

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 January 2026 08:34:06 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 14/01/2026 8:34 AM.

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: Larchwood 1 Anscombe Woods Crescent Haywards Heath

Comments Details

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Commenter Type: | Neighbour or general public |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| Reasons for comment: | |
| Comments: | We object to the above planning application on the basis that the submitted documents, taken as a whole, demonstrate conflict with the Mid Sussex District Plan, national planning policy, and established planning principles. This objection is based solely on material planning considerations and deficiencies within the application submission as summarised below. |

1. Biodiversity Net Gain - Failure to Meet Mandatory National Requirements

Relevant documents:

- The ecological information submitted with the application, including habitat surveys and baseline assessments
- The submitted biodiversity metric calculations quantifying habitat losses and gains associated with the proposal

The submitted biodiversity calculations identify a net biodiversity loss of approximately 16.5%. Since February 2024, developments are required to achieve a minimum +10% Biodiversity Net Gain. A proposal that results in a quantified net loss is non-compliant with national legislation and cannot be approved unless materially redesigned or secured through enforceable off-site mitigation. The application documents do not demonstrate how mandatory BNG will be achieved, provide secured off-site compensation or present a lawful mechanism to offset the identified loss. This also conflicts with Policy DP38 (Biodiversity) of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which requires no net loss and net gain where possible, particularly adjacent to sensitive habitats.

2. Ancient Woodland Buffer Encroachment and Veteran Tree Harm

Relevant documents:

- The submitted site layout drawings showing development boundaries, buffer zones, and tree locations
- The ecological and arboricultural information assessing trees, woodland constraints, and buffer impacts
- The design justification explaining site constraints and layout decisions

The plans explicitly acknowledge:

"Minor (additional) encroachment areas within the 15m Ancient Woodland buffer."

There is no policy basis within national guidance or the Mid Sussex District Plan for allowing "minor" encroachment into an ancient woodland buffer. The purpose of the buffer is to prevent indirect harm, including root damage, hydrological change, and long-term degradation. Furthermore, veteran oak trees forming the north-eastern boundary of the woodland appear to be located within the buffer zone rather than outside it. A giant redwood also appears to lie within the defined buffer. The buffer alignment appears arbitrary and unsupported by robust arboriculture justification. This conflicts with national policy protections for ancient woodland and veteran trees and with Policy DP38.

3. Character and Design - Failure to Respond to Immediate Context

Relevant documents:

- The submitted design justification and contextual assessment explaining architectural approach, scale, and massing

The design justification states that the proposed design is informed by Bowden Way. This approach fails to address the most immediate and visually influential context, namely Ansccombe Woods Crescent. Policy DP26 (Character and Design) requires development to respect local character and identity, respond positively to local distinctiveness, and demonstrate an understanding of its immediate surroundings. The submitted design information does not adequately address the 19th-century character of Ansccombe Woods Crescent or the historic context of the former St Francis Hospital grounds. As a result, the proposal introduces massing and form that is out of place with its surroundings, contrary to adopted policy.

4. Overlooking, Visual Dominance and Loss of Amenity

Relevant documents:

- The submitted site section and level drawings illustrating relative ground levels and building heights
- Supporting drawings within the drainage and infrastructure information showing site levels and relationships

The submitted drawings indicate site levels approximately 10-15 metres higher than Bowden Way and separation distances of approximately 16 metres to existing dwellings. When combined with building height, this results in sustained overlooking, visual dominance and loss of privacy and outlook. The application documents do not demonstrate how these impacts are mitigated to an acceptable standard. This conflicts with Policy DP26 and the National Planning Policy Framework requirement to maintain a high standard of amenity for existing residents.

5. Failure to Address the August 2024 Appeal Decision

Relevant documents:

- The planning justification and supporting narrative submitted with the application
- The proposed plans, elevations, and massing information

An appeal decision dated 28 August 2024 dismissed a previous proposal on this site. Clause 10 of that decision identified unacceptable dominance of three-storey development over Bowden Way, exacerbated by elevated ground levels.

The current submission introduces buildings of similar height and massing, retains elevated site levels and does not demonstrate how the previously identified harm has been resolved.

The application documents fail to meaningfully engage with or overcome the Inspector's findings, rendering the proposal inconsistent with established appeal reasoning.

6. Drainage Strategy - Reliance on Unsecured Third-Party Land

Relevant documents:

- The drainage and utilities information submitted with the application, including foul and surface water proposals
- Notes within the planning register and supporting material referring to drainage connection arrangements

The drainage information states that implementation relies on:

"permissions to lay sewage across third-party land"

and confirms that the final foul drainage connection is yet to be determined. Policies DP20 (Securing Infrastructure) and DP42 (Water Infrastructure & the Water Environment) state that planning permission should not be granted on the assumption that third-party consents will be obtained at a later date unless evidence is provided.

No evidence of third-party consent, guaranteed access rights or confirmed final connection arrangements is included within the submission. The application is therefore premature and incapable of lawful approval.

7. Highway Safety and Roundabout Use

Relevant documents:

- The transport, access, and highways information submitted with the application
- The submitted site layout drawings showing access, parking, and vehicle movements

The proposal introduces increased vehicular movements and parking activity in the existing roundabout and pedestrian area.

The transport information does not adequately assess the functional role of the roundabout, pedestrian and vulnerable user safety, conflict arising from parking and manoeuvring in this location. The absence of a robust assessment of these impacts represents a failure to demonstrate highway safety acceptability.

The submitted documents demonstrate that the proposal fails mandatory biodiversity requirements, encroaches into protected woodland buffers, harms residential amenity, relies on unresolved and speculative infrastructure, repeats previously dismissed planning harm, and raises non-assessed highway safety concerns.

For these reasons, the application should be refused.

Kind regards