

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 May 2025 14:32:23 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/0856

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/05/2025 2:32 PM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Land To R/O 99 Leylands Road Burgess Hill RH15 8AA                                                                                                                        |
| Proposal:     | Demolition of existing garage and shed and erection of a single storey 2no bedroom dwelling with associated landscaping, parking for two cars and erection of a new shed. |
| Case Officer: | Caroline Grist                                                                                                                                                            |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                          |
|----------|--------------------------|
| Address: | 15 Millbank Burgess Hill |
|----------|--------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Neighbour or general public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Reasons for comment: |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Comments:            | Objection to Planning Application: Land to Rear of 99 Leylands Road Ref: DM/25/0856<br><br>Dear Ms Grist, RE: Objection to Revised Planning Application at Land to Rear of 99 Leylands Road (March 2025 Submission)<br>Following the submission of a revised planning application and the associated Planning and Sustainability Statement, I would like to reiterate and update my formal objections to this proposal. Having reviewed the new submission carefully, I believe many of the |

issues previously raised remain unresolved and, in some cases, new concerns have emerged.

#### Summary of Original and Continuing Objections:

- - The proposal still represents overdevelopment of a constrained backyard site.
- - Access remains extremely limited via Millbank, with disruption to residents inevitable.
- - Impact on residential amenity at 15 Millbank remains severe, including loss of light, privacy intrusion, and sense of enclosure.
- - Visitors will increase the already overcrowded street parking in Millbank.
- - Boundary distances have worsened, now 14m to 101A and 101B Leylands Road (previously 15m stated).
- The overall height of the building on this new application has only been reduced by just over 4 feet.
- - Misleading site description persists, stating 'rear of 99 Leylands Road' while access is solely from Millbank.
- - Drainage and sewage disposal concerns remain, with no confirmed approvals from Southern Water.
- - The proposal still conflicts with Policy H2 (Backyard Development), Burgess Hill neighbourhood plan 2016
- - Historical refusals by MSDC Planning Committee and previous Inspectors are still highly relevant.
- - Concerns over transparency and missing objections from earlier processes remain.
- There was 15 objections to the last application listing many different objections, which are still valid, with only one in support, 97 Leylands Road which is not even impacted by the application and was the original owner of the land where the existing garage and strip of land in front of it is located on this application!

#### New Concerns Arising from Latest Submission:

- - ECE document: 'Planning and Sustainability Statement - Land at Millbank Bungalow, (although still dated March 2024, is an updated version for this latest application), and specifically states that Pre-Application advice for was undertaken with a quote from their own document: "Since the refusal, we have sought Pre-Application advice for a reduced scale scheme. Although it is clearly noted that the proposals would be unlikely to be supported at Full Application Stage."
  - - Section 6.52 of the same document states: "The proposed access of the land is sought to be retained as part of this proposal, with the inclusion of an upgraded footpath serving pedestrian access to the property." If this relates to the existing footpath in Millbank, part of this path is laid on land owned by 15 Millbank and should not be touched. There is also access to utilities very close by.
  - - Section 6.83 of the same document is completely irrelevant given the scale of the application
-

- - Statement in the same document "A flat roof is proposed over the single storey section that would have a height of approximately 2.9 metres". Drawings show it is actually a ridged roof with a flat top.
  - - In the conclusion section of the same document, (Page 51), the 'informal view' of the planning consultants concludes by stating: "As outlined, the current proposal is unlikely to be supported at the full application stage. It is considered that the location of the site at lowest part of the slope along Millbank naturally increases the locations prevalence in views offered from the public domain. Additionally, whilst there has been an increase in the separation distance towards the adjacent neighbouring dwellings at 101A and 101B, it is considered that an adverse imposing impact would still be incurred." It appears this professional advice should be taken into account.
  - - his is now the 5th attempt with a history of refusals: Still valid
  - - Misleading description of access: Still valid
  - - Access limitations and disruption: Still valid
  - - Boundary distance claims: Distance now 14m, less than previous application
  - - Impact on 15 Millbank (light/privacy): Still valid - Height only reduced by 1.25m
  - - Overdevelopment: Still valid
  - - Inspector's previous refusal: Still valid
  - - Transparency and missing objections: Still valid
  - - Drainage/sewerage risks: Still valid
  - - Surface water drainage failures: Still valid, confirmed by CCTV survey
  - - TN01 Additional flood risk assessment by 'Motion' shows flood risk for infiltration requiring water storage with controlled release for the site. Failure of this structure would increase flood risk
  - - Position of trees and hedges shown on the plans are likely to interfere with existing or new drainage
  - - Despite the building being a Bungalow, the overall building surface area for this latest application has increased by 22% - 16m<sup>2</sup> and the height only reduced by approximately 1.25m
  - - Use of 'self-build' status to potentially bypass mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements.
  - - Greater reduction in private garden/amenity space than previously indicated.
  - - Heavy downplaying of traffic and access impacts despite unchanged physical constraints.
  - - Selective use of precedent (Hanlye Lane case) is not directly comparable to this site as this was an application for nearly 60 houses. Also the reduced boundary distance is not evident in this application.
  - - Minimization of flood risk concerns despite known surface water drainage limitations.
  - - No substantive enhancement to biodiversity or meaningful ecological mitigation measures.
  - - 'Refusal' details outlined in ECE updated Planning document submitted with this application, lists all of the previous objections,
-

(which are too lengthy to list here again), but I would ask these original objections be taken into account as I do not believe the attempt to address these has been achieved.

Specific Requests if Application is Approved:

- - Restriction of further extensions to the dwelling to prevent future overdevelopment.
- - Confirmation and documentation of secure ownership and access rights over Millbank land.
- - Confirmation of Heat Pump location and noise levels
- - Liaison with 15 Millbank as to drainage being rerouted as this is drainage from 13 & 15 Millbank. (Section 8 of TN01 Additional Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy document produced by Motion) and is Pitch Fibre.
- - Fence adjoining 15 Millbank driveway not to be altered or shortened as this is owned by 15 Millbank. The end of the fence depicts the edge of 15 Millbank boundary. Permission will not be given for access over 15 Millbank land.
- - Full Southern Water approval for foul drainage disposal and confirmation of necessary diversions at no cost to neighbouring properties.
- - Enforcement of working hours, delivery logistics, and on-site material storage.
- - Protection and retention of all existing fences and boundary treatments.
- - Restriction on scaffolding or construction overhanging onto neighbouring properties without permission.
- All deliveries to be unloaded on the proposed building land and not in Millbank.
- Restriction of builders and tradesmen parking in Millbank during construction.
- A Steel plate to be placed over access to avoid damage to all footpaths and drains.

In summary, the revised application fails to address the fundamental issues previously raised and introduces new areas of concern. For the reasons set out above, I respectfully urge Mid Sussex District Council to refuse this planning application.

---

Kind regards