

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 November 2025 16:19:56 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 11/11/2025 4:19 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:	Timbers Broadlands Burgess Hill
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	This application does not comply with the local and national planning policy, is unsuitable for this semi-rural location and will cause significant harm. It should be refused.

Planning decisions in Mid Sussex are currently governed by the NPPF and the MSDC District Plan 2014-31 (as the District Plan Review has not yet been adopted following its rejection by the Planning Inspector).

This application for 26 houses is extremely similar to the application 19/3334 for 33 houses that was refused by MSDC. Several of the grounds for refusal given by MSDC in that decision apply equally to application 25/2634.

The first reasons why this application should be refused can be provided using direct quotes from MSDC's decision notice for 19/3334. These must be applied in the same way to this application in order to comply with the letter and spirit of MSDC planning policy, and to avoid causing harm.

1. "The proposed development is located within a countryside location outside of the built up area of Burgess Hill which is not... contiguous with a built-up area boundary and thus would be contrary to policies DP12 and DP15 of the District Plan. Whilst the dwellings will make a contribution to additional housing in the district, the proposed development would not protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and would have an intrusive and harmful urbanising impact on the landscape. The proposal is thereby contrary to policies DP12 and DP15 of the Mid Sussex District Plan"

It is also therefore contrary to DPC1 & DPC2 of the District Plan Review.

2. "The proposed scale of development identified in the indicative site layout plan of a high density cul-de-sac development would not reflect the existing low density ribbon development character of Keymer Road. Due to the development of this site the proposal would result in an adverse impact on views from the adjacent public footpath and public open space where the proposed houses would be seen above the hedge and result in an unacceptable urbanisation of the site which would harm the semi-rural character of the site and the area in general detracting from local views from the adjacent public open space. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policy DP12 of the District Plan and policy 170 of the NPPF" [and DPC1 of the District Plan Review.]

3. This harmful application requires the removal of significant lengths of native hedgerow which is protected by UK Law, therefore point 3 of the 2019 decision applies:

"The proposed removal of a 39 metre section of a historic hedge to the front boundary to accommodate the access and visibility splays would result in significant harm to biodiversity through the loss of an irreplaceable habitat of a historic hedgerow that represents a living landscape history as well as a complex ecosystem. The proposed mitigation of the translocation of the hedge is not considered appropriate in this instance. The proposal

would therefore be contrary to Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, and policy 175 of the NPPF" [and DPN4 of the District Plan Review.]

MSDC have previously demonstrated their commitment to this protection when they took enforcement action against developers in this area for hedgerow destruction (EF/15/0019), and should remain consistent in this approach.

Additional reasons for refusal include:

4. The developer suggests that this proposed development is suitable because there is already planning permission to build on this site. The site was in fact only deemed appropriate for 2 large detached houses (to match the spread out ribbon development characteristic of this semi-rural road) in application DM15/3955. This current application is instead an entirely out of keeping housing estate - almost identical to that refused by MSDC in 2019.
5. This location is also unsuitable because of its proximity to the South Downs National Park, the boundary of which lies only a few hundred metres away. The site is clearly visible from the Downs, and such an urbanising development would spoil the protected views and the setting of the Park. The setting of the South Downs National Park is protected by the District Plan, and this application contravenes District Plan Policy DP19 and policy and DPC5 of the District Plan Review.
6. This site adjoins the Batchelors Farm public greenspace, an important amenity for local residents and part of the Burgess Hill Green Circle. Such an urbanising, intensive development will harm the setting of the green space, causing noise and light pollution to this valued area. This development is therefore inappropriate according to paragraph 180 of the NPPF which states that planning decisions must be mindful of "the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development" and should "protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason"
7. There are serious concerns regarding drainage as there is no mains drainage in this location (because it is rural) therefore soakaways will be used. However, the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy supplied by the applicant agrees with the findings from the 2019 application - because of the Weald Clay underlying the site there is no possibility of using the standard infiltration method as the ground simply cannot take it. It is proposed to use a combination of other methods ending ultimately in discharge to the small watercourse in the Batchelors Farm public open space. Anyone who walks there knows this area is frequently flooded and wet all year round. Local residents also experience annual surface water flooding in their gardens and the Jones Homes Folders Grove development flooded recently. With

mild wet winters and heavy rainfall an ever more frequent occurrence, this site will suffer from and contribute to more flooding in the area. The site is simply unsuitable for a housing estate.

For all the above reasons this application must be refused. The site is suited only for the 2 single detached houses already agreed. This will allow the majority of the land to remain as green space and preventing these many harms.

Kind regards