

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 November 2025 20:00:35 UTC+00:00
To: "Martin Dale" <martin.dale@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2634

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/11/2025 8:00 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To Batchelors Farmhouse Keymer Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 0BQ
Proposal:	Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved (except the means of access from the public highway) for residential development and the construction of up to 26 dwellings, with vehicular accesses, and new footpath links to Keymer Road, the provision of new landscape amenity space, areas of ecological enhancements, together with associated Highways, Drainage and Utilities works associated with the proposed development.
Case Officer:	Martin Dale

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Tinkers Broadlands Burgess hill
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 26 residential units surrounding Batchelor's Farmhouse on Keymer Road, Burgess Hill.

1. Incompatibility with Local Character

The proposed development is wholly out of character with the existing streetscape of Keymer Road and Ockley Lane, which predominantly features larger executive-style homes with generous gardens. Introducing a high-density cluster of 26 homes would disrupt the established aesthetic and diminish the area's residential quality.

2. Unsafe and Ill-Considered Access Points

The application proposes two separate entrances, which are excessive for a development of this scale. The second entrance, located near Broadlands and adjacent to the driveway of Yondover, appears arbitrary and poorly planned. This section of Keymer Road is narrow and already presents visibility challenges for residents exiting Broadlands. The addition of two new junctions would significantly increase the risk of accidents, especially given the high-speed traffic approaching from the south, despite recent speed limit reductions.

Furthermore, the absence of a pavement near the second entrance poses a serious hazard to pedestrians, who would be forced to cross the road in a dangerous location close to Broadlands.

3. Impact on the Nature Reserve and Local Environment

The development would have a detrimental impact on the tranquillity and visual integrity of the adjacent Nature Reserve. The scale and proximity of the proposed housing are overbearing and would erode the natural character of the area. It is difficult to imagine such a proposal being approved in areas such as Lindfield, raising concerns about equitable planning standards.

4. Lack of Local Infrastructure Capacity

There is no demonstrable need for additional housing in this location. Burgess Hill is already undergoing extensive residential expansion, with thousands of homes either approved or under construction. This proposal appears to be driven by developer profit rather than genuine community need. Local services, such as the Silverdale medical practice, are already at capacity. The development would place further strain on essential infrastructure without offering any mitigation.

5. Parking and Verge Protection

Should the application proceed, it is imperative that conditions be imposed to prevent construction and service vehicles from parking along Broadlands. The road is narrow and frequently used by visitors to the Nature Reserve. Unregulated parking would exacerbate congestion and pose safety risks. Additionally,

residents wish to preserve the grass verges, which contribute to the area's rural charm and should be protected from damage during construction.

6. Conclusion

This application is inappropriate in scale, poorly designed in terms of access, and poses significant risks to both safety and the environment. It fails to respect the character of the area and does not address the limitations of local infrastructure. I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal in its current form.

Kind regards