

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 May 2026 06:54:22 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 09/05/2026 6:54 AM.

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 117 and reducing the size of the proposed roundabout).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 126 Sandpit Cottages Borde hill lane Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Land at Borde Hill Lane, Haywards Heath Sugworth farm
	Dear sirs,

I object.

117 Dwellings proposed at Sugworth Farm is a still a huge amount for such a small area.

The lanes leading up to the HUGE motorway style roundabout which appears to be many times larger than the one there already are already over their capacity. I live on Borde Hill Lane and I can no longer get out of my driveway daily without facing the increasing risk of being hit by the amount of cars there is now and the lack of visibility. It's a narrow lane and part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, does this not mean anything any more in mid Sussex? As is Hanlye lane. The amount of accidents has been increasing in frequency and severity since we purchased our property 14 years ago. The traffic since building on Penland farm has increased the traffic hugely. The impact on anyone living on Borde Hill Lane and in Balcombe will be huge. Hanlye lane is just dangerous despite the new traffic signs. There has been multiple accidents and they've been increasing since the roundabout for Penland development was put in. My neighbours have had many near misses and accidents already. Borde Hill lane is now treated as a rat run for huge amounts of traffic into and out of Haywards Heath. They have no regard for residents. 125 houses would increase this further when its already dangerous as it is.

Borde Hill Lane is not accessible by Buses or high sided vehicles due to the low bridge coming from Balcombe where the railway line to London crosses it. Surely people needing affordable housing need a bus route also. So how can anyone justify the massive roundabout being proposed. The lanes feeding it are not able to cope.

We do not have enough places in the local schools for the children that already live here.

We cannot get a doctors appointment for weeks - why add more strain to our already stretched NHS local services.

More traffic - means its even harder for emergency services to get through on lanes not fit for passing as it is. More strain on local services.

We have been on a hosepipe ban since 2025 which has only recently been lifted. How can more houses that need more water be justified? They can't be.

The waste water company - will it be able to cope with so many more houses too? No confirmation of this.

Nothing seems to have been thought out and the environment and our precious AONB and green local areas which make up our once beautiful Sussex countryside seem to be being disregarded.

As far as I am aware, Borde Hill Lane and Hanlye lane are part of the AONB, part of our National Landscapes, something we are losing rapidly in this part of Sussex. It therefore has the 'highest

level of protection for it's scenic beauty' so I fail to see how a huge, unsightly roundabout and all the traffic and light pollution and environmental damage to the area and the disruption to wildlife and their dwindling habitat in this area are being protected.

Flood risks, have obviously been previously discussed and were part of the previous reasons that past applications were rejected. What has changed? Please see Lead Local Flood Authority letter from Stephen King - confirms there is still a huge flood risk and clearly no plans to address it. A really important reason to reject this planning application surely.

Why if this has already been turned down previously for fewer dwellings - due to some of the issues mentioned above and more so, is being considered again and now again. Surely it should be rejected again.

I urge this application to be rejected.

Kind regards