

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 June 2026 23:08:51 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1315

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/06/2026 11:08 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of Gatesmead Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed 49 new homes together with open space and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 18 Old Wickham Lane Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Planning Application DM/26/1315 on the following 5 grounds: 1. Undetermined Right of Way (DMMO 3/22) The legal status of an alleged public right of way affecting this site remains unresolved; it has been undetermined by WSCC for over four-and-a-half years. Approving this planning application in its current form would prejudice any future enforcement of the right of

way.

The DMMO application reflects this route being regularly used by pedestrians and dog-walkers for recreational purposes over many years. Previously this route could be used un-interrupted, without need to cross roads or mind vehicular traffic. The alternative proposed by Crest Nicholson (CN) pushes pedestrians and dog-walkers within 12m of the trainline, without an uplift in protection (particularly relevant for dogs).

Additionally, the current timber bridge (north-west corner of the site) is not adequate to support further foot traffic, which will inevitably follow from further residences and with current walkers pushed further north in order to access open countryside. Given it resides within the site boundary its replacement (with a safe and permanent alternative) should, at the very least, form part of the plan.

2. Loss of Open Green Space and Biodiversity

The development would destroy approximately 11 acres of open grassland, a vital local habitat. It is one of the few areas of accessible countryside; supports diverse and protected species; and is home to many mature trees.

The banking and build up for the proposed vehicular access encroach within the 15m buffer of this ancient woodland and a further 3.44 area habitat units are required to achieve a 10% net gain.

Additionally, the soil makeup already means significant proportions of the path and surroundings become severely waterlogged and muddy for approximately half the year; to the point of being almost impassable. Significantly increasing footfall would lead to soil compaction, thereby reducing natural drainage capacity and exacerbating existing waterlogging issues (particularly at the entry/exit point from Old Wickham Lane).

3. Access via Gatesmead, with no viable alternatives.

All vehicular access is proposed via Gatesmead, a quiet residential street unsuitable for the increased traffic from 49 new homes, and the construction traffic required in the interim. While alternative access points have been considered, none adequately mitigate the significant traffic impact on local residential areas.

We are regular users of the children's play park in Gatesmead, and both construction and enduring additional traffic raise safety concerns, particularly regarding junction visibility and pedestrian safety. There is also a blind hill, which presents a pre-existing safety hazard.

4. Harm to Heritage Assets (Grade II Listed Buildings)

The development would harm the setting of two Grade II* listed buildings, Wickham Farmhouse and Sunte House. Their historic significance is intrinsically linked to their open countryside setting, and the impact is not sufficiently offset by the proposed buffer/screening.

The settings of properties on Wickham Way (whilst not heritage) would also be materially affected by significant numbers of people funnelling down the hill and into town. The junction at the foot of the hill presents significant safety concerns due to poor visibility for vehicles making left turns, particularly for pedestrians.

5. Local Infrastructure Capacity

Our water supply infrastructure cannot cope with the current level of development. Water pressure is already consistently poor; areas within a few miles of the proposed development have suffered water outages; and hosepipe bans/treatment capacity warnings have become the norm.

It would be irresponsible for further development to be undertaken locally until the Government or South East Water commits to a significant increase in capital expenditure to upgrade. Similarly, local schools and nurseries are at capacity.

Kind regards