

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 February 2026 10:44:57 UTC+00:00  
**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 09/02/2026 10:44 AM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	16 Coniston Avenue Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Planning Application DM/25/3129 Land East of Borde Hill Lane / North of Balcombe Road - Proposed Development of 125 Dwellings  I wish to formally object to planning application DM/25/3129 for the development of 125 dwellings on greenfield land east of Borde Hill Lane and north of Balcombe Road. My objection is based on the following material planning

considerations:

1. Unsustainable development and loss of greenfield land

The proposal represents a significant expansion on greenfield space, resulting in the loss of open countryside and rural character. This site forms part of the setting of the High Weald landscape and contributes to the transition between the built environment and surrounding countryside. Development at this scale would erode this character and harm the wider landscape.

2. Impact on the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The site sits within the setting of the High Weald AONB. Development of 125 homes would introduce substantial urbanisation, lighting, traffic, and noise, all of which would detract from the landscape qualities and tranquillity of the area. The cumulative impact would be significant and contrary to policies intended to protect nationally important landscapes.

3. Highways, road safety and infrastructure pressures

The proposed development would place major additional pressure on already constrained and, in places, dangerous local roads. Increased traffic along Borde Hill Lane, Balcombe Road, and surrounding routes would worsen congestion, increase travel times for existing residents, and reduce safety.

Of particular concern is the proposed relocation of the newly constructed roundabout. This represents:

- Significant disruption during construction
- Increased congestion and safety risks
- Questions around sustainability and justification for moving recently completed infrastructure (roundabout)

The impact during works alone would be substantial for local residents, commuters and local businesses that will be adversely impacted by the works.

Parts of the illustrative plan appear to lack sufficient turning provision for refuse and for fire safety and including this would require a reduction in number of properties

4. Council's previous assessment of site capacity

The council has previously indicated that this site is suitable for approximately 60 dwellings. The proposed increase to 125 homes represents a substantial intensification that is not adequately justified within the submitted documentation. The scale is therefore inappropriate and risks overdevelopment of the site.

5. Pressure on local services and education

Local services are already stretched, including:

- GP surgeries
  - Dentists
  - Community health provision
  - Schools and early years settings
-

There is insufficient evidence that existing infrastructure can accommodate this scale of growth, and the development risks placing unsustainable pressure on essential services.

#### 6. Lack of adequate play space provision

The application appears to provide insufficient on-site play space for future residents. This is likely to result in increased reliance on nearby facilities, particularly the play area within the Penland Green development. That facility is privately maintained by residents, and increased use would lead to:

- Accelerated wear and maintenance costs
- Additional financial burden on existing residents
- Conflict over access and responsibility

This impact has not been adequately addressed.

#### 7. Surface water flooding concerns

There are serious concerns regarding surface water management. The area is known to experience drainage and runoff issues, and the introduction of large areas of hard surfacing could exacerbate flood risk both on-site and downstream. The application does not provide sufficient reassurance that flood risks can be mitigated effectively.

#### 8. Impact on wildlife and biodiversity

The site supports local wildlife, including bats that feed in the area. Increased lighting, loss of habitat, and construction activity would harm foraging routes and ecological networks. The ecological impact appears understated and requires more robust assessment and mitigation.

#### 9. Countryside character and environmental impact

The development would result in:

- Loss of open countryside
- Urban encroachment into a rural setting
- Increased light pollution
- Reduction in biodiversity

This conflicts with planning principles aimed at protecting the natural environment.

#### 10. Construction impacts on the local community

Construction works, particularly those associated with moving the roundabout, would have a major impact on:

- Daily travel times
- Local road safety
- Noise and disruption
- Air quality

These impacts would affect residents for a prolonged period and have not been sufficiently addressed.

---

#### Conclusion

This proposal represents an overdevelopment of a sensitive greenfield site. It would place unacceptable strain on local

---

infrastructure, harm the countryside and AONB setting, increase flood risk, and negatively affect wildlife, road safety, and local services.

The scale of development far exceeds the council's previously identified capacity of approximately 60 homes and is not justified by the supporting documentation.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to refuse planning application DM/25/3129.

---

Kind regards