

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 23 March 2026 20:56
To: Steven King
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 23/03/2026 8:55 PM.

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:	
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam, Re: Objection to Proposed Development of 125 Dwellings I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 125 houses on the site near my home. Firstly, the site is not included in the adopted District Plan and was previously recommended for exclusion. Its inclusion in the Draft District Plan remains under challenge, and it is therefore premature and inappropriate to bring forward such a substantial application at this stage. I have serious concerns regarding flooding. I have personally witnessed flooding on local

roads including Penland Road and surrounding areas, caused in part by the nearby Scrase/West Common Stream. The site's clay soil already leads to standing water during wetter months, and parts of the land fall within a flood zone. The addition of 125 homes will significantly increase hard surfaces, inevitably worsening surface water runoff. The proposed drainage measures-basins, earth banks, and the use of roads as overflow routes-are overly complex, reliant on long-term maintenance, and unlikely to be robust during extreme weather. In my view, this presents an unacceptable risk to existing residents.

The impact on protected wildlife is also deeply concerning. Surveys have confirmed the presence of legally protected dormice and several bat species on the site. As someone who values our local environment, I am troubled that this development would destroy vital habitats, including hedgerows and feeding areas. Mitigation proposals at a later stage do not adequately address the fundamental question of whether this site is suitable for development at all.

The site's proximity to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty makes the landscape impact particularly harmful. I regularly travel along Borde Hill Lane and greatly value its rural character. A development of this scale would urbanise the countryside, erode the setting of the AONB, and introduce noise, lighting, and activity into what is currently a tranquil area.

There are also important heritage considerations. The development would harm nearby historic buildings such as Sugworth Farmhouse and South Lodge, and there is evidence of a Roman road on the site that has not been properly investigated. Our local heritage should be protected, and the level of harm identified has not been justified by any clear or compelling public benefit.

The proposed remodelling and expansion of the roundabout at Balcombe Road, Hanlye Lane, and Borde Hill Lane is another major concern. Previous works caused months of disruption, including road closures and unsuitable diversion routes such as Copyhold Lane. Experiencing this again, alongside years of construction traffic on narrow country roads, is unacceptable. Moreover, enlarging the roundabout will not resolve existing issues and will increase light pollution in a rural setting.

Local infrastructure is already under pressure. An additional 125 homes could bring around 350 new residents, including many children. In my experience, local schools and GP services are already stretched, and there is no clear evidence that they have the capacity to accommodate this level of growth.

The proposal also involves the loss of a mature English oak and sections of woodland to facilitate access. Mature trees are irreplaceable in the short term and are vital for both wildlife and the character of the area. Their removal further demonstrates that the site is being overdeveloped.

Finally, the scale of the proposal is excessive. The council's own draft plan suggested around 60 houses for this site, yet this application seeks more than double that number. This significant increase has not been adequately justified and will intensify all of the concerns outlined above.

For all of these reasons, I strongly object to this application and respectfully request that the council refuses permission until it can be clearly demonstrated that the issues relating to flooding, wildlife, heritage, infrastructure, and landscape impact have been properly and satisfactorily addressed.

Yours faithfully,



Kind regards

