

PPC maintains strong objections to the proposed development and is seeking advice on how best to represent villagers at the appeal inquiry. In the meantime, the following analysis may help you in understanding the benefits and dis-benefits of the scheme so you can support or object accordingly:

Area	What the developer has said	What PPC thinks	Key message
Planning Policy	That this scheme is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	This scheme does not accord with the first NPPF principle on Plan Making set out in paragraph 15 which states “The planning system should be genuinely plan-led.” A development of this size should be considered in a proper plan, against other sites across LDC.	The proposed development is not part of our Neighbourhood Plan and should be judged through the local plan process, not in isolation.
Planning Policy - Tilted Balance	That this should go ahead under the presumption of sustainable development in the NPPF.	The NPPF clearly states that the presumption does not apply when the reasons to say ‘no’ outweigh the reasons to say ‘yes’ – let’s not forget that this has been turned down twice by planning officers and elected councillors.	The benefits of this development do not outweigh the dis-benefits.
Windfall	LDC did not allocate all its land supply in the local plan	That is the case, and your Neighbourhood Plan does support the principle of windfall sites but delivering up to 86 developer-led units in a single hit when we have a planned allocation of 70 over 15 years should not be regarded as appropriate for windfall.	The development is too big to be regarded as ‘windfall’. Permission for 45 houses on this site was refused in 2019 so 86 cannot be acceptable 3 years later.
Plumpton Housing Allocation	That Plumpton was only allocated a ‘modest’ housing target by LDC and can take more.	Modest is not defined in planning. We were allocated a minimum of 50, and your PPNP will deliver 70. Similar ‘service villages’ outside of the SDNP were only allocated a minimum of 30 against a suggested range of 30-100. 70% of the maximum range for Plumpton Green does not appear modest; 156% of the maximum is clearly excessive.	Plumpton is already taking its fair share of new housing.

Housing Need	LDC is short on land supply and must build more.	<p>The goalposts were moved by government and now local plans last only 5 years (not the 15 years LDC planned for).</p> <p>Housing need is no longer based on objective analysis of local need, but on the widely criticised Standard Method, a national statistical model.</p> <p>Central Government now forces LDC to plan for a minimum of 782 dwellings per year rather than the 345 in the local plan – a number the government’s own inspector accepted in 2016 as being appropriate up until 2030.</p>	Government is reviewing policy as part of levelling up – the Standard Method may be changed. LDC is delivering to the agreed local plan; it is premature to commit to the Standard Method increased target until the need is confirmed.
Building Boundary	That developing right to the parish boundary on the eastern side is defensible.	<p>We want to maintain a clear gap between Plumpton Green and East Chiltonton based on the existing building line.</p> <p>Extending development further east than existing established sites risks additional development behind all existing sites. More worryingly, it would link Plumpton Green to the potential Eton site, and could even be used as an access point.</p>	The development represents an unacceptable extension of the eastern boundary of development.
Size and Scale	That the development is of appropriate size and scale for Plumpton Green.	<p>LDC planning committee unanimously opposed this development and like the hundreds of people who objected we back the LDC view that it is not acceptable.</p> <p>Adding 86 dwellings in one development more than doubles the 70 we had allocated over 15 years of the plan.</p> <p>It threatens cohesion as it is a lot of new residents to assimilate in a very short time period, especially if the estate has its own play facilities, and business hub that undermines the village hall.</p>	A 25% growth in the village harms community cohesion.

Housing Location	Plumpton is a highly sustainable location.	LDC has undertaken an issues and options consultations of sustainable locations for the next local plan. Building in villages like Plumpton did not feature in the top 3 choices.	Development should be directed to the best locations, not those preferred by developers.
Sustainability - General	That Plumpton Green is the best location for more and more developments and scored highest in a 2012 survey of equivalent LDC settlements.	Plumpton scored highest at 19 points, but even the lowest scoring equivalent settlement (Barcombe Cross) achieved 17 points. All scored the same on key services, but Plumpton Green 'won' because it had access to a bank/atm, and a frequent train service – where are those now?	All LDC options for growth should be considered.
Sustainability – Transport	That Plumpton Green is unique amongst LDC service villages in having a train station.	True, but ignores the fact that other villages like Cooksbridge also have train stations. Many essential services like the surgeries, hospitals, dentist and so on are not accessible by train or public transport in general, so car dependency is high. We see regular reduction in the Bus timetable. The developer knows this which is why the proposal delivers so many car parking spaces.	Having a train station does not guarantee a reduction in car dependency.
Social Benefits - Road Access	That Station Road severs the community from facilities like the primary school and shop and needs narrowing to improve safety in crossing it.	These changes are to allow the development to use an otherwise unsafe access solution. Everything else is window dressing. It will do nothing to address the issues we face due to motorists ignoring the Highway Code and parking anti socially around road junctions throughout the village. The school crossing is already being addressed and cannot be used to justify this development. Narrowing Station Road will only exacerbate the issues arising from anti-social parking. The proposal also refers to wider traffic calming measures that would be required.	The road narrowing is out of character for the village and unlike anything that exists already or is needed for the Neighbourhood Plan sites.

Social Benefits – Traffic Calming	This development will provide money to put additional traffic calming measures in Station Road.	Station Road does not need traffic calming on the urban scale proposed. It needs sensible parking and parking enforcement that cannot be delivered by new housing.	Existing parking issues will not be improved by new development.
Social Benefits - Play facilities	That Plumpton Green is short of children’s play facilities, and these will be delivered within the new estate.	The quoted research to justify this was undertaken in 2014 and identifies our facilities as in the top 25% across LDC. Your Neighbourhood Plan already identifies the need to improve the King George V facilities, especially for teenagers, but needs the planned sites to be built to provide the Community Infrastructure Levy funding. We want a solution that maintains the integrity of Honeybees and all the sports and casual users of the recreation ground, not a partial solution elsewhere.	Village cohesion is undermined if play facilities are built outside of the central recreation ground.
Infrastructure - Sewage	That the development will fund improved sewage infrastructure.	Southern Water should address the inadequacies for existing residents and not rely on unplanned developments to subsidise its operations.	Infrastructure should be fit for purpose for existing residents and not conditional on accepting unplanned large developments.
Infrastructure – Surface Water	There is negligible risk of flooding and surface water sewer or highway drainage issues.	We know your concerns over all these issues and are particularly troubled that the cumulative effect of existing and planned sites is properly assessed.	Surface water management is not a negligible risk in Plumpton Green.
Infrastructure – Electricity	Not mentioned by developer	The Oakfield and Glebe sites are not using air source heat pumps as UK power networks has advised that the supply cannot be guaranteed. Instead, both sites are using LPG as will Riddens thereby contributing to the climate crisis.	Electricity supplies to existing residents need improvement and cannot sustain planned sites.

Economic Benefit – CiL	That the development will provide significant Community Infrastructure Levy money to LDC and PPC.	That is the law – LDC will get 75% and PPC 25%. We don't think that receive a payment justifies unplanned development.	Being paid to take a large estate in the village does not justify approving unplanned development.
Economic Benefits – Increased Local Expenditure	That the development will provide more residents who spend locally.	That is a generic benefit of all new developments but doesn't justify more than doubling planned growth.	Economic benefits are only one factor in deciding new developments.
Economic Benefits – Increased Employment	That the development would support over 260 jobs in the short term.	This is based on the House Builders Federation model. Given the way that the housing market operates, these are more likely to be existing jobs than new.	Sustaining developers is not the same as sustainable development.
Environmental Benefits	That the development will increase biodiversity by more than 10%.	It is not the houses that achieve this, but separate work that could be carried out regardless.	New houses do not directly increase biodiversity.
Additional Points			
Social Benefits – Scouts	<i>Not mentioned by developer</i>	Developing this site displaces decades of local scouting activity.	A valued scouting location will be lost.
Infrastructure – Electricity	<i>Not mentioned by developer</i>	The Oakfield and Glebe sites are not using air source heat pumps as UK power networks has advised that there is insufficient capacity in the network to provide the power necessary for air source heat pumps in the new developments. Instead, both sites are using LPG as will the Riddens development thereby contributing to the climate crisis.	Electricity supplies to existing residents need improvement and cannot sustain planned sites.