

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 03 March 2026 12:33:54 UTC+00:00
To: planning@haywardsheath.gov.uk
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3129

Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3129

Dear Sir/Madam,

. Haywards Heath Town Council,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to Mid Sussex District Council using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 03/03/2026 12:33 PM from . Haywards Heath Town Council.

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

Name:	. Haywards Heath Town Council
Email:	planning@haywardsheath.gov.uk
Address:	Haywards Heath Town Council The Town Hall 40 Boltro Road Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 1BA

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Town or parish council
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	

Comments:

The Town Council wishes to state its strong OBJECTION to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Traffic, Highway Safety, and Sustainable Transport

The Town Council has severe concerns regarding the additional traffic this proposal would generate. Surrounding rural and semi-rural roads, including Balcombe Road, Borde Hill Lane, and Hanlye Lane, are narrow and lack capacity for further widening. The National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") states that development should be refused on highway grounds if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be "severe".

The Town Council contends that the local highway network has reached a critical saturation point. The addition of 125 dwellings, combined with the inherently constrained nature of narrow rural lanes as mentioned above, creates a cumulative impact that is likely to create a 'severe' impact under the terms of NPPF Paragraph 116. As the network lacks the physical capacity for further widening or suitable mitigation, the residual impact is an unavoidable state of gridlock that would compromise the strategic function of the north Haywards Heath road network. The Town Council is also of the view that the current application does not contain the information required for the Highways Authority to make a fully informed conclusion as to the impact to the area.

Furthermore, the lack of safe pedestrian routes on Borde Hill Lane and the fragmented pavement on Balcombe Road shows that pedestrian and cycle movements have not been given priority in the application. This also fails the requirement of NPPF Paragraph 115 to ensure that "safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users".

2. Unsuitability of Proposed Infrastructure and Design

The proposed enlarged multi-lane roundabout is inappropriate in a semi-rural setting. NPPF Paragraph 135 requires that developments are "visually attractive" and "sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting". A multi-lane roundabout is fundamentally at odds with the character of the narrow single-lane roads it serves. Furthermore, NPPF Paragraph 198 requires that development be appropriate for its location, taking into account the "likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment," which directly supports our concerns regarding noise and dust from the elevated roundabout.

3. Inappropriate Development in Areas of Flood Risk

The site's history as a functional flood plain for the Scrase Stream makes it unsuitable for residential development. NPPF Paragraph 170 is clear that "inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from

areas at highest risk". By introducing significant hardstanding, this proposal risks increasing flood risk elsewhere, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 181. The Town Council believes the proposal fails to demonstrate that any "residual risk can be safely managed".

4. Failure to Conserve and Enhance the Natural Environment

The proposal would result in the loss of vital wildlife corridors and mature trees, which serve as "natural capital". As the site sits adjacent to the High Weald National Landscape (AONB), it must be assessed against NPPF Paragraph 187, which states that planning decisions "protect and enhance valued landscapes" and recognise the "intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside". The scale of this development would significantly diminish the landscape buffer between the town and the protected National Landscape.

5. Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Sustainable Development

Sustainable development requires a "social objective" to support healthy communities with "accessible services". The proposal provides no on-site services or amenities, and with local schools already oversubscribed, it fails to "align growth and infrastructure" as required by NPPF Paragraph 11. This lack of infrastructure provision places the development in direct conflict with the NPPF's overarching objective to foster well-designed, safe places with accessible services.

6. Conflict with the Plan-Led System

The NPPF states that the planning system should be plan-led. This site is not allocated in the current Mid Sussex District Plan (2014-2031). While it is noted in the emerging draft Plan, it is allocated for only 60 units. A proposal for 125 units represents an unsustainable density that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. In addition, it is noted that the site is not allocated in the Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan or the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan.

The Town Council concludes that for the reasons set out above, including the severe residual cumulative impacts on the highway network, flooding risks, unacceptable safety risks to pedestrians, and the unjustified environmental harm to a site adjacent to a National Landscape, the application should be refused.

Kind regards

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or

forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.