Site selection criteria			RAG rating		HKNP 008 - Land to the west of Church Lane
		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.			4.3 hectares
Site availability	Availability of site	Site owner has said that the site is definitely available during the plan period.  Site in single ownership.	Site owner has said that the site is likely to be available at some point during the plan period.  Site in multiple ownership or	Site owner has said that the site will definitely not be available during the plan period.  Sites in multiple ownership	Site owner has said that the site is definitely available during the plan period.  Site in single ownership.
		Site in single ownership.	with minor issues which can be resolved.	with unwilling partners.	
Rural identity and needs	Site capacity**	Site is capable of making a significant contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs.  Site is not of a size that would mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change.	Site is capable of making a limited contribution towards addressing Horsted Keynes's housing needs (has more that 10 dwellings so should provide on-site affordable housing).  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.	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).  Site is so large that it would mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change and developer unwilling to subdivide and provide a smaller site.	Site could theoretically deliver over 80 dwellings which would fully address Horsted Keynes's housing needs, including for affordable housing. However, developer is suggesting that only 1.6 hectares of land on the southern part of the site would be developed, so yield would be much lower, possible nearer to 25-35 dwellings. This would mean that the site could contribute towards a significant proportion of Horsted Keynes's needs, including affordable housing.  Site is of a size that could mean Horsted Keynes's identity as a village would materially change but if a significant proportion of the northern part of the site were given over to public open space, built development would therefore cover a much smaller part of the site and Horsted Keynes would be unlikely to materially change.
	Site configuration	Site does not significantly extend the settlement area of Horsted Keynes village		Site significantly extends the settlement area of Horsted Keynes village or is separate from the main built-up area of the village.	Full extent of site would extend settlement area of Horsted Keynes considerably. However, if development is focused on the southern part of the site then this would not be considered to be significant.

Land use	Brownfield/greenfield	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
	Existing use	Vacant site (including agriculture)	Existing use with a reasonable prospect of being relocated.	Loss of community asset	Agriculture
	Access to village centre services (post office, shop, village green)*	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	Less than 400m
tion	Access to primary school*	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	Less than 500m
Transportation	Access to public transport*	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	Less than 400m
Tra	Public rights of way (PROW)	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.	Development would have no impact on existing PROWs but would be able to link up with the adjacent PROW runing along the northern boundary of the site.

Footways	There are existing, safe footpaths/ pavements accessing the site that provide links to the village centre.	It is possible to create new, safe footpaths/pavements from the site to the village centre.	There is little potential to provide safe footpaths/pavements from the site to the village centre.	Pedestrian access to the centre of the village would be best achieved by gaining access through HKNP 021 (Martindale Centre). Whilst this site has also separately been submitted for development consideration, its owners are saying that it is not available for such an access. If this could be overcome, this would also require crossing of Station Road to access existing footpaths. Scale of development would create potential for providing a dedicated pedestrian crossing.  Alternative pedestrian access could be provided via Church Lane, although this would need agreement of an adjacent property owner. Alternatively, if access cannot be achieved via the Martindale Centre land, then the developer has stated that they would seek to purchase a property on Church Lane, so pedestrian access would be achievable. However, this would result in a long and circuitous route from the housing on the southern part of the site, in order to access the centre of the village.
Linkages	Site provides opportunities to integrate with rest of village by providing new foot/cycle linkages across the site and into existing neighbourhoods.	Site has no or limited connections with neighbouring areas.	Existing routes are blocked or re-directed preventing people from walking through the site to get somewhere else.	Site is reasonably well connected to the rest of the village, particularly if pedestrian/cycle access could be achieved from both the Martindale Centre land and via Church Lane (but both are currently not in the control of the landowner).

	Highways access	An appropriate and safe access can be provided.	An appropriate access can be provided but only with major improvements that could compromise site deliverability.	An appropriate access cannot be provided.	Two alternative option have been proposed:  (1) Onto Station Road through the Martindale Centre land, which would be appropriate and safe. However, this land is in third party ownership and its owners have not expressed a willingness for their land to be used in this way.  (2) Onto Church Lane, which would be appropriate and safe. However, this would involve the purchase and demolition of a residential property. A number of the current property owners have been approached but to date, none have indicated a potential interest in the sale of their property. This solution would also result in a long access road running through part of the proposed green open space in order to connect a possible entrance point with the housing on the southern part of the site.
	Impact of traffic on village centre	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 if access provided via the Martindale Centre land.  If the access is provided off Church Lane, then traffic could travel west via Leighton Road and therefore would not come through the village.
Heritage assets	Listed building	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.	Site is adjacent to a grade II listed building on eastern boundary. Impact would need to be mitigated but development on site unlikely to be in close proximity to this.
He	Conservation Area	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 is adjacent to Conservation Arra on eastern boundary. Impact would need to be mitigated but development on site unlikely to be in close proximity to this.

	Site of Special Scientific interest	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>.</b>	Site of Nature Conservation Importance	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. A tiny portion of the northern tip of the site is a priority habitat but this could be retained and any impact mitigated, particularly given that it is not expected that this part of the site would be developed.
Natural Environment	Local Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve	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
Natural I	Ancient Woodland	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
	Tree Preservation Area	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 does not affect a TPO tree
	Important hedgerow	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.
Water	Flood zone	Site in Flood Zone 1	Site in Flood Zone 2	Site in Flood Zone 3	Flood Zone 1
Landscape and green infrastructure	Landscape character	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 would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and is unsuitable for strategic scale development. Development of the whole of the site would potentially represent a strategic scale development but development of only the southern part as proposed would not.

Safeguarding important views and landmarks	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.	No important views would be affected by development of the site. Development is proposed in the southern part of the site which is the lowest part of the site and therefore subject to the least visual impact - this would also mean that views of the Church would be unaffected.
Protecting the landscape setting of Horsted Keynes	Land considered appropriate for development in landscape terms. Land is contiguous with the existing settlement edge.  Land would include one or more of the following: - Flat or shallow sloping land which is not highly visible from a distance; and can be mitigated through planting; - Land visible from a limited number of properties or viewpoints; which can be mitigated through planting; - Land already affected by infrastructure or disturbed, derelict or damaged land.	Land considered to have the potential for consideration of development in landscape terms. Land is contiguous with the existing settlement edge.  Land would include one or more of the following:  - Land including ridgelines which are not fully visible;  - Sloping land which is partially visible or partially concealed by woodland and where visual impact can be mitigated with planting;  - Small enclosed fields adjoining the settlement edge where visual impact can be mitigated with planting.	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.  Land would include one or more of the following: - Ridgelines, hilltops and visually prominent hillsides; - Steep valley sides and river valleys or corridors including floodplains; - Woodland blocks, significant tree belts, hedgerows and locally distinctive vegetation patterns.	The land is contiguous with the existing settlement edge.  Development of the southern part of the site is considered suitable in landscape impact terms. There may be some impact on views from PROW 7HK, but these likely to be minimal and capable of mitigation through planting.  Development on the southern side would be on higher ground, falling away to the nothern end of the site, so it would be necessary for careful design and screening to minimise the impact on views.
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	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.

ı	I		N1 //: 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
		Opportunity to increase opportunities for public access to the countryside.	No/limited opportunity to increase opportunities for public access to the countryside.	Development would reduce existing opportunities for public access to the countryside.	The site can provide public access to the countryside.  The site represents a significant
	Green infrastructure	Opportunity to provide green open space on site and developer is willing to make provision.	Limited opportunity to provide green open space on site and developer willingness to make provision is uncertain.	No opportunity to provide green open space on site or developer unwilling to make provision.	opportunity to provide expanded green open space on site and developer is willing to make provision.  The site does not affect the setting of the
		The site does not affect the setting of the village green.	The site does not affect the setting of the village green.	The site does affect the setting of the village green.	village green.
Community infrastructure	Community facilities***	The site is capable of accommodating community infrastructure and is in a location that would serve the majority of the existing community	The site is capable of accommodating community infrastructure but is not well located to serve the majority of the existing community	The site is not capable of accommodating community infrastructure	The site is capable of accommodating community infrastructure and is in a location that would serve the majority of the existing community. This assumes that the Martindale Centre is included (which has been put forward separately for development) and would enable reprovision of an improved facility to address the wider needs of the community, which the site promoter has indicated a willingness to deliver. However, the landowner of the Martindale Centre would need to be in agreement. If agreement with the landowner could not be reached then such provision could not be made. Alternative community provision could be made elsewhere on the site but, with the only access point being off Church Lane, would be slightly less accessible to the community.

Business and commercial	Retail/local facilities and employment premises	The site can provide viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises	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.	The site has no prospect of providing viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises	The site may be able to provide viable new retail/local facilities or small-scale employment premises but only the very southern portion of the site (the Martindale Centre, put forward separately as HKNP 021 for development consideration) is sufficiently well located to serve the majority of the communuity, particularly as a retail facility. The site promoter has also suggested that reprovision could also include some small office space. However, the landowner of the Martindale Centre would need to be in agreement. If agreement with the landowner could not be reached then such provision could not be made.  Alternative community provision could be made elsewhere on the site but, with the only access point being off Church Lane, would be slightly less accessible to the community.
Energy	On-site community energy	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

		This site represents a sustainable development but is particularly so if access is provided through the Martindale Centre land. However, this third party landowner is not willing for their land to be used as such.
Overall	Overall assessment	The landowner has stated that an alternative access could be provided off Church Lane through the purchase of a residential property. However, whilst some of these property owners have been approached, none to date have indicated a willnigness to see their property. Therefore there is no evidence that such a solution is achievable.
		This represents a fundamental constaint to what would otherwise represent a sustainable development (assuming that only the southern part of the site was built upon).

## Assessment

Postive	
Neutral	
Negative	

## Notes

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

	Facilities, e.g shops,	Commuting / school	Other
	bus stop.		
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.