

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 January 2026 14:36:22 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3146

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/01/2026 2:36 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Antler Homes Development Site Anscombe Woods Crescent Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	The erection of two buildings to provide: 2 no. 4 bedroom houses and 6 no.1 bed apartments (total 8 units), with associated access, car parking, covered cycle parking, refuse store and woodland management plan
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	1 Bowden Way Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We wish to formally object to the above planning application. When considered as a whole, the submitted documents demonstrate clear and fundamental conflict with the Mid Sussex District Plan, national planning policy and established planning principles. Firstly, this proposal fails to address the findings of the appeal

decision dated 28 August 2024. In that decision, the Inspector concluded that three-storey development on this elevated site would be unacceptably dominant when viewed from Bowden Way. Although the current application replaces flats with townhouses, the buildings remain of similar height, massing and position, and the site levels are unchanged. The harm previously identified has therefore not been resolved, and the Inspector's conclusions remain directly applicable.

Secondly, the application fails to meet mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. The submitted biodiversity calculations identify a net habitat loss of approximately 16.5%. Since February 2024, development proposals must deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. A scheme that results in a quantified net loss is non-compliant with national legislation and Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. Furthermore, parts of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain assessment appear to be missing or redacted, undermining transparency and robust decision-making. No secured on-site or off-site mitigation has been demonstrated.

The proposal also results in unacceptable encroachment into the 15-metre buffer zone of adjacent Ancient Woodland. The application explicitly refers to "minor" encroachment within this buffer, yet there is no policy justification for allowing any level of intrusion. The buffer exists to protect ancient woodland and veteran trees from indirect harm, including root damage and hydrological change. In addition, protected oak trees and other notable specimens appear to be placed at risk by proposed infrastructure and refuse facilities. This conflicts with both national policy protections and Policy DP38.

In terms of character and design, the proposal fails to respond appropriately to its immediate context. The design justification relies primarily on Bowden Way while largely ignoring Anscombe Woods Crescent, which lies nearby on the same elevation and contains 19th-century buildings historically associated with the former St Francis Hospital estate. Policy DP26 requires development to respect local character and respond positively to local distinctiveness. By overlooking the most relevant historic context, the proposal introduces a form and scale that is incongruous with its surroundings.

The elevated position of the site, combined with short separation distances of approximately 16 metres and multiple upper-floor windows, would result in sustained overlooking of neighbouring homes and gardens. This would cause a serious loss of privacy, outlook and residential amenity. The development would also appear overbearing and visually dominant when viewed from surrounding properties. Landscaping alone cannot mitigate the fundamental impacts created by the significant difference in ground levels. This is contrary to Policy DP26 and the National

Planning Policy Framework requirement to safeguard existing residents' amenity.

The submitted Drainage Strategy further demonstrates that the application is premature. It relies on future permissions to lay foul drainage across third-party land, yet no evidence has been provided to confirm that these rights have been secured or guaranteed. Policies DP20 and DP42 are clear that planning permission should not be granted on the assumption that such consents will be obtained at a later stage.

Finally, the application raises additional unresolved concerns, including the adequacy of access for emergency vehicles, insufficient assessment of highway safety around the roundabout and pedestrian areas, and inconsistencies in the treatment and screening of refuse and cycle storage.

For all of these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with local and national planning policy, repeats previously dismissed planning harm, and relies on unresolved and speculative infrastructure arrangements. I therefore respectfully request that the application be refused.

Kind regards