

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 January 2026 12:33:01 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3155

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/01/2026 12:33 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Havens Sportsfield Car Park The Haven Centre Hophurst Lane Crawley Down West Sussex
Proposal:	New/Replacement Village Hall.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Haven Farm House Hophurst Lane Crawley Down
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I object to the application based on the following comments: 1. It is six years since the original application and since then there has been hundreds of new houses built in the vicinity and there are hundreds more planned (eg DM/25/25/0014). As a result there has been a significant increase in traffic in this area, adding to the dangers that will arise if this application is approved. There seems to have been no attempt to assess or quantify the impact of this. The decisions made about traffic and highways for the original application in 2019 can no longer sensibly apply now. The volume and speed of traffic on this road means the increased use of the

car park for this facility would create huge potential for dangerous accidents in an area used heavily by children.

2. I have still seen no evidence of legal advice to confirm that this development can happen within the confines of the over-riding legal covenant that applies to this piece of community land.

3. The height of the proposed building continues to be intrusive to neighbours and unnecessary. It was designed for badminton - something that is not now needed given that there is no longer a badminton club affiliated with the village hall charity.

4. Indeed the whole building is too large for its purpose (larger than the building it is intended to replace), and does not warrant the destruction of one of the few remaining natural areas left in the village.

5. Some of the proposed new trees are sited far too close to our property. They are positioned inappropriately and exactly where previous trees had had to be removed in the past (at the council's cost) because of the damage they were doing to our property.

Had the applicant followed standard and polite protocols and consulted with neighbours over their plans they would know this!

6. I still do not believe the applicant has the finances to build (and importantly complete) the proposed building. This matter was raised at the charity AGM in April 2025, at which time we were all promised by the applicant that the financial position would be clarified immediately after the meeting. We still have not been updated on this. As a result there is a real risk that this project could start and not be completed, after destroying a perfectly good piece of our natural local environment!

7. This is even more inappropriate as a site for a new community hall than it was 6 years ago. It is almost next door to the larger Haven Centre which continues to be underused/have capacity for further use (despite the old village hall having been closed for two years!). Also, the new development to the west of the Turners Hill Road (DM/25/0014) will not only further shift the centre of the village, it also (based on plans originally circulated to residents) included allowance for a community hall. It would make much more sense for another hall (if one is needed, which I doubt) to be located within this new development. If not, even more traffic is going to be generated around the Haven Sportsfield - bad for the environment, and dangerous. I assume someone within the planning department has a responsibility to look at ALL planning going on in the area so that sensible joined-up decisions can be made. If not we will find ourselves with a collection of individual plans that do not make any sense when all fitted together??

Thank you

Kind regards