

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 May 2025 13:33:41 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/2957

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 20/05/2025 1:33 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Prince Albert Copthorne Bank Copthorne Crawley West Sussex RH10 3QX
Proposal:	Sever existing land to retain existing public house use and area of pub garden and erect a convenience store and 4 no. apartments with associated works, including alterations to the existing vehicular access and car park (Amended plans and retail justification received 1 May 2025)
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	43 Pinetrees Close Copthorne
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The revised plans fail to address any of the earlier objections made against the development, it simply tidies up a few minor details, there is no substantive change I can see. There is no significant demand for additional retail in this location, the suggested attainable revenue figures for the area as a whole

are spurious and without foundation. Numbers simply plucked from thin air. Additional retail would be far more welcome and appropriate around the new Heathy Wood estate.

The increase in traffic and the consequent danger it would likely cause at a busy junction has not even been considered. There is a bus stop immediately next to and opposite the site.

Additional retail in such close proximity to an existing store would significantly impact that business with the possible, if not probable result being the closure of the village post office, a valuable and essential resource to many. Post offices are supposedly one of the governments "protected species", consequently this development might not even be consistent with government policy.

The loss of the garden from the pub makes it less attractive for families with small children who often enjoy playing there. There is precious little safe space for families as it is, this is just another nail in that particular coffin.

Just because a planning application meets the requisite criteria does NOT mean it should be granted. The needs of the village and the wishes of residents should take precedence. The sheer numbers of objections to the original application serves as testimony to the overwhelming lack of support for this development and I trust that MSDC will make that their determining factor in refusing the application

Andrew Dymond

Kind regards