

Caroline Grist

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 03 June 2026 22:31
To: Caroline Grist
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/26/1315

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/06/2026 10:31 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of Gatesmead Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed 49 new homes together with open space and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 Gatesmead Haywards Heath
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Objection to Planning Application DM/26/1315

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing as a concerned resident to formally object to planning application DM/26/1315, which proposes the construction of 49 new dwellings on land accessed via Gatesmead, Lindfield.

1. Unresolved Right of Way - DMMO 3/22

A Definitive Map Modification Order application (DMMO 3/22) affecting this site has remained undetermined by West Sussex County Council since 15 November 2021 - now over four and a half years. The legal status of the alleged public right of way over or adjacent to the site remains unresolved. It would be wholly inappropriate for Mid Sussex District Council to determine this planning application in a way that could prejudice that route before WSCC has

concluded its own legal process. Should the right of way later be found to exist, any dwellings already built across it would represent an irreversible harm to public access rights.

2. Loss of Open Green Space and Biodiversity

The proposed development would destroy approximately 11 acres of open grassland of genuine ecological value. As a resident at the end of the road, I can personally attest to the richness of the wildlife in and around this site. I regularly observe deer, rabbits, pheasants, partridges, mice and a wide range of bird species. This is not incidental - it reflects a functioning, biodiverse habitat on the urban fringe that residents actively enjoy and value.

I understand that protected species have also been recorded on the site, including black redstart (a Schedule 1 protected species with fewer than 100 UK breeding pairs) and slow worm, alongside buzzards, sparrowhawks and red kites. Given this, I would strongly urge that the applicant's ecology evidence be tested against a fully independent survey before any determination is made.

3. Highway Safety - Access via Gatesmead

All vehicular access to the proposed development is routed via Gatesmead, a quiet residential street that was simply not designed to accommodate the traffic generated by 49 additional homes. During school-run times and peak hours, the road and surrounding junctions are already under noticeable pressure. The addition of construction traffic - lorries, plant machinery and regular deliveries over an extended build period - would pose a real and unacceptable risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. I do not consider that highway safety, junction visibility or refuse vehicle access have been adequately addressed in the submitted application.

4. Harm to Grade II Listed Heritage Assets*

Both Wickham Farmhouse (c. 1580) and Sunte House (c. 1700s) are Grade II* listed buildings - a designation reserved for only around 5.8% of listed buildings in England. The open countryside setting of both buildings is integral to their character and to the reason they carry this level of protection. The applicant's own heritage consultants have acknowledged that development of this site "may affect the significance of these designated built heritage assets." Under the National Planning Policy Framework, great weight must be given to the conservation of such assets, and any harm requires clear and convincing justification. I do not believe that justification has been provided, particularly given that alternative sites may be available.

5. Local Infrastructure Capacity

GP appointment waiting times locally are already a source of significant concern for residents, and school admissions in this catchment are under pressure. The cumulative impact of this and other recent or planned developments in the immediate area has not, in my view, been properly assessed. I am not satisfied that the application adequately demonstrates how the additional demand from 49 new homes can be absorbed without further degrading services that existing residents already find stretched.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out above, I formally object to application DM/26/1315 and respectfully request that it be refused. Should the application nonetheless be proceeded with, I ask that it be referred to the Planning Committee for determination rather than decided under delegated powers, given the significance of the site, the unresolved legal status of DMMO 3/22, and the potential harm to two Grade II* listed buildings.

Yours faithfully



Kind regards