

**WSSC CONSULTATION RESPONSE:
County Planning – Minerals & Waste Planning Authority**

TO:	Case Officer: Matthew Porter
DATE:	25/03/2026
LOCATION:	Land North West of Southwater
SUBJECT:	DC/26/0366 Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the highway) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Classes C2 and C3); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure.
RECOMMENDATION:	☐ Advice ☐ More Information ☐ Objection ☐ Consulted in Error ☐ No Objection ☒ No Objection Subject to:

The proposed development seeks outline permission for the development some 116ha of land to the west of Southwater for the delivery of 1000 dwellings and associated facilities, infrastructure and landscaping. The application site is located within the mineral safeguarding areas for building stone (Horsham Stone) and is partially within the brick clay (Weald Clay) safeguarding area. The northern extent of the application site (adjacent to the A24) is also located within the Waste Safeguarding Consultation Buffer Zone for the Hop Oast Depot (Household Waste Recycling Site).

Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018, Partial review March 2021) (JMLP):

The applicant has provided a Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) which considers the non-mineral development in relation to the safeguarded mineral resource, as required by Policy M9 of the JMLP, which reads as follows:

Policy M9

Proposals for non-mineral development within (Mineral Safeguarding) areas will not be permitted unless:

- (i) "Mineral sterilisation will not occur; or*
- (ii) It is appropriate and practicable to extract the mineral prior to the development taking place, having regards to the other policies in this Plan;*
- or*



- (iii) *the overriding need for the development outweighs the safeguarding of the mineral and it has been demonstrated that prior extraction is not practicable or environmentally feasible."*

The submitted MRA provides discussion around the potential prior extraction of the underlying mineral resource which, through submission of preliminary ground investigations (including 35 hand-dug trial pits and 20 window samples, both within and proximal to the application site), suggests that both the brick clay and building stone resources are present in varying qualities across the site. That said, when considering the viability of the extraction of these resources prior to the non-mineral development taking place, the report concludes that it would not be economically practicable or environmentally feasible, owing to; a significant overburden above the safeguarded resource (>2m in most cases), poor quality and a wide dispersion of quantity across the site, and shallow groundwater tables.

The MRA states that there is a strong case to be made for the overriding need for the non-mineral development that would override the sterilisation of the safeguarded mineral resources and, when combined with the existing reserves at allocated extraction sites across the county, concludes that the extraction of the safeguarded mineral resources would not be viable in this instance.

While the potential quantity of resource expected to be sterilised remains unknown, it is expected that a significant amount of both Weald Clay and Building Stone would be sterilised as a result of the proposed development if no prior extraction is achieved, particularly with regard to building stone within the northern part of the site.

That said, through the analysis of preliminary investigative groundwork, the submitted MRA has demonstrated that the majority of the underlying mineral resources are not of a high quality or readily accessible to the point where they could be extracted on a large scale prior to the delivery of the non-mineral development. These factors, in combination with nearby environmental constraints (including partial areas of previously developed land within the site) and the abundance of the brick clay resource across the county, suggest that the prior extraction of the brick clay mineral resource underlying the application site as 'low' priority.

Therefore, it is considered that the economic practicability of the brick clay resource is likely to be low and, given the application site forms part of a wider development on land allocated for residential development (particularly in the south, as identified within the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031), the need for the proposal may outweigh the safeguarding of the mineral resource as per Policy M9 of the JMLP, albeit the level of weight to afford this will be for LPA to determine.

With regard to building stone; consideration should be given to the potential usefulness of this resource within the local built landscape or the proposed development itself, and the MWPA would recommend that the LPA contact their Conservation Officer to fully assess the level of weight to afford the safeguarding of this resource (see 2.5 of the [Mineral and Waste Safeguarding Guidance](#)).



The MWPA would suggest that the applicant consider the potential for incidental extraction of higher quality or accessible resources for export or use within the development (as per their safeguarded properties) in conjunction with the submission for reserved matters should they come forward. The applicant should consider, where practical, how extraction of the resources can be implemented into the landscaping of the development, which may include the delivery of SUDS, or use within the design or finish of the wider site, for example.

Therefore, the MWPA would offer no objection to the proposed development, subject to the LPA being satisfied that the overriding need for the non-mineral development outweighs the safeguarding of the mineral reserve, and that they are satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that full prior extraction would not be economically practicable or environmentally unfeasible.

WSSC Waste Local Plan (2014):

The northern extent of the application site is located within the waste safeguarding buffer zone, which seeks to ensure that development proximal to operational waste sites are compatible, as per the agent of change principle.

National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) seeks planning applications for non-waste development to ensure that the likely impact upon existing waste facilities do not prejudice their implementation and operation. This is reflected in Policy W2 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014)('WLP'), which reads as follows:

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure

Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing waste management sites or infrastructure that make an important contribution to the transfer of waste will not be permitted unless:

- (a) the current use is temporary and the site or infrastructure is unsuitable for continued waste use;*
- (b) continued use of the site or infrastructure for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of its impact on local communities and/or the environment;*
- (c) redevelopment of the site or loss of the infrastructure would form part of a strategy or scheme that has wider social and/or economic benefits that clearly outweigh the retention of the site or the infrastructure for waste use; or*
- (d) a suitable replacement site or infrastructure has been identified and permitted.*

The applicant has provided a brief assessment with regards to Policy W2 within their submitted Planning Statement. This assessment draws upon the conclusions of the transport assessment, noting that the cumulative highways impacts would not prevent or prejudice the continued operation of the waste site, and further notes that (c) of W2 would apply in any case. The MWPA would note that the application of W2 (c) in this instance would not be relevant as the proposal would not result in the loss or redevelopment of any waste infrastructure.

At this stage, the MWPA is not overly concerned with the potential for the development to interact negatively with the operational waste infrastructure, noting the degree of separation between the two land uses and that the illustrative masterplan seeks to provide a significant natural buffer along the northern boundary of the site against the A24, which would likely afford some amenity benefits for proposed residential land uses. Further, the



HDC EHO has not raised any significant concerns with the proposal at this stage, albeit their expertise should be sought on this specific matter should the determining authority require further guarantee of their compatibility.

Therefore, subject to the above, the MWPA would raise no objection to the proposal at this stage from a Waste Safeguarding perspective.

Kind regards,

Edward Anderson (Planner)

[Redacted signature block]