

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 March 2025 16:39:56 UTC+00:00
To: "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0445

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/03/2025 4:39 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Colwell Farm Lewes Road Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved except for access, for up to 80 dwellings with associated landscaping, open space, infrastructure and vehicular and pedestrian accesses.
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Bedales Cottage, Lewes Road Lewes Road
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write to object on the following grounds: 1. Contrary to recently approved local plan. 2. The traffic analysis was conducted in December 2023 and recorded average speeds of c40mph. The site access is on a long straight stretch of the A272 used by a large number of motorbikes in summer who regularly speed at significantly above the limit (often 70-80mph+) as a first opportunity to do so after exiting

Haywards Heath. The road is partially shade covered due to surrounding trees making fast travelling bikers harder to spot. It presents an obvious and serious risk of traffic collisions.

3. Reduces strategic gap to Scaynes Hill.

4. Lack of viable public transport and local secondary school some 40 minutes walk away.

5. The ecology assessment is flawed and provides no proper analysis of the likelihood of success of the mitigants suggested. They simply may not work. The ecological importance is not disputed and it is plainly a very significant site.

6. Further light pollution expanding that from the Lewes Road area to the south where there is currently very limited light pollution.

7. The community involvement statement has no value. The sample size was six(6) individuals which is too small a sample size to have any validity. The original consultation document stated on the front page that no reliance should be placed on the information it contained (i.e. they disclaimed the information it contained). It also, contrary to the supporting ecology assessment, stated it would "improve biodiversity". Quite evidently this is wrong.

8. No local need with recent developments at Fox Hill, Wivelsfield, Sandrocks, Walstead, and Scaynes Hill and with approved development at Scamps Hill.

Kind regards