

MSDC response to Action Point AP-013

Action Point AP-013

Council to provide detailed evidence including email correspondence, agendas, and minutes to support the contention that it has complied with the duty to co-operate with the prescribed bodies throughout the preparation of the Plan up to its submission

1. Background

- 1.1. The Council is obliged by legislation and national planning policy to review (and where necessary, update) its Local Plan every five years. The adopted District Plan re-iterates this requirement in policies **DP4: Housing** and **DP5: Planning to Meet Future Housing Need** which both required the Council to review the District Plan.
- 1.2. The District Plan Review commenced in 2021. The Council reviewed the Duty to Co-Operate Framework (2015) [DC2] which accompanied the adopted District Plan to ensure the strategic planning issues requiring co-operation remained up-to-date and therefore fit for purpose. The review confirmed these were correct.
- 1.3. The Council held a Duty to Co-Operate meeting with all neighbouring and nearby authorities in September 2021 to formally commence work on the Plan review. This included discussion on cross-boundary strategic issues and a commitment from the Council to share findings and seek agreement on outcomes as Plan preparation progressed.
- 1.4. This paper sets out a summary of how the Council has complied with the Duty to Co-Operate. Detailed evidence is set out in appendices A - D.

2. Identification of Strategic Planning Issues

- 2.1. The Duty to Co-Operate Compliance Statement [DC1] confirms the five Strategic Planning Issues, which were the subject of engagement throughout preparation of the Plan. These are:
 - 1) **Meeting Housing Need**
 - 2) **Jobs and Employment**
 - 3) **Transport**
 - 4) **Infrastructure**
 - 5) **Environment**

- 2.2. Due to the varied nature of these issues, there are different partners for each one. The Statement summarises the key relationships with prescribed bodies and how the Council has been engaging with them throughout the plan-making process up to submission of the District Plan. This includes the Council's role on a number of cross-boundary groupings as well as the relationships with individual authorities and bodies.
- 2.3. Further detail on how the effectiveness of the Plan has been maximised as a result of this engagement is provided below and in Appendices A - D, for each Strategic Planning Issue and for Prescribed Bodies.

3. Maximising Effectiveness

- 3.1. The legal duty was introduced by the Localism Act in 2011 and via section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to "maximise effectiveness" when preparing a Local Plan. National Policy (paragraph 35 of the NPPF) requires plans to be deliverable over the plan-period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by statements of common ground.
- 3.2. As set out in the Duty to Co-Operate Statement, the Submitted District Plan reflects the outcomes of cross-boundary strategic joint working on the full range of Strategic Planning Issues identified. In addition, the Council has engaged proactively with Prescribed Bodies on the plan as a whole.

Strategic Planning Issue 1 - Meeting Housing Need

- 3.3. This Strategic Planning Issue has involved engagement with the following groupings:
 - Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area
 - West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board
 - Individual Local Authorities
- 3.4. This engagement has maximised the effectiveness of the Plan through the following outcomes.

Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area

Partners: Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council

- 3.5. The three authorities that make up the Northern West Sussex Housing Market Area (NWS HMA) have worked collaboratively and on an ongoing basis to address the unmet housing need in the NWS HMA as far as practically possible.

- 3.6. Mid Sussex has been an active member of this group and has worked effectively and on an ongoing basis with its neighbours, a position that both neighbours agree with as evidenced in the joint and individual Statements of Common Ground. This work has built upon the long-standing relationship between the three authorities which led to the unmet need in the HMA being met in full in the three adopted Local Plans. Despite a significant level of unmet need arising in Crawley at that time, both Mid Sussex and Horsham Councils made contributions in their adopted Local Plans so that this unmet need was met in full. This success formed the starting point for the reviewed Plans which have emerged since 2018.
- 3.7. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:
- The most appropriate way to plan to meet housing needs across the HMA e.g. joint plan, joint evidence.
 - The scope of evidence to be produced to support plans including any jointly procured evidence
 - Site selection processes and spatial strategy
 - Cumulative impacts of planned housing developments
 - Allocation of sites and engagement on policy requirements

Identifying an appropriate way to plan to meet housing needs across the HMA

- 3.8. The three authorities identified that for the next iteration of local plans they should explore the merits of preparing a Joint Plan vs each authority individually progressing the review of their adopted Plans. These options were considered in 2018. It was determined that progressing with the individual reviews of Local Plans would be the most effective way to maximise meeting housing needs. This was because Crawley and Horsham had adopted their Local Plans in 2015 and therefore needed to progress with work on their reviews quickly to ensure they were completed within the five-year period. Mid Sussex had just adopted its District Plan and was required to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to ensure the housing need in the adopted Plan could be met. The staggered nature of the three Plans meant there was no obvious point at which commencing a Joint Plan would have been feasible.
- 3.9. The three authorities agreed to progress with reviews of their individual plans because this was the most effective and efficient way of ensuring delivery of new homes in a timely fashion. The Councils progressed with the review of their individual plans whilst continuing proactive discussions in relation to how each plan was prepared (including the scope and commissioning of evidence) and the emerging outcomes and conclusions of that work.

Preparing and collaborating on the evidence base

- 3.10. Following agreement to progress the review of individual Plans, the three authorities reviewed the potential for joint evidence to be produced to provide a common evidence base for the local plans. Such an approach would ensure that key issues of shared interest were considered on a consistent basis.

- 3.11. The three authorities have a long-standing relationship which had led to positive outcomes in their three adopted Local Plans. The evidence base defined Mid Sussex's position within the NWS HMA and that this was the primary HMA – this position has been supported in all SHMA updates since and during examination of previous Plans. As a result, the three authorities agreed that NWS HMA should be the first priority when determining whether contributions could be made towards unmet need and that plans should proceed on this basis. This is reflected in the agreed Housing SoCG and set out in the supporting text to policy DPH1: Housing.
- 3.12. It was agreed that an update to the NWS Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) should be carried out. The three authorities collaborated in commissioning consultants and reviewing the updated outputs to ensure that the methodology and results from the work provided a consistent basis for the three Plans that each authority could sign-up to. As Crawley and Horsham were further ahead in their plan-making cycle, the two authorities published a joint SHMA in 2019. The Mid Sussex SHMA was prepared by the same consultant and methodology and was published in 2021.
- 3.13. The Councils also discussed the value of producing other shared evidence base documents as well as the sufficiency of other evidence base documents being prepared by each Council in support of their Local Plans. In response to engagement with its neighbours who had encouraged the Council to maximise supply from all sources, the Council proactively commissioned an Urban Capacity Study [H3] to maximise brownfield site delivery. Recognising that Mid Sussex had carefully considered the extent to which greenfield sites could contribute towards supply, it was suggested by neighbouring authorities at various stages of engagement that infill/maximisation of brownfield sites could help boost supply. This work led to an increase in potential housing supply from this source in addition to the proposed site allocations – this increased by 506 dwellings between an original draft Regulation 18 version of the Plan and the one formally approved and published for consultation.

Spatial strategy and site selection

- 3.14. The three Councils have worked constructively together to look at how strategic approaches to accommodating growth across the authority areas could be maximised to boost housing supply across the HMA.
- 3.15. In 2009, a joint piece of work, the “At Crawley Study” [O12] was produced. The aim of this work was to identify potential site options in the Crawley area which could meet emerging Crawley housing need. Of the sites identified in this document, all of the sites except Crabbet Park have been identified for allocation in adopted or emerging Local Plans since its publication. It was agreed that Crabbet Park should be allocated for development in the submitted Mid Sussex District Plan (as DPSC2: Crabbet Park) given its sustainable location adjacent to Crawley and its potential to provide services and facilities on-site that would meet both the needs of the development itself but also increase capacity to address

cross-boundary strategic issue such as secondary school provision emerging in the north of Mid Sussex and in Crawley.

- 3.16. Specific engagement with Crawley included joint site visits and meetings with the site promoter which have influenced the policy requirements included in Policy DPSC2 such as requirement for a secondary school, requirements to improve sustainable transport routes to Three Bridges train station (in Crawley borough) and Crawley Town Centre to minimise use of the private car, and a commitment to explore mechanisms for provision of affordable housing to meet Crawley needs such as through seeking shared nomination rights. These are set out in the individual SoCG with Crawley Borough Council [DC6].
- 3.17. In addition to this, the authorities sought to identify other large-scale sites that had been promoted to them, which could make a strategic contribution to meeting the housing needs of the HMA and were located on or close to administrative boundaries. The only site which met this criterion was Mayfield Market Town, which was a strategic site for approximately 10,000 dwellings straddling the Horsham/Mid Sussex border, 900 of which would be in Mid Sussex. The site had previously been rejected by both authorities when preparing their adopted Local Plans however was reconsidered during the Site Selection process for the reviewed District Plan [Site reference #678 in SSP2 and SSP3].
- 3.18. For the Mid Sussex element to be sustainable and deliverable, it would have required allocation of the remainder of the site in the Horsham Local Plan. Whilst this option was considered by both Horsham and Mid Sussex through their site selection processes, the site was rejected – for Mid Sussex, full details are set out in SSP2 and SSP3. Further to this, the site was formally withdrawn by the site promoter in 2023. The SoCG confirms that there are no further suitable and/or deliverable sites on or close to administrative boundaries that could contribute towards increasing housing supply within this plan period (p.23).
- 3.19. In tandem with these discussions, the Council was progressing the assessment of all other smaller scale options for strategic housing development within Mid Sussex. This work commenced in 2021.
- 3.20. The Council has been open and transparent on the evidence that has informed the development of the Plan including the approach to, and outcomes of, its site selection process. The Council has actively sought feedback from CBC and HDC throughout the process. This has included agreeing shared principles at the start of the plan-making process for site selection and consulting on the methodology to maximise potential supply (i.e. to ensure that sites were not being ruled out prematurely) – the agreed principles resulting from this engagement are set out in section 5 of the agreed NWS Housing SoCG [DC4]. Initial outcomes from the site selection process were shared with the two authorities so that they could be scrutinised and challenged.
- 3.21. The emerging results of the site selection process (based on the agreed shared principle and feedback from neighbouring authorities on the process) were shared

ahead of the formal stages of publication of the District Plan (e.g. Regulation 18 and Regulation 19) to ensure the findings of the engagement would be able to influence the plan. The Council notes that, as a result of this ongoing engagement, neither Crawley or Horsham have objected to the methodology, challenged the results, or suggest that any further sites could/should have been allocated. This position is confirmed in the NWS SoCG: Housing.

- 3.22. The three authorities have recognised that the housing need position has become more challenging, with each authority presented by challenges in meeting its own need before being able to consider the extent to which it could assist another. The significant issue of Water Neutrality arose in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone in late-2021. This led to a pause in plan-making for both Crawley and Horsham whilst potential solutions were identified and the impacts on potential supply were not fully known until 2023 (particularly in respect to the amount of growth Horsham could accommodate). By this time, work on the Mid Sussex District Plan had progressed to Regulation 19 stage.

Cumulative impacts of planned housing developments

- 3.23. Through both the individual authority meetings and the regular Northern West Sussex meetings, the authorities kept each other informed of cross-boundary cumulative impacts arising from the emerging Plans and in particular arising from the proposed housing development. Planned developments occurring cross-boundary were included in the transport modelling, including allowances for future growth occurring beyond the Mid Sussex boundary. Emerging results from the Transport Study where the planned development would have impacts on junctions outside of the Mid Sussex administrative area were shared with the authorities and no further actions were identified as a result of this work.
- 3.24. After applying the Site Selection methodology, the Council shared draft Transport Study findings with its NWS neighbours. The Council explained there were potential constraints to growth in this respect and that this would influence the spatial strategy and quantum of growth to be planned for, including the extent to which it could contribute towards unmet need. This enabled the NWS authorities to understand the proposed spatial strategy and contribution towards unmet need once the first draft of the District Plan was shared.

Allocation of sites and engagement on policy requirements

- 3.25. Given the individual constraints to accommodating growth that each authority was facing, combined with emerging issues such as Water Neutrality, the Council engaged with the NWS HMA authorities to seek to maximise the contribution it could make towards unmet need. The Council's starting point has always been to seek to meet its own need and contribute towards unmet need arising elsewhere as far as possible. The Council's position on this is summarised in response to Action Point 18 [AP-018].

- 3.26. The Council's total supply (set out in policy DPH1: Housing) reflects the capacity-led approach discussed and agreed with CBC and HDC. The Council assessed sites for their suitability/sustainability by using the agreed methodology and allocated as many of these sites as possible, taking into account the appropriateness of individual sites for allocation and the cumulative impacts of planned growth on sensitive receptors and infrastructure including transport capacity.
- 3.27. At Regulation 18 stage [DP15], the Council identified a potential over-supply of 302 dwellings which would contribute towards unmet need in the NWS HMA. This increased to 996 dwellings at Regulation 19 stage. The Council could have persisted with an over-supply of 302 but instead proactively decided to increase this figure given its understanding of unmet need arising elsewhere. This demonstrates the Council's continued commitment to supporting higher growth as much as it can given its own constraints.

Summary of Outcomes:

- Agreement to progress with reviews of individual plans rather than produce a Joint Local Plan, in order to maximise scale of housing delivery across the HMA.
- Agreement to collaborate on joint housing evidence and to commission additional pieces of evidence to maximise housing supply.
- Recognition in the Plan that the Northern West Sussex HMA should be prioritised.
- Joint working on cross boundary sites including the proposed allocation of DPSC2: Crabbet Park. Agreement that there are no further site options on/close to administrative boundaries, which represent a strategic option for meeting housing needs across the HMA.
- Ongoing discussions on the site-specific proposals and policy requirements for DPSC2: Crabbet Park including infrastructure and active travel requirements and commitment to exploring nomination rights for affordable housing.
- Agreement on Site Selection principles to guide plan-making with the aim of maximising supply.
- Increase in supply of brownfield sites identified in submitted District Plan.
- Inclusion of the agreed priority order in supporting text to DPH1: Housing which sets out the agreed approach towards unmet need contribution in the NWS HMA.
- Allocation of sites to meet Mid Sussex need with an over-supply of 996 to contribute towards unmet needs arising in the Northern West Sussex HMA.
- Joint Statement of Common Ground: Housing [DC4] agreed. This includes agreement that there are no further suitable and/or deliverable sites on or close to administrative boundaries which could contribute towards unmet need in this plan period, and that that options for increase supply have been

explored.

3.28. Appendices A1 and A2 provides further details of engagement undertaken with the Northern West Sussex Authorities and in undertaking this engagement, how the effectiveness of the Plan has been maximised. This includes copies of relevant agendas and minutes.

West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board

Partners: Arun District Council, Adur & Worthing Councils, Brighton and Hove City Council, Chichester District Council, Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Lewes District Council, South Downs National Park Authority, West Sussex County Council.

3.29. The West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board (WSGB) was set up in 2012 to identify and manage strategic planning issues within that area. Mid Sussex joined the Board in 2014. The Board completed work on a non-statutory planning framework in a Local Strategic Statement (LSS) which was endorsed by constituent authorities in 2013. A refreshed LSS (LSS2) was endorsed in 2015. The Board agreed to commence work on LSS3 in 2017. Mid Sussex has played an active role in the work of the Board and its accompanying officer group.

3.30. An overview of the work of this group and outcomes is set out in the Council's response to AP-011. This position has been confirmed by all partner authorities. To avoid repetition this information is not reproduced here however a summary is provided.

3.31. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Commissioning a joint evidence base to identify strategic spatial options for growth within the WSGB area and to agree a Statement of Common Ground to agree actions and timings for this work
- Identifying strategic and spatial priorities
- Preparing LSS3 for endorsement by partner authorities

Commissioning a joint evidence base

3.32. In 2017, the Board agreed to commission work to provide a joint evidence base to support the development of a longer-term strategy to address housing and other needs in the WSGB area. The partner authorities committed resources to carrying out the following studies:

- Need and Capacity
- Mapping strategic constraints (i.e. those identified in the NPPF)
- Review of existing and emerging growth locations and key constraints
- Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity for change

- Economic Geographies
- Transport Constraints and Opportunities
- Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment

3.33. An initial study to identify Housing Market Areas and Functional Economic Market Areas was completed in 2017. It confirmed Mid Sussex's position predominantly in the NWS HMA with overlaps with a secondary Coastal HMA in the south of the district. This is consistent with the findings of evidence commissioned by previously by the NWS authorities. The outputs of this work were agreed by all partners.

3.34. In 2020, a specialist advisor was appointed by the Board to draw up the specifications for the remaining evidence base work. However, to date these studies have not been commissioned or completed. This was predominantly due to an emerging Water Neutrality position affecting much of the sub-region which paused plan making for a number of authorities, as well as the increase in housing needs and the withdrawal of potential strategic site options. This is set out in more detail in AP-011, paragraphs 18-27.

Identifying Strategic Priorities, preparing a SoCG and preparing LSS3

3.35. Since the joint evidence base has not progressed (for the reasons summarised above and set out in AP-011), the WSGB group has not identified any potential strategic and spatial priorities. To date, no conclusions have been reached by the WSGB Board on apportioning growth or to any particular spatial strategy. LSS3 has therefore not been completed or endorsed by any partner authorities.

3.36. It has therefore not been possible for this work to influence emerging Local Plans within the WSGB area. This conclusion has been reached in both the Worthing (2023) and Crawley (2024) Local Plan examinations. The situation is the same for the submitted District Plan despite the Council's active and ongoing engagement with the group.

Outcomes:

3.37. The partnership authorities agreed to progress with LSS3 in order to inform Local Plan reviews commencing in 2017 onwards. It was agreed to commission evidence base work to achieve this.

3.38. To the extent that the evidence base has been commissioned, this work has re-confirmed the outcomes of previous studies – mainly that Mid Sussex District sits predominantly in the NWS HMA with overlaps with a secondary Coastal HMA in the south of the district. The WSGB authorities agreed with the conclusions of this work.

3.39. The extent of unmet need in the WSGB region requires a sub-regional and strategic response. For the reasons set out above and explained in more detail in AP-011, LSS3 has not progressed as anticipated. The authorities have continued to engage, and the NWS authorities have proactively sought to revive the group

since the Water Neutrality position became clearer. However, as LSS3 has not been forthcoming, it has not been able to inform the submitted District Plan, as anticipated.

- 3.40. AP-011 explains that the partner authorities agreed that LSS3 could not inform the current set of emerging plans. However, all partners remain committed to active engagement and co-operation to influence the next set of plans when the position (particularly regarding Water Neutrality) will be clearer. The partner authorities concluded that LSS3 has been 'paused' but not abandoned.
- 3.41. Appendices A3 and A4 provides further details of engagement undertaken with the WSGB and in undertaking this engagement, how the effectiveness of the Plan has been maximised. This includes copies of relevant agendas and minutes.

Individual Local Authorities

Partners: Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Lewes District Council, Tandridge District Council, Wealden District Council, Brighton and Hove City Council, Adur-Worthing Councils and South Downs National Park Authority.

- 3.42. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:
- Collaboration on housing need evidence and emerging findings with respect to cross-boundary issues
- 3.43. Mid Sussex sits predominantly within the NWS HMA (with Crawley and Horsham). There are overlaps in the southern part of the district with Brighton, which sits within the Coastal HMA. The Council's key strategic partners are therefore Brighton & Hove City Council, Crawley Borough Council and Horsham District Council. As a result of engagement and sharing of evidence base information, it is agreed that Mid Sussex is not identified as being in the same HMA as neighbouring Lewes, Wealden or Tandridge, and the only strategic matters identified with these neighbours relate to housing development at neighbouring settlements rather than meeting strategic housing need.
- 3.44. The Council has engaged with all of its neighbouring local authorities on a 1:1 basis throughout the plan making process to identify cross-boundary issues and share evidence as it has emerged. This included individual meetings with Crawley and Horsham which are supplemental to those held on a joint NWS basis and specific to individual authority matters.
- 3.45. The Council shared the emerging findings of its Regulation 18 assessments – this included evidence related to proposed development scenarios and their impact on the transport network in neighbouring areas. The SoCGs demonstrate that there are no outstanding objections on this matter.

3.46. Once the Council had completed its initial evidence gathering and initial assessment of sites, it engaged with neighbouring local authorities in a ‘Show and Tell’ session. At these sessions, the Council explained the site selection process, evidence base and proposed plan strategy and invited feedback and comments. This was to ensure that all neighbouring authorities could be satisfied with the Council’s preferred approach and to ensure it was maximising housing growth by not rejecting sites prematurely.

3.47. The Council has also engaged in meetings of the Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Planning Policy Group. This group meets twice a year and includes Councils in the Gatwick Diamond Area, across West Sussex and Surrey. Standing items for discussion at this group include infrastructure updates, Local Plan and Wider South East Planning matters, Other Duty to Cooperate Work and Local Plan updates.

Outcomes

- Agreement that Mid Sussex does not fall in the same Housing Market Area as its neighbours Lewes, Wealden or Tandridge
- Agreement that cross-boundary housing matters are related to individual sites, rather than housing need
- Agreement on potential cross-boundary impacts and how these would be avoided/mitigated, as set out in individual SoCGS.

3.48. Appendices A5 and A6 provides further details of engagement undertaken with individual neighbouring authorities and in undertaking this engagement, how the effectiveness of the Plan has been maximised. This includes copies of relevant agendas and minutes.

Strategic Planning Issue 2 - Jobs and Employment

Partners: Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Brighton & Hove City Council

3.49. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Scope of evidence to be produced on a joint Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) basis
- Determining employment need (and unmet needs) in the FEMA and beyond
- Understanding of authorities’ supply position and cumulative impacts

Preparing Joint Evidence –Economic Growth Assessment

3.50. Building upon joint-working for the adopted set of Plans which identified Crawley, Horsham and Mid Sussex as being in the same Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA), the Northern West Sussex authorities commissioned an updated joint

Economic Growth Assessment (EGA) which was published in January 2020. This considered employment need, future employment supply and policy implications for the FEMA including in-combination impacts. The authorities agreed that each individual authority would commission authority-specific updates to inform their respective Local Plans, using the same methodology. The Mid Sussex update was completed in 2022 and shared with the NWS authorities.

Employment supply and site allocations

- 3.51. The adopted District Plan and Site Allocations DPD allocated employment sites. At the time the Site Allocations DPD was adopted in 2022 [BD2], residual employment need was identified as 10-15ha. The Site Allocations DPD identified 17.45ha of employment land to meet this need, resulting in a modest over-supply. In addition to meeting identified employment need, the DPD allocated a 50ha Science and Technology Park (policy SA9) to the west of Burgess Hill to support the District's economic growth ambitions.
- 3.52. This significant over-supply has meant that there is no residual employment need for the submitted District Plan to allocate. However, to support sustainable communities, employment land is proposed on the Sustainable Communities sites DPSC1-3.
- 3.53. Neighbouring authorities agree that the committed employment supply in the adopted District Plan, Site Allocations DPD and small-scale proposals in the submitted District Plan complement existing/proposed employment allocations. There is an over-supply of employment land which will support economic growth in the FEMA and contribute towards unmet needs elsewhere.
- 3.54. As set out in the agreed Statement of Common Ground [DC5], Brighton and Hove City Council agree that proposed development and committed developments will support employment growth in the Greater Brighton City Regional area and ensure economic activity is retained in the region. This position is consistent with SoCG agreed as part of the adopted District Plan and Site Allocations DPD processes.

Outcomes

- 3.55. The joint evidence base has influenced the submitted District Plan by determining the employment need for the plan period and provide an understanding of the types of need within the FEMA. Given the jobs and employment position was concluded and agreed through the adopted District Plan and Site Allocations DPD and the review concluded no further allocations were required in the submitted District Plan, however sustainable communities sites are providing small-scale employment. Policy **DPE2: Existing Employment Sites** safeguards existing sites to ensure there is no loss in supply.
- 3.56. Appendices A1 and A2 provides further details of engagement undertaken with the Northern West Sussex Authorities and in undertaking this engagement, with Appendix A5 and A6 setting out the engagement with Brighton & Hove City Council. This includes copies of relevant agendas and minutes.

Strategic Planning Issue 3 – Transport

Partners: National Highways, West Sussex County Council, East Sussex County Council, Surrey County Council, Tandridge District Council, Wealden District Council, Lewes and Eastbourne Councils

3.57. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Preparation of transport evidence, including the Mid Sussex Transport Model
- Understanding cross-boundary impacts arising from Mid Sussex proposals and sharing these with neighbours
- Engaging with the West Sussex County Council Highways Authority and National Highways on results and determining interventions (both sustainable and physical)

Preparation of transport evidence

3.58. The Council has actively engaged with the West Sussex County Council Highways Authority, National Highways and neighbouring highways authorities during the preparation of the Plan.

3.59. At the start of the review process, the Council updated its Transport Model with input from West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and National Highways (NH) on specification. At all stages of model development, both authorities were asked to provide inputs, test assumptions, and confirm agreement with the model. The outcome of this is included in the Local Model Validation Report [T1]. Both authorities are satisfied that the model is fit-for-purpose.

3.60. As each iteration of the Transport Study has been prepared, both WSCC and NH have been engaged and involved in the process. This has included agreeing assumptions to be used such as trip internalisation rates, committed mitigations, cross-boundary development implications, base model/reference case dates and agreeing the approach to covid-related trip rates. This engagement has led to a robust transport model which has supplemented the Plan at all stages.

Understanding Cross-Boundary Impacts

3.61. Alongside liaison with the highways authorities, the Council has actively sought to share and explain the outcomes of the transport modelling that has been undertaken to enable neighbouring authorities to understand the impacts of the Plan on the wider highway network. This has included undertaking further modelling at the request of neighbouring authorities. For example, East Sussex County Council (ESCC) and Surrey County Council (SCC) requested that more detailed modelling was undertaken so that they could understand the plan impacts on the areas they have responsibility for. The Council commissioned Systra to carry out this work, which was shared with both bodies.

3.62. This has led to East Sussex County agreeing that the Mid Sussex Transport study concludes that there are no cross-boundary ‘severely’ impacted locations arising from planned growth in the emerging local plan [DC7]. Surrey County Council (SCC) agree that the impacts on the highway network have been assessed based on the NPPF using criteria agreed by MSDC and WSCC. In addition, SCC have confirmed that they found the additional transport evidence to satisfactorily demonstrate the forecast cross-boundary impacts of the proposed spatial strategy to be relatively modest [DC11].

Engaging with WSCC and NH on results and interventions

3.63. West Sussex County Council adopted the West Sussex Transport Plan in November 2022. This plan has introduced a move away from a ‘predict and provide’ approach to managing increases in travel demand, to a ‘monitor and manage’ approach that seeks to enable a shift in more sustainable travel patterns of travel. The Council has worked closely with WSCC to develop a Plan strategy that enables WSCC to deliver its Transport Plan objectives. The Council has facilitated engagement with the promoters of the proposed Sustainable Communities to develop mobility strategies that will deliver a modal shift to sustainable transport modes. The information has been input into the Transport Modelling assumptions, which has resulted in a reduction in the number of severe impacts on the highway network, reducing the number of physical improvements that need to be made to it.

3.64. A series of meetings have been held with NH throughout the plan making process, and results from draft studies shared for their comment. This has led to the inclusion of potential physical interventions being included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Outcomes

- Engagement with WSCC and NH to determine transport model assumptions and inputs
- Agreement from WSCC and NH that the transport model is fit-for-purpose
- Agreement from WSCC and NH on development assumptions such as trip rates, internalisation and sustainable travel
- Sharing cross-boundary impacts with neighbours (including neighbouring highways authorities) with no outstanding objections

3.65. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendices B1 and B2. A number of the meetings were held as informal officer-level meetings; therefore, no formal agendas or meetings were produced.

Strategic Planning Issue 4 – Infrastructure

Partners: NHS Sussex Integrated Care Board, West Sussex County Council (Education), Infrastructure Providers

3.66. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Understanding additional demand on existing infrastructure and requirements for new infrastructure resulting from proposed development
- The need to provide adequate healthcare facilities to meet the needs of the growing population
- The need to provide adequate education facilities to meet the needs of the growing population

Engagement with Infrastructure Providers

3.67. The council proactively engaged a wide range of infrastructure providers throughout 2022 to inform the Regulation 18 District Plan. This engagement included the following key partners:

- West Sussex County Council Highways (details set out under Strategic Planning Issue 3)
- National Highways (details set out under Strategic Planning Issue 3)
- National Gas Transmission
- National Grid
- Network Rail
- Openreach
- Southern Gas Network
- South East Coast Ambulance
- South East Water
- Southern Water
- Sussex Police
- Thames Water
- UK Power Networks
- Internal MSDC departments including Open Space and Leisure

3.68. This included sharing potential development scenarios for impacts to be assessed and asking each provider to prepare an Infrastructure Position Statement which sets out key infrastructure issues, existing provision, planned provision and sources of funding. These are set out in section 6 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) [IV1]. This engagement has directly influenced the infrastructure asks set out in individual site allocations policies and reflected in the IDP.

Health

- 3.69. The Council has held regular meetings with the NHS Sussex Integrated Care Board (ICB) (formerly the Clinical Commissioning Group) as the responsible body for healthcare provision throughout the plan-making process. NHS Sussex oversees the provision of primary care following agreed strategic priorities and resource allocation across all NHS organisations in Sussex.
- 3.70. The primary objective of this engagement was to ensure that the NHS were fully aware of the emerging Plan strategy, location and quantum of future developments to enable them to effectively advise and plan for healthcare provision. As set out above, this engagement directly influenced the individual site allocations policies and IDP.
- 3.71. Prior to Regulation 18, the Council shared with NHS Sussex the emerging development options. The feedback provided by NHS Sussex on healthcare needs has directly influenced the policy requirements for the Sustainable Communities which, at Regulation 18, identified contributions to healthcare needs as on-site provision and financial contribution which is what the NHS requested.
- 3.72. As the Plan progressed to Regulation 18, further engagement with NHS Sussex enabled the policy wording to be refined. NHS Sussex had advised the Council that they would not be requiring new healthcare provision on the three significant sites but that financial contributions should instead be sought. Consequently, the requirement for on-site healthcare provision was removed from the policies for the three significant sites. The wording for all site allocations were therefore aligned at Regulation 19 to require financial contributions to reflect the NHS request.
- 3.73. The wording of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which accompanied the Plan at each relevant stage was kept updated with respect to Health to reflect the requirement position informed by the NHS at the time.
- 3.74. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendix C1 and C2. The meetings were held as informal officer-level meetings; therefore, no formal agendas or meetings were produced.

Education

- 3.75. The Council has had regular meetings with West Sussex County Council (WSCC), Education Authority. WSCC oversee the education provision for Early Years, Primary, Secondary and Special Education Needs.
- 3.76. The primary objective of this engagement was to ensure that the Education Authority was fully aware of the emerging Plan strategy, location and quantum of future developments. The Council and the Education Authority have worked closely from the outset, engaging on emerging development options to enable the

education needs arising from planned growth to be effectively accommodated either as on-site provision or through financial contributions. This engagement resulted in a comprehensive understanding of the education requirements which were reflected in the wording of each of the policies for the proposed site allocations and IDP which was published along the Draft Local Plan at Regulation 18 consultation.

3.77. In the case of the Sustainable Communities, education provision will be provided on-site – the location, quantum and specifics (e.g. number of forms of entry) have been directly influenced by the engagement with the Education Authority. The site-specific requirements have also fed into the IDP which has been updated on rolling basis and published alongside the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations (November 2022 and January 2024, respectively) and Submission (July 2024).

3.78. The Education Authority has been involved from an early stage, so that requirements can be included in policy drafting and accounted for in site masterplanning and other areas of plan preparation: transport modelling and viability testing. This will ensure the Plan is effective in securing education provision to meet the needs of future residents.

Outcomes

- Infrastructure requirements on a site-by-site and strategic basis set out in the District Plan policy requirements and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

3.79. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendices C3 and C4. The meetings were held as informal officer-level meetings; therefore, no formal agendas or meeting minutes were produced.

Strategic Planning Issue 5 – Environment

Water Neutrality

Partners: Chichester District Council, Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, South Downs National Park Authority, West Sussex County Council, Natural England and Environment Agency

3.80. The key issues that were the subject of on-going engagement throughout the preparation of the Plan were:

- Understanding implications from Water Neutrality for Mid Sussex (as a small area of the district is impacted)
- Understanding implications from Water Neutrality for neighbouring authorities, including implications for meeting their housing need
- Identifying potential solution(s) to enable housing development to take place

Implications for Mid Sussex

- 3.81. Water neutrality is a cross-boundary issue that affects a small part of Mid Sussex District. The limited extent of this issue in Mid Sussex has meant this issue has not had a direct bearing on the Strategy of the Plan.
- 3.82. A small part of Mid Sussex lies within Southern Water's Sussex North Water Resource Zone (WRZ), within which water is mains-distributed by Southern Water. As well as this area of Mid Sussex District, the WRZ covers Crawley Borough, Horsham District, parts of Arun and Chichester Districts, and areas of the South Downs National Park. To protect nature conservation sites, development in the WRZ must demonstrate that it is water neutral. This is in line with a Position Statement issued by Natural England in September 2021.
- 3.83. As set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance [DC1], Mid Sussex District Council is working in partnership with other local authorities and prescribed bodies (Environment Agency and Natural England) to address water neutrality matters including seeking solutions.
- 3.84. As a result of co-operating with the various Water Neutrality groupings (including being a partner on the Executive Board, Lead Officers Group and Planning Policy Working Group) the direct impact for Mid Sussex is minimal. However as a result of this engagement, an agreed joint local authority approach was taken to ensure a consistent policy position is set out in respective local plans. The submitted District Plan includes policy DPS6: Water Neutrality which is consistent with the latest agreed joint position, recently adopted in the Crawley Local Plan.
- 3.85. This partnership work on water neutrality is referenced in the signed Statements of Common Ground with Crawley Borough Council [DC6], Horsham District Council [DC8] and the South Downs National Park Authority [DC10], and through these it is agreed that the local authorities have cooperated. There is also a separate Statement of Common Ground for water neutrality (July 2023) [DC20].

Understanding implications from Water Neutrality for Neighbouring Authorities

- 3.86. The local authorities affected by this issue have jointly prepared a policy update in relation to progress on meeting water neutrality requirements [ENV13]. Other documents have also been prepared that provide more detail including a joint topic paper on water neutrality [ENV21] and a series of project updates on SNOWS. A timeline and key milestones for water neutrality is set out within these documents.
- 3.87. With respect to housing need, the implications have taken significant work by our neighbours to fully understand and the position was not clear until November 2023, the same time the Regulation 19 District Plan was going through its final Committee cycle.

Identifying Potential Solutions

- 3.88. There are several leadership and technical working groups that meet regularly as part of a formal governance structure and the Council has been involved with

these groups from the start. These meetings are ongoing as work is continuing to progress SNOWS. As set out above, Mid Sussex is an active partner in this grouping and has included the offsetting approach and joint policy in the submitted District Plan.

Outcomes

- Agreed approach to Water Neutrality from all partner authorities
- Inclusion of jointly agreed model Water Neutrality policy in the Plan (DPS6)
- Continued engagement on the implementation of the SNOWS offsetting scheme
- Specific Statement of Common Ground on this matter agreed by all partners

3.89. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendix D1.

High Weald National Landscape (AONB), South Downs National Park and Ashdown Forest

3.90. The Council engages on an on-going basis on matters relating to the High Weald National Landscape (AONB), South Downs National Park and Ashdown Forest given their protected status in the NPPF. This engagement is set out below to address the key issue of ensuring the implications of development proposals within Mid Sussex are understood and accord with the NPPF for these locations.

High Weald National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) Partnership

Partners: Ashford Borough Council, Crawley Borough Council, East Sussex County Council, Hastings Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Kent County Council, Rother District Council, Sevenoaks District Council, Surrey County Council, Tandridge District Council, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Wealden District Council and West Sussex County Council. The JAC also includes representatives from the Country Land and Business Association, Forestry Commission, the National Farmers Union and Natural England, and other co-optees

3.91. The High Weald National Landscape Partnership is constituted as a Joint Advisory Committee involving the 15 local authorities that cover the National Landscape (AONB) and representatives of local communities and other stakeholders. Its role is to champion the National Landscape, prepare a joint management plan and co-ordinate delivery of the Plan's objectives. The Partnership was set up in 1989 as an advisory body. Mid Sussex District Council is an active member of the High Weald National Landscape Partnership at both officer and Member level. Mid Sussex are active partners on the High Weald Joint Advisory Committee, High Weald Management Board and High Weald Officer Steering Group.

Influencing the Mid Sussex District Plan

- 3.92. The High Weald National Landscape team has inputted into the preparation of the District Plan. The methodology and approach for assessing the impact of the SHELAA sites on the High Weald AONB has been developed and refined in discussion with the High Weald National Landscape team [ENV6, para 26 and para 29]. Similarly, the methodology and approach for the Major Development in the High Weald AONB paper has been developed and refined in discussion with the High Weald National Landscape team [ENV7, para 17]. The High Weald National Landscape team has also provided advice on the character components that comprise the natural beauty of the High Weald AONB which has assisted with the assessment of sites. These two background papers [ENV6 and ENV7] form part of the site selection process and background evidence for the District Plan.
- 3.93. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendix D2.

South Downs National Park

Partner: South Downs National Park Authority

- 3.94. As set out in the Statement of Common Ground with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) [DC10], the two authorities agree that they have engaged on an ongoing basis throughout the preparation of the Submitted District Plan and consider that the duty to cooperate has been met.
- 3.95. Appendix D3 sets out details of engagement between Mid Sussex District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority in relation to consideration of the setting of the South Downs National Park.
- 3.96. As noted in the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance [DC1], Mid Sussex District Council has liaised with the South Downs National Park Authority during the preparation of the evidence base for the Submitted District Plan. In particular, the Council requested comments from the South Downs National Park Authority on the initial conclusions of the work to assess the potential impact of the SHELAA sites on the setting of the South Downs National Park. Comments from the South Downs National Park Authority have been reflected in the 'Setting of the South Downs National Park – Assessment of the SHELAA Sites' background paper [ENV8]. This is also noted in paragraph 4.12 of the background paper [ENV8].
- 3.97. Further engagement with the South Downs National Park Authority has taken place regarding the master planning for the proposed allocation at Sayers Common (DPSC3) in response to comments received during the Regulation 19 publication.
- 3.98. Appendices D3 and D4 sets out the meetings that have taken place between Mid Sussex District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority in relation to this matter.

Ashdown Forest

Partners: Wealden District Council, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Lewes District Council, Sevenoaks District Council, Tandridge District Council, South Downs National Park Authority, Crawley Borough Council, Eastbourne Borough Council, Brighton & Hove City Council, Natural England, Conservators of Ashdown Forest

- 3.99. There is a long history of cooperation and partnership work on matters affecting the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC: recreational pressure and atmospheric pollution. Since at least 2008, affected local authorities and Natural England (a prescribed body) have been working together to address these matters and seek solutions. This partnership work has continued through the preparation of the District Plan from its early stages to Submission and beyond. Meetings are scheduled when needed.
- 3.100. There are clear outcomes from this work including an agreed strategic solution for recreational pressure at Ashdown Forest that is supported by Natural England; this strategic solution is reflected in planning policy. Adopted District Plan Policy DP17 is currently being implemented and Policy DPC6: Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC follows the same approach with some minor clarification to be consistent with the current application of the policy, best practice and other local authorities. Policy DPC6: Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC is supported by Natural England.
- 3.101. Local authorities are currently implementing and progressing a joint SAMM Strategy. This has included commissioning visitor surveys at Ashdown Forest and at the SANG sites.
- 3.102. In relation to atmospheric pollution, the local authorities are considering a strategic approach and have commissioned joint air quality monitoring which is ongoing.
- 3.103. Further background and context to Ashdown Forest is set out in the:
- Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance [DC1]
 - Habitats Regulations Assessment [DP10, DP11, DP12, DP13 and DP14]
 - MSDC Response to Matter 1 [MSDC-01a]
- 3.104. The Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [DC18] also makes clear that there has been considerable, continued and ongoing cooperation on matters related to Ashdown Forest and Habitats Regulations Assessment. This is also confirmed by Natural England in its letter to the Inspector [MSDC-AP004].
- 3.105. A summary of the key issues covered at each of the meeting, as well as the outcomes, are provided in Appendix D5.

Outcomes

- Preparation of specific Topic Papers (High Weald AONB Major Development [ENV7] and Setting of the South Downs National Park [ENV8]) including assessments of sites, informed by engagement with the relevant bodies
- Sharing site scenarios and accompanying policy wording to ensure adequate protections/mitigations are included
- Informed specific policies on the AONB, National Park and Ashdown Forest including reference to jointly agreed approaches to mitigation such as SANG and joint SAMM strategy.

Engagement with Prescribed Bodies

Partners: Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England

3.106. This section summarises the cooperation between the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England. There were no representations received at the Regulation 19 stage from these statutory bodies relating to non-compliance with the duty to cooperate.

Statements of Common Ground

3.107. There are Statements of Common Ground with the Environment Agency [DC16] and Natural England [DC18]. As discussed at the hearings, a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England was not prepared as they did not see merit in agreeing one based on their supportive comments at Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages.

Duty to Cooperate

3.108. The Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance [DC1] sets out that the Council continues to work with the statutory bodies and the following work has taken place during the preparation of the Submitted District Plan.

- **Environment Agency** – involved in the Water Cycle Study and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment evidence base work, as well as supported the development of the joint planning policy on water neutrality. Further detail on water neutrality can be found in Appendix D1.
- **Historic England** – has been consulted during the District Plan preparation, including advice on heritage policies formation and individual site allocations.
- **Natural England** – has been involved during the District Plan preparation and particularly with the Habitats Regulations Assessment work. Further detail on water neutrality can be found in Appendix D1. Further detail on the Habitats Regulations Assessment work can be found in Appendix D5 and further detail on the High Weald National Landscape (AONB) Partnership can be found in Appendix D2.

Consultation

3.109. The statutory bodies prefer to be consulted at the formal plan consultation stages (Regulation 18 and Regulation 19) rather than informally throughout the plan-making process and there have been no specific matters to raise with these bodies, outside of formal consultation periods. All three statutory bodies have provided comments at both the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages. The Statements of Consultation set out how any comments received have been addressed in the plan-making process [C1 (Regulation 19) and C3 (Regulation 18)].

Regulation 18

3.110. The Statement of Consultation for Regulation 18 [C3, page 17] summarises the comments received from the statutory bodies:

- **Environment Agency** – Recommended amendments to policy wording, in particular DPS4: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage, to strengthen policies and ensure they reflect recently updated guidance. No objection was raised against proposed housing allocations with Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the site boundary and the Environment Agency supported the Council’s approach to avoid development within those areas. They suggested that the Council should ensure that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is up to date – as a result the Council prepared an updated SFRA.
- **Historic England** – Generally supportive of the Council’s approach but requested some additional policy criteria for sites which have an impact on heritage assets.
- **Natural England** – Suggested various policy wording amendments to strengthen proposed policies. Natural England requested that significant sites within the setting of a protected landscape should be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) or a landscape capacity study ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation. No objections to the Habitats Regulations Assessment, although minor additional work was required to ensure full support from Natural England as the plan progressed.

3.111. As detailed in the Statement of Consultation [C3], the Council has taken on board the comments made by the statutory bodies and, where relevant, the policies have been amended to reflect the comments made by the statutory bodies.

Regulation 19

3.112. All the statutory bodies also submitted a representation at the Regulation 19 stage. The comments received are summarised as follows:

- **Environment Agency** – Generally supportive of the Council’s approach and pleased that their comments made at the Regulation 18 stage have been incorporated into the Plan. No specific issues to raise apart from some minor points and comments on specific policies.

- **Historic England** – Welcome the inclusion of policies for the historic environment. Agree that the comments made at the Regulation 18 stage have largely been addressed in the Submission version or are not now likely to affect the soundness of the Plan. Recommend some minor revisions to the site-specific policies.
- **Natural England** – Acknowledges the well-designed policies in the Plan which seek to conserve and enhance the natural environment and welcome the standalone policies for the South Downs National Park and the High Weald AONB. Pleased that the majority of the advice made at the Regulation 18 stage has been reflected in updated policy wording. Recommend some minor revisions to some of the policies.

3.113. As detailed in the Statement of Consultation [C1], the Council has taken on board the comments made by the statutory bodies and, where relevant, there are proposed modifications to the policies to reflect the comments made by the statutory bodies [DP2].

3.114. In response to comments from Natural England at the Regulation 19 stage, as explained in Council's response to Matter 1 question 10 of the [MSDC-01a], the Council has worked closely with Natural England during the preparation of the District Plan from its early stages to submission. The Regulation 19 version of the HRA [DP11] was updated [DP10] to reflect Natural England's response to Regulation 19 representation. No substantive changes were required to the HRA or its conclusions. The Submission version was also reviewed by Natural England before it was finalised; its agreement to the content and findings is recorded in a Statement of Common Ground [DC18]. This is also confirmed by Natural England in its letter to the Inspector [MSDC-AP004].

4. Engaging Constructively, Actively and on an On-Going Basis

4.1. As required by the NPPF, the Council has prepared signed Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with relevant partners. Each SoCG has been prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. With respect to agreement of strategic issues, these were originally agreed in the suite of SoCG that accompanied the adopted District Plan and subsequent Site Allocations DPD and are therefore long-standing. These strategic issues were reviewed at the start of the plan-making process for the submitted Plan and reflected in the updated SoCGs in the examination library.

4.2. The Council has agreed SoCGs with all its local authority neighbours and County Councils as well as prescribed bodies. As discussed at the hearings, a SoCG with Historic England was not prepared because Historic England did not see merit in agreeing a SoCG based on their supportive comments at Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages of Plan preparation.

- 4.3. All the Council's neighbours, County Councils and prescribed bodies confirm that Mid Sussex has engaged on an on-going basis throughout the plan making process and that the Duty to Co-Operate has been met. This position has been confirmed in Regulation 19 consultation responses, Statements of Common Ground, and confirmed by those participating at the Duty to Co-Operate hearing session.
- 4.4. In total, Mid Sussex has participated in over 175 formal meetings with neighbouring authorities, statutory bodies, formal groupings (such as West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board and Officer Group) during the preparation of the submitted District Plan.
- 4.5. This includes regularly programmed meetings (such as the regular Northern West Sussex HMA meetings held every 8 weeks) to ensure that key issues and priority actions agreed were progressed in a timely manner to ensure outcomes of the discussions could influence the content of the Plan. These are supplemented by additional follow-up calls/emails, many of which have been on an ad-hoc basis and are not formally recorded.
- 4.6. A Chronology of meetings, unmet need requests and Council's governance/Committee cycles is included at Appendix E. This demonstrates that Mid Sussex District Council has constructively and actively engaged, on an on-going basis with the relevant bodies.
- 4.7. Appendices A -D and their subsections provide further details of the engagement from 2018 onwards (i.e. when the current District Plan was adopted) to the point of submission of the emerging District Plan, which is the subject of this examination. It confirms how during each stage of plan preparation the engagement has influenced the content of the Plan and maximised its effectiveness.

5. Appendices

Appendix A: Strategic Planning Issue 1: Meeting Housing Need and Strategic Planning Issue 2: Jobs and Employment

- A1:** Summary of Engagement – Northern West Sussex Authorities
- A2:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes – Northern West Sussex Authorities
- A3:** Summary of Engagement – West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board
- A4:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes – West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board
- A5:** Summary of Engagement – Individual Authorities
- A6:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes – Individual Authorities
- A7:** Unmet Need Requests and Mid Sussex District Council Responses

Appendix B: Strategic Planning Issue 3: Transport

- B1:** Summary of Engagement
- B2:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes

Appendix C: Strategic Planning Issue 4: Infrastructure

- C1:** Summary of Engagement - Health
- C2:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes - Health
- C3:** Summary of Engagement - Education
- C4:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes - Education

Appendix D: Strategic Planning Issue 5: Environment

- D1:** Summary of Engagement - Water Neutrality
- D2:** Summary of Engagement - High Weald AONB/National Landscape
- D3:** Summary of Engagement - South Downs National Park
- D4:** Agendas/Minutes/Notes - South Downs National Park
- D5:** Summary of Engagement - Ashdown Forest

Appendix E: Duty to Co-Operate Chronology

Note: The appendices contain agendas/minutes held on file. Where these were not readily available, the Council has contacted other partner authorities/attendees for their records. In some cases, no formal or final agendas/minutes are available and where this is the case, it is indicated. In these cases, the summary and outcomes are based on Mid Sussex officer-level notes only. Some meetings did not include formal agendas or minutes and where this is the case, it is indicated.