

Katherine Williams

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 04 August 2025 12:27
To: Katherine Williams
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/1593

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/08/2025 12:26 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Woodlands Close And Land To The North Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down Crawley West Sussex RH10 4JZ
Proposal:	The demolition of numbers 9-11 Woodlands Close together with the demolition of other existing buildings on site and erection of 48 dwellings (Use Class C3) with open space, landscaping, car parking and associated infrastructure including provision of internal access roads and access road onto Woodlands Close.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 SYCAMORE LANE CRAWLEY DOWN
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>Subject: Objection to Planning Application for the Demolition of 9-11 Woodlands Close and Construction of 48 Dwellings</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the above planning application on several key grounds, including issues with infrastructure capacity, site access, and non-compliance with the adopted planning policies, including the Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Local Plan. The proposed development is inconsistent with site allocations set out in the MSDC Plan and would negatively affect both current residents and the already overstretched infrastructure of the village. Local services such as schools, medical care, roads, and drainage are already under significant pressure, and this proposal would only exacerbate those problems.</p> <p>1. Inadequate Access Provisions</p> <p>The proposed access design effectively isolates No. 13 Woodlands Close between two roadways, causing significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants. The submitted Transport Statement acknowledges insufficient visibility splays. Required sightlines for a 30mph speed limit are 2.4m x 43m, yet the application achieves only 32.3m to the south-a shortfall of 25%-and 37.6m to the north-13% below standard. These deficiencies represent an unacceptable</p>

safety risk. It is doubtful that a Road Safety Audit (RSA) would approve this arrangement.

2. False Consultation Claims and Misleading Promotional Material

The applicant's marketing materials contain misleading information about supposed engagement with local groups. For example, it was claimed that discussions had occurred with the village football club, yet conversations with both the football club and the parish council confirm this is untrue. This demonstrates a disingenuous approach by the land promoter, whose tactics seem geared toward pushing the development forward regardless of local input. Genuine community consultation is a crucial aspect of the planning process. The false claims made not only breach procedural expectations but also erode public trust in the system.

3. Unauthorized Footpath Links to Burleigh Woods

The proposal includes a pedestrian route connecting into the existing Burleigh Woods estate, but this access has been rejected by the Residents' Management Company (RMC) and will not be permitted. Including it in the plans is misleading and invalidates part of the proposal.

4. Infeasible Drainage Plan

The proposed surface water drainage system relies on discharging through the Burleigh Woods estate. This has also been rejected by the RMC, not least due to concerns over flooding and the existing drainage network. Therefore, the proposal currently lacks a workable and acceptable drainage solution.

5. Inadequate Village Infrastructure

Crawley Down Surgery was rated "inadequate overall" by the CQC in September 2023 and is currently under special measures. Contributions via Section 106 agreements will not resolve the systemic issues the surgery faces. An influx of approximately 120 new residents will only place additional strain on already insufficient healthcare, educational, and recreational amenities. Kiln Road is in poor condition and would deteriorate further due to the extra traffic, including construction vehicles and around 100 additional cars resulting in an estimated 400 vehicle movements per day. Drainage infrastructure in the village already experiences frequent failures, including contamination of the village pond-exactly where runoff from this development is expected to go.

6. Access Route Contradicts MSDC Site Allocation DPD

According to the Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD (2022), this site (SA22) should be accessed via Sycamore Lane. The proposed access via Woodlands Close directly contradicts this requirement. The applicant acknowledges in their Transport Statement (para 2.15) that Sycamore Lane is the designated access point, yet claims land ownership constraints prevent this route. However, deviation from the adopted plan on these grounds is not acceptable. In fact, MSDC previously ruled out access via Woodlands Close due to highway safety concerns and community opposition. The alleged above-market purchase of 9 and 11 Woodlands Close to enable access suggests a deliberate strategy to circumvent planning policy, which could set a dangerous precedent.

7. Discrepancies in Public Notification Deadlines

There is a critical inconsistency regarding the consultation deadlines. While the planning portal and public notices displayed on posts list the closing date for comments as 15 August 2025, written correspondence received by residents indicates a deadline of 8 August 2025. This conflicting information could result in members of the public missing their opportunity to comment. This administrative error renders the consultation process unclear and potentially invalid, warranting its suspension and a formal investigation.

In conclusion, the proposed development is deeply flawed on numerous levels. It conflicts with planning policy, lacks essential infrastructure, and has been promoted using misleading consultation claims and unacceptable access arrangements. I urge the Council to reject this application in full.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Kind regards