

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 May 2026 20:28:32 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/05/2026 8:28 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 117 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access. (Amended plans and supporting statements received 15th April reducing the number of proposed dwellings to up to 117 and reducing the size of the proposed roundabout).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 5 High Point Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

- The scale is still wrong. 117 houses is still nearly double the 60 that the council's own draft plan suggested. The developer has not justified why so many more are needed.

- Landscape harm remains. The independent landscape report found that even 60 houses would cause major harm to the High Weald National Landscape. 117 is nearly double that.

- Heritage harm is unresolved. The MSDC Conservation Officer has confirmed the site makes a strong contribution to the setting of Grade II listed Sugworth Farmhouse. The developer has not convincingly avoided or minimised this harm. Under national planning policy, this must be given great weight.

- Flooding is still deferred, not solved. The application relies on drainage systems yet to be designed. Critical flood risk issues have been pushed to later stages rather than resolved now. The development of Penland Green has already made flooding worse in Orchard Way and surrounding roads - this will make it worse still.

- Water supply cannot cope. There is no plan to increase water supply capacity to serve this development, and even if there were, it would take years to deliver.

- Schools are full. West Sussex County Council has confirmed local schools do not have capacity. S106 contributions do not guarantee school places will be delivered in time.

- Roads cannot cope. Local roads are narrow and already at or near capacity. The roundabout, despite being slightly smaller, remains urbanising and out of character with the surrounding rural road network.

- The site is still not in the current District Plan. Applying for Outline Planning Permission before the site is even confirmed in the District Plan is an attempt to get a foot in the door.

The roundabout is still enormous. Visibility splay lines cut deep into the surrounding fields on every arm - some extending 70 metres out. Two of the arms are even marked "indicative only" on the developers' own drawings, meaning they have not fully resolved where those arms will go or whose land they will affect. This is still a massive piece of new road infrastructure pushing out into open countryside.

The "indicative only" arms are a red flag. Two of the four arms on the developers' own drawings are marked indicative only beyond a certain point. This means the land take, the impact on verges and hedgerows, and the effect on visibility from the AONB have not been fully assessed. Permission should not be granted for infrastructure whose extent and impact is still unknown.

Construction impact. Building a roundabout of this scale on a live rural road would require significant closures or traffic management - replicating or exceeding the disruption of the previous roundabout works, which caused months of misery.

The four-arm question. The current junction serves Borde Hill Lane, Balcombe Road and Hanlye Lane. The fourth arm serves only this development. Enlarging and rebuilding the entire junction to serve one housing site - at what cost, and to whose benefit? The public benefit does not justify the harm.

A small cluster of houses in the north-western corner of the site has been removed. The developers present this as a significant concession. It is not. It was done specifically because council officers raised concerns about landscape and heritage impact - and even with this change, those problems remain completely unresolved.

Haywards Heath Town Council, Cuckfield Parish Council and Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council all object to this application. Hundreds of local residents object. The strong objection submitted against 125 houses is fully maintained for 117 dwellings. Here is why the amendments change nothing of substance:

Kind regards