

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 October 2025 11:38:11 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2478

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 19/10/2025 11:38 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To Great Haywards Wealden Way Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed erection of 1 No. detached self-build dwelling and single detached garage, with provision of a new access from Wealden Way.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	59, Wealden Way Haywards Heath
----------	--------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objections related to Planning Application DM/25/2478
	Access to Wealden Way. There are several reasons why putting in a new road off Wealden Way should be refused. It may look from the plan that it is merely a driveway to a new house. However, there is a document associated with this application entitled Street Naming and Numbering saying this application will need a street name. The

applicant, Mr Eldred, is desperate to get access into Wealden Way as demonstrated by his numerous previous planning applications. If this application for one house is accepted, it won't stop with one house, further applications will follow for more houses. The most recent development on this land quite rightly refused a new road or any access from Wealden Way to facilitate building work. Access was granted via Amberly Close to this land. Should any further development be granted it should use the existing access. Mr Eldred has previously submitted many applications for multiply dwellings on this land, and now seeks permission for one dwelling, any access from Wealden Way granted now would be just the start of further applications to over develop this land which is in the curtilage of the Grade II listed Great Haywards House.

The proposed area of access into Wealden Way falls in a place that has been left free of parking restrictions by the council for the benefit of residents and visitors of Wealden Way plus, the even numbered houses in Duncton Close. This parking area is all that is left since the council extended parking restrictions in the street. Any new access would take away at least 3 parking spaces and would mean the council would have to remove some its yellow lines to allow the same amount of parking to be available to residents.

Since the completion of Bolnore Village Phase 4, Wealden Way has suffered from a significant increase in traffic and foot fall. Whilst the council realised Wealden Way was unsuitable to allow a through road in Bolnore, it did allow a pathway access. This has resulted in Bolnore residents and visitors driving cars to the bottom of Wealden Way, parking at the bottom and walking through to Bolnore. This is compounded by motorbikes, scooters, push bikes etc all using this access. This has resulted in Wealden Way having far more traffic than it was designed for and any further access off this street would only add to what is already, overuse.

Issues relating to the Development

The size of the development is not in keeping with the rest of the dwellings in the street.

There would be a significant loss of trees and wildlife habitat. The hedgerows are used by many species of birds, and the pond is also an important wildlife habitat in particular for newts. Newts are often found in nearby gardens and where possible returned to the pond. This area suffered a significant loss of wildlife habitat when Bolnore Phase 4 was built. The entire Badger community was lost during this development. We know this because they had a regular "run" at the back of our gardens on the railway embankment. The area cannot afford to loose any further wildlife habitats.

My neighbours and my own outlook would significantly suffer from loss of trees and be replaced by the sight of a building which does not belong in the place it is proposed.

Ecological Report

So, a surveyor turns up in Wealden Way, he's armed with a clip board, a camera and an iPad. He can't access the whole of the site because it's completely overgrown except for a gap in the hedgerow by the pond which is accessible up to the point a few yards in where the owners recently cut down a perfectly healthy oak tree. Apart from that, it is not possible to walk around and report on wildlife habitation. The surveyor doesn't take long to look at the limited amount he can see and goes off. From this visit a 34-page ecological report had been submitted! Are we seriously expected to believe that its content are an accurate assessment of the site? I would suggest the report contains a lot of cut and paste padding along with guess work and a few photos. It's not worth the paper it's written on and cannot be taken seriously as a document to support a planning application.

The Developer

As mentioned above Mr Eldred's latest development on this land was to build 2 dwellings The Byre and The Shippen. The planning conditions for this development included a clause that disallowed any access from Wealden way for heavy machinery or building materials. Despite this, Mr Eldred ignored planning conditions. The day work started, the contractors turned up in Wealden way with low loaders transporting JCB's. They cut down the trees of the hedgerow and bulldozed their way into the site from Wealden Way, over the public pavement and onto their land. As there were cars legally parked on the curb side where they wanted to break in, they enlisted the help from the police station at the top of the road to get the cars moved so they could carry out their illegal entry. I would therefore suggest that this developer is not a fit and proper person to be allowed to benefit from any further permission to develop this land.

Conclusion

I believe this planning application should be refused.

Kind regards