

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 May 2026 17:24:42 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/05/2026 5:24 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 117 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access. (Amended plans and supporting statements received 15th April reducing the number of proposed dwellings to up to 117 and reducing the size of the proposed roundabout).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	12 Orchard Way Haywards Heath
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am directly affected by this proposal because I live locally (in Orchard Way) and use Borde Hill Lane frequently every week. I continue to object to this revised proposed development for a number of reasons, including that the site does not meet the requirements for development published by national government

and is not included within Mid Sussex District Council's District Plan.

This appears to be an opportunistic proposal at the cost of Mid Sussex residents' quality of life (including the provision of local services) and enjoyment of life in an area of rural and natural beauty. The changes proposed in April 2026 are minor in terms of a reduction in the number of houses from 125 to 117 - this is still too many. The change reducing the size of the roundabout is welcome but does not go far enough to prevent this development destroying the rural nature of this area. For this reason these small changes do not negate any of the objections raised on the earlier proposals as set out by me and all other residents/parties, and these should continue to be taken into account in the council's consideration of this application, and are strong reasons why it should be refused in its entirety.

As set out in my previous comments, there are a number of reasons why I object to this proposal:

1. The site occupies a sensitive area in the rural landscape surrounding the edge of Haywards Heath, neighbouring the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and immediately to the East of Borde Hill Gardens. It would be disingenuous to say that this is a 'transitional area' - instead it is part of the rural landscape and any attempt to build on it would be encroachment on the green spaces that surround our rural town.
 2. An independent landscape report from 2022 said even 60 houses would cause major harm to the AONB and local countryside character. The revised proposal for 117 houses would of course be far worse. Any development of the site for housing pushes urban development into the countryside. It would create a harsh and unnatural boundary between town and protected landscapes. It would also increase noise, light and activity near a protected area meant to be tranquil and with significant ecological and wildlife benefits.
 3. It is not clear why the developer has doubled the number of houses for the proposal. It is not clear why so many houses are needed (or indeed if any houses are needed - see recent analysis for Mid Sussex given significant developments in Burgess Hill). It is extremely unlikely that the site could handle 117 houses without significant issues. One possibility is that the 117 houses proposal has been submitted on a tactical basis to allow for a possible 'negotiation' to a reduced number (as perhaps was the 125 houses earlier proposal). No such negotiation should be permitted - the site is too sensitive and requires protection from all development. Any development would urbanise the countryside and harm the setting of the High Weald. As a local resident I would be directly adversely impacted.
 4. The effect on local wildlife would be devastating. Surveys have found protected species living on the site including dormice (that are legally protected) and several bat species (some of which are vulnerable). In addition, the site is the home of red kites (finally at home in Sussex after their reintroduction to England), buzzards (largely absent in Sussex in the 70s and 80s, only recently
-

recovering populations) and kestrels. At night, tawny owls are heard calling. The plans for development include the removal of hedgerows, grassland, and trees including mature oaks as well as overall woodland reductions, which will have an adverse impact on our woodland-resident tawny owls and have a direct impact on local residents like me who enjoy listening to and watching these and other birds, and who value local wildlife in our area. Mature trees take decades to grow and as well as value to wildlife also offer environmental benefits (carbon capture, cooling of the atmosphere) in addition to character for the local rural area.

5. The effect on local services including utilities does not appear to have been considered. South-East Water confirmed that in early autumn 2025 Haywards Heath and surrounding areas were 6 weeks away from having no water supplies (despite hose pipe bans and restrictions on local residents' water use being in existence. The lack of supply infrastructure is a significant issue for Mid Sussex and would be made only worse by allowing significant additional housing developments. The planning proposal should be rejected unless South East Water can guarantee that they can supply drinking water to the new houses and all existing Mid-Sussex residents despite climate change and periods of drought. (It is not enough that South East Water do not raise objections - as they will collect an additional standing charge from each new house regardless of whether water supplies can be delivered). In addition, Southern Water have confirmed that additional housing on this site will put pressure on existing local sewage systems (already under strain, see recent local issues in Fairfield Way). There is a risk of local flooding as the site is in an area prone to water-logging, and the inevitable new hard landscaping of the proposal will make this worse. The proposal should be rejected on these serious water/sewage issues alone.

6. In addition, other local services including but not limited to GPs, NHS dentists, train services to/from London and Brighton, parking spaces at the station and in town, bus services to the station, hospital and town centre (non-existent at the moment) should be analysed and made available to ensure continued quality of care. Places at primary and secondary schools should also be considered.

7. Any extension of the roundabout on Borde Hill Lane would be an intrusion of urban life on a beautiful rural area next to Borde Hill Gardens and would ensure the destruction of the character of the area. This was comprehensively rejected a few years ago on the basis that it would destroy the rural character of the area. In addition, local residents should not be subjected to the noise, road closures and disruption that this would cause (again). West Sussex County Council have struggled to maintain Borde Hill Lane and beyond to Balcombe and into Haywards Heath, with many significant dangerous potholes appearing each winter (including 2025-26) which has resulted in car damage. For example, there have been recent dangerous driving conditions near the viaduct and in the area around the River Ouse. This has directly affected local residents like me who have

either risked an accident or avoided the route, both of which have added driving time to journeys (including those made by emergency services vehicles). Adding additional traffic to this rural sensitive route from new housing will make the issues worse. Unless funding and resources from West Sussex County Council to directly address these issues now and in future years are a mandatory part of this planning application then the proposals should be rejected as they will adversely affect all residents using Borde Hill Lane. These problems will be amplified during the period of any building works with lorries etc.

For all these reasons I object to this application and ask the council to refuse it on the grounds that this is a rural site completely unsuitable (and out of line with government guidelines) for large-scale housing development.

Kind regards