

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 March 2026 14:32:22 UTC+00:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/03/2026 2:32 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Saxonmead Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	FORMAL OBJECTION LETTER Application Reference: DM/25/3129 Site: Land east of Penland Road / near Borde Hill Lane Objector: Owner of Saxonmead, Borde Hill Lane, RH16 1XP
	1. Introduction I am writing as the owner of Saxonmead, Borde Hill Lane (RH16 1XP), whose rear (east facing) boundary directly adjoins the

application site. This proposal for 125 dwellings, new estate roads, ground re grading, drainage basins, lighting and infrastructure will have severe and irreversible impacts on the use, enjoyment, privacy, landscape setting and environmental quality of my home.

This representation should therefore be treated as a formal objection.

2. Severe Loss of Privacy, Overlooking and Amenity

My property shares its rear boundary with the application site. The applicant's own Building Heights Parameters Plan (2508/PL.05) and sections (SDP DR D 311) confirm:

- the land rises behind my garden, and
- the proposed housing parcels sit on this higher ground.

The LVIA concedes that this is a "sensitive residential boundary", yet houses are pushed right up against it.

This means:

- Two storey dwellings will look down into my garden and property.
- The change in levels creates direct, unavoidable overlooking, far worse than the plans visually suggest.
- No defensible buffer, tree belt or open space is provided behind existing homes.

This is an unacceptable loss of privacy, contrary to DP26 (Character & Design) and DP28 (Living Conditions). The applicant's own documents acknowledge the sensitivity, yet the layout completely ignores it.

It is not necessary to build houses right up against our boundary. Given that the plan was originally for 60 houses, this is completely unnecessary and excessive. The number of houses should be reduced and these should be the first to go. If the applicant is insistent on applying for 125 then they can re position these houses on the northern part of the site and have this area as green area with mature trees. The existing residents should be considered and not ignored.

3. Destruction of Rural Setting and Visual Amenity

The harm to my property is not limited to privacy - it destroys the entire rural setting and open countryside view that the property was built around.

At present, I enjoy:

- expansive views of natural farmland,
- hedgerows and a wildlife corridor,
- Trees including a mature oak in the centre of the view line (see photo attached)
- dark rural skies,
- and a peaceful edge of countryside environment.

I attach several photos from my garden and window during the summer and winter to show the current view from my property.

The proposal replaces this with:

- houses on engineered platforms,
-

- estate roads,
- street lighting and car headlights,
- parked cars,
- garden fences,
- drainage basins,
- and urban activity operating from dawn until late.

The LVIA records a "Moderate Adverse" impact on this boundary in Year 1 and admits the change constitutes a "major" alteration to views. This is a devastating loss of rural amenity.

Given the site forms part of the immediate setting of the High Weald National Landscape (AONB), such harm carries significant weight

This contradicts both the District Plan and the NPPF requirement to protect rural character and avoid visually harmful development.

4. Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss

The fields behind my home provide habitat for:

- owls,
- bats,
- birds of prey,
- hedgehogs,
- deer,
- pheasants and songbirds,
- and other small mammals.

The applicant's Ecological Impact Assessment and BNG Statutory Metric (Dec 2025) confirm:

- habitat loss,
- removal of hedgerow sections,
- biodiversity units cannot be delivered onsite, and
- the development relies on off site parcels and purchasing watercourse credits to even meet the legal minimum BNG.

This means biodiversity is not enhanced here - it is merely offset elsewhere. The hedgerow and boundary vegetation behind my property is given no meaningful buffer. The development will have a devastating and irreversible effect on all these habitats, ecosystems, bat flight paths ect. Once its gone its gone.

5. Drainage, Water Capacity and Flooding Risks

Southern Water has already raised concerns regarding constrained local infrastructure.

The Outline Drainage Strategy relies heavily on SuDS features in an area where:

- soil infiltration is limited,
- slopes direct water toward existing properties, and
- attenuation basins sit close to garden boundaries.

Given the rising land behind my property, runoff and waterlogging risks are significant. The applicant has not demonstrated compliance with:

- Mid Sussex's SuDS guidance,
- national SuDS standards,
- or the NPPF requirement not to increase downstream flood risk.

Water capacity is already at its limit evidenced by the yearly

drought orders and unbelievably the hose pipe ban from the summer has only just been lifted. You cannot keep adding hundreds of houses without addressing this first.

The four houses along Borde Hill Lane that are affected most by this development have septic tanks which all drain into the ditch that runs along the back of the boundaries (within the Sugworth Farm title). All four properties have a right to use this ditch and access it at all times for maintenance. Any newly built homes must not be anywhere near this ditch or disturb it in anyway. This further emphasises the need for a large buffer zone between the existing houses and the new development.

6. Highway Safety & Severe Traffic Impact

Feeding 125 new dwellings into the narrow, semi rural network around Borde Hill Lane and Balcombe Road will worsen:

- congestion at peak times,
- air quality,
- road noise,
- and safety on bends and narrow sections.

The Transport Assessment fails to reflect the current congestion reality experienced daily. The NPPF requires refusal where cumulative impacts on the transport network are "severe". That threshold is clearly met here.

7. Local Infrastructure is Already at Breaking Point

The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024) states that:

- local schools are at or beyond capacity,
- water supply infrastructure (including drought orders) remains constrained,
- GP surgeries cannot absorb additional patient numbers,
- roads in this part of Haywards Heath are already saturated.

The NPPF requires that adequate infrastructure must exist or be deliverable before permission is granted - not afterwards. That is not the case here.

125 houses means around 350 new residents and approximately 30-40 primary school age children. The application makes no provision for new schools, GP surgeries or other services. All the reports state that these services are already stretched and there is no capacity for hundreds of new residents without more services being built first. It is a battle to book anything, everything is oversubscribed. New services must be built before new developments.

8. Unacceptable Noise, Disturbance and Loss of Peaceful Enjoyment

The proposal introduces an estate road directly behind my garden boundary, bringing:

- further continuous vehicle noise, on top of the noise from Borde Hill Lane which will be further increased by the additional traffic.
 - headlights shining into my property,
 - delivery vehicle movements,
 - refuse truck noise,
-

- and general urban activity late into the evening.
This location was chosen for layout convenience, not suitability. It is incompatible with DP29 (Noise, Air & Light Pollution) and the protection of residential amenity.

9. Fundamental Conflict With the Mid Sussex District Plan

The development lies in open countryside, forming a major, unallocated urban extension that is explicitly contrary to the Adopted Mid Sussex District Plan (2014-2031), including:

- DP12 - Protection & Enhancement of the Countryside
- DP13 - Preventing Coalescence
- DP26 - Character & Design
- DP28 - Housing Mix
- DP29 - Noise, Air & Light Pollution

The countryside is to be protected from intrusive development, ensuring rural character, landscape value and residential amenity are preserved. This scheme blatantly breaches this requirement by:

- pushing dense built development directly against the rear gardens of established homes,
- providing no meaningful buffer,
- urbanising a previously rural settlement edge,
- re grading land and constructing an internal estate road along the boundary.

The NPPF requires development to be plan led, to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and to avoid significant adverse impacts on amenity and landscape. This application fails on all counts.

10. Enlarged Roundabout and Access Works Worsen the Urbanisation

The scheme requires the complete enlargement of the Penland Road roundabout and a re engineered arm entering the site. This produces overwhelming harm to the rural entrance into Borde Hill Lane and the High Weald setting by:

- removing mature boundary trees (including a mature English oak, which the arboricultural report calls "regrettable but unavoidable"),
- stripping away green roadside character,
- replacing rural views with engineered carriageway, bollards, signs and lighting,
- fundamentally changing the character of this long established rural approach.

This roundabout alone transforms a countryside gateway into an urban junction, directly contrary to countryside protection policies.

11. Construction Impacts Will Be Severe

Constructing 125 dwellings on rising ground immediately behind my home will inevitably create:

- heavy plant and machinery noise for several years,
-

- vibration and compaction,
- dust and pollution,
- construction traffic directly overlooking my property,
- and a loss of ability to use my garden.

No construction management plan could reasonably mitigate impacts caused by such direct proximity.

12. If Approval Is Considered A Complete Redesign Is Required Even if the Council were minded to approve development here, the layout is fundamentally unacceptable.

I strongly request:

1. A redesign of the plans to provide a substantial landscape buffer behind the four existing homes on Borde Hill Lane.
2. Dramatically reduce the number of houses to be built bearing in mind only 60 houses was originally discussed for this site.
3. Mature tree planting, using species capable of immediate dense and tall screening.
4. Relocation of internal roads, parking and hard infrastructure away from existing gardens.
5. Acoustic and secure fencing or other noise mitigation measures.
6. Upgrades to window insulation for existing homes if the road remains behind the boundary.
7. Connection of existing homes to the public sewer if works are carried out.
8. A safe footpath link from Borde Hill Lane to the Penland Road roundabout.
9. A 30mph speed limit is introduced in the approach up to Penland Road roundabout to reduce noise
10. Substantial measures to protect the existing homes from the construction site and do everything possible and implement measures to minimise noise, dust, pollution, traffic and anything that will impact on the use and enjoyment of my garden and property.

Given the extreme impacts caused by the chosen layout, these measures are not optional but essential.

13. Conclusion

This proposal causes severe and direct harm to the amenity, privacy, rural character, landscape setting, tranquillity and environmental quality of my home.

This development was originally supposed to be 60 houses but the application has been submitted for 125. This proposal is excessive and destroys another part of the countryside, habitats, cutting down mature trees and has a total disregard for preserving green spaces, wildlife or existing residents.

It conflicts with the District Plan (DP12, DP13, DP16/DPC4, DP26, DP28, DP29) and the NPPF's requirements to:

- protect the countryside,
 - conserve the High Weald setting,
-

- avoid significant amenity harm,
- ensure adequate infrastructure,
- and deliver biodiversity and drainage safely.

The application should therefore be refused.

If the Council is nevertheless minded to approve, it must be conditional on a complete redesign, including a wide green buffer, heavy planting, noise control measures and protection for existing homes on Borde Hill Lane.

Kind regards