

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 04 March 2025 23:53
To: Steven King
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/0014

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/03/2025 11:53 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of Turners Hill Road And South Of Huntsland Turners Hill Road Crawley Down West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved) for the erection of up to 200 dwellings, and associated infrastructure including new access points off of Turners Hill Road with associated spine roads and car and cycle parking; the provision of open space and associated play facilities; utilities infrastructure, surface water drainage features, and associated features, on land west of Turners Hill Road and south of Huntsland, Crawley Down, West Sussex
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application DM/25/0014 - Sustainability, Infrastructure, and Flood Risk DM/25/0014 - Land West Of Turners Hill Road And South Of Huntsland Turners Hill Road Crawley Down West Sussex Dear Sir/Madam, I write to formally object to the proposed development under the relevant provisions of UK planning law. This objection is submitted in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant local planning

policies.

The proposal fails to adequately address key environmental, infrastructure, and flood risk concerns, posing a significant risk to the local community. Additionally, inaccuracies in government assessments, particularly regarding watercourses and drainage, have placed undue responsibilities on affected landowners under riparian law. My objections are detailed below.

1. Sustainability and Environmental Impact

The proposed development does not adhere to NPPF Section 2 (Achieving Sustainable Development), which requires planning decisions to meet present needs without compromising future generations. The failure to include the existing watercourse in the site plans is a material omission that directly conflicts with:

NPPF Paragraph 174 - requiring developments to conserve and enhance the natural environment. The misrepresentation of natural watercourse could undermine ecological stability and biodiversity.

The Environment Act 2021 - mandating measurable biodiversity net gain in development projects. The current proposal does not include sufficient measures to mitigate habitat loss or compensate for environmental damage.

Local Development Framework Policies (where applicable) - requiring sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to reduce surface water flooding risks not to enhance flood risk elsewhere. This proposal lacks adequate mitigation for increased surface water runoff onto the southern side of the worth way along Wallage Lane. and fails to incorporate sustainable urban drainage solutions on the southern side of the worth way along Wallage lane. The absence of these measures suggests non-compliance with planning policies that prioritise climate resilience.

2. Carriageway Infrastructure and Pedestrian Safety

The proposed development will significantly increase traffic levels on the Turners Hill Road, yet no substantial improvements to the existing carriageway infrastructure have been proposed. This contravenes:

NPPF Paragraph 110 - requiring developments to ensure safe and suitable site access for all users.

NPPF Paragraph 112 - mandating developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and facilitate access to public transport. The current proposal lacks adequate pedestrian facilities, including safe footpaths and crossings.

The Highways Act 1980 - requiring highway authorities to maintain roads in a condition that ensures public safety. The additional strain on existing roads without necessary upgrades could result in increased hazards for all road users.

Furthermore, the proposed lack of pedestrian infrastructure disproportionately affects vulnerable road users, including children, elderly residents, and individuals with disabilities, conflicting with the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010).

3. Increased Flood Risk on Wallage Lane

The proposal inaccurately portrays the flood risks on Wallage Lane. It is highly likely therefore that the flood risk will be higher due to the proposed development in direct conflict with:

NPPF Paragraph 159 - requiring developments to avoid areas at risk of flooding and ensure flood risks are not increased elsewhere.

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 - placing a duty on local authorities to implement effective flood risk management strategies. The omission of proper drainage assessments contradicts this legal requirement.

The Land Drainage Act 1991 - stating that any works affecting a watercourse must ensure proper maintenance and flow. The failure to acknowledge the watercourse puts nearby properties at risk and may lead to legal disputes over drainage responsibilities.

Additionally, local residents, including myself, have been forced to assume ownership under riparian law, meaning we are now responsible for maintaining a watercourse that should have been properly integrated into the development's flood risk assessment. This represents an unfair transfer of liability, resulting directly from planning assessment inaccuracies.

Conclusion and Formal Objection

For the reasons set out above, I formally object to this planning application on the grounds of:

Failure to meet sustainability obligations under national and local planning policies.


Deficient road and pedestrian infrastructure, creating significant public safety risks.

Increased flood risk due to inadequate drainage considerations, contravening environmental and planning laws.

Given these breaches of planning law and policy, I urge the planning authority to refuse this application unless substantial amendments are made to address these concerns.

Please ensure that my objection is recorded in the consultation process, and I request written confirmation of its receipt.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the objector.

Kind regards