 food and drink use, B1a office use, medical use or residential use will be permitted providing that:*

- (a) it can be shown that the existing use is no longer viable*
- (b) adequate parking facilities are available*
- (c) the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the area”*

- 10.14 This Paper suggests that the Retail Hierarchy as set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is amended with an additional Category. The amended hierarchy reflects the role these settlements have as service centres and the additional category details the villages that retail development should be encouraged to meet the needs of the individual communities. The proposed amended retail hierarchy is reproduced below: This draft hierarchy will be further influenced by the analysis of the representations received on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.

**To have a policy that encourages the development of retail uses, taking account of the following retail hierarchy:**

**Category 1 (Preferred location for major retail uses to serve the town and surrounding villages)**

**Town centres of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath**

**Category 2 (Preferred location for retail uses to meet the needs of the larger individual communities and their surrounding communities)**

**Ashurst Wood, Copthorne, Crawley Down, Cuckfield, Handcross, Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint, Lindfield**

**Category 3 (Preferred location for retail uses to serve the needs of the individual villages and rural hinterland)**

**Albourne, Ansty, Ardingly, Balcombe, Bolney, Horsted Keynes, Sayers Common, Scaynes Hill, Sharpthorne, Staplefield, Turners Hill, West Hoathly**

**Category 4 (Location for retail uses to serve the needs of individual villages)**

**Fulking, Newtimber, Pease Pottage, Poynings, Pyecombe, Slaugham, Twineham, Warninglid**

**Question 8 – Do you agree with the proposals for retail development in the rural areas of the District? Do any settlements require retail development to meet local needs?**

## 11 Employment

- 11.1 An Employment Land Review has recently been completed to assess employment needs and floorspace requirements for the District up to 2026. The Review considered where and how this employment floorspace could be provided and recommended that the Council plan for the provision of up to 300,000 sq metres (gross) for the period 2004 – 2026; that best use of existing floorspace should be made, including in general the retention of existing employment sites; and through existing and additional employment land provision as part of strategic development / urban extension proposed through the Core Strategy.
- 11.2 The Employment Land Review outlines the importance of rural enterprise in the villages and rural area and the need to provide businesses a choice of locations and premises and allow indigenous businesses to grow and encourage inward investment. The Review highlighted a high level of ‘voiced demand’ for rural locations. The Review recognises the importance that this demand is directed to locations where the need can be accommodated in a sustainable manner without compromising the needs of businesses.
- 11.3 The Review recognises that the existing employment locations offer reasonable potential and applied a series of criteria to existing sites within the District to identify a portfolio of site for suitability for intensification/expansion to meet future requirements. This used a series of criteria, which consisted of access requirements, sustainable development criteria, market requirements and perceptions and site availability. Listed below are the details of the sites to meet future additional need for the more rural parts of the District. The Review recommended that all other rural sites identified should be retained, as they are suitable for continued employment use.

### Preferred sites to meet future additional need (within rural area)

- Hassocks Goods Yard
- Bolney Grange Industrial Estate
- Cross Post Industrial Estate, Bolney
- Lakeland Business Estate (nr. Pease Pottage)
- Nursery/ waste amenity site (nr. East Grinstead)
- Silverwood Industrial Estate (nr. Copthorne)

Extract from Employment Land Review (2005)

- 11.4 The Employment Land Review highlighted a shortfall of rural office floorspace (B1a and B1b uses) but stated that there is capacity for this to be provided on the urban fringe of settlements which may represent attractive opportunities for firms not wishing to locate within the District’s towns. The Review also identified a slight deficit in non-office requirements (B1c, B2, B8) but stated that this could too be accommodated within the opportunity areas on the fringe of the larger settlements.
- 11.5 Whilst the Review did not highlight the need for the allocation of further employment sites in the rural area it highlights the need for flexibility and choice in the provision of employment opportunities in the rural area. The Core Strategy suggests a policy that supports new business development within built up areas where compatible with adjoining uses and outside of the settlements where such development requires a rural location, or re-uses an existing previously developed site or rural buildings and supports the sustainability of the rural area.
- 11.6 As stated in paragraph 8.41, there was general support from the Parish Councils for live/work units in the rural areas as a substitute for providing land for formal employment floorspace and that working from home was relatively popular in the rural settlements which

was attributed to the improvements to technology and broadband coverage in the rural areas. The need for a proportion of new village developments to include live/work units was expressed by a number of the Parish Councils. Information from the 2001 Census indicates that the rural areas have a higher proportion of 'work at home' than their urban counterparts and this seems to be a growing trend with 'one person' office based and trade businesses.

- 11.7 There is general support from the Parish Councils for the conversion of unused agricultural buildings for employment use to support and enable the rural economy to diversify, provide opportunities for the employment of local people and relieve pressure for employment floorspace in small settlements where suitable premises are uncommon. There was also general support for the protection of existing rural business sites, particularly from residential development pressures, that provide local employment and self-sufficiency and help prevent villages from becoming commuter dormitories for urban areas.
- 11.8 Slaugham Council discussed the possibility of a future employment allocation site as part of a future residential development scheme to help encourage local employment. Ashurstwood Parish Council expressed the need for the retention of and investment at the Ivy Dene Industrial Estate. Bolney Parish Council expressed the need for existing employment opportunities to be retained with intensification and expansion of the Bolney Grange Industrial Estate.

**Question 9 – Do you agree with the Council’s approach to employment provision in the rural area? What alternative approach could be used?**

# APPENDICES

## **Appendix 1 - Affordable Housing and rural exception sites**

Rural exception sites are a mechanism by which delivery of affordable housing is enabled in rural communities that would not normally deliver housing development due to the presumption against development by countryside designations. Exception sites should seek to address the needs of the local community by remaining affordable for local people in perpetuity, and enabling local residents and those with a local connection to remain in the community, together with ensuring that rural areas continue to develop as sustainable, mixed, inclusive communities. Some exception sites have come forward for development the District, however, traditionally they have been difficult as their delivery relies on a benevolent landowner who is prepared to sell land at agricultural value for affordable housing.

The current method of allocating affordable housing is on the basis of those on the Common Housing Register who have applied for affordable housing. The priority accorded to those on the list is established through the allocation scheme, which awards points according to the applicants' housing need. The current system does not take account of local housing need with specific regard to local connections with the district. A review of the current allocations policy is underway in order for priority to be afforded to those with a local connection. Local connection is defined by four criteria, that the applicant:

- i) has resided in the district as their only principle home for at least 6 months of the last 12 months;
- ii) has resided in the district as their only principle home for a period of at least 3 years in aggregate out of the preceding five years;
- iii) has permanent paid employment (or a confirmed offer of such) in the District;
- iv) has close relatives who reside in the District as their only principle home and have done so for at least the previous five years.

The Local Authority and Housing Association have the mechanism to enter into a Local Lettings Agreement which can enable affordable houses to be allocated in perpetuity for households who have a housing need who meet local residence criteria. This is usually applied to rural exception sites, however it can be utilised for other affordable housing development. A change to the allocation of affordable housing in Mid Sussex is currently underway. Whereby in new developments, priority is given to residents with identified housing need with demonstrable local connection. This applies to the first allocation only and thereafter allocation would be on the basis of the Common Housing Register for residents across the District.

A countywide Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently underway (see paragraph 5.22) and from the results of this it may be possible to gain information at ward or parish level. If this is the case it may be possible to prioritise the allocation affordable housing to those with a local parish or ward connection. For rural exception schemes Housing Needs Surveys of all residents in the appropriate village are undertaken. Mid Sussex currently has only partial coverage of housing need by parish.

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) (Annex B) provides the following definitions of affordable housing:

*“Affordable housing:*

*‘Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should:*

- *Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices.*
- *Include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision’.*

*Social rented housing is:*

*'Rented housing owned and managed by local authorities and registered social landlords, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. The proposals set out in the Three Year Review of Rent Restructuring (July 2004) were implemented as policy in April 2006. It may also include rented housing owned or managed by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Housing Corporation as a condition of grant.'*

*Intermediate affordable housing is:*

*'Housing at prices and rents above those of social rent, but below market price or rents, and which meet the criteria set out above. These can include shared equity products (e.g. HomeBuy), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent.'* ”

### Housing Needs Surveys

A brief summary of the results of the Housing Needs Surveys that have been undertaken can be found below.

#### Ashurst Wood:(July 2007)

68.9% in favour of a small development of affordable housing if there was a proven need.

18 households in need of affordable housing

13 households in other housing need

Sites are currently being identified and investigated.

#### Horsted Keynes (March 2008)

81% in favour of a small development of affordable housing if there was a proven need.

20 households in need of affordable housing.

13 households in other housing need.

#### Cuckfield:(June 2007)

71% in favour of a small development of affordable housing if there was a proven need.

21 households in need of affordable housing.

19 households in other housing need.

#### Ardingly:(March 2007):

63.5% in favour of a small development of affordable housing if there was a proven need.

18 households in need of affordable housing (11 who wish to stay in district).

#### Worth.

Worth Parish Council has not undertaken a Housing Needs Survey but the Parish Council agree that there was a substantial need from the Common Housing Register so it was not necessary. Sites in Crawley Down and Copthorne are being investigated.

#### Fulking and Bolney

Fulking and Bolney have shown interest in Housing Needs Survey and this will be followed up.

## Appendix 2 – Population estimates

**Table 2 - Settlement population estimates (2001)**

| <b>Settlement Name</b>     | <b>Estimated Population</b> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hassocks                   | 6,820                       |
| Lindfield                  | 5,395                       |
| Hurstpierpoint             | 4,900                       |
| Crawley Down               | 4,660                       |
| Copthorne                  | 3,620                       |
| Cuckfield                  | 3,270                       |
| Turners Hill <sup>51</sup> | 1,850                       |
| Ardingly                   | 1,835                       |
| Ashurst Wood               | 1,770                       |
| Balcombe                   | 1,765                       |
| Horsted Keynes             | 1,500                       |
| Bolney                     | 1,210                       |
| Handcross                  | 1,070                       |
| Scaynes Hill               | 1,030                       |
| Sayers Common              | 770                         |
| Sharpthorne                | 750                         |
| West Hoathly               | 725                         |
| Albourne                   | 600                         |
| Staplefield                | 375                         |
| Pease Pottage              | 310                         |
| Slaugham                   | 310                         |
| Ansty                      | 300                         |
| Poynings                   | 285                         |
| Twineham                   | 270                         |
| Fulking                    | 250                         |
| Warninglid                 | 230                         |
| Pyecombe                   | 200                         |
| Newtimber                  | 93                          |
|                            |                             |

Source: 2001 Census

Table 2 demonstrates the wide variation and a grouping of population size of the District's rural settlements, with a small number of villages with a relatively large population (3,000+ persons), a similar number between 1,000 and less than 3,000 persons and a larger number of settlements below 1,000 persons. Unsurprisingly, the villages with the larger populations tend to have a wider range of services and facilities.

---

<sup>51</sup> Including Turners Hill Park and Worth Abbey area

## **Appendix 3 – Travel to work data**

**Table 3 - Distance travelled to work**

|                      | % work mainly at home | % work within 2km of home | % work within 5km of home | % work at or within 5km of home | % work 5km+ from home |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Albourne             | 17.1%                 | 7.3%                      | 21.0%                     | 38.1%                           | 61.9%                 |
| Ansty                | 23.1%                 | 6.8%                      | 21.1%                     | 44.2%                           | 55.8%                 |
| Ardingly             | 14.7%                 | 16.4%                     | 26.0%                     | 40.6%                           | 59.4%                 |
| Ashurst Wood         | 11.6%                 | 18.9%                     | 33.8%                     | 45.3%                           | 54.7%                 |
| Balcombe             | 14.1%                 | 10.0%                     | 15.2%                     | 29.4%                           | 70.6%                 |
| Bolney               | 19.0%                 | 7.8%                      | 14.5%                     | 30.5%                           | 69.5%                 |
| Copthorne            | 10.3%                 | 10.4%                     | 37.0%                     | 47.4%                           | 52.6%                 |
| Crawley Down         | 11.0%                 | 6.9%                      | 20.8%                     | 31.9%                           | 68.1%                 |
| Cuckfield            | 15.1%                 | 11.0%                     | 25.7%                     | 40.9%                           | 59.1%                 |
| Fulking              | 18.2%                 | 6.6%                      | 10.2%                     | 28.5%                           | 71.5%                 |
| Handcross            | 10.5%                 | 13.9%                     | 19.6%                     | 30.1%                           | 69.9%                 |
| Hassocks             | 11.0%                 | 12.1%                     | 28.4%                     | 39.4%                           | 60.6%                 |
| Horsted Keynes       | 15.1%                 | 9.0%                      | 15.7%                     | 30.9%                           | 69.1%                 |
| Hurstpierpoint       | 13.4%                 | 11.5%                     | 22.6%                     | 36.0%                           | 64.0%                 |
| Lindfield            | 12.2%                 | 21.3%                     | 33.1%                     | 45.4%                           | 54.6%                 |
| Pease Pottage        | 8.5%                  | 6.0%                      | 18.0%                     | 26.5%                           | 73.5%                 |
| Poynings             | 21.7%                 | 6.6%                      | 9.9%                      | 31.6%                           | 68.4%                 |
| Pyecombe             | 22.9%                 | 6.3%                      | 16.7%                     | 39.6%                           | 60.4%                 |
| Sayers Common        | 14.1%                 | 7.4%                      | 17.7%                     | 31.9%                           | 68.1%                 |
| Scaynes Hill         | 11.4%                 | 7.1%                      | 31.5%                     | 42.9%                           | 57.1%                 |
| Sharpthorne          | 11.4%                 | 9.9%                      | 12.9%                     | 24.3%                           | 75.7%                 |
| Slaugham             | 21.5%                 | 15.4%                     | 18.1%                     | 39.6%                           | 60.4%                 |
| Staplefield          | 19.4%                 | 18.7%                     | 25.2%                     | 44.5%                           | 55.5%                 |
| Turners Hill         | 14.3%                 | 15.3%                     | 23.7%                     | 38.0%                           | 62.0%                 |
| Twineham             | 23.4%                 | 7.3%                      | 9.5%                      | 32.8%                           | 67.2%                 |
| Warninglid           | 24.5%                 | 0.0%                      | 2.7%                      | 27.3%                           | 72.7%                 |
| West Hoathly         | 14.4%                 | 12.4%                     | 17.2%                     | 31.6%                           | 68.4%                 |
| Burgess Hill         | 8.8%                  | 24.4%                     | 36.1%                     | 44.9%                           | 55.1%                 |
| Haywards Heath       | 9.2%                  | 27.8%                     | 35.6%                     | 44.8%                           | 55.2%                 |
| East Grinstead       | 9.5%                  | 28.6%                     | 36.6%                     | 46.1%                           | 53.9%                 |
| District mean figure | 10.8%                 | 20.7%                     | 31.6%                     | 42.4%                           | 57.6%                 |
| "Rural" mean figure  | 13.2%                 | 12.0%                     | 25.1%                     | 38.3%                           | 61.7%                 |
| "Town" mean figure   | 9.1%                  | 26.7%                     | 36.1%                     | 45.3%                           | 54.7%                 |

This table gives an indication of the distances travelled by those who commute to work in the District. A mean figure for the entire district and the rural area and towns is included to allow comparison.

Source: Census 2001<sup>52</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Data is based on Super Output Areas to "best fit" settlement boundaries but may include parts of the surrounding area

**Table 4 - Method used to travel to work**

This table breaks down the main method used by those who commute to work in the rural areas of the District. The towns are included to allow comparison between the urban and rural areas.

| Location              | Train | Bus /<br>Minibus<br>/ Coach | Taxi | Car-<br>driver | Car-<br>pass'gr | M'trcycle | Bicycle | On foot | Other |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------------|------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------|-------|
| Ardingly and Balcombe | 9.3%  | 1.0%                        | 0.4% | 72.1%          | 4.3%            | 1.5%      | 1.3%    | 9.4%    | 0.7%  |
| Ashurstwood           | 7.3%  | 3.2%                        | 0.7% | 73.0%          | 5.4%            | 1.2%      | 0.9%    | 6.9%    | 1.3%  |
| Bolney                | 9.4%  | 1.3%                        | 0.0% | 73.8%          | 4.1%            | 2.1%      | 1.6%    | 6.8%    | 0.8%  |
| Burgess Hill          | 11.7% | 1.9%                        | 0.4% | 66.2%          | 6.0%            | 0.7%      | 2.5%    | 10.1%   | 0.5%  |
| Copthorne & Worth     | 6.1%  | 1.9%                        | 0.3% | 74.9%          | 5.2%            | 1.0%      | 1.5%    | 8.0%    | 1.1%  |
| Crawley Down & T Hill | 6.0%  | 2.4%                        | 0.2% | 76.6%          | 6.6%            | 1.4%      | 1.2%    | 5.1%    | 0.5%  |
| Cuckfield             | 17.4% | 0.6%                        | 0.5% | 65.4%          | 5.2%            | 1.3%      | 1.3%    | 7.0%    | 1.3%  |
| East Grinstead        | 9.0%  | 1.0%                        | 0.6% | 66.1%          | 6.0%            | 0.7%      | 1.9%    | 14.3%   | 0.5%  |
| Hassocks              | 17.1% | 1.2%                        | 0.2% | 64.3%          | 5.3%            | 1.3%      | 2.1%    | 8.1%    | 0.5%  |
| Haywards Heath        | 17.9% | 1.6%                        | 0.5% | 56.5%          | 5.9%            | 0.7%      | 1.2%    | 15.0%   | 0.7%  |
| High Weald            | 11.1% | 1.2%                        | 0.4% | 70.0%          | 5.0%            | 1.4%      | 1.1%    | 8.6%    | 1.2%  |
| Hurst & Downs         | 8.7%  | 2.0%                        | 0.1% | 73.3%          | 5.6%            | 0.8%      | 1.7%    | 7.0%    | 0.7%  |
| Lindfield             | 18.7% | 1.2%                        | 0.2% | 62.3%          | 5.3%            | 0.8%      | 1.8%    | 9.2%    | 0.5%  |
|                       |       |                             |      |                |                 |           |         |         |       |
| District average      | 12.1% | 1.6%                        | 0.4% | 66.1%          | 5.7%            | 0.9%      | 1.7%    | 10.8%   | 0.6%  |
| "Rural" average       | 11.2% | 1.6%                        | 0.3% | 70.5%          | 5.3%            | 1.2%      | 1.5%    | 7.6%    | 0.8%  |
| "Town" average        | 12.7% | 1.5%                        | 0.5% | 63.3%          | 6.0%            | 0.7%      | 1.9%    | 12.9%   | 0.5%  |


## Appendix 4 – Demographic information

**Table 5 – Parish and town demographic information**

| Parish / town ward | Age structure / % of total population |        |         |         |         |         |       | Mean age of population |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|------------------------|
|                    | 0 - 4                                 | 5 - 15 | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65 - 74 | 75+   |                        |
| Albourne           | 7.8%                                  | 15.2%  | 6.3%    | 25.5%   | 31.0%   | 10.2%   | 4.0%  | 38.9                   |
| Ardingly           | 5.8%                                  | 20.4%  | 14.2%   | 24.1%   | 22.4%   | 7.1%    | 5.8%  | 35.1                   |
| Ashurst Wood       | 5.2%                                  | 19.2%  | 7.6%    | 24.8%   | 27.0%   | 8.7%    | 7.5%  | 39.5                   |
| Balcombe           | 4.5%                                  | 13.1%  | 8.0%    | 22.3%   | 27.9%   | 10.2%   | 14.0% | 44.7                   |
| Bolney             | 4.3%                                  | 19.4%  | 7.1%    | 23.8%   | 29.9%   | 10.4%   | 5.0%  | 39.7                   |
| Burgess Hill       | 6.8%                                  | 14.3%  | 9.6%    | 31.3%   | 23.9%   | 7.7%    | 6.5%  | 37.8                   |
| Cuckfield          | 6.8%                                  | 15.3%  | 7.7%    | 28.2%   | 25.2%   | 7.8%    | 8.8%  | 39.5                   |
| Cuckfield Rural    | 6.7%                                  | 16.2%  | 7.0%    | 24.5%   | 30.2%   | 7.9%    | 7.4%  | 40.0                   |
| East Grinstead     | 5.8%                                  | 14.4%  | 9.5%    | 28.3%   | 26.6%   | 7.7%    | 7.7%  | 39.2                   |
| Fulking            | 3.2%                                  | 12.0%  | 5.6%    | 27.2%   | 36.0%   | 8.4%    | 7.6%  | 42.9                   |
| Hassocks           | 4.5%                                  | 11.3%  | 7.5%    | 21.0%   | 29.1%   | 12.8%   | 13.8% | 46.3                   |
| Haywards Heath     | 6.0%                                  | 13.3%  | 9.5%    | 29.4%   | 25.2%   | 7.8%    | 8.8%  | 39.8                   |
| Horsted Keynes     | 5.2%                                  | 14.3%  | 8.3%    | 22.1%   | 31.3%   | 9.1%    | 9.8%  | 42.4                   |
| Hurst & Sayers C   | 6.5%                                  | 14.6%  | 8.7%    | 25.5%   | 26.6%   | 8.9%    | 9.2%  | 40.4                   |
| Lindfield          | 4.8%                                  | 12.2%  | 6.5%    | 21.2%   | 29.2%   | 12.1%   | 14.0% | 45.9                   |
| Lindfield Rural    | 5.0%                                  | 15.9%  | 9.6%    | 22.5%   | 30.5%   | 8.7%    | 7.9%  | 40.7                   |
| Newtimber          | 4.3%                                  | 12.9%  | 3.2%    | 37.6%   | 23.7%   | 8.6%    | 10.8% | 42.9                   |
| Poynings           | 8.4%                                  | 10.5%  | 8.4%    | 31.7%   | 31.4%   | 6.6%    | 3.1%  | 37.8                   |
| Pyecombe           | 7.0%                                  | 12.0%  | 6.0%    | 21.0%   | 32.0%   | 11.5%   | 10.5% | 41.9                   |
| Slaugham           | 5.4%                                  | 12.4%  | 7.9%    | 29.8%   | 25.7%   | 9.5%    | 9.3%  | 41.4                   |
| Turners Hill       | 3.6%                                  | 16.5%  | 14.0%   | 20.0%   | 25.6%   | 11.0%   | 9.2%  | 40.6                   |
| Twineham           | 6.3%                                  | 19.2%  | 6.6%    | 27.7%   | 31.0%   | 5.5%    | 3.7%  | 36.9                   |
| West Hoathly       | 5.8%                                  | 13.5%  | 9.1%    | 26.2%   | 30.6%   | 8.3%    | 6.5%  | 40.2                   |
| Worth              | 5.7%                                  | 15.2%  | 9.7%    | 27.1%   | 29.5%   | 7.8%    | 5.0%  | 38.5                   |
| Mid Sussex average | 5.9%                                  | 14.2%  | 9.2%    | 27.6%   | 26.5%   | 8.5%    | 8.2%  | 40.5                   |
| "Town" average     | 6.2%                                  | 14.0%  | 9.5%    | 29.8%   | 25.2%   | 7.7%    | 7.6%  | 38.9                   |
| "Rural" average    | 5.5%                                  | 14.5%  | 8.6%    | 24.5%   | 28.3%   | 9.5%    | 9.0%  | 40.8                   |
| West Sussex        | 5.6%                                  | 13.5%  | 9.1%    | 26.7%   | 24.8%   | 9.8%    | 10.5% | 41.4                   |
| South East         | 5.9%                                  | 14.0%  | 10.6%   | 28.8%   | 24.3%   | 8.4%    | 8.0%  | 39.1                   |
| England            | 6.0%                                  | 14.2%  | 10.9%   | 29.3%   | 23.8%   | 8.4%    | 7.5%  | 38.6                   |

Source: 2001 Census

**Table 6 – Average age structure comparison**



Source: 2001 Census

## Appendix 5 – Service Centre Classification Criteria

| Settlement name   | Classification | 5 Retail uses <sup>53</sup> | 1-4 Retail uses | Bank/ cash point | Convenience store | Post office | Public House | Village hall/ community centre | Place of worship | Good provision of recreational facilities <sup>54</sup> | Pre-school | Infant school | Primary school | Significant local employment opportunities within 5km | Health centre/GP facilities | Dispensary | Built up area boundary |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---|------------|---------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Albourne          | B              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             |              | ✓                              | ✓                |   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Ansty             | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   |            |               |                | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Ardingly          | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Ashurst Wood      | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Balcombe          | B              |                             | ✓               | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              |   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Bolney            | B              |                             | ✓               | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              |   | ✓                           |            | ✓                      |
| Copthorne         | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Crawley Down      | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Cuckfield         | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Fulking           | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                |   | ✓          |               |                |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Handcross         | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Hassocks & Keymer | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Horsted Keynes    | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   |            | ✓             | ✓              |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Hurst'pt          | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Lindfield         | A              | ✓                           |                 | ✓                | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   | ✓                           | ✓          | ✓                      |
| Newtimber         | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             |              |                                | ✓                |   |            |               |                |   |                             |            |                        |
| Pease Pottage     | C              |                             | ✓               | ✓                | ✓                 |             | ✓            |                                | ✓                | ✓   |            |               |                |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Poynings          | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          |               |                |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Pyecombe          | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            |                                | ✓                |   |            |               |                |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Sayers Common     | B              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   |            |               |                | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Scaynes Hill      | B              |                             |                 |                  | ✓                 |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Sharpthorne       | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                |   |            |               |                |   |                             |            | ✓                      |
| Slaugham          | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            |                                | ✓                |   |            |               |                |   |                             |            |                        |
| Staplefield       | B              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   |            | ✓             | ✓              | ✓   |                             |            |                        |
| Turners Hill      | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 | ✓           | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                | ✓   |            | ✓             | ✓              |   | ✓                           |            | ✓                      |
| Twineham          | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             |              |                                | ✓                |   |            | ✓             | ✓              |   |                             |            |                        |
| Warninglid        | C              |                             |                 |                  |                   |             | ✓            | ✓                              |                  |   |            | ✓             | ✓              |   | ✓                           |            | ✓                      |
| West Hoathly      | B              |                             | ✓               |                  | ✓                 |             | ✓            | ✓                              | ✓                |   | ✓          | ✓             | ✓              |   | ✓                           |            | ✓                      |

Key: A – Local Service Centre B – Limited Local Service Centre C - Unclassified

<sup>53</sup> Defined as 5 Class A1 units (excluding post offices) as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and its subsequent amendments unless there is a large equivalent retail unit.

<sup>54</sup> Defined as a fair provision of playing pitches (all types), tennis and/or multi-use courts

## **Appendix 6 – Sharing of services**

**Table 7 – Sharing of services - settlements within 5km threshold**

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Albourne            | Burgess Hill, Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint  |
| Ansty               | Cuckfield                               |
| Ardingly            | Balcombe, Lindfield                     |
| Ashurst Wood        | Forest Row, East Grinstead              |
| Balcombe            | Ardingly                                |
| Bolney              | Cuckfield                               |
| Copthorne           | Crawley, Crawley Down                   |
| Crawley Down        | Copthorne, East Grinstead               |
| Cuckfield           | Haywards Heath                          |
| Fulking             | Poynings                                |
| Handcross           | Pease Pottage                           |
| Hassocks and Keymer | Hurstpierpoint, Burgess Hill, Ditchling |
| Hickstead           | Albourne, Hurstpierpoint                |
| Horsted Keynes      | Danehill                                |
| Hurstpierpoint      | Hassocks, Burgess Hill                  |
| Lindfield           | Haywards Heath                          |
| Newtimber           | Fulking, Poynings, Pyecombe             |
| Pease Pottage       | Handcross, Crawley                      |
| Poynings            | Fulking                                 |
| Pyecombe            | Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint                |
| Sayers Common       | Hurstpierpoint                          |
| Scaynes Hill        | Haywards Heath, Lindfield               |
| Sharpthorne         | Turners Hill, West Hoathly              |
| Slaugham            | Handcross                               |
| Staplefield         | Handcross, Cuckfield                    |
| Turners Hill        | Crawley Down, Sharpthorne, West Hoathly |
| Twineham            | Bolney                                  |
| Warninglid          | Handcross                               |
| West Hoathly        | Sharpthorne, Turners Hill               |

## Appendix 7 – Village services

|                     | Allotments | Bank | Cash Machine <sup>1</sup> | Community Hall/ Centre | Convenience Store | Traffic free cycle Route to nearest town or local service centre | Dentist | Dispensary | Health centre/ doctors facility <sup>2</sup> | Library <sup>3</sup> | Significant local employment opportunities within 2km <sup>4</sup> | Significant local employment opportunities within 5km <sup>5</sup> | Petrol Station | Place of worship | Post Office | Public House | Rail Station    | School (nursery/ Pre-school) | School (Infants) | School (Primary) | School (Secondary) | Play area (all types) | Playing pitches (all types) | Sports Pavilion / changing facilities | Teenager areas | Tennis/ Multi courts | Peak hours public transport service to significant employment opportunity <sup>6</sup> | Frequent public transport service to towns / local service centres <sup>7</sup> |
|---------------------|------------|------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|---------|------------|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|---|
| Albourne            | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            |  |                      | ✓  |  | ✓              |                  |             |              |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    |                       |                             |                                       |                | ✓                    | ✓  |   |
| Ansty               |            |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  |                      | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              |                  |             | ✓            |                 |                              |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     |                |                      |  |   |
| Ardingly            |            |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  |                | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    |  | ✓   |
| Ashurst Wood        |            |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  |                | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Balcombe            | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  |  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            | ✓               | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Bolney              |            |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    |  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓ <sup>9</sup>   | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              |                      |  |   |
| Copthorne           | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Crawley Down        | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 | ✓  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Cuckfield           | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 | ✓  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Fulking             |            |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       |                |                      |  |   |
| Handcross           | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              |                      |  | ✓   |
| Hassocks and Keymer | ✓          | ✓    | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 | ✓  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |                 | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |
| Horsted Keynes      | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  | ✓                    |  |  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            | ✓ <sup>10</sup> |                              | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    |  | ✓   |

Notes: 1 – Some cash machines are located inside shops/pubs but essentially provide service if necessary during office hours. 2 – Includes outreach surgery services. 3 – Includes mobile service. 4/5 - Significant local employment opportunities for local resident population based on distance local people travel to work. Data based on 10% of residents travelling within 2km and 20% travelling within 5km of home to work. Figures are both based around the “rural average” (12% and 25% respectively) for Mid Sussex. Excludes work at home data. 6 – Based on travel to work data. Criteria based on peak time hourly service to nearest town and/ or railway station (at least an hourly service). 7 – Frequent public transport to nearest town and/or local service centre (at least 2 hourly service). 8 – Private Club that requires membership. 9 – Restricted opening hours. 10 – Station to north of village part of Bluebell Heritage Railway. Line currently used for leisure purposes but work underway to link up with East Grinstead.

|                | Allotments | Bank | Cash Machine <sup>1</sup> | Community Hall/ Centre | Convenience Store | Traffic free cycle Route to nearest town or local service centre | Dentist | Dispensary | Health centre/ doctors facility <sup>2</sup> | Library <sup>3</sup> | Significant local employment opportunities within 2km <sup>4</sup> | Significant local employment opportunities within 5km <sup>5</sup> | Petrol Station | Place of worship | Post Office | Public House | Rail Station | School (nursery/ Pre-school) | School (Infants) | School (Primary) | School (Secondary) | Play area (all types) | Playing pitches (all types) | Sports Pavilion / changing facilities | Teenager areas | Tennis/ Multi courts | Peak hours public transport service to significant employment opportunity <sup>6</sup> | Frequent public transport service to towns / local service centres <sup>7</sup> |  |
|----------------|------------|------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|---------|------------|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Hurstpierpoint | ✓          | ✓    | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |              | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |  |
| Lindfield      | ✓          |      | ✓                         | ✓                      | ✓                 |  | ✓       | ✓          | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  |                | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |              | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       |                | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |  |
| Newtimber      |            |      |                           |                        |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                |             |              |              |                              |                  |                  |                    |                       |                             |                                       |                |                      |  |   |  |
| Pease Pottage  |            |      | ✓                         |                        | ✓                 | ✓  |         |            |  | ✓                    |  |  | ✓              |                  |             | ✓            |              |                              |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       |                |                      |  | ✓   |  |
| Poynings       | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              | ✓                            |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              |                      |  |   |  |
| Pyecombe       |            |      |                           |                        |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              |                              |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     |                             |                                       | ✓              |                      | ✓  | ✓   |  |
| Sayers Common  |            |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              |                              |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       | ✓              |                      | ✓  | ✓   |  |
| Scaynes Hill   |            |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  | ✓                    |  | ✓  | ✓              | ✓                |             | ✓            |              | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              |                      |  | ✓   |  |
| Sharpthorne    | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            |  |                      | ✓  |  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              |                              |                  |                  |                    |                       |                             |                                       |                |                      |  | ✓   |  |
| Slaugham       |            |      |                           |                        |                   |  |         |            |  |                      | ✓  |  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              |                              |                  |                  |                    | ✓                     |                             |                                       |                |                      |  |   |  |
| Staplefield    |            |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            |  |                      | ✓  | ✓  |                | ✓                |             | ✓            |              |                              | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       |                |                      |  | ✓   |  |
| Turners Hill   | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓  |                | ✓                | ✓           | ✓            |              | ✓                            |                  | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              | ✓                    | ✓  | ✓   |  |
| Twineham       |            |      |                           |                        |                   |  |         |            |  |                      |  |  |                | ✓                |             |              |              |                              | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                                       |                |                      |  |   |  |
| Warninglid     | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      |                   |  |         |            | ✓  |                      |  |  |                |                  |             | ✓            |              |                              | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     |                |                      |  |   |  |
| West Hoathly   | ✓          |      |                           | ✓                      | ✓                 |  |         |            | ✓  | ✓                    | ✓  |  | ✓              | ✓                |             | ✓            |              | ✓                            | ✓                | ✓                |                    | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                                     | ✓              |                      |  | ✓   |  |

Notes: 1 – Some cash machines are located inside shops/pubs but essentially provide service if necessary during office hours. 2 – Includes outreach surgery services. 3 – Includes mobile service. 4/5 - Significant local employment opportunities for local resident population based on distance local people travel to work. Data based on 10% of residents travelling within 2km and 20% travelling within 5km of home to work. Figures are both based around the “rural average” (12% and 25% respectively) for Mid Sussex. Excludes work at home data. 6 – Based on travel to work data. Criteria based on peak time (7-9 am) hourly service to nearest town and/ or railway station (at least an hourly service). 7 – Frequent public transport to nearest town and/or local service centre (at least 2 hourly service).

## **Appendix 8 – Identified needs within the village**

The needs identified in Appendix 8 are the result of an initial study of Parish Plans and the results of the PPG17 Open Space Assessment and Parish Survey and confirmed or amended at the subsequent Parish follow up meetings. It must be noted that the viability of providing any additional or improved leisure facilities has not been taken in to account here. A further assessment would be required to ensure the deliverability of the additional facilities stated.

|                   | Households identified as being in need of affordable housing (no. of affordable housing units) <sup>55</sup> | Indicative time to let all applicants based on current supply and vacancy rates | Identified need for particular type of housing | New/ additional / improved health service/ premises | New/ additional /improved community hall | New / improved / additional youth facilities | Additional or upgraded play space | Additional/improved public open space | Additional/ improved public/community transport | Additional/ improved recreational facilities (stated) | Additional/ improved car parking | Improved/ additional local retail facilities | Improved/ additional local employment opportunities | New/additional allotments | Traffic management | Other identified needs (stated) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Albourne          | 13(29)   | 10  | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | -  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                    | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                        | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | -                               |
| Ansty             | 0 (4)  | -   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>5</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>6</sup>            | -                  | ✓ <sup>7</sup>                  |
| Ardingly          | 29(80)   | 7.5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                      | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                   | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>            | ✓ <sup>5</sup>     | -                               |
| Ashurst Wood      | 26(64)   | 11  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                 | -   | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                           | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>  | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                   | -  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                                      | ✓ <sup>7</sup>            | ✓ <sup>8</sup>     | -                               |
| Balcombe          | 38(100)  | 7   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                   | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>5</sup>            | ✓ <sup>6</sup>     | -                               |
| Bolney            | 15(36)   | 7.5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                      | -  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>5</sup>  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                   | ✓ <sup>7</sup>                               | ✓ <sup>8</sup>                                      | -                         | -                  | -                               |
| Copthorne         | 47(69)   | 9   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>4</sup>     | -                               |
| Crawley Down      | 59(127)  | 5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>4</sup>     | -                               |
| Cuckfield         | 58(172)  | 5.5   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                 | -   | -  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                                  | -   | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                   | -  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                                      | -                         | ✓ <sup>7</sup>     | ✓ <sup>8</sup>                  |
| Fulking           | 4(5)   | 12  | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                           | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                                  | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                  |
| Handcross         | 29(109)  | 3.5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>4</sup>  | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                   | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>6</sup>     | -                               |
| Hassocks & Keymer | 126(252)   | 4   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                    | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                        | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>5</sup>  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                   | ✓ <sup>7</sup>                               | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                  |
| Horsted Keynes    | 10(112)  | 2.5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                   | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | -                               |
| Hurstpierpoint    | 82(328)  | 3   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -   | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>3</sup>     | -                               |

<sup>55</sup> Common Housing Register Progress Report (October 2007) – (first area preference as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007). Does not include 135 applicants not stating first area of preference (24 Mid Sussex North, 71 Mid Sussex Central and 40 Mid Sussex South). Please read in conjunction with housing needs survey information (listed for each village in growth potential section).

Further information and data sources:

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Albourne     | 1 – Smaller affordable dwellings (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey) 3 – Children’s play area (8-12), Supervised adventure play area (Identified in Parish Plan and PPG17 Parish Survey), teenage facilities (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey) 4 – Village green (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey)   |
| Ansty        | 1– Live/work units and affordable housing for local people (Identified in follow up meeting – as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish). 2– (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3- Deficiency in teenage facilities identified in PPG17 Assessment (as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish). 4– Limited bus service (Identified in follow up meeting). 5 - Deficiency in tennis courts (Identified in PPG17 Assessment as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish). 6 – (Identified in PPG17 Assessment – as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish). 7 – Lack of footpaths/ cycle routes in area – particularly links to Burgess Hill (Identified in follow up meeting)  |
| Ardingly     | 1– Small / starter homes (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 -Doctor/District Nurse facility (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 - (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 – (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey). 5 – (Identified in follow up meeting).   |
| Ashurst Wood | 1 – Ashurst Wood Housing Needs Survey Report (July 2007). 2 - Affordable housing (preferably on exception sites). Need for small family (starter) homes and sheltered housing. Live/work units. 3 – Improved village hall to provide better facilities for community and house Parish Council. 4 - Pavilion improvements at recreation ground (Parish Plan/ follow up meeting). Deficiency for multi-sport courts identified (PPG17 Survey/follow up meeting), bowling green (PPG17 Parish Survey). 5 – Follow up meeting. 6 – Ivy Dene Estate requires investment. 7 - Allotments (PPG17 Assessment / follow up meeting) 8 – Lack of pathways in village. Problem with rat-running and road junctions in area (Follow up meeting).   |
| Balcombe     | 1 - Some new housing suitable for young, local families and elderly - social/ low cost (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 2 – (Identified in Parish Plan, PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3 – Frequency and service times of rail and particularly bus services (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 4 – (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 5 – (Identified in PPG17 Assessment) 6 – Comprehensive traffic management scheme required for village (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Bolney       | 1 – Affordable housing. Housing required for young families and elderly (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 2 – As part of Rawson Institute re-development (Identified in Parish Plan). 3 – Improved youth facilities required but most should be provided for by new village hall (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 – (Identified in follow up meeting). 5 - Batchelors Field multi-use tarmac area – expansion and enhancement (Identified in Parish Plan). Deficiency in tennis courts identified (Identified in PPG17 Assessment), Bowling Green (Identified in follow up meeting). 6 – Parking problems in village need resolution (Identified in follow up meeting). 7 – Retention of Post Office – possible relocation into allocated housing development (Identified in follow up meeting). 8 – Units at Bolney Grange should be allowed to extend / intensify (Identified in follow up meeting). |
| Copthorne    | 1 – Starter homes for young families including a proportion of shared equity housing (Identified in Parish follow up meeting – as part of Worth Parish). 2 – Long-term need to improve transport network in Parish (Identified in Parish follow up meeting). 3 – Recreation ground in need of renovation including improved drainage (identified in Parish follow up meeting). 4 – Long-term need to improve transport network in Parish (Identified in Parish follow up meeting).  |
| Crawley Down | 1 – Starter homes for young families including a proportion of shared equity housing (Identified in Parish follow up meeting – as part of Worth Parish). 2– Long-term need to improve transport network in Parish (Identified in Parish follow up meeting). 3 – Recreation ground in need of renovation including improved drainage (identified in Parish follow up meeting). 4 – Long-term need to improve transport network in Parish (Identified in Parish follow up meeting).   |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Cuckfield           | 1 – Cuckfield Housing Needs Survey Report (June 2007) 2 – Requirement for sheltered housing for elderly and affordable starter homes for local people. Live/ work units should be explored. Increased proportion of shared equity housing (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 – Improved youth facilities for youth including new premises for youth club (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 4 – Improved bus service particularly for commuters (Identified at follow up meeting). 5 – Improvement of existing facilities in village (Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 6 – Small local business units should be provided as part of any future large-scale development around village (Parish Plan). 7 – A series of traffic management schemes are required for the village (Parish Plan). 8 – Extension of cycle route to Bolnore Village (Parish Plan).   |
| Fulking             | 1 – New village hall (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – Improved public transport, particularly time of last service (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 – A local shop would benefit the village (Identified in follow up meeting).   |
| Handcross           | 1 – Mixed type of housing but particular need for starter homes (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – To replace existing hall (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 – Improved public transport service in particular frequency and time of last service (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 – New sports pavilion to replace existing (Identified in follow up meeting). 5 – (Identified in follow up meeting). 6 – (Identified in follow up meeting).   |
| Hassocks and Keymer | 1 – Affordable housing for local people. Housing suitable for frail elderly persons. All types of housing including flats and family homes. Provision of flexible live works units as part of future developments (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – Children’s Play Area (8-12) (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey) Delivery of a new play space (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 – Village green (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey). Village square (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 - Rail and Bus improvements including Hassock Station improvements (identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 5 – Basketball/ netball facility and new sports pavilion at Adastra Park (identified in PPG17 Parish Survey). 6 - Increase in car parking provision at station (Identified in follow up meeting). 6 - Delivery of cycle path allocated in Local Plan (2004) between Hassocks and Burgess Hill (Identified in follow up meeting). 7 – Village square with facilities for farmers market. Possible mixed-use scheme as part of Hassocks Station redevelopment. Need for greengrover/café/resturant facilities within village (identified in follow up meeting). |
| Horsted Keynes      | 1 – Younger people/family starter homes and homes suitable for older persons. 2 - Teenage facilities (particularly outdoor) (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting) 3 – Improved frequency and times of service (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 - Improved facility required (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Hurstpierpoint      | 1 – Low cost, smaller, affordable housing for people living within Parish (Identified in Parish Plan / follow up meeting). 2 - Improve / expand Fairfield or Court Bushes recreation ground formal facilities including an all weather multi-game surface (Identified in Parish Plan/follow up meeting) Deficiency identified for multi-sport courts (Identified in PPG17 Assessment). 3 – Traffic management issues with the High Street (Identified in follow up meeting)   |

|               | Households identified as being in need of affordable housing (no. of affordable housing units) <sup>56</sup> | Indicative time to let all applicants based on current supply and vacancy rates (years) | Identified need for particular type of housing | New/ additional / improved health service/premises | New/ additional /improved community hall | New / improved / additional youth facilities | Additional or upgraded play space | Additional/improved public open space | Additional/ improved public/community transport | Additional/ improved recreational facilities (stated) | Additional/ improved car parking | Improved/ additional local retail facilities | Improved/ addition local employment opportunities | New/additional allotments | Traffic management | Other identified needs (stated) |
|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Lindfield     | 97(174)  | 6   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>4</sup>                                  | -   | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                   | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>6</sup>     | -                               |
| Newtimber     | No data  | No data   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                  |
| Pease Pottage | 32(20)   | 12  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                  | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>2</sup>     | -                               |
| Poynings      | 2(12)  | 1   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                   | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                  |
| Pyecombe      | 8(10)  | 24  | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | -  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                    | -                                     | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>4</sup>     | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                  |
| Sayers Common | 7(43)  | 3   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                           | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                  |
| Scaynes Hill  | 4(52)  | 1   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | ✓ <sup>4</sup>  | -                                | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                               | -   | -                         | -                  | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                  |
| Sharpthorne   | 5(13)  | 4   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>4</sup>     | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                  |
| Slaugham      | 0(0)   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                  | -   | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                   | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | -                               |
| Staplefield   | 0(3)   | -   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | -   | ✓ <sup>3</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>            | -                  | -                               |
| Twineham      | 1(6)   | 1.5   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>1</sup>     | -                               |
| Turners Hill  | 36(77)   | 4.5   | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | -   | ✓ <sup>3</sup>  | -                                | -  | -   | ✓ <sup>4</sup>            | ✓ <sup>5</sup>     | ✓ <sup>6</sup>                  |
| Warninglid    | 9(18)  | 5.5   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                                 | -                                     | -   | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | -                  | -                               |
| West Hoathly  | 17(28)   | 13  | ✓ <sup>1</sup>                                 | -  | -  | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                               | -                                 | -                                     | ✓ <sup>3</sup>                                  | -   | -                                | -  | -   | -                         | ✓ <sup>4</sup>     | ✓ <sup>5</sup>                  |

<sup>56</sup> Common Housing Register Progress Report (October 2007) – (first area preference as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007). Does not include 135 applicants not stating first area of preference (24 Mid Sussex North, 71 Mid Sussex Central and 40 Mid Sussex South). Please read in conjunction with housing needs survey information (listed for each village in growth potential section).

Further information and data sources:

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Lindfield     | 1 – Sheltered housing within easy reach of village centre on brownfield sites. Smaller, family starter homes (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 2 – Extension of King Edward Hall or additional facilities (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 3 - All weather-playing surface (Parish Plan). 4 – More frequent service particularly in evening (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 5 – (identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). 6 – (Identified in Parish Plan and follow up meeting). |
| Newtimber     | 1 – Conversion of church building into a church based community building.   |
| Pease Pottage | 1 – Improved public transport service in particular frequency and time of last service (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 - (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Poynings      | 1 – (Identified in Parish Plan). 2 – (Identified in Parish Plan)  |
| Pyecombe      | 1 – Low cost dwellings for younger and older local people - (Identified in Pyecombe Design Statement (PDS) – Village Survey including Parish Councillors). 2 – village meeting place (Identified in PDS). 3 – Extensive playground with kick-about area (Identified in PDS). 4 – (Identified in PDS). 5 – Back-up generator at water reservoir to provide uninterrupted source of clean water. Designated school bus stop (Identified in PDS).  |
| Sayers Common | 1 – Smaller affordable dwellings (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – Replacement village hall (Identified in follow up meeting). 3 – A shop providing day to day needs (Identified in follow up meeting)   |
| Scaynes Hill  | 1 – Lower cost/family housing (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – Youth Centre (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3 – Frequency and times of service / school bus (Identified in follow up meeting). 4 – Tennis courts (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 5 – Reinstatement of the village post office (Identified in follow up meeting). 6 - Safe cycle route to Haywards Heath (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Sharpthorne   | 1 – Small family homes/starter homes. Elderly persons housing. Provision of some live/work units (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 - Teenage Facilities (identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3 – Frequency of service especially outside school term time. Community bus scheme at capacity. 4 – (Identified in follow up meeting). 5 - Support services for elderly community (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Slaugham      | 1 – Improved public transport service in particular frequency and time of last service (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 - (Identified in follow up meeting).  |
| Staplefield   | 1 – Live/work units and affordable housing for local people (Identified in follow up meeting – as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish). 2 - Deficiency in teenage facilities (PPG17 Assessment/ PPG17 PS) 3 - Deficiency in multi-sport courts, tennis courts (PPG17 Assessment - as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish) 4 - Deficiency identified (PPG17 Assessment – as part of Cuckfield Rural Parish)  |
| Turners Hill  | 1 – Affordable housing for local people (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 – Youth Centre – improvement of existing facilities (Identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3 - Bowling green (identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 4 – (Identified in PPG17 Assessment). 5 - Provision of a cycleway to link Worth Way to village (Identified in follow up meeting). 6 – Traffic calming required in village, especially at centre of village along East Street (Identified in follow up meeting).        |
| Twineham      | 1 - Traffic management issues both within the village and wider area.   |
| Warninglid    | -   |
| West Hoathly  | 1 – Small family homes/starter homes. Elderly persons housing. Provision of some live/work units (Identified in follow up meeting). 2 - Teenage Facilities (identified in PPG17 Parish Survey and follow up meeting). 3 – Frequency of service especially outside school term time. Community bus scheme at capacity. 4 – (Identified in follow up meeting). 5 - Support services for elderly community (Identified in follow up meeting).  |