

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 October 2026 16:31:41 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2214

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/10/2026 4:31 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land East Of Keymer Road And South Of Folders Lane Broadlands Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	Variation of Condition No: 33 relating to planning application DM/22/3049 - to allow for design changes. The proposed new drawings reflect changes made on only the Thakeham parcels (Build Phase 1: Access Road and Northern Land phase only).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	11 Willowhurst Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Comment er Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comment s:	Planning Application DM/26/2214 Land East of Keymer Road and South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill Formal objection

I wish to object to planning application DM/26/2214, which seeks to vary Condition 33 of planning permission DM/22/3049 to allow changes to the approved house types within the Thakeham parcels.

Having reviewed the applicant's Cover Letter and the changes proposed, I do not consider this to be a matter that should be treated simply as a minor design amendment.

The applicant's own submission confirms that the proposed changes affect 24 plots and would result in 20 additional bedrooms across the amended parcels. The submission also identifies changes to the housing mix, parking requirements and compliance with the Nationally Described Space Standard.

These changes have wider planning implications and should be assessed cumulatively before the application is determined.

1. The extent of the proposed changes

The application concerns changes to a number of already-approved house types rather than a single isolated design amendment.

The applicant's Cover Letter identifies 24 affected plots and explains that the revised house types provide additional bedroom capacity.

The fact that the overall number of dwellings remains at 260 should not be the only consideration.

An increase of 20 bedrooms represents a material change in the amount of residential accommodation being provided within the development. It has potential implications for housing mix, occupancy, parking, highways and infrastructure.

The Council should therefore consider the actual effect of the proposed changes rather than simply the fact that the dwelling total remains unchanged.

2. Additional bedroom capacity

The applicant states that the proposed changes would provide 20 additional bedrooms across the Thakeham parcels.

This is an important change.

Additional bedrooms can increase the potential occupancy of the development and may affect parking demand, vehicle movements and demand for local infrastructure.

The applicant itself recognises this wider effect in its Cover Letter by identifying the need for the relevant Section 106 contributions to be recalculated.

I therefore ask the Council to consider the additional bedroom capacity as a material planning consideration in its own right.

3. Change in housing mix

The proposed amendments also change the housing mix.

The applicant's information identifies a reduction in the proportion of two-bedroom market homes from 19% to 13%.

The Council should consider whether this represents an acceptable change to the housing mix secured through the original permission.

The original housing mix was part of the assessment of the development. Replacing smaller homes with larger accommodation should not automatically be regarded as neutral simply because the total number of dwellings remains unchanged.

The Council should assess the proposed mix against its current housing needs and relevant planning policies, including the implications for smaller households, first-time buyers and downsizers.

4. Nationally Described Space Standard

The application raises a particularly important issue concerning the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS).

The applicant acknowledges that 17 of the 260 dwellings would not meet the relevant space standard.

The applicant seeks to rely on exceptional circumstances, with the Cover Letter explaining that the relevant plots have already progressed to slab level and that this constrains the ability to deliver the revised house types while meeting the standard.

I do not consider that the Council should simply accept this justification without careful consideration.

The Council should establish:

- * which 17 dwellings are affected;
- * the precise shortfall for each dwelling;
- * why the shortfall is necessary;
- * whether alternative compliant house types could be provided;
- * whether the circumstances genuinely amount to exceptional circumstances; and
- * whether the proposed benefits outweigh the reduction in the standard of accommodation.

The fact that construction has progressed should not, in itself, automatically establish that a departure from the applicable space standard is justified.

The Council should be satisfied that the resulting homes provide an acceptable standard of accommodation and that any departure from the relevant standard is properly justified on planning grounds.

5. Parking

The applicant's Cover Letter provides its own parking calculation.

It states that the approved scheme required 181.6 parking spaces, with 239 spaces provided.

For the proposed amended scheme, the stated requirement increases to 191.3 spaces, while 239 spaces remain provided.

This represents a reduction in the applicant's stated parking surplus from approximately 57.4 spaces to 47.7 spaces.

I therefore ask the Council to consider carefully whether the revised parking provision remains adequate.

The increase in parking requirement is consistent with the proposed increase in bedroom capacity and demonstrates that the amendments do have consequences beyond the appearance of the individual house types.

The Council should ensure that the assessment also properly considers visitor parking, the practical use of garages and driveways, and the potential for overspill parking onto surrounding roads.

6. Highway implications

The proposed increase in bedroom capacity should also be considered in relation to the wider highway network.

I recognise that the application does not propose an increase in the number of dwellings. However, the applicant is proposing additional bedroom capacity within those dwellings.

The Council should therefore be satisfied that the revised accommodation does not create unacceptable additional pressure on the surrounding highway network or access arrangements.

This should include consideration of parking, vehicle movements and the cumulative effect of the amended homes alongside the wider development.

7. Broadlands access

I also ask the Council to specifically consider the wider issue of access through Broadlands when determining this application.

I recognise that a potential Broadlands connection has previously been considered, that neighbouring residents objected to the connection and that the Council upheld that position.

I am not suggesting that DM/26/2214 itself is an application for a new access.

However, the circumstances in which the wider development is now being

delivered should remain part of the Council's consideration when further changes to the development are proposed.

The development is continuing to evolve, and this application proposes additional bedroom capacity within the approved homes.

If the Council is minded to approve these amendments, I ask that it specifically considers whether the existing access arrangements remain appropriate and whether the previous decision regarding a Broadlands connection should now be revisited.

In particular, if the Council considers that the additional residential capacity represented by the 20 additional bedrooms is acceptable, it should also consider whether there is now a case for providing greater resilience in the access arrangements.

I therefore ask the Council to place the potential for a Broadlands connection firmly on the agenda when considering the wider development, rather than treating the previous decision as incapable of reconsideration irrespective of subsequent changes.

If the Council considers that an additional Broadlands connection is not required, I ask that this is expressly considered and addressed as part of the determination of the application.

8. Infrastructure and Section 106

The applicant's Cover Letter itself recognises that the additional bedroom capacity has implications for the existing Section 106 arrangements.

The applicant states that the contributions need to be recalculated to reflect the proposed changes, including matters relating to infrastructure.

This is significant because it demonstrates that the proposed amendments have consequences beyond the individual plots.

The Council should therefore ensure that any necessary changes to the Section 106 agreement are properly assessed and legally secured before the amended development is approved.

The Council should consider the implications for relevant infrastructure, including:

- * education;
- * healthcare;
- * community facilities;
- * sports and recreation;
- * library provision;
- * transport and access; and
- * any other infrastructure secured through the original permission.

The additional bedroom capacity should not be accepted without ensuring that the infrastructure mitigation remains appropriate.

9. Cumulative effect

The individual changes should not be considered in isolation.

The application affects 24 plots and, according to the applicant's own submission, introduces 20 additional bedrooms, changes the housing mix, increases the stated parking requirement and results in 17 dwellings falling below the relevant space standard.

Taken together, these are substantive planning considerations.

The Council should therefore assess the cumulative effect of the amendments on:

- * housing mix;
- * bedroom capacity;
- * residential quality;
- * space standards;
- * parking;
- * highways and access;
- * infrastructure; and
- * the wider character and functioning of the development.

Describing the application as a Minor Material Amendment should not remove the need to consider the actual planning consequences of the proposed changes.

10. Request to the Council

I respectfully ask Mid Sussex District Council to carefully consider the application before granting permission.

In particular, I ask the Council to:

1. assess the significance of the 20 additional bedrooms;
2. reconsider the proposed change in housing mix, including the reduction in two-bedroom market homes from 19% to 13%;
3. carefully scrutinise the justification for the 17 dwellings that do not meet the Nationally Described Space Standard;
4. assess the implications of the increase in stated parking requirement from 181.6 to 191.3 spaces;
5. ensure that highway and access implications have been properly assessed;
6. ensure that the necessary infrastructure contributions and Section 106 arrangements are recalculated and secured;
7. consider the cumulative effect of all of the proposed changes rather than assessing them solely as individual house-type substitutions; and
8. specifically reconsider the wider Broadlands access issue in light of the development now being delivered and the additional residential capacity proposed.

If the Council is not satisfied that these matters have been adequately addressed, I ask that further information is required before the application is determined or that the proposed amendment is refused.

Conclusion

The proposed changes should not be regarded as purely cosmetic.

The applicant's own information identifies 20 additional bedrooms, a change in housing mix, an increased parking requirement and 17 dwellings that do not meet the applicable space standard.

These changes have wider planning consequences and warrant proper consideration before the Council determines whether the amended scheme remains acceptable.

For these reasons, I respectfully object to DM/26/2214 and ask the Council to refuse the application unless it is satisfied that all of the above matters have been adequately addressed and that the revised scheme remains acceptable in planning terms.

Where
did you
hear
about this
applicatio
n?

Not specified

Kind regards