

Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 Examination

Our ref 61647/02/MS/HBe
Date 21 November 2024
From Lichfields obo Berkeley Strategic Land Limited

Subject Matter 7: Economic Development

This Hearing Statement has been submitted by Berkeley Strategic Land Limited ('Berkeley'); promoting the 'Land North West of Southwater' (HA3) 'Strategic Site' for around 1,000 homes.

Appendix 1 to Berkeley's Matter 1 statement sets out a Table of Modifications as proposed within Berkeley's submitted Hearing Statements (Matters 1 to 10).

1.0 Issue 1 – Whether the approach to employment land and supply is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared?

Q1. Is Strategic Policy 29: New Employment sound? a) What is the overall employment land requirement (hectares and floorspace) over the plan period, is this justified and effective, and should this be more clearly specified in the Plan?

1.1 No comment.

b) What is the total employment land supply (hectares and floorspace) over the plan period including sites allocated in the Plan, is this justified and effective and should this be more clearly specified in the Plan?

1.2 For the plan to be clearer, Policy SP29 (and specifically Table 6) should be updated to specify the total amount of employment floorspace allocated over the plan-period; albeit this is not a point of soundness.

c) Are the overall employment land requirements and supply provided by the Plan justified and effective? What is the evidence that the employment supply will be delivered within the plan period and that the employment requirement will be met?

1.3 Berkeley supports the 4ha employment land provision required at 'Land North West of Southwater' (Policy HA3); to help deliver the overall supply of employment land in the district over the plan period. As per Berkeley's response to Matter 9 (Q6) Berkeley intends to deliver the employment land well within the plan period, likely as part of Phase 1 of the development. This phasing is linked to the logical build-out strategy starting by delivering

access from the north (linking too the Hop Oast roundabout), enabling the employment land's earlier delivery.

d) Is it clear whether proposals must meet all criterion 1-10? Is the detailed wording of each of these criteria effective?

1.4 No comment.

e) Are allocations EM1-EM4 soundly based, with particular regard to the mix of uses and constraints identified?

1.5 No comment.

f) Is the geographical application of this policy clear?

1.6 No comment.

Q2.

1.7 No comment.

2.0 Issue 2 – Whether the other economic development policies are justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared?

Q1 – Q4.

2.1 No comment.

Q5. Is Strategic Policy 35: Town Centre Hierarchy and Sequential Approach sound? a – c.

2.2 No comment.

c) is the threshold for retail impact assessment of 500 metres square set out in criterion 5 justified?

2.3 No. **Berkeley object.** The threshold for retail impact assessment at criterion 5 should be clear that this does not apply to retail development within allocated sites to accord with NPPF (Sep 23) paragraph 90. This is because the retail provision would be in accordance with an up-to-date local plan. A suitable modification would resolve Berkeley's objection.

d) is the geographical application of this policy accurately identified on the submission Policies Map?

2.4 No comment.

Q6.

2.5 No comment.



Word Count: 183