

MID SUSSEX DC

02 DEC 2025

Kingsland Cottages
Reeds Lane
Sayers Common
BN6 9JG

25 November, 2025

Mid Sussex District Council
Planning
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Dear Sirs,

DM/25/2661

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) comprising a residential development of up to 210 dwellings (Use Class C3); with associated access; landscaping; amenity space; drainage and associated works.

OBJECTION – Coombe Farm Development, Sayers Common

I am a resident of Sayers Common and wish to record a formal objection to the proposed Coombe Farm development. I recognise the need for new homes in Mid Sussex, but this specific proposal is inappropriate in location, scale, environmental impact and supporting infrastructure, and therefore conflicts with key planning policies.

1. Significant loss of protected and priority wildlife

The site currently supports a wide range of species already declining locally, including owls, bats, herons, goldcrests, slowworms, deer, foxes and purple emperor butterflies. The removal of established oak woodland, low-level vegetation and deadwood habitats would destroy vital breeding, feeding and migratory corridors.

This conflicts with:

- **MSDC District Plan policies DP37 & DP38, and**
- **NPPF paragraphs 174–180, which require biodiversity conservation, habitat protection and measurable ecological net gain.**

2. Increased flood risk to an already vulnerable village

Surface water will naturally run downhill from the development site into Sayers Common. Southern Water has already designated parts of the village as a flood plain, and 100-year-old homes have previously suffered repeat flooding and sewage incidents. The proposal does not demonstrate that attenuation ponds will prevent off-site flooding or network overload.

This fails:

- DP41 (Flood Risk and Drainage) and
- NPPF paragraphs 159–169,

which require proof that development will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

3. Insufficient local infrastructure and public services

Sayers Common currently lacks capacity in:

- GP and primary care services,
- school places,
- sewage and drainage systems,
- highways and road maintenance.

No mitigation strategy, funding mechanism or infrastructure timetable has been evidenced. This conflicts with DP20, DP21 and DP41, which require development to be supported by adequate community infrastructure.

4. Harm to landscape character, woodland and rural identity

The site contains established oak trees, woodland belts and open countryside views that shape the settlement's character. Their loss would permanently alter the rural setting and erode one of the few remaining natural green spaces available to residents.

This contradicts DP12, DP24 and NPPF paragraph 130, requiring development to enhance rather than diminish local character.

5. Unsuitable building heights and density

The introduction of three-storey dwellings in a low-rise, rural village context is visually intrusive and inappropriate. Sayers Common's built form is predominantly two storeys, and higher structures would overlook neighbouring homes, undermine amenity and urbanise the village.

6. Traffic, parking and highway safety

The proposal will generate substantial additional vehicle movements — residents, deliveries, construction lorries — on roads already experiencing congestion and deterioration. Parking provision appears inadequate, increasing the likelihood of on-street parking, obstruction and unsafe conditions. A horse was recently struck on the main road, demonstrating real safety consequences.

This conflicts with **DP21** and **NPPF paragraph 111**, which require developments to avoid severe transport impacts.

7. Erosion of community cohesion

Sayers Common has a strong, active village identity. Large-scale commuter-led development risks creating a dormitory settlement disconnected from village life, placing pressure on limited facilities without strengthening the social fabric. Sustainable development must reinforce communities, not dilute them.

8. Loss of accessible walking, cycling and recreational routes

The existing landscape provides valued informal walking, dog-walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Without guaranteed, continuous and safe green-corridor access, this amenity will be lost, contrary to **DP19 (Rights of Way and Green Infrastructure)**.

Conclusion

For these reasons, the application fails to demonstrate sustainable development under the **National Planning Policy Framework**, nor compliance with multiple policies in the **Mid Sussex District Plan**.

I therefore respectfully request that the application be **refused**, or at minimum **deferred**, until the applicant can provide:

1. guaranteed protection and enhancement of habitat, woodland and biodiversity,
2. independent, evidence-based flood-risk and drainage assessments with enforceable mitigation,
3. proven infrastructure capacity and funding commitments,
4. revised building heights, density and parking standards appropriate to the village, and
5. a masterplanned, community-supported approach to development in Sayers Common.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]