

## Stuart Malcolm

---

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 21 November 2025 17:58  
**To:** Stuart Malcolm  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/2661

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/11/2025 5:57 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land At Coombe Farm London Road Sayers Common West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) comprising a residential development of up to 210 dwellings (Use Class C3); with associated access; landscaping; amenity space; drainage and associated works.
Case Officer:	Stuart Malcolm

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address: [REDACTED]

### Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,  
I am writing to formally object to the above planning application. While I appreciate the need for appropriate and sustainable development, I have serious concerns that this proposal is unsuitable for our village and will have a negative impact on both existing residents and local infrastructure. My key grounds for objection are as follows:  
1. Flood Risk  
The proposed development site and the surrounding area are already vulnerable to flooding. Additional hard-surfaced areas will increase surface-water runoff, placing nearby roads and neighbouring properties at greater risk. The existing drainage systems are already under strain, and the development does not adequately demonstrate how these increased flood risks will be mitigated. This poses a significant safety concern for the village.  
2. Traffic and Highway Safety  
The main access road is already heavily used, particularly during peak commuting times. Adding further residential properties will inevitably increase traffic volumes, leading to congestion and raising the likelihood of accidents. The proposed development does not provide a realistic assessment of the cumulative impact on road safety, nor does it offer

meaningful solutions to manage the additional traffic.

### 3. Lack of School Provision

Our village does not have a local school, meaning that any children living in the development would need to travel to neighbouring towns or villages. The surrounding schools are already at or near capacity, and there is no plan in place to ensure that additional school places will be available. This undermines the sustainability of the development and places further burden on families and local services.

### 4. Inadequate Public Transport

Public transport provision in the village is extremely limited, with only two bus services available and no alternative transport links. This makes the development highly car-dependent, which is contrary to modern planning principles that prioritise sustainable travel. The increased reliance on cars will further exacerbate the traffic issues mentioned above.

### 5. Insufficient Community Amenities

The village currently lacks essential community facilities. The only shop is a small volunteer-run operation, and there are limited services available to support an expanded population. Without proper amenities, new residents may place additional pressure on already stretched local resources, and the development will not contribute to creating a balanced, sustainable community.

### Conclusion

For these reasons, I strongly believe that the proposed development is inappropriate for our village and does not meet the necessary criteria for sustainable or responsible growth. I respectfully request that the planning authority refuses this application

---

Kind regards