

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 June 2026 21:35:10 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 24/06/2026 9:35 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:	Gatesmead Haywards Heath
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Local amenity society or association
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Access, Traffic and Highway Safety One of the most troubling aspects of this application is the apparent intention to direct traffic through Gatesmead despite the site's existing access being via Wickham Way. Residents have seen this story before. The previous development of 37 houses was granted access via

Gatesmead, despite Crest Nicholson owning, but repeatedly refusing to acknowledge ownership of, Birchen Lane. Only last month was that liability apparently disposed of through a sale for the nominal sum of £1. Residents are therefore entitled to question whether lessons have genuinely been learned from the last development, or whether history is once again being repeated.

The proposal appears to favour the most convenient solution for the developer rather than the most sensible solution for existing residents.

If the amenities referenced throughout the application are genuinely important to the development's success, then the developer should be expected to exhaust every possible opportunity to negotiate access arrangements that utilise the closest and most appropriate existing routes. Instead, the proposal appears to steer additional traffic through a quiet, narrow cul-de-sac that has already experienced a substantial increase in vehicle movements as a result of previous development.

This raises obvious concerns regarding both capacity and safety.

The junctions from Gatesmead onto Birchen Lane, and subsequently onto Portsmouth Road, are already difficult and potentially hazardous. Visibility is poor, traffic levels continue to increase, and residents regularly experience the consequences of vehicles attempting to negotiate roads that were never designed to accommodate this volume of traffic.

The condition of the roads themselves further compounds these concerns. Gatesmead suffered significant damage during the previous Crest Nicholson development and, despite assurances given to residents that remedial resurfacing works would be undertaken, the road has never been properly restored. Residents are therefore being asked to accept further disruption and further deterioration based on promises that bear an uncomfortable resemblance to those made previously.

There is also a significant risk that the development will become an unofficial parking area for rail commuters. The site's proximity to the station creates an obvious incentive for non-residents to park within the development and walk via Wickham Way. The application appears to give little consideration to the impact this could have on parking availability and congestion for both existing and future residents.

Above all, the Council should apply a simple test of common sense.

There is an existing access to the site. There is an existing public right of way. There are established traffic issues arising from

previous development decisions. The solution should be to make the best use of existing infrastructure, not to repeat the mistakes of the past by forcing additional traffic through unsuitable residential roads and severing established pedestrian routes.

The fact that a road is privately owned should not automatically remove it from consideration, particularly given the well-documented difficulties and controversy surrounding Birchen Lane during the previous development. Planning decisions should be driven by what is safest, most practical and most beneficial for the wider community, not merely by what is most convenient for the developer.

Kind regards