

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 02 March 2026 12:38:40 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/26/0303

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/03/2026 12:38 PM.

### Application Summary

**Address:** Land North Of Borers Arms Road Copthorne West Sussex RH10 3LH

**Proposal:** Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for the demolition of an existing commercial building and the erection of up to 260 dwellings, up to 1,700sqm of employment floorspace E(c)(iii), E(g)(i)(ii)(iii), car parking, landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Copthorne Bank and Borers Arms Road.

**Case Officer:** Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

**Address:** 40 Lashmere Copthorne Crawley

### Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Neighbour or general public

**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

**Reasons for comment:**

**Comments:** 1. Green Belt status

The applicant's assertion that the land is "grey belt" is disputed. The site has long been understood locally to form part of the Green Belt, performing clear Green Belt functions: preventing

sprawl, maintaining openness, and preserving the separation between settlements. Any attempt to re-characterise the land should be evidenced and independently verified, as misclassification would materially affect the assessment of harm and policy compliance.

## 2. Unsafe access through Borers Arms Yard

The proposed access route through Borers Arms Yard raises significant safety concerns. This is a mixed-use access point where commuters, pedestrians, and commercial vehicles would be forced to share space. Industrial vehicles entering and exiting the yard must cross the footway, creating conflict points that cannot be mitigated by signage alone. The constrained geometry and existing commercial activity make this an inherently unsafe access arrangement.

## 3. Lack of a Safe Route to School assessment

It is unclear whether a Safe Route to School audit has been undertaken. Given the proximity to local schools and the likelihood of increased pedestrian movements, this assessment is essential. Without it, the application fails to demonstrate that children could travel safely on foot or by bicycle.

## 4. Access constraints from Copthorne Bank

The alternative access from Copthorne Bank is equally problematic. Pavements are extremely narrow, and the road includes a dangerous bend with limited visibility. These constraints make it unsuitable for increased pedestrian or vehicular traffic and raise concerns about the ability of emergency vehicles to manoeuvre safely.

## 5. Absence of a continuous footpath

Borers Arms Road lacks a continuous footpath, forcing pedestrians into the carriageway. This is already a known hazard and would be exacerbated by additional development. The proposal does not demonstrate how safe pedestrian access would be provided or funded.

## 6. Ecological impacts

The site contains unimproved meadow, a habitat of high ecological value. Surveys indicate the presence of bats, badgers, and other protected species. The loss or fragmentation of this habitat would represent a significant ecological impact. The applicant has not demonstrated that avoidance, mitigation, or compensation measures would achieve a net gain in biodiversity, as required by national policy.

---

## 7. Flooding and drainage concerns

The site's characteristics suggest sensitivity to surface-water flooding and drainage issues. Development risks increasing runoff into surrounding areas, including residential zones. The application does not provide sufficient detail on sustainable drainage systems, long-term maintenance, or downstream impacts.

Comments to Mid Sussex District Council (infrastructure, village impact)

### 1. Infrastructure pressure on Copthorne

Although the site lies within Tandridge, the impacts will fall predominantly on Copthorne, which sits within Mid Sussex. This includes pressure on schools, GP services, road networks, and community facilities. The application does not demonstrate that these services have capacity to absorb additional demand. We already have water shortages as the infrastructure is insufficient for the current demand placed on it.

### 2. Movement and safety within the village

Increased traffic will funnel through Copthorne's constrained road network, particularly Copthorne Bank and Borers Arms Road. These routes already experience congestion and safety issues. Additional vehicle movements would worsen conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and residents. Access by car to the A264 towards the motorway, i.e, turning right at the end of Borers Arms Road has become a significant safety/accident risk due to the volume and speed of traffic on the A264. A high percentage of residents at this end of the village already drive through the village to access the A264 at the roundabout at the end of Brookhill Road. Add cars from 260 houses plus employment areas and the congestion and pollution will be totally unacceptable.

### 3. Lack of clarity on infrastructure contributions

There is no clear mechanism explaining how infrastructure payments made to Tandridge will be transferred to Mid Sussex, despite the fact that the majority of impacts will be felt within the village. Without a cross-boundary agreement, Copthorne risks receiving no funding to mitigate the development's effects.

### 4. Cumulative impact on village character

Copthorne is a village with a distinct character and limited capacity for further growth. The proposal risks eroding this character through increased traffic, pressure on services, and loss of surrounding green space that contributes to the village's setting.

---

Kind regards