

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 November 2025 12:03:37 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 13/11/2025 12:01 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:** Downsview Wellhouse Lane Burgess Hill

### Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Neighbour or general public

**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

**Reasons for comment:**

**Comments:** I wish to strongly object to planning application DM/25/2634 to construct up to 26 dwellings on Batchelor Farm land.

This development impinges on & has an adverse affect on the

strategic gap between Burgess Hill & southern villages. It would substantially encroach on the semi-rural nature of the area adversely affecting the transition from the town to the countryside. The site is resting in an area of countryside restraint & has never been identified as suitable for development following extensive studies by MSDC.

It would appear that the drainage & sewage arrangements are inadequate & pose a risk to the local watercourses.

Back garden infill developments are discouraged by current guidelines.

Vehicular access on a narrow lane with a 40 mph speed limit & significantly increasing traffic demand boosted by Templegate & Ockley Park sites will increase the probability of hazardous events.

A previous planning application DM/19/334 for 33 new dwellings on Batchelor Farm land was refused planning permission vis decision notice dated 7th February 2020 on the following grounds:-

"1. The proposed development is located within a countryside location outside of the built up area of Burgess Hill which is not allocated for housing nor contiguous with a built-up area boundary and thus would be contrary to policies DP12 and DP15 of the District Plan. The Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and there is no identified need for these dwellings in this location as the proposal is not necessary for the purposes of agriculture and are not supported by other policies in the 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 and the aims of the NPPF.

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 para 170 of the NPPF.

3. 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.

4. The proposed development does not satisfy the requirements of Policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in respect of infrastructure requirements, including affordable housing provision, to service the development as supplemented by the Council's Development Infrastructure and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.

It is contended that this past ruling acts as a firm precedent against this application as the majority of the above objections remain valid for this planning application DM/25/2364 constituting a sound basis for its rejection.

---

Kind regards