

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 January 2026 23:48:05 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 25/01/2026 11:48 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:	Holly House Sandhill Lane Crawley Down
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to planning application DM/25/3191 for eight new homes on land to the south of Burleigh Lane. After reading the details of the proposal, I have several concerns about the impact this development would have on Burleigh Lane, the surrounding area, and the village as a whole.

1. Burleigh Lane is not suitable for more traffic

Burleigh Lane is a narrow, rural road with no pavements, tight bends and poor visibility. It already struggles with the traffic it has. This development includes 27 parking spaces and access taken directly from Burleigh Lane, which would significantly increase vehicle movements.

This goes against Policy DP21, which requires development to provide safe and suitable access. I don't believe the lane can safely cope with the extra traffic from eight large houses.

2. The location is not sustainable

The site sits on the south-eastern edge of Crawley Down, with no safe walking routes and very limited public transport. Key village services are already under pressure-GP appointments, school places and parking are all stretched.

The proposal doesn't meet DP19, which expects new homes to be in sustainable, accessible locations.

3. The development would spoil the rural character of the lane

The planning statement makes clear that the site is currently surrounded by:

A hedged boundary and single dwelling to the east
A tree belt and pastureland (with a sand school) to the south
More pastureland to the west, separating it from homes on Sandhill Lane
This area acts as a green buffer on the edge of the village. Putting six 5-bed, two-storey houses and two single-storey units on this land is out of keeping with the current low-density, rural setting.

This conflicts with DP26 and with Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan policies CDNP04 and CDNP05, which protect the character of rural edges like this.

4. Impact on wildlife

The site's hedgerows, tree belt and surrounding pastureland play an important role for local wildlife. There isn't clear evidence that the ecological surveys are thorough enough, nor that a net gain in biodiversity will be delivered.

This goes against DP37, which requires proper protection and enhancement of biodiversity.

5. Drainage and surface water concerns

Parts of Burleigh Lane already suffer from surface water after heavy rain. Replacing 1.77 hectares of rural land with houses,

driveways and hard surfacing will only make this worse unless drainage is properly addressed-which the application does not convincingly show.

This falls short of DP41, which requires development not to increase flood risk.

Conclusion

Overall, this application conflicts with several important planning policies in both the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan.

For these reasons, I strongly object to DM/25/3191 and ask that the Council refuse the application.

Yours faithfully

Daniel Lethbridge

Kind regards