

Caroline Grist

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 24 June 2026 21:32
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 24/06/2026 9:31 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:	High Mead 4 Birchen Lane Haywards Heath
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Planning Application DM/26/1315 Dear Caroline Our comments are as follows: 1. Undetermined Right Of Way. We understand that the legal status of the alleged public right of way over or adjacent to the proposed site is unresolved, as a Definitive Map Modification Order DMMO 3/22 was received by West Sussex County Council on November 15th 2021. We assume that Mid Sussex District Council cannot properly determine the above planning application until the legal status of the contested right of way has been established. This is a material planning consideration that the case officer and the planning committee must take into account. We moved to our house in 2000 and have used that area for walks during that time. This area has a lot of wildlife and is very important for the local ecosystem. The undetermined right of way must be resolved before the planning application can be reviewed. 2. Access by Gatesmead. We understand that vehicular access will be using Gatesmead. This road has reduced width near the Birchen Oak development, and would not be suitable for the likely construction traffic that will be used. Additionally, where Gatesmead exits into Birchen

Lane, this is an area where there is already a junction visibility issue. That part of Birchen Lane which leads onto Portsmouth Lane is already in a poor state some of which would have been due to the earlier construction traffic involved for Birchen Oak. Portsmouth Lane is a busy road leading to Ardingly and it is already very busy and makes it very difficult for pedestrians to cross the road. Additional housing would lead to a worsening situation and therefore safety must be a prime consideration for pedestrian traffic.

3. Heritage Assets. Sunte House and Wickham Farmhouse are both Grade II* listed. The NPPF requires utmost consideration to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The applicant's own consultants have admitted the site development may affect these designated heritage assets. What an admission!. These assets have been there for centuries. This area of Haywards Heath/Lindfield has been subject to many developments, and why cannot areas that have already been designated as suitable for development by MSDC and WSCC be utilised, without having to develop areas of beautiful countryside.

4. Services including GP surgeries, Schools, Dentists and Water/Sewerage. These are already under pressure and many with no additional capacity. If no additional suppliers of such services, presumably owners of the proposed new homes would need to travel further afield thereby requiring using their cars, which would lead to additional traffic. I understood that proposed new developments would have required that new residents would be able to access these services on foot, thereby reducing vehicle use. Recent years have involved water restrictions being placed in West Sussex, and indeed earlier this year we have had a hosepipe ban. Additional housing and the cumulative effect of new housing within the county could lead to a worsening situation. With the proposed development on the field, this will involve a lot of land being covered by concrete etc, and therefore there would be reduced capacity for excess rainfall to soak into the land, which could lead to flooding in the local area. Now important due to Global Warming. How has this aspect been addressed?

We object to the planning application DM/26/1315 and request that this is refused. If it is to be determined, we would ask that it must be considered by the Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers, given the site significance, the unresolved legal status of DMMO 3/22 and the impact on two Grade II* listed buildings.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Kind regards