

Stuart Malcolm

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 05 November 2025 11:12
To: Stuart Malcolm
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2661

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/11/2025 11:12 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Land At Coombe Farm London Road Sayers Common West Sussex
Proposal: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) comprising a residential development of up to 210 dwellings (Use Class C3); with associated access; landscaping; amenity space; drainage and associated works.
Case Officer: Stuart Malcolm

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Local amenity society or association
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:
Comments: I wish to object to planning application DM/25/2661 - Land at Coombe Farm, Sayers Common, on the following material grounds.

1. Unsustainable and Premature Development

The proposal for up to 210 dwellings lies outside the built-up-area boundary and forms part of a wider group of uncoordinated developments totalling around 2,300 homes. It would predetermine decisions that should properly be taken through an up-to-date strategic plan. This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 50-51 and Policy DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

[REDACTED]

2. Coalescence and Loss of Settlement Identity

The site plays a key role in maintaining the open gap between Sayers Common, Hurstpierpoint

and Albourne.

The applicant's assertion that "there is a strong sense of separation" is inaccurate: the cumulative effect of current schemes would merge the three villages and permanently erode their distinct rural setting, contrary to NPPF paragraph 8(c) and Neighbourhood Plan policies on local character and settlement separation.

[3M]

3. Design, Height and Density

The indicative density of 37 dwellings per hectare and proposed three-storey forms are inappropriate for this edge-of-village location.

They would be visually intrusive when viewed from London Road and surrounding footpaths and fail to respect local character, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 129-135 and Policy DP12 (Design and Character).

[3M]

4. Active Travel and Transport Deficiencies

The Travel Plan and Transport Assessment are inconsistent and fail to meet national standards for safe walking and cycling.

There is no continuous, segregated pedestrian or cycle link to the village centre, community facilities or bus stops, and no safe crossing of the B2118.

This is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 109-118 and Gear Change (2020), which require that new housing be "built around making sustainable travel the first choice for journeys".

Under Government policy, Active Travel England is a statutory consultee for major developments of this scale; it should be invited to review the application.

To comply with LTN 1/20 Design Principles, the scheme must incorporate - at minimum - a signal-controlled crossing and segregated cycleway connecting to the wider Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan network.

[3M]

5. Flood Risk and Drainage

The Flood Risk Assessment considers only on-site attenuation and disregards surface-water flows toward Furzeland Way and the A23 corridor.

Without a catchment-wide solution, the development risks worsening existing flooding.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 167-172 and Policy DP41 (Flood Risk and Drainage).

A culvert or managed overflow to the western basin should be required if the scheme proceeds.

[3M]

6. Biodiversity and Irreplaceable Habitat

The applicant's own ecological survey identifies ancient and semi-natural woodland within and adjacent to the site.

The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculations appear to "trade down" habitat quality by replacing high-distinctiveness woodland with low-distinctiveness grassland.

This approach is inconsistent with NPPF paragraphs 180-182 and Policy DP38 (Biodiversity), as well as the Environment Act 2021 requirement for a genuine 10 % net gain based on habitat value and irreplaceability.

[3M]

7. Heritage Impact

The development would harm the setting of the listed buildings at Coombe Farm, which derive their significance from their open agricultural surroundings.

No convincing mitigation or heritage impact assessment has been provided, contrary to NPPF paragraph 210 and Policy DP34 (Heritage Assets).

[3M]

8. Cumulative and Infrastructure Impacts

This scheme cannot be assessed in isolation.

The combined impact of adjacent developments on traffic, drainage, landscape character and community facilities has not been considered, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 24-28 (duty to co-operate).

A masterplan or infrastructure strategy should be prepared before further approvals are granted.

[3M]

9. Public Health and Integration

The layout creates an inward-facing enclave with limited permeability and poor access to existing facilities.

It fails to deliver the "healthy, inclusive and safe places" required by NPPF paragraphs 96-101 and Policy DP24 (Open Space and Recreation).

[3M]

10. Conclusion

We recognise that additional housing is required, but this proposal, in its current form, is contrary to national and local planning policy.

It should be withdrawn and redesigned, or refused, unless the applicant can demonstrate full compliance with:

- Mid Sussex District Plan Policies: DP6, DP12, DP21, DP34, DP38 and DP41;
- NPPF paragraphs: 7-12, 50-51, 109-118, 129-135, 167-172, 180-182, 208-214; and
- Government Active Travel Policy (Gear Change, DfT 2020) and LTN 1/20 design standards.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse planning application DM/25/2661 or require its withdrawal pending a master-planned, policy-compliant revision that genuinely enhances quality of life and environmental sustainability in Sayers Common.

Kind regards