

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 October 2026 21:13:14 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2214

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 05/10/2026 9:13 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land East Of Keymer Road And South Of Folders Lane Broadlands Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	Variation of Condition No: 33 relating to planning application DM/22/3049 - to allow for design changes. The proposed new drawings reflect changes made on only the Thakeham parcels (Build Phase 1: Access Road and Northern Land phase only).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Broadlands Grange Broadlands Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons
for
comment:

Comments: We object to the above application for the following reasons.

1. Non-compliance with National Space Standards (Policy DP27)

The applicant's own letter accepts that 17 dwellings would not meet the Nationally Described Space Standard but frames this as "only 17 of the 260 dwellings across the scheme" - a figure that includes Charles Church's 140 dwellings, which this application does not touch. This MMA relates solely to the Thakeham parcel of 120 houses, so the true non-compliance rate is 17 out of 120 homes - nearly 15%, more than double the rate implied by the applicant. Presenting the shortfall against the whole scheme rather than the parcel actually affected is a disingenuous framing of a materially significant non-compliance rate.

Separately, the "exceptional circumstances" claimed under DP27 are not a feature of the site or dwelling design - they exist only because the applicant built to slab level before securing approval for the revised house types. A shortfall created by the developer's own sequencing is not the "clear evidence" of "exceptional circumstances" the policy requires and accepting it would reward building ahead of consent.

2. Commercially driven change Housing Mix (Policy DP30)

The amendment cuts two-bedroom homes from 19% to 13%, below the Council's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) range of 20-25% - the evidence base the applicant relies on elsewhere in the same letter. Critically, the applicant's own stated justification is market conditions (interest rates, stamp duty, mortgage availability, and competition with Charles Church's different price point), not any change in local housing needs. Slow sales of the existing two-bedroom units could show that those homes are not selling at their current asking price; they are not evidence that fewer two-bedroom homes are needed in Burgess Hill.

A pricing or marketing problem with one developer's product range should be addressed commercially not by permanently reducing the supply of smaller, more affordable homes that DP30 and the SHMA identify as needed. Policy DP30 ties housing mix to assessed local need, not to a developer's sales performance, and the application provides no updated evidence of need to justify departing from the SHMA range.

3. Need to recalculate Section 106 contributions

The applicant confirms that contributions toward infrastructure, education, health and transport must be recalculated via a Deed of Variation to reflect the extra 20 bedrooms. No decision should be issued until that Deed is agreed and the increased contributions are legally secured.

4. Scale of change is not "minor"

Altering house types, layouts and bedroom numbers across 24 plots - 20% of Thakeham's part of the development - is a substantial redesign, not a "minor" amendment, and should receive scrutiny equivalent to a fresh application, particularly on space standards.

For these reasons, we ask that the application be refused, or at minimum that no decision be issued until the Section 106 Deed of Variation is completed and full space-standard compliance evidence is provided.

Where
did you
hear
about this
applicatio
n?

Not specified

Kind regards