

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 June 2026 10:48:32 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
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 04/06/2026 10:48 AM.

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:	2 Elm Close Haywards Heath West Sussex
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to object to planning application DM/26/1315 for the proposed development of 49 dwellings at Wickham Fields. My principal concern is the proposed access through Gatesmead. Gatesmead is a quiet residential road that was never designed to accommodate the volume of traffic that would be generated by an additional 49 homes. This includes not only the residents themselves, but includes delivery vehicles, service providers, refuse collection vehicles, maintenance contractors and

emergency services. The proposal would fundamentally alter the character and function of the road and place an unreasonable burden on existing residents.

I am also deeply concerned about the impact of construction traffic. If approved, the development would result in construction traffic using the same residential access route for a prolonged and potentially indefinite period. This would create significant disruption, congestion, noise and safety concerns. As a parent, I am particularly worried about the effect this would have on my daughters' daily walk to school along Gatesmead, and Birchen Lane. The increased volume of large vehicles travelling through a residential area used by children and families would create an unacceptable risk.

The loss of Wickham Fields itself is another major concern. The site forms part of one of the remaining areas of open green space in this part of Haywards Heath. It contributes to the character of the area, provides visual relief from surrounding development, supports local wildlife and offers an important natural environment for residents to enjoy.

Another concern that the proposal fails to address is the additional pressure that 49 new homes will place on local infrastructure. There is no corresponding provision for additional healthcare facilities, secondary school places, water infrastructure or other essential public services. Local GP surgeries, schools and other community facilities are already under pressure. It is unclear how these services will absorb the demands created by the development.

Finally, I do not believe that the cumulative impact of existing and proposed developments in the wider area has been adequately considered. Each additional development may appear modest in isolation, but collectively they place substantial pressure on local roads, schools, healthcare services and community infrastructure.

Kind regards