

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 February 2026 10:39:08 UTC+00:00
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 17/02/2026 10:39 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 119 Penland Road haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I strongly object to the development of land on Borde Hill Lane for the following reasons 1. Unsustainable development and loss of greenfield land The proposal represents a significant expansion on greenfield space, resulting in the loss of open countryside and rural character impacting on wildlife. This site forms part of the setting of the High Weald landscape and contributes to the transition

between the built environment and surrounding countryside. Development at this scale would erode this character and harm the wider landscape.

2. Impact on the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The site sits within the setting of the High Weald AONB.

Development of 125 homes would introduce substantial urbanisation, lighting, traffic, and noise, all of which would detract from the landscape qualities and tranquillity of the area. The cumulative impact would be significant and contrary to policies intended to protect nationally important landscapes.

3. Highways, road safety and infrastructure pressures. Balcombe Road is clearly not intended to take the levels of traffic already seen. There is no safe pavement and walking down there is already dangerous for everyone. Wide loads already encroach on pedestrians causing danger. There is no way any parent would allow their children to walk there. I note the traffic reports were done during half term. To do this at a known time of lower traffic seems questionable at best. Simply to argue 'it's just a few more' is not good enough when it is already overloaded. The council should be looking for ways to reduce traffic here and not overload it when it is already at breaking point/ Large speed bumps and cameras should already be in place. Maybe the council is waiting for a death or serious accident before it takes action!. People already speed up and down penlands road to try and use it as a short cut at busy times.

The proposed development would place major additional pressure on already constrained and, in places, dangerous local roads. Increased traffic along Borde Hill Lane, Balcombe Road, and surrounding routes would worsen congestion, increase travel times for existing residents, and reduce safety.

Of particular concern is the proposed relocation of the newly constructed roundabout. This represents:

- Significant disruption during construction
- Increased congestion and safety risks
- Questions around sustainability and justification for moving recently completed infrastructure (roundabout)

The impact during works alone would be substantial for local residents, commuters and local businesses that will be adversely impacted by the works.

Parts of the illustrative plan appear to lack sufficient turning provision for refuse and for fire safety and including this would require a reduction in number of properties

4. Council's previous assessment of site capacity

The council has previously indicated that this site is suitable for approximately 60 dwellings. The proposed increase to 125 homes represents a substantial intensification that is not adequately justified within the submitted documentation. The scale is therefore inappropriate and risks overdevelopment of the site.

5. Pressure on local services and education

Local services are already stretched, including:

- GP surgeries
- Dentists
- Community health provision
- Schools and early years settings

There is insufficient evidence that existing infrastructure can accommodate this scale of growth, and the development risks placing unsustainable pressure on essential services.

6) Surface water flooding concerns

There are serious concerns regarding surface water management. The area is known to experience drainage and runoff issues, and the introduction of large areas of hard surfacing could exacerbate flood risk both on-site and downstream. The application does not provide sufficient reassurance that flood risks can be mitigated effectively.

7) Impact on wildlife and biodiversity

The site supports local wildlife, including bats that feed in the area. Increased lighting, loss of habitat, and construction activity would harm foraging routes and ecological networks. The ecological impact appears understated and requires more robust assessment and mitigation.

8) Countryside character and environmental impact

The development would result in:

- Loss of open countryside
- Urban encroachment into a rural setting
- Increased light pollution
- Reduction in biodiversity

This conflicts with planning principles aimed at protecting the natural environment.

10. Construction impacts on the local community

Construction works, particularly those associated with moving the roundabout, would have a major impact on:

- Daily travel times
- Local road safety
- Noise and disruption
- Air quality

These impacts would affect residents for a prolonged period and have not been sufficiently addressed.

Conclusion

This proposal represents an overdevelopment of a sensitive greenfield site. It would place unacceptable strain on local infrastructure, harm the countryside and AONB setting, increase flood risk, and negatively affect wildlife, road safety, and local services.

The scale of development far exceeds the council's previously identified capacity of approximately 60 homes and is not justified by the supporting documentation.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to refuse planning

Kind regards