

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 08 December 2025 15:10:17 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/2634

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/12/2025 3:10 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To Batchelors Farmhouse Keymer Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 0BQ
Proposal:	Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved (except the means of access from the public highway) for residential development and the construction of up to 26 dwellings, with vehicular accesses, and new footpath links to Keymer Road, the provision of new landscape amenity space, areas of ecological enhancements, together with associated Highways, Drainage and Utilities works associated with the proposed development.
Case Officer:	Martin Dale

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address: Burgess Hill Town Council 96 Church Walk Burgess Hill

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Town or parish council
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The Committee of 17th November Recommend Refusal based on the following Local Authority planning policy:

## 1. Loss of Protected Green Space and Open Space

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy G1 (Areas of Open Space)

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy G4 (Local Green Space)  
NPPF Paragraph 187(a)

Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP38

Grounds for Objection under: Protected Green Space and Open Space

The site represents greenfield land that contributes to the green infrastructure network connecting Burgess Hill. The loss of this open space would be contrary to the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan's Core Objective CO 5 to "protect and improve areas of existing landscape value and open space identified by local communities" and Core Objective CO 6 to "provide new open space areas where there are deficiencies.

## 2. Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns

### Policy References:

NPPF Paragraphs 170-172 (Planning and Flood Risk) -

"Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk

NPPF Paragraph 181 - Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where it can be demonstrated that "it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.

Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD Principle DG5 - States that "development proposals should normally incorporate sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) as an integral part of the landscape structure" and that "consideration must be given to the future management and maintenance of sustainable drainage otherwise flood risk could increase.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC6 - Requires development to "not result in the net loss of green space" and mandates replacement "of similar value.

The application site is located in an area where surface water drainage is a known concern. Based on technical assessments for nearby sites on Keymer Road, the area has surface water flood risk issues. The site slopes downward and any development would increase impermeable surfaces, exacerbating surface water runoff and potentially increasing flood risk to existing properties downstream, including those on Broadlands. In light of the above, should a Sequential Test be applied?

---

The application must demonstrate:

A comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment showing flood risk from all sources

Detailed sustainable drainage strategy (SuDS) showing the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere e.g. Broadlands.

That surface water can be managed within the site boundary without overloading existing drainage infrastructure.

### 3. Highway Safety and Traffic Access Concerns

#### Policy References:

NPPF Paragraph 115 - States that "in assessing sites...it should be ensured that...safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

NPPF Paragraph 116 - "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network...would be severe

Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD Principles DG8, DG9, DG17 - Require development to "establish a clear movement network that connects with the surrounding area," "reduce reliance on the private car," and "provide attractive streets and spaces...that encourage low speeds and that are safe to use by everyone.

Grounds for Objection:

Cumulative Impact: When considered alongside other recent and proposed developments in the area (including the 260-home development at SA13: Land East of Keymer Road and South of Folders Lane), creates severe cumulative impacts on the local road network.

Highway Safety: The access arrangements onto Keymer Road must demonstrate:

Adequate visibility splays

Safe entry/exit movements for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists

That the access will not create additional traffic conflicts or hazards

Appropriate junction capacity analysis.

### 3a. Character and Townscape Impact

---

Policy References:

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy H3 (Protect Areas of Townscape Value)

NPPF Paragraph 135

Grounds for Objection:

The site lies adjacent to Keymer Road, designated as an Area of Townscape Value. Development of 26 homes would adversely affect the character of this important approach to Burgess Hill, undermining the semi-rural character and spaciousness that makes this area valued by the community.

## 5. Inadequate Site Planning and Design

Policy References:

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy G2 (The Green Circle Network)

Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD Principle DG3 (Work with the site's natural features)

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Core Objective CO 1 - "Promote sustainable and well-designed development in the right location taking into account the character and amenity of the local area. Preserve and enhance existing residential neighbourhoods.

Grounds for Objection:

As an outline application with all matters reserved except access, insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate:

How the development will integrate with existing natural features

Provision of adequate public open space within the development

Connections to the Green Circle Network

How the development will preserve and enhance the character of the existing area

Adequate landscape buffers to protect neighbouring residential amenity on Broadlands

## 6. Prematurity and Plan-Led Development

Policy References:

NPPF Paragraph 15

---

## NPPF Paragraph 12

### Grounds for Objection:

The site is not allocated for development in the adopted Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan 2016 or Site Allocations DPD. Approving this speculative application would undermine the plan-led system and set a concerning precedent for similar developments on unallocated greenfield sites around Burgess Hill.[burgess-hill-neighbourhood-plan.pdf](#)

## 7. Lack of Infrastructure Capacity

### Policy References:

#### NPPF Paragraph 20(b)

#### Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan Core Objective CO 3

### Grounds for Objection:

The application has not demonstrated that adequate infrastructure capacity exists (or will be provided) for:

School places for additional children  
GP and medical services  
Wastewater and sewerage capacity  
Surface water drainage infrastructure  
Local services and facilities

### Summary of Recommendations:

Based on the above grounds the Committee objects to planning application DM/25/2634 on the following principal grounds:

Conflict with Policy G1 (Areas of Open Space) - Loss of valued greenfield land[burgess-hill-neighbourhood-plan.pdf](#)

Conflict with Policy H3 (Areas of Townscape Value) - Keymer

Road designation[burgess-hill-neighbourhood-plan.pdf](#)

Insufficient Flood Risk Assessment - Contrary to NPPF

Paragraphs 170-182[NPPF\\_December\\_2024-Policy-Framework.pdf](#)

Highway Safety Concerns - Inadequate access assessment, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 116[NPPF\\_December\\_2024-Policy-Framework.pdf](#)

Cumulative Traffic Impact - Combined with other developments on Keymer Road

Prematurity - Site not allocated in development plan, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 12[NPPF\\_December\\_2024-Policy-Framework.pdf](#)

---

Inadequate Infrastructure Provision - Insufficient capacity assessment

The applicant would need to comprehensively address the following concerns:

Detailed Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy  
Full Transport Assessment including cumulative impact analysis  
Comprehensive landscape and visual impact assessment  
Infrastructure capacity assessment

END of comment

---

Kind regards