

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 January 2026 14:47:24 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/3191

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/01/2026 2:47 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved except for access from Burleigh Lane, for the erection of up to eight self-build/custom build dwellings, drainage and ancillary works.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	Orcombe, Sandhill Lane Crawley Down
----------	-------------------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Both Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane (access to Burleigh Lane) are public footpaths as well as access roads. Burleigh Lane is a single lane with only 7 properties. We have no separate paths. Burleigh and Sandhill lane are very narrow, and are maintained by the residents to a non adoptable standard (poor quality with no streetlighting) The lane is also utilised as a public footpath as well as residents access.

By granting this application it would cause an acute risk to pedestrians due to the vastly increased levels of traffic, particularly during construction. Sandhill Lane is not suitable for this type of traffic.

The chances of a significant safety incident or worse is very likely. For context the lane is utilised by children walking to school, dog walkers from the village, walkers using lane as public footpath and horses.

How will WSCC planning ensure the risk is mitigated? I can see no practical solution to make the safety risk acceptable. The planning application is accurate with regards traffic report, paragraph 4.6. It states formal passing points. This is wrong.

The lane isn't suitable for construction vehicles and would create very serious safety issues, noise, disruption and damage to the lane (which isn't suitable for anything larger than a van) The construction would potentially be carried out over an extended period due to construction strategy of self builds (8 separate builders, supply chain etc all starting at different times) This is unacceptable.

Put simply, the lane isn't fit for purpose for 8 additional properties, and the associated increased traffic. I would question how WSCC Planning department can ever grant planning with the significant pedestrian safety issues on both Burleigh and Sandhill Lane.

---

Kind regards