

Site selection criteria		RAG rating			HKNP 014 - Land to north of farm buildings (A), Jeffreys Farm
		<i>A traffic-light system is to be applied to the assessment criteria with a positive assessment classified 'green', or if mitigation might be required, 'amber'. Some criteria are given extra weight by enabling them be classified 'red' if significant mitigation is required or more serious issues emerge.</i>			0.77 hectares
Site availability	Availability of site	<p>Site owner has said that the site is definitely available during the plan period.</p> <p>Site in single ownership.</p>	<p>Site owner has said that the site is likely to be available at some point during the plan period.</p> <p>Site in multiple ownership or with minor issues which can be resolved.</p>	<p>Site owner has said that the site will definitely not be available during the plan period.</p> <p>Sites in multiple ownership with unwilling partners.</p>	<p>Site owner has said that the site is definitely available during the plan period.</p> <p>Site in single ownership.</p>
Rural identity and needs	Site capacity**	<p>Site is capable of making a significant contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs.</p> <p>Site is not of a size that would mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change.</p>	<p>Site is capable of making a limited contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs (has more than 10 dwellings so should provide on-site affordable housing).</p> <p>Site is of a size that could mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change but developer potentially willing to sub-divide and provide a smaller site.</p>	<p>Site is not capable of making any contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs (has 10 or less dwellings so will not provide any on-site affordable housing).</p> <p>Site is so large that it would mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change and developer unwilling to sub-divide and provide a smaller site.</p>	<p>Site could deliver approximately 15 dwellings so is capable of making a contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs, including for some affordable housing.</p> <p>The location of the site is such that it would require HKNP 015, 016 or 017 to come forward in order that it could be delivered. Together with any one of these sites, the area would total between 1.6 and 2.2 hectares, so could deliver between 30 and 55 dwellings. This quantum of development would provide for all of Horsted Keynes's needs, although a lower quantum of development could also be delivered on any combination of the sites if part of the area was given over to public open space and/or community infrastructure. Together, it is not considered that development would materially change the identity of the village.</p>
	Site configuration	<p>Site does not significantly extend the settlement area of Horsted Keynes village</p>		<p>Site significantly extends the settlement area of Horsted Keynes village or is separate from the main built-up area of the village.</p>	<p>Site does extend the settlement area of the village quite considerably to the west. This could be minimised if the western part of the site was kept open.</p>

<b>Land use</b>	<b>Brownfield/greenfield</b>	Site is brownfield, i.e. is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.	Site is greenfield, i.e. land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, recreation grounds and allotments.		Greenfield
	<b>Existing use</b>	Vacant site (including agriculture)	Existing use with a reasonable prospect of being relocated.	Loss of community asset	Agriculture
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Access to village centre services (post office, shop, village green)*</b>	Walking distance to village centre 400m or less	Walking distance to village centre between 400m and 800m	Walking distance to village centre more than 800m	400m - 800m
	<b>Access to primary school*</b>	Walking distance to primary school 500m or less	Walking distance to primary school between 500m and 2,000m	Walking distance to primary school more than 2,000m	500m - 2,000m
	<b>Access to public transport*</b>	Walking distance to nearest bus stop 400m or less	Walking distance to nearest bus stop between 400m and 800m	Walking distance to nearest bus stop more than 800m	400m - 800m
	<b>Public rights of way (PROW)</b>	Development would have no impact on a PROW. Development would be able to make improved PROW linkages.	PROW affected but can be routed through public open space and segregated from estate roads and footways.	PROW requires significant diversion or extinguishment.	No impact on an existing PROW but no potential to link up with nearby PROWs.

<p><b>Footways</b></p>	<p>There are existing, safe footpaths/ pavements accessing the site that provide links to the village centre.</p>	<p>It is possible to create new, safe footpaths/pavements from the site to the village centre.</p>	<p>There is little potential to provide safe footpaths/pavements from the site to the village centre.</p>	<p>If access was via HKNP 016 or 017, would require crossing of Sugar Lane which could create highway safety concerns but, once on the east side of Sugar Lane, there are safe footpaths that provide links into the village centre.</p> <p>If access was via HKNP 015 then this would come off Keysford Lane which has no footpath.</p>
<p><b>Linkages</b></p>	<p>Site provides opportunities to integrate with rest of village by providing new foot/cycle linkages across the site and into existing neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Site has no or limited connections with neighbouring areas.</p>	<p>Existing routes are blocked or re-directed preventing people from walking through the site to get somewhere else.</p>	<p>Being on the west side of Sugar Lane, the site has limited connections with neighbouring areas.</p>
<p><b>Highways access</b></p>	<p>An appropriate and safe access can be provided.</p>	<p>An appropriate access can be provided but only with major improvements that could compromise site deliverability.</p>	<p>An appropriate access cannot be provided.</p>	<p>An appropriate and safe access is likely to be capable of being provided off Sugar Lane via HKNP 017. An issue is safe pedestrian access to the east side of Sugar Lane. A pedestrian crossing point could be provided.</p> <p>Access via HKNP 015 would also be possible off Keysford Lane but pedestrian access would be an issue.</p>

	<b>Impact of traffic on village centre</b>	Shortest route to strategic road network avoids village centre	Shortest route to strategic road network is through the village centre but scale of development unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	Shortest route to strategic road network is through the village centre	Shortest route to strategic road network out to Haywards Heath avoids village centre
<b>Heritage assets</b>	<b>Listed building</b>	Development would not harm, or could enhance, a Listed Building or its setting.	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm a Listed Building or its setting.	Development would harm a Listed Building or its setting.	Development would have no impact on any listed buildings.
	<b>Conservation Area</b>	Site outside Conservation Area and does not affect it	Site within or likely to impact on setting of Conservation Area.	Development would harm Conservation Area	Site outside Conservation Area and does not affect it
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<b>Site of Special Scientific interest</b>	Site does not affect SSSI	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm a SSSI	Site contains all or part of a SSSI	Site does not affect SSSI
	<b>Site of Nature Conservation Importance</b>	Site does not affect SNCI	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm an SNCI	Site contains all or part of a SNCI	Site does not affect SNCI
	<b>Local Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve</b>	Site does not affect an LWS/LNR	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm an LWS/LNR	Site contains all or part of an LWS/LNR	Site does not affect an LWS/LNR
	<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	Site does not affect Ancient Woodland	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm an Ancient Woodland	Site contains all or part of an Ancient Woodland	Site does not affect Ancient Woodland
	<b>Tree Preservation Area</b>	Site does not affect a TPO tree	Mitigation measures would be required to ensure that development would not harm a TPO tree on site or immediately adjacent.	Development would harm a TPO tree on site or immediately adjacent.	Site may not affect TPO trees although several specimen trees on site may need to be retained.
	<b>Important hedgerow</b>	Site does not affect an Important Hedgerow.	Partial removal of an Important Hedgerow required.	Development would require the removal of all or most of an Important Hedgerow.	Site does not affect an Important Hedgerow.
<b>Water</b>	<b>Flood zone</b>	Site in Flood Zone 1	Site in Flood Zone 2	Site in Flood Zone 3	Flood Zone 1

<b>Landscape and green infrastructure</b>	<b>Landscape character</b>	Significant characteristic elements of the landscape/settlement will be unaffected.	Some characteristic elements of the landscape/settlement will be liable to loss.	Significant characteristic elements of the landscape/settlement will be liable to loss.	Site is within Oddynes High Weald landscape character area. LCA considers this area has low capacity to accommodate development, i.e. development is likely to have a significant and adverse effect on the character of the landscape area as a whole. Development of the whole of the site could have a detrimental impact but a smaller scale development of the northern part of the site would have a much lower landscape impact.
	<b>Safeguarding important views and landmarks</b>	Important views and landmarks would be unaffected by development of the site	Important views and landmarks could be protected subject to the layout and design of development.	Important views and landmarks would be adversely affected by development of site.	Important views to and from the west could be affected but it is likely that they could be protected subject to the layout and design of development.
	<b>Protecting the landscape setting of Horsted Keynes</b>	<p>Land considered appropriate for development in landscape terms. Land is contiguous with the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>Land would include one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flat or shallow sloping land which is not highly visible from a distance; and can be mitigated through planting;</li> <li>- Land visible from a limited number of properties or viewpoints; which can be mitigated through planting;</li> <li>- Land already affected by infrastructure or disturbed, derelict or damaged land.</li> </ul>	<p>Land considered to have the potential for consideration of development in landscape terms. Land is contiguous with the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>Land would include one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land including ridgelines which are not fully visible;</li> <li>- Sloping land which is partially visible or partially concealed by woodland and where visual impact can be mitigated with planting;</li> <li>- Small enclosed fields adjoining the settlement edge where visual impact can be mitigated with planting.</li> </ul>	<p>Land considered unsuitable for development in landscape terms. Landscape character should be protected through the prevention of development. Land is separate from the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>Land would include one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ridgelines, hilltops and visually prominent hillsides;</li> <li>- Steep valley sides and river valleys or corridors including floodplains;</li> <li>- Woodland blocks, significant tree belts, hedgerows and locally distinctive vegetation patterns.</li> </ul>	<p>If developed along with HKNP 017, then the site would be contiguous with the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>However, the site would not relate very well to the existing settlement boundary because the existing defensible boundary of Sugar Lane would have been breached.</p> <p>Development could have a landscape impact but it is thought that this could be mitigated through screening on the western and northern boundaries. This would be important to protect the views from PROW 14HK, although these views of the site are not particularly significant.</p> <p>Long distance views from the west would not be affected provided there was careful design and screening.</p>
	<b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b>	Development would not have an unacceptable impact on the AONB.	Development may not have an unacceptable impact on the AONB, depending on layout of development.	Development would have an unacceptable impact on the AONB.	Development may not have an unacceptable impact on the AONB, depending on layout of development.

	<b>Green infrastructure</b>	<p>Opportunity to increase opportunities for public access to the countryside.</p> <p>Opportunity to provide green open space on site and developer is willing to make provision.</p> <p>The site does not affect the setting of the village green.</p>	<p>No/limited opportunity to increase opportunities for public access to the countryside.</p> <p>Limited opportunity to provide green open space on site and developer willingness to make provision is uncertain.</p> <p>The site does not affect the setting of the village green.</p>	<p>Development would reduce existing opportunities for public access to the countryside.</p> <p>No opportunity to provide green open space on site or developer unwilling to make provision.</p> <p>The site does affect the setting of the village green.</p>	<p>The site can provide an opportunity for public green open space although wider access to the countryside would be limited. The developer is amenable to this provision.</p> <p>The site does not affect the setting of the village green.</p>
<b>Community infrastructure</b>	<b>Community facilities***</b>	<p>The site is capable of accommodating community infrastructure and is in a location that would serve the majority of the existing community</p>	<p>The site is capable of accommodating community infrastructure but is not well located to serve the majority of the existing community</p>	<p>The site is not capable of accommodating community infrastructure</p>	<p>The site is capable of accommodating some limited community infrastructure. Its location on the edge of the village is not ideal for serving the existing community but if developed along with HKNP 017 and a pedestrian crossing was provided across Sugar Lane then it would be an accessible location.</p>
<b>Business and commercial</b>	<b>Retail/local facilities and employment premises</b>	<p>The site can provide viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises</p>	<p>The site may be able to provide viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises but there could be issues of viability or it is not well located.</p>	<p>The site has no prospect of providing viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises</p>	<p>The site may be able to provide viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises but it is not well located to serve the majority of the community, particularly as a retail facility.</p>

<b>Energy</b>	<b>On-site community energy</b>	The site is capable of providing an on-site community energy scheme	The site is capable of supporting an off-site community energy scheme	The site is not capable of supporting an off-site community energy scheme or providing an on-site scheme	The site is capable of providing an on-site community energy scheme
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>				<b>The site on its own is poorly related to the village. If developed along with HKNP 017, and if the western half of the site is left open for public green open space and possibly community uses then it has much better potential. The impact on the landscape and views is a possible issue.</b>

**Assessment**

<b>Positive</b>
<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Negative</b>

**Notes**

\* This is based on the following guidance provided by the Institute of Highways and Transportation:

	Facilities, e.g shops, bus stop.	Commuting / school	Other
Desirable	200m	500m	400m
Acceptable	400m	1000m	800m
Preferred maximum	800m	2000m	1200m

Source: Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot (IHT 2000)

\*\* Assessment of affordable housing provision is based on the MSDC emerging Local Plan policy on affordable housing - Policy DP29 in the withdrawn Local Plan - which reflects the emerging approach to delivering on-site affordable housing. This was updated on 28th November 2014 by national planning guidance which states that sites of 5 dwellings or less in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will not provide on-site affordable housing and sites of between 6 and 10 dwellings will only make a financial contribution towards affordable housing so there will be no direct provision on site.

\*\*\* 'Community infrastructure' includes, but is not limited to, community centres, play and youth facilities, community orchards, sports and leisure facilities (indoor and outdoor) and allotments.