

Steven King

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 May 2026 17:25
To: Steven King; planninginfo
Subject: Comments/Objections To Revised Planning Application DM25/3129

Dear Sirs,

I refer to your notification letter contained within your email dated 17/4/26 sent at 10.16hrs relating to Amendments to Planning Application DM/25/3129. May I first start by pointing out that this ended up going to my junk mail and so I did not see it until sometime after it was first sent. I suspect that this might also be the case for other residents that you have contacted in connection of this Application and something that you ought to be aware especially given the deadline for comments so close to a Bank Holiday.

I have examined the revised proposals and whilst I acknowledge that any reduction in overall housing numbers is a slight improvement - I remain convinced that practically speaking this is an inappropriate and problematic site in the first place. And that the proposed flood alleviation measures (if they are fit for purpose, or whether they are not) will require on-going close and costly maintenance. A cost which ultimately, I suspect will end-up passing to the general rate payer in the same way these site problems always seem to. I also believe that there remain very strong aesthetic reasons why this beautiful piece of land - so close to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a wildlife haven should not be developed as well. Others have already made strong arguments on this issue so I won't waste more words repeating them again here other than to say when its gone, its gone!

Whilst there has been some slight adjustment to the preposterously massive new roundabout, I see no justification to why this is actually required in the first place! Whilst Highways have commented at some length on the niceties of minor tweaks and compliance with various road building regulations, I still see no justification or comment from them on all the disruption this phase of the development will actually impose on both local and wider communities during what is likely to be an extended construction period, nor why if these changes are so fundamentally necessary - why they were not picked-up on the earlier Redrow development that always suspiciously put in another snub-noised exit from its roundabout in the first place?

Fundamentally, the earlier objections I made in my previous representation comments (which are available on the Planning Portal dated 6/2/26, 16/2/26, 26/2/26, 20/3/26 and 9/4/26) remain.

I have heard that earlier comments made against the original DM/25/3129 for the 125 properties will still be taken into consideration, so I hope this will indeed be the case.

I spent some considerable time developing the argument that drainage (both surface and waste water) flood mitigation measures and future infra-structure needed to be looked at in a context way beyond the confines of the site itself - because of the pre-existing flooding issues linked to the Scrase stream well beyond the site and into other parts of Haywards Heath and Lindfield as well as current failures and short falls in Southern Waters management of sewage into the pre-existing system that

this plan proposes to link into. I see that Mr Fanning's (Consultee representing the Environment Agency) latest comments of 27/4/26, do now clarify his departments wishes that the development be flood resilient, and especially that the overall flood risk both on and off-site is not increased. Just how this can be established relying purely on the Developers own commissioned reports remains a concern to me.

The removal of the 8 houses in the field between the existing dwellings at Buntinghill and Hill Cottage is in part to reduce the likely flood risk to existing dwellings immediately adjacent to one part of the proposed site, but the question as to whether or not this is enough for others remains to be seen. And this of course assumes that this reduction is not re-introduced at some later stage. If Outline planning permission does end up being given despite the objections previously voiced by a majority of both Haywards Heath and Staplefield counsellors in the meetings I attended - then at least this reduction on this particular field ought to be written in as a permanent condition.

Having spent so much time talking about an excess of water, it is worth noting that only a few days ago local residents received an email from South East Water reminding it's customers of likely water shortages due to the unseasonably low April rainfall and the need for on-going economic use of water - no doubt pending the return of the future emergency measures we saw last summer. This only goes to under-pin the point that whatever higher level government building targets have been set, improvements to infrastructure need to come first. However, as we all know this never happens, so we are just storing up more problems for the future.

Yours faithfully

