

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 August 2025 12:01:22 UTC+01:00
To: "Stuart Malcolm" <stuart.malcolm@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1434

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 12:01 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Rear Of Chesapeake Reeds Lane Sayers Common Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9JG
Proposal:	Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling house, stables and barn buildings and the proposed development of 27 dwellings, with a new vehicular access, associated landscaping, parking, open space, and all other associated development works.
Case Officer:	Stuart Malcolm

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Albourne Village Hall The Street Albourne
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Town or parish council
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	APC (Albourne Parish Council) consultee response to DM/25/1434 - Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling house, stables and barn buildings and the proposed development of 27 dwellings, with a new vehicular access, associated landscaping, parking, open space, and all other associated development works. APC's main objection is the lack of reference to the wider development/Masterplan and draft policy DPSC GEN but

recognising that this is not, in itself, a reason for refusal. As you are aware this planning application is site DPSC4 which is part of a Sayers Common Sustainable Community Masterplan of 2,393 dwellings for which all the developers have signed a Statement of Common Ground in Aug 2024. As such although this site is outside of APC's area we would have expected to be consulted especially as the major site DPSC3 of 1,850 dwellings for which Berkeley, the developer, is responsible for coordinating the Masterplan. Apologies for the late response as we only become aware of this a few weeks ago and needed to consult with our experts for comment which is incorporated into our response below. If you could ensure that APC is registered as a consultee for all Masterplan planning application sites, it would be greatly appreciated.

This site, as do all the sites in the Masterplan, need to act together however there is no reference to this and the other sites and how it is part of a Masterplan and as such we request that this is REFUSED and resubmitted with evidence of how it is part of the Masterplan. This should be the case for all sites being submitted and trust that this will be conveyed to all the developers. This maybe via a common statement from MSDC on the District Plan. We are currently awaiting a follow up meeting to be arranged by MSDC with all PC's, MSDC and the developers as a promised follow at a meeting to the one held at MCDC offices on 20th May 2025. As part of our response to this application we will not go into detail on the Masterplan only where it is relevant.

APC's residents' major concerns are Highways and Flooding. Highways.

Although this is only a small site of 27 dwellings it will put additional traffic onto a busy road.

APC agree with WSCC Highways Authority consultation comments briefly as follows.

1.

With recommended amended designs for this development Reeds Lane will be able to cope with the additional traffic.

2.

With reference to Site Context - Mid Sussex Local Plan, that is, that concern that the Local Plan 2021-2039 has been raised over a duty cooperate WSCC - Highways Authority have stated that this site needs to demonstrate how this site relates to the other sites which total 2,393 dwellings.

3.

That a coordinated approach and collaboration with other housing allocations in the Plan within Sayers Common and Prioritise pedestrian and cycle access through the site

This being the smallest and looking at it in isolation this may have little effect on highways but our concern is if all the sites are looked at in the same way this would be a major divergence as what is in the District Plan, that they are to be part of a Masterplan, that is a traffic strategy would be proposed for all the sites, and suggest this need to be part of all the site applications. DPSC6 has 100 dwellings and part of DPSC3 which has 1,850

dwelling all enter and exit onto Reeds Lane. Masterplan DPSC3, 4 and 6 will have a unique relationship coming onto Reeds Lane, surely this is one of the many benefits of the Masterplan that they are looked at together and not in isolation?

Drainage/Flooding.

This is a major concern for all sites in the Masterplan and so it is for this application.

The Water Authority has been consulted however Southern Water have been consulted not South East Water which this site falls under. APC request that they will be able to comment on the consultation provided by South East Water when it is available.

Our observations on the information submitted are as follows:

1. The copy of the FRA has no proposed ground levels or finished floor levels. We believe this is important because within the FRA it states that the pumping station and the houses of the south need to be raised. However there appears not to be a drawing indicating the proposed levels. Please can this be provided to comment on.

2. The drainage drawing has no levels for the attenuation tanks. It is stated on the drainage drawing the attenuation tanks are 0.5 deep with 0.9 cover. Therefore, that would give a total depth of 1.4m. According to the drainage drawing the permeable paving is 1.1m.

The attenuation tanks need to be higher than the permeable paving to work as they drain into the permeable paving. Please can the ground level be placed on the drawing.

Similar if you use the levels on the drainage drawing, plot 10 appears to be lower than the roads, when the permeable paving is half full will the houses flood?

3. It is noted that the front of the development is draining to a highway drain. Please can it be confirmed from either the planner or the highway department that it is acceptable to place third party surface water into the highway drain. There is no evidence confirming

that surface water from the site can be drained into the road highway system. If this is not allowed the drainage strategy will need to be reconsidered.

4. South East Water have not confirmed that the foul water can drain into the system. APC are aware there are existing capacity issue. We await South East Water comments. If there is a capacity issue, then due to a new pumping station being

delivered as an infrastructure upgrade then please could a condition be included in the planning permission that no occupation is to happen until the sewerage infrastructure is upgraded.

5. We have no comment on the model as this is beyond APC's ability to check.

6. As stated flooding is a major concern and although the site has a low point so it works that it can drain to the low point the houses are raised and unless there is a bund around the site by raising the ground this will discharge water on neighbouring properties which is totally unacceptable. If the levels have to be raised does this not highlight there is a drainage/flooding issue in this area.

As part of our comments, we would like to draw your attention to the consultee from 1 Kingsland Cottages, which highlights local concerns and provides further details on the issues mentioned above. Although the information/comments on this consultee with regards to flooding provides good evidence including photographs of severe flooding APC do not agree with the comment that this site should not be dealt with as part of the submitted District Plan 2021-2039.

The submitted District Plan 2021-2139 has received a comment by The Inspector that she is looking to fail it due to duty to cooperate with neighbouring councils and MSDC is looking to challenge this, but by virtue of this comment it is sound in all other aspects. However, MSDC are looking to continue that this site is part of a Masterplan and as such should be treated as such. APC also believe that this will be the best outcome for this planning application and other applications that are part of this Masterplan. APC attended a meeting with MSDC on 20th May 2025, specifically set up to discuss the Masterplan at which all developers attended, including Antler Homes. At this time, The Inspector had passed her comments, 4th April 2025, on the District Plan but it was not evident that the developers looked not progress as per the District Plan and the Masterplan. Far from it, it was agreed to arrange workshops with MSDC, developers and PC's to establish close consultation on the Masterplan to enable a robust Masterplan that would satisfy the community in the best way possible.

One such comment which is in the consultee comments from 1 Kingsland Cottages, is an email from West Sussex Highways dated 24th Nov 24 which states 'The ongoing surface water problem looks to be caused by insufficient surface water sewer/District Council watercourses/Rife/River that the council's surface water discharges into.

This local information as with a request for community to engage

for further flooding information could be collated as part of the Masterplan so the proposed 2,393 dwellings can be developed into a drainage strategy that would not only prevent flooding on the allocated sites but also assist the neighbourhood a win win for all residents new and old.

Finally with reference to DM/24/2296 Land to The North of Lyndon, Reeds Lane Sayers Common West Sussex, and amendment to the s106 to change the tenure of affordable rent dwellings to shared ownership has been submitted and approved. This relates to DM/22/0640 approval for 36 dwellings.

This amendment changes the affordable rent dwellings to sell the properties at 30% below market value and as such there will be NO affordable rented homes on this development. We understand the benefit of selling the properties at 30% below market value but not the result in there being NO affordable rented dwellings on this development of 36 homes. The reason that we mention this is that if this should happen to one of the sites in the Masterplan this could be addressed by increasing the affordable rented homes on another site to keep the balance. One of APC's aspirations is for a higher number of affordable homes than policy require which rented homes would form a part of.

Councillor John Spencer
Planning Lead for Albourne Parish Council

Kind regards