

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 22 March 2026 20:35
To: Steven King
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/03/2026 8:34 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.
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:	Application: DM/25/3129

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to formally object to planning application DM/25/3129 for residential development at land north of Balcombe Road.

While we recognise the District's responsibility to meet housing need, we do not consider this site to represent a suitable or sustainable location for development. Having reviewed the submitted technical documents, we have significant concerns regarding flood risk, transport sustainability, landscape impact (including effects on the setting of the High Weald AONB), and pressure on local infrastructure.

Our detailed reasons are set out below.

1. Flood Risk and Surface Water Concerns

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraphs 165-175 (Flood risk and sequential approach)
 - Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP41 (Flood Risk and Drainage)
 - Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP42 (Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment)
- The applicant's own evidence confirms that the site performs an important natural drainage function.

The Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges that:

- the site currently has no formal drainage system, with runoff infiltrating or flowing toward West Common Stream
- the Environment Agency identifies the site as partly within Flood Zone 3 and within an area of high risk of surface water flooding
- there are no formal flood defences in the vicinity

Under NPPF paragraph 170, development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should only be permitted where it can be demonstrated to be safe for its lifetime.

Similarly, Policy DP41 requires development to:

- avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding
- ensure no increased flood risk on or off site
- prioritise the use of natural drainage systems

Given the site's current role as permeable greenfield land draining toward West Common Stream, there is insufficient confidence at outline stage that these requirements are met.

The reliance on engineered SuDS solutions (dependent on long-term maintenance and climate resilience) does not provide robust assurance that flood risk will not increase elsewhere, contrary to national and local policy.

2. Car Dependency and Unsustainable Location

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraph 110 (Promoting sustainable transport)
- NPPF paragraph 115
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP21 (Transport)
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP19 (Accessibility)

The Transport Assessment raises clear concerns regarding the site's sustainability.

The nearest bus service (31A):

- operates only every 120 minutes on weekdays
- has no evening or Sunday service

This level of provision falls well short of what would normally support a genuinely sustainable location.

The applicant's own data shows:

- approximately 54% of journeys to work are by car
- bus use is extremely low (around 1%)

Under NPPF paragraph 110, significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.

Policy DP19 requires development to be located where it is accessible by sustainable modes, while Policy DP21 seeks to reduce reliance on the private car.

Given the clear evidence of car dependency and weak public transport provision, the proposal conflicts with these policy objectives.

3. Highway Impact and Safety

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraph 115
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP21 (Transport)

Access is proposed via a new arm on the South Lodge roundabout.

However:

- Balcombe Road already experiences substantial peak traffic
- the corridor serves multiple recent developments
- the Transport Assessment relies heavily on modelling

The collision review within the TA identifies recorded injury accidents in the immediate junction area, indicating an already sensitive junction environment.

Under NPPF paragraph 115, development should only proceed where safe and suitable access can be achieved and where impacts on the transport network can be cost-effectively mitigated. At present, it is not convincingly demonstrated that the cumulative impacts have been fully assessed.

4. Impact on the Setting of the High Weald AONB

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraph 182 (Great weight to AONBs)
- NPPF paragraph 183
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP16 (High Weald AONB)
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of Countryside)

Insufficient weight appears to have been given to the site's relationship with the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

While the site lies outside the designated boundary, it forms part of the immediate setting of the AONB and contributes to the transitional landscape between the Haywards Heath settlement edge and the nationally protected countryside beyond.

The Landscape material confirms the site sits within this sensitive interface location adjacent to the AONB and the Borde Hill Registered Park and Garden.

Under NPPF paragraph 182, great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs.

Policy DP16 similarly requires development affecting the High Weald AONB to conserve and enhance its natural beauty, including its setting.

The proposed development would:

- extend the urban edge northwards
- introduce suburban form and activity into a rural approach
- erode the soft transition into the High Weald landscape

Of particular concern is the likely increase in night-time light spill and urbanising influence, which has not been robustly assessed at outline stage.

In our view, the proposal conflicts with both national policy and Policy DP16.

5. Landscape and Countryside Harm

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraph 180
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of Countryside)

The proposal would result in the permanent loss of greenfield land forming part of the countryside edge of Haywards Heath.

Policy DP12 seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

While planting and buffers are proposed, these cannot fully mitigate the fundamental change from open countryside to built form, particularly in the early and medium term.

6. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Relevant policy:

- NPPF paragraph 34
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP20 (Key Infrastructure)
- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP19 (Accessibility)

The Planning Statement asserts convenient access to services, but capacity evidence is limited.

Local services are already experiencing pressure, including:

- primary healthcare
- school places
- road network capacity

Policy DP20 requires that development be supported by, and not outpace, necessary infrastructure.

At present, it is not clearly demonstrated that infrastructure delivery will keep pace with occupation.

7. Planning Balance

We acknowledge the national housing need and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

However, when assessed in light of:

- NPPF paragraphs 110, 170 and 182
 - Policies DP12, DP16, DP19, DP20, DP21, DP41 and DP42
- the proposal gives rise to significant and unresolved concerns.

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse planning permission for application DM/25/3129.

This representation is made in the interest of ensuring that future growth in the District is genuinely sustainable, infrastructure-led, and environmentally responsible.

Yours faithfully,



Kind regards