

Full Responses Can be found as appended under Rep No.					
Rep No	Organisation / Individual	Policies Referred To	Comments to Consider	Actions for HHTC	General Comments/Outcome
A	Rail Estate on behalf of Bluebell Railway.	10C	Praise for the support of Bluebell Railway in the HHNP, but concern about the change of the policy wording from the pre submission document published in March 2014.	To consider placing the following supportive wording in the HHNP general text and or the policy in line with the following suggestion, 'The Council will support the Bluebell Railway western extension to Haywards Heath and the safeguarding of land as appropriate to provide a terminus at Haywards Heath Railway Station'	Response - incorporate addition supporting text in the HHNP. The change of policy wording was due to the need to make the policy a 'land use' policy.
B	Mr Pargeter	H1	Concern about the future of Hurstwood Lane in line with the proposed development of Hurst Farm and across the road on the Amenity Land (including the School).	To consider the request to close off Hurstwood Lane to ensure that it does not become an access road. 'Inclusion of requirement to close Hurstwood Lane at one end in policy H1.'	Policy amended to include the following addition requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on how the existing ancient woodland within the site will be safeguarded, managed and maintained • Details of the mitigation measures for Hurstwood lane to include its closure to through traffic. Additional narrative within the introduction as follows; 'HHTC expects the development to deliver sustainable traffic measures including the closure of a Hurstwood Lane to through traffic.'
C	N/A	E1 - E13 and H1 - H10	Request for holistic flood risk plans to be considered and support for housing off the road network in the South of the Town.	Comments Noted	The Local Planning Authority and statutory agencies will consider flood risk plans. Not with the power or expertise of the HHNP.
D	Mr Bates	All policies	Please see tab D below	Comments Noted	Please see tab D below for responses.
E	Mrs Bacon	All policies	Please see tab E below	Comments Noted	Please see tab E below for responses.
F	N/A	E1 - E13, B1 -B13	Broadly supportive of all polices E1 - E13, but concerns with regards to legal arrangements for Green Gaps and developer led travel plans. Supportive of B1 - B3 supportive. T1 - T3 supportive but concerns raised about bus providers. Support of H1 to H10 apart from concerns about the loss of parking resulting from H8.	Comments Noted	The reference to bus services are a commercial matter (outside the gift of the plan) as is the decision to close Harlands Road Car Park. The increased provision of parking at the station is a mitigation.
G	N/A	E1, E5, E6, E7, E8, T1, T2 and H1 - H10	Supportive of all policies.	Comments Noted	N/A
H	N/A	E1, E2, E5, E10, E11, E13, T1, T3, H1 - H8, L1, L2, L7, L9	E1 question of wording 'Will be generally resisted'. E2 - would like to see public record of how Council has held developers to account. E5 wish for removal of second part of the policy. E10 feeling that this is poorly worded. E11 and E13 again poorly worded. T1 - T3 poorly worded. Concern over all housing policies in line with pre-submission in March 14. Against housing policies. Supportive of L1, L2, L7 and L9.	Review wording of policies flagged to be poor or not favourable in the eyes of the respondent. Consider rewording of T1 -T3 taking into account the limited remit of HHNP with issue. Challenge housing policy.	No changes to be made to the policies. These policies have been subject to an independent health check and MSDC review. HHNP has positively respond to the housing needs with the Plan area.
I	Fox Hill Residents Association	H1 - H10	Representation outlines an objection to housing development in the locality of Fox Hill due to the view that the development of housing will have wide ranging detriment to local residents. The objection is also based on the view that there is not enough highway infrastructure and employment opportunities in the Town.	To consider the request of Fox Hill residents association to not pursue development the south of the Town around the Fox Hill area.	No change. HHNP has positively responded to the housing needs with the Plan area. HHTC recognises the community benefit arising from the development at Hurst Farm.
J	Mr Bateson	E1, E2, E6 - E8, E9, E11, E13, B1 - B3, T1- T3 and H1 - H8	Consider suggested change to policies E1, E2, Housing policy challenge on numbers. Supportive of Transport and Business policies. In respect of Leisure no direct comment.	"Planning applications for development and/or uses that would result in the loss of open spaces that have been appraised and identified as important to the character and/or appearance of their surroundings will be resisted unless or until they have been identified elsewhere in any Development Plan for development or re-use or, exceptionally, where the public benefits arising from any such development or use would outweigh any harm or loss that may arise". and E2 Therefore, our suggestion is that the draft policy is amended by the flowing insert at the start of the policy: "Unless it would result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of any neighbouring property occupier, in which case only mono-functional use will be required,....". Note challenge to HHNP housing number.	No change. This response relates specifically to the development of Sunte House and should be taken in context with HHTC's objection to the development of the site.

K	Southern Water	H1, H2, H3, H7		That the following addition be made to the specific housing policies. H1 - A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. · Existing underground sewers on site are protected, or appropriate arrangements are made for their diversion. H2 -A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. H3 - A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. H7 - A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. H8 - A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. · Existing underground sewers on site are protected, or appropriate arrangements are made for their diversion. Proposed new policy - New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the development plan.	No changes to policy. Developers are required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity or that additional infrastructure can be provided both on and off the site to serve the development. This infrastructure issue is covered in the MSDC District Plan (DP42).
L	Mr Hurst	N/A	Lobiest for better accommodation near to Town Centres for the disabled.	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
M	N/A	E5 - E13, H1 - H10	Supportive of all policies. Mention made of the need for sufficient parking off road ref H8 and the need to protect the north of the Town.	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
N	Ms Wood	All policies	Please see tab D below	Comments Noted	Please see tab N below for responses.
O	N/A	E5, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10 and L1 - L9	All comments supportive of HHNP	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
P	N/A	E5, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10 and L1 - L9	All comments supportive of HHNP	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
Q	N/A	E5, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10 and L1 - L9	All comments supportive of HHNP	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
R	N/A	E5, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10 and L1 - L9	All comments supportive of HHNP	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
S	Response could not be opened - request sent to resend in.				N/A
T	Barton Wilmore	E6, E9, E11, E12, E13, H3,	Promotion of the a site to the South of Old Rocky Lane. Representation advises how the development meet HHNP policies.	Site to be confirmed for inclusion in the plan if members see fit.	The site is with the proposed built up area boundary and was supported in the HHNP pre submission draft. Development such site is supported in principle by policy H9 Site currently subject to a planning application. As a result policy H3 removed from the plan and site marked as under consideration.
U	Ms Carter	N/A	Brownfield sites supported, concerns about development on Greenfield sites, concerns about the infrastructure to meet new houses . Concerns made noting that 'hands are tied' to an extent by the Government. Objection to an urban sprawl.	Comments Noted	No changes to policy. HHNP has positively respond to the housing needs with the Plan area. HHTC has identified infrastructure requirements for the Town.
V	Mr Northorpe	N/A	Concerns raised about all aspects of infrastructure and the feeling that the Town it is not built for an ever increasing population.	Comments Noted	No changes to policy. HHNP has positively respond to the housing needs with the Plan area. HHTC has identified infrastructure requirements for the Town.
W	N/A	E5, E7, T1-T3	Suggestions made on the policies responded to. Supportive of E5	Consider additional sentence suggested to; E7, SUDS should preferably be managed and maintained by a regulatory authority or similar empowered entity such as Southern Water, MSDC or WSSC and T's, Suggest weight limit on vehicular traffic allowed to use South Road (unless for access) to enforce use of new road bypass.	No changes to policy. The policy requires developers to indicate how SUD's are to be managed and maintained. Weight use is not a land use matter.
X	West Sussex County Council	N/A	Highways related issues in line with existing strategies and studies.	To agree to add a statement in the HHNP supporting the WSCC Transport study. Amend policy H1 map boundary to include both sides of Hurstwood Lane. Correction in 8.15 (MSDC Transport Study) 'that the consultants were working for MSDC rather than WSCC.	Policy H1 map amended. Text corrected. Reference to WSCC Haywards Heath Transport Study 2015 included within evidence base.
Y	Nexus Planning	H8	The representation contests policy H8 allocation of 40 dwellings on the basis that it does not make best use of the Brownfield sites. The number of dwellings is deemed to be contrary to MSDC housing policy on housing density and not meeting the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 basic conditions to a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; b) that the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; and c) that the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority.	Consider suggested change to policy to Policy H8 (first bullet) to read : "Capacity: The site should provide for approximately at least 40 dwellings."	No change to policy. HHTC excepts need to make best use of Brownfield Sites and considers the wording of the policy provides flexibility for the developer. HHTC notes that MSDC policy DP24a would apply to this.

Z	W. T. Lamb Holding	E5, E11, E12, H1 - H10	E5 - Challenge to this policy. E11 and E12 it was questioned whether these policies are needed within the HHNP.	To consider challenges to E5, E11, E12, H1 - H10 and what course of action to take. Consider the allocation of Land at Downlands Park, HH for inclusion in the HHNP for elderly care dwellings.	Revised built up area boundary that clarifies the whole of Downlands Park is within the built line. Policy H9 Supports in principle residential development in the built up area. However HHTC considers that this site should be subject to a specific housing policy to reflect the owners intention for housing development for the elderly. Please see policy H7
AA	Mr and Mrs White	N/A	Support for the plan and green corridor around the north of the Town.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
AB	N/A	E1 - E13, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10, L1 - L9	Fully supportive of the HHNP policies. Questioning of Wickham Field being designated as application under consideration.	Review figure 4b map in Sunte House/Wickham Farm area to check the allocation is correct.	Revised map to clarify that Sunte House/Wickham Farm are outside of the built up area and subject to policy E5.
AC	Historic England		Praise for highlighting the distinctive character of the Town. There are suggestions for point 2.21, 4.3 and policies E1, E5, E9, H1, H2, H5 of the HHNP,	To consider suggestions to the narrative of the plan and challenges to policies - 2.21, 4.3 and policies E1, E5, E9, H1, H2, H5	Please see tab AC below for responses.
AD	DMH Stallard	E5, E9, E10	Challenges to each of the policies referred to.	Policy E5: We object to this policy because "local gaps" are an additional layer of planning control which is contrary to established planning guidance and goes through controls envisaged through the NPPF. It would also appear that the Policy seeks to impose restrictions on land outside the neighbourhood plan area. The Policy does not allow for necessary future growth of the town. The Policy appears somewhat confused in stating in the first sentence that the land outside the built up area should provide a landscaped buffer. However, in the final sentence indicating that development would only be permitted if it does not harm the setting of the town. Policy H9 and H10: Bullet point 4: we would question the necessity of this bullet point referring to materials being compatible with the materials of the existing buildings. In many cases a change in materials and form is acceptable and may lead to a more appropriate design solution. There should be no need to replicate the materials of any host building.	No changes to be made to the policies. These policies have been subject to an independent health check and MSDC review.
AE	Duplicate Southern Water				N/A
AF	Cuckfield Parish Council	E5	Support for policy E5 and suggestion that outside of the HHNP that the Town Council may wish to investigate working with the Borde Hill Estate to create additional green infrastructure to incorporate Millennium Wood and Paiges Meadow/Blunts Wood	Comments Noted	No change to policy.
AG	DMH Stallard on behalf of Ashton House Care Home	N/A	H7	Consider the movement of the built line as please see attachment AG1	Amendment to built up area boundary to include Ashton House. Line corrected to make clear it follows Bolnore Lane.
AF	Lindfield Parish Council	N/A	General Support for the HHNP	Comments noted	No change to policy. HHTC has identified infrastructure needs for the Town in MSDC's IDP.
AG	N/A	E5	General Support for the HHNP	Comments noted	No change to policy.
AH	Natural England	E9, E11	The plan is unlikely to have significant impact on any internationally designated sites and, therefore, should not require a HRA. It is felt that the High Weald Management Plan should be referred to.	Consider the inclusion of the High Weald Management Plan in policy E11,	Change to policy E11.
Ai	Mid Sussex District Council (landlord)	H1 - H10	Request to increase density in line with new MSDC policy. Support for allocation of Hurst Farm.	Review District Plan Policy 24a in line with HHNP policies H1 - H7	Policy DP24a will applied to policies H1 - H7.
AJ	N/A	E5, H1 - H10	Support for policy E5 and all housing policies.	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AK	N/A	E5, H1 - H10	Support for policy E5 and all housing policies.	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AL	N/A	E5, H3	Support for policy E5 and E3.	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AM	Strutt and Parker	N/A	Proposals for development of land at Central Sussex College.	HHTC to consider inclusion of the site for residential development.	No changes to policy. HHNP has positively responded to the housing needs with the Plan area. HHTC has identified infrastructure requirements for the Town and notes a deficiency in sports pitches.
AN	N/A	N/A	Fully supportive of the HHNP	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AO	N/A	E5, E6, E7, E10, E11, E13, H1 - H10	Supportive of all policies noted.	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AP	N/A	N/A	Fully supportive of the HHNP	Comments noted.	No change to policy.
AQ	Metro Bus	AQ	Supportive. Suggested addition of wording to policy E12.	Consideration of the inclusion of a reference to bus stops in Policy E12	Change to narrative in para 8.10 to support provision of bus stops.
AR	N/A	E1 - E13	Reference to Gamblemead noted but the site is not a consideration of the HHNP as it is already in the planning system. There is a distinct lack of vision for the retail amenities in the town and the town has declined over the past few years as a result. Too much prominence is given to large retailers and the redevelopment of the station site is an example of this. The town should consider encouraging smaller retailers to start up in South road and consider reducing business rates for smaller shops to make this viable. There is not enough use of existing Brownfield sites	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
AS	Environment Agency	N/A	Neighbourhood Plan check list provided.	Checklist reviewed and HHNP is not promoting development in flood zones 2 or 3.	No changes to policy.
AT	West Sussex County Council	Duplicate	N/A	N/A	No changes to policy.

AU	Robinson Escott Planning LLP - Crest Nicholson	E1 - E13, H1 - H10	Objection lodged to the land North of Birchen Lane being designated as a green corridor. Objection to the total number of houses in the HHNP	To consider the objections lodged and make a response.	No changes policy. HHTC and MSDC have both objected to this application and a planning enquiry will be completed before the HHNP is adopted.
AV	N/A	All policies	See tab AV below	See tab AV below	See tab AV below for response.
AW	Highways England	All policies	No comments	N/A	No changes to policy.
AX	Horsham District Council	All policies	No comments	N/A	No changes to policy.
AY	N/A	N/A	Formal notification of the objection to the planning application on Gamblemead.	Comments noted	No changes to policy.
AZ	N/A	E1 - E13,	There is a huge gap in policies E1 to E13, since nothing is said about the need of traffic calming measures and the reduction of pollution within the built up area line. I find that surprising since this clearly is an important challenge to Haywards Heath, where there are several important axis with both cars and pedestrians. Currently dangerous driving and pollution make it extremely unpleasant and dangerous to be a pedestrian, leading to most people taking the car even for short stretches, in particular when going with children (school run). I know this first hand since I have a child at St. Joseph's and live at Fox Hill. After several life-threatening incidents due to dangerous driving my daughter is very scared of the traffic and so am I (and my partner). The consequence is that we, in spite of preferring to walk, take the car, thereby adding to the problem. Otherwise E1-E13 are well meaning, but we know from experience that any allocated green space will be exploited in a forthcoming neighbourhood plan as has been the case before, see H1 below. There is no reason to believe this will change. B1-B3 appears well meaning. I find that it is a pity that Haywards Heath centre is left in such a sad state when high street could be quite handsome if the many modernist buildings were carefully renovated. The objective 8A must be the most important in this plan. I am surprised that nothing is said about traffic calming measures here. This is a disaster in Haywards Heath. The whole axis towards the south ending in B2112 has very strong traffic, with huge speeding problems through Fox Hill. Rigorous traffic calming measures should be taken on this stretch (and presumably other stretches in Haywards Heath of similar character) to ensure safety for pedestrians and cyclists and also to reduce pollution. This is a really serious health and safety issue. In my family alone we have narrowly escaped serious accidents at several occasions that were entirely due to speeding and wreckless driving. I suggest either a general 20 limit within Haywards Heath or numerous speed cameras making sure that the 30 mph limits are respected.		
BA	N/A	N/A	General Support for the plan. General comments about bus services and infrastructure. Housing development to the South of Town was referred in relation to supportive local shops.	Comments noted.	Comments to be fed into Hyawards Heath Transport Working Party.
BB	Hayward Heath Society	N/A	Supportive of the HHNP but feels that the HHNP could be more robust on the protection of the existing historic and cherished buildings, green spaces, park and open spaces and the preservation of the Dolphin and Clair Hall .	Comment noted.	No changes to policy.
BC	Mr Waite	N/A	Reference to office accommodation being turned into flats. And importance of working with organisations such as the Business Association.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BD	Mr Loewry	N/A	Query relating to the Town Boundary.	Comments noted and passed to MSDC draftsman who is preparing the HHNP map for comment.	No changes to policy. Plan updated and corrected.
BE	N/A	E3, E4, B1-B3, H1	Support for the policies referred to in the representation. The main comment being that there needs to be thought on the impact on local residents resulting from the HHNP.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BF	N/A	E3, E4, H1	Support for polices E3, E4 - request for sympathetic school building design.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
		E3, E4, H1	Support for the policies referred to in the representation. The main comment being that there needs to be thought on the height and location of the school at Hurstwood Lane.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BG	Duplicate of Rail Estate (a)				
BH	Mid Sussex District Council Cabinet Member for Property and Economic Development	H1	Request made to increase the number of Houses on Hurst Farm (Policy H1).	Members to consider raising the number of Houses allocated for Hurst Farm from 275 to at least 350 as requested by Mid Sussex District Council	Housing number raised to 350 in line with District Plan policy 24a.
BJ	N/A	E8, E5, B2, T1, T3, H1, L1, L2	The importance of E8 and E5 is stated. General support fort the other policies.	Comments noted	No changes to policy.
BK	N/A	E8, E5, T1, T3, H1, H2, L1, L2	Supportive for all policies. Reference to the protection of Woodland around sites H1 and H2.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BL	N/A	All policies	See BL1 as attached to email.	Comments Noted	No changes to policy.
BM	N/A	N/A	Representation relates to the planning application for the development of Gamblemead, which is currently being considered by MSDC.	Comments noted	No changes to policy.

BN	N/A	E1 - E13, B1 - B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H10, L1 - L9	General Support for the plan.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BO	N/A	E5, H1 - H10, L1 - L9	Support for policy E5 and L1 - L9. Statement of a wish to protect the rural setting within the housing policies and preference for Brownfield development.	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BP	N/A	All policies	Support for environment, business, transport and leisure policies. Objection to building outside of the existing built line.	Comments noted.	No change to policy. HHNP has positively responded to the housing needs with the Plan area. Policy E5 seek to maintain the rural setting of the Town.
BQ	N/A	E1, E5, B1, T1 - T3, H1 - H10, L1, L2, L3	Support for E1 and E5 with reference for the need to reduce the risk of flooding. Objection for retail to be permitted outside of the Town Centre. Reference to inadequacies of the road network to include cycle paths. Support for Brownfield sites and objection to Greenfield sites being brought forward. Support for policies L1, L2, L3	Comments noted.	No change to policy. HHNP has positively responded to the housing needs with the Plan area. HHTC has identified infrastructure requires through the Haywards Heath Transport Study, which has been fed into the MSDC IDP.
BR	N/A	All policies	Support for all policies and the HHNP	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BS	N/A	E1, E5, objective 9A and all other policies.	Support for all policies and the HHNP	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BT	N/A	E1, E5, objective 9A and all other policies.	Support for all policies and the HHNP	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BU	N/A	E1 - E7, E8, E9, E10, E11, E12, E13, B1, B3, T1 - T3, H1 - H8, L1 - L9.	Support for E1 - E13, B1 to B3 relates to concern about the retail offer in HH in relation to what is planned in BH. T1 - T3 supported. Request to change wording of relief road opening as out of date. Support for housing sites H1 - H8 and reference to objection to sites in the north or the Town. Policies L1 - L9 all supported	Comments noted.	No changes to policy.
BV	N/A	E1 - E13, H1 - H10	Endorsement of developing Brownfield Sites. Challenge to the inclusion of the areas of Townscape Character. Concerns in relation to the reliance on the Northern Arc to make HH shortfall. Concern that the site promoted by the respondent has not been included in the HHNP	Members to consider the removal of reference and support for areas of Townscape Character. Members are asked to consider tab BV. Members to consider site at 35 Balcombe Road.	No change to policy. The development of Brownfield Sites within the built line is supported under policy H9. This is a small scale development proposal that the owner is able to bring forward to be considered against the policies included within the HHNP. The 8 areas of Townscape Character identified within the Plan area highlight different characteristic of the Town and identify local character, which HHTC considers important when considering development proposals.