

# 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 6: Infrastructure, Transport and Healthy Communities

---

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 Infrastructure Provision is legally compliant, justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared?

**Q1. Is Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision sound? a) Does this policy apply to both development sites allocated in the Plan and other sites not identified in the Plan?**

1.1 **Berkeley object** as it is not clear whether this policy applies to development allocated within the plan as well as sites not. SP23 could be read as seeking additional infrastructure beyond that already listed in site specific policies (i.e. HA3). Policy SP23 should be clear via an amend to criterion 2 to make it read "*Where there is a need for extra capacity (as identified in specific allocation policies)*". This would ensure the policy is justified and effective.

1.2 Modifications to the supporting text are needed to support our proposed amends. The Council has already proposed a suitable amendment to paragraph 8.5 of the plan<sup>1</sup> that would overcome Berkeley's objection.

**b) Is the relationship between this policy and the site specific infrastructure requirements identified for each site allocation clear?**

1.3 No. **Berkeley objects** to the supporting text of policy of SP23 as it is not effective (NPPF paragraph 35c). The proposed modification to criterion 2 (as set out in response to Q1a above) and the Council's proposed modification to para 8.5<sup>2</sup> would in combination resolve Berkeley's objection. This proposed modification is linked to a further modification to policy HA1 (see our response to Matter 9, Q5) that Berkeley also supports.

---

<sup>1</sup> HM028, SD14

<sup>2</sup> HM028, SD14

**c) Is this policy sufficiently flexible to deal with and respond to changing circumstances?**

- 1.4 No. **Berkeley objects** to policy SP23 as it is not effective (NPPF Para 35c). The Council's proposed modification (referred to in SD14 as being to either policy SP23 or paragraph 8.5) would resolve Berkeley's objection. It would ensure the policy is effective: adding flexibility to account for changing circumstances over the plan-period.

**d) Would this policy potentially prevent development proposed in the Plan from being built as envisaged and if so how will this be addressed?**

- 1.5 Yes. **Berkeley objects** to policy as it is not clear whether this policy applies to development allocated within the plan as well as sites not. This may prevent development coming forward as envisaged. Implementing the proposed modifications as set out to questions 1a-1c above would resolve Berkeley's objection.

**Q2. Is Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport sound? a) With reference to the relevant evidence, would the Plan be effective in ensuring that any significant impacts from the development proposed on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), highway safety and habitats can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree?**

- 1.6 In so far as policy SP24 and the relevant evidence base relates to 'Land North West of Southwater' (HA3), Berkeley supports the measures proposed to ensure the schemes impacts can be suitably mitigated.

**b) Are the funding mechanisms and strategic transport improvements identified in paragraph 8.13 up to date and are they consistent with the schemes identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan?**

- 1.7 Yes, in respect of the Hop Oast roundabout. As part of delivering allocation HA3 (Land North West of Southwater), the Hop Oast roundabout would be signalised<sup>3</sup> (secured via a S106 agreement with Berkeley providing proportionate contributions – as was proposed in the now withdrawn 1,500 home outline planning application<sup>4</sup>). The need for this signalisation has been established in the plan's evidence base<sup>5</sup> and has been identified as essential infrastructure to delivered through this plan in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan<sup>6</sup>.

**c) – e).**

- 1.8 No comment.

**Q3 – Q6.**

- 1.9 No comment.

<sup>3</sup> As required in Policy HA3 7cii.

<sup>4</sup> Ref. DC/22/1916.

<sup>5</sup> I07.

<sup>6</sup> Page 87, SP04.

**Word Count: 399**