

# Horsham District Local Plan (2023-2040)

Hearing Statement Relating to Matter 10  
On Behalf of Vistry Group PLC  
Relating to Land to the North of Mannings Heath

November 2024

**Vistry Group**

**Gillings**  
Planning

## Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Our Responses to the Matters Issues and Questions:	5

### Author

Daniel Wiseman BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI MIoL  
Senior Director

Gillings Planning Ltd  
2 Wessex Business Park  
Colden Common  
Winchester  
Hampshire  
SO21 1WP



### Client

Vistry Group PLC

### Date of Issue

22<sup>nd</sup> November 2024

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared on behalf of our client Vistry Group PLC ('Vistry') in response to the publication of the Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 (the 'Plan').
- 1.2 Our client previously made representations at Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages of the Local Plan preparation.
- 1.3 Vistry have land interests within the Plan area at a site known as Land to the North of Mannings Heath.

### **Mannings Heath**

- 1.4 Representations have previously been submitted to the Council's Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation stages on the Horsham District Local Plan on behalf of Countryside Properties ('Countryside'), which is now part of the Vistry Group. This included documentation which set out the significant benefits of the Site, which adjoins the settlement boundary of Mannings Heath.



Aerial photograph showing the Mannings Heath site outlined in red (by courtesy of Google ©)

### **This Statement**

- 1.5 This brief Hearing Statement has been prepared in accordance with the prevailing planning policy and guidance, in particular the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), September 2023 and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- 1.6 We do not seek to unnecessarily repeat points raised in the representations submitted by Vistry Group, but we have answered the questions posed by the Planning Inspector in the Matters, Issues and Questions (14<sup>th</sup> October 2024) where we feel it would be helpful to do so.
- 1.7 Gillings Planning, on behalf of the Vistry Group PLC wish to take a full and active part in the relevant Hearing sessions relating to their interests in the site.

## 2.0 Our Responses to the Matters, Issues and Questions

### Matter 10 – Monitoring and Review

**Matter 10, Issue 1 – Whether the Plan would be able to be monitored effectively to ensure timely delivery and trigger the need for review?**

*Q2. How would the implementation of the Plan be monitored? Would it be effective? How would the results of any monitoring be acted upon? What would trigger a review of the Plan or specific policies within it? Are main modifications needed to the Plan to reflect this?*

2.1 Whilst we cannot assist the Inspector with answers to these questions, we do consider that a clear expression of the triggers for a review of the Plan are in the interests of all parties. Given that the difference between the current and future Standard Methodology is substantial the Council will need to review the Plan “as soon as possible” and a timetable for such a review should be set out now.

*Q3. Overall does the Plan deal adequately with uncertainty?*

2.2 No. As we have demonstrated in our representations, there are flaws and conflicts that would prevent windfall sites from coming forward on the edge of settlements due to the overly restrictive wording of policies SP14 and SP15. Furthermore, there is uncertainty with regards to the ability of windfalls sites to achieve water neutrality if the water neutrality mitigation is only permitted to be assigned to allocated sites.

2.3 Windfall sites can greatly assist housing supply during times of uncertainty, and so without certainty that windfall sites can come forward, by default the Plan is not adequately dealing with uncertainty.