

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 July 2025 14:00:42 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1593

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/07/2025 2:00 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Woodlands Close And Land To The North Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down Crawley West Sussex RH10 4JZ
Proposal:	The demolition of numbers 9-11 Woodlands Close together with the demolition of other existing buildings on site and erection of 48 dwellings (Use Class C3) with open space, landscaping, car parking and associated infrastructure including provision of internal access roads and access road onto Woodlands Close.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	5 Sycamore Lane Crawley Down
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	To whom it may concern. I wish to object to the proposed development DM/25/1593. My objection is for a number of reasons.

1: MSDC's own inspector recently recommended that access to the proposed site via Woodlands Close was not appropriate. The inspector stated that unless access could be gained via Sycamore Lane, the development should be removed from the plan.

The developer has twice sought permission from the land owners of Sycamore Lane and twice been refused.

On the second occasion, the developer stated it was their final offer.

As no agreement was made, the developer has sought access by other means contrary to the recommendations of the MSDC planning inspectors.

I believe access to the land is available through Burleigh Lane with an agreement of building circa 15 properties. Therefore, the proposed access is unnecessary.

2: Risk of flooding.

The developer acknowledges in their own consultation literature delivered to all local residents that; 'An unconstrained watercourse runs through our site towards nearby homes,'...

After scanning the QR code on said literature they go into further detail.

They state; 'If left unconstrained this may lead to a risk of flooding towards the Miller Homes development to the North.'

It then goes on to state; 'Part of our application involves comprehensive measures to address this risk and protect our neighbours, which should reduce the flood risk...'

I'm afraid, if a flood risk has been acknowledged and identified by the developer, then stating on their website that it 'should' be ok, is not adequate mitigation or a suitable guarantee.

3: Local infrastructure cannot support this.

Given the imminent approval of 350 extra homes to Crawley Down, the village cannot support further growth.

I have heard several anecdotes about children who live on the Miller Homes development north of the proposed land failing to gain a place at the village school. As the new proposed development is further from the school, it can be surmised that potential future residents will not achieve a place either.

This will mean increased traffic on a road network which cannot cope with the existing level of traffic.

Kiln road is already having to be repaired several times a year and this will only increase with the extra traffic forced to use the roads. Costing the council money.

The local Doctors surgery has been placed into special measures. Adding an extra burden on them in terms of patient numbers will certainly not help them to improve their situation or help current

villagers desperately in need of satisfactory medical care.
It has also been noted the sewage network is dated and not able to cope with the extra housing. There is again no easy or cheap resolution to this and will undoubtedly cost the council yet more money.

4: The proposed development encroaches on open space enjoyed by wildlife. Does this proposal conform to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010?

Deer are frequently seen grazing in the field of the proposed development. Badgers have been spotted as well as many other smaller species. By developing this field to such an extent, we risk removing their habitat and driving them away from an area where they currently coexist happily with existing residents.

The committee also needs to ascertain if this proposal satisfies the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

5: The age of the houses proposed for demolition.

I must admit, I am not certain about the age of the houses proposed for demolition. I do however, strongly suspect they were built before the abolition of asbestos products making it highly likely there are hazardous materials within the building framework. It is therefore an unnecessary risk to local residents to expose them to hazardous materials as part of a demolition process which is not needed.

6: The resident(s) of 13 Woodlands Close, who will be surrounded by roads creating a dangerous road junction.

It should be noted, I do not know the resident(s) of 13 Woodlands Close.

The proposal takes no account of this resident's right to enjoy their property without undue noise or disturbance. They will be effectively living in the centre of a roundabout.

Not only is this highly inconsiderate for the individual(s), it would be a dangerous junction with the existing road network for all users.

I suspect this is the reason the MSDC inspector recommended that access through Woodlands Close is not appropriate?

To reiterate, access via Sycamore Lane has been, and will continue to be refused.

Access via Woodlands Close has been deemed inappropriate.

I believe access via Burleigh Lane is already an available option to the developer for a smaller development.

7: The effect of the proposed development on the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation.

From a previous appeal, it was stated;

There is concern over the protection of 2 bird species, the Dartford warbler and the nightjar as well as great crested newts.

Potential impacts from development within Mid Sussex District have been identified as disturbance from increased recreation activities, particularly dog walking, and air pollution from increased traffic. The proposed site is within the 7km buffer zone identified by Natural England within which residential development has the potential to have a significant effect alone or in combination with other developments on the interest features for which the Ashdown Forest has been classified.

8: Protected Species Report identifies risk specifically to the Great Crested Newt.

The report clearly states ponds P21 and P22 (within 250m of the survey boundary) tested positive for great crested newt eDNA. In going on to evaluate the findings it reports; 'the survey area is considered to be of Local-District Importance for GCN. Without mitigation, the Proposed Development is likely to result in destruction of crested newt habitat or present a risk of killing, injury or disturbance for individuals if present during works, which would constitute an offence under Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.'

9: Danger to bat species.

The report mentioned above states; 'The site is predominantly used by a high proportion of common and widespread bat species'...

...'is considered to be of local importance for its bat population.'

'The proposed development will result in a permanent loss of up to c2.64ha of neutral grassland, bramble scrub, mixed scrub and woodland across the survey area.'

Although certain risks are deemed low, the report suggests a lighting strategy should be put in place to avoid light spill falling onto retained habitats.

I have seen no such strategy from the developer.

10: Parking provision on proposed site.

Ten visitor spaces allocated for the entire development is woefully insufficient. This will result in cars blocking surrounding highways or damaging green areas in an attempt to park off road. This creates further risk as visibility to cross roads and junctions will be impaired by visitor car parking.

Councillor Williams made a speech to MSDC's planning committee recently regarding a different proposed development and stated ... "Such a legal battle if lost would result in the development being forced upon us, costing the council taxpayer a fortune while losing Crawley Down's residents benefits from Section 106 funding"...

I urge you to reconsider this approach.

Treating every planning application as a fait accompli should not be policy.

This proposed development can and should be stopped.

Please register my objection and consider the points above in detail.

Thank you for your time in dealing with this application.

Kind regards