

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 05 January 2026 15:22:23 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/3146

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/01/2026 3:22 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Antler Homes Development Site Anscombe Woods Crescent Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	The erection of two buildings to provide: 2 no. 4 bedroom houses and 6 no.1 bed apartments (total 8 units), with associated access, car parking, covered cycle parking, refuse store and woodland management plan
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	2 The Willows Haywards Heath
----------	------------------------------

### Comments Details

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

#### Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to object to the proposed development on the following grounds, which demonstrate clear conflict with the Mid Sussex District Plan and National Planning Policy.
-----------	---

The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment appears to be incomplete, with sections redacted or omitted, including pages 29-31 and 46 (relating to bird

habitats), and page 34 (with regards to retiles). Is this due to the later Reptile Survey Report? In the interest of transparency and robust decisions making, the full unredacted report should be made available. 4.2.3 Reptiles also highlights that "the site holds a moderate potential for reptiles with further surveys recommended", is this the included Reptile Survey Report SE Ecology?

DP38 of the Mid Sussex District plans states "no net loss, and where possible net gain". Table 4.1 of the PEA and Full BNG SE Ecology report identifies a range of habits recorded within the central area of the proposed site, to the south of and also to the north of. This includes Willow scrub (H3J) and bramble (H3D). This proposal would result in the partial loss of these habitats.

Critically, the Final Results of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on page 39 shows the Total net % Change of Habitat units as - 16.54%. It states "it is not possible for a 10% BNG to be delivered on-site for habitat units, based on the current plans, with the trading rules also not being met due to the net loss of scrub and grassland". This I believe places the proposal in direct conflict of Policy DP38 (Biodiversity) of the Mid Sussex District Plan, that require "no net loss and, where possible, net gain". It also fails to meet the mandatory national Biodiversity Net Gain policy introduced in February 2024.

The site forms part of the wider historic St Francis Hospital estate and lies adjacent to buildings of historic design and character. However, the Design & Access Statement relies on Bowden Way to inform the proposed external appearance (Page 14), while failing to acknowledge Anscombe Woods Crescent, located approximately 19 meters to the west/north-west of the site and on the same elevation. The 19th-century dwellings in Anscombe Woods Crescent, historically associated with St. Francis Hospital, represent the immediate and most influential built context of the site. The omission from the character assessment constitutes a flawless and selection appraisal of local character. Policy DP26 (Character and Design) required development to "respect the character and identity of the local area" and "respond positively to local distinctiveness". By failing to properly consider the nearest historic buildings, the proposal doesn't demonstrate an appropriate contextual response and would appear incongruous within its setting.

The Submitted Drainage Strategy identifies, under "next steps", the requirement for "Permissions to lay sewer connections across third party land". No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the applicant has secured the necessary legal rights or that agreements are in place. As such, the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy DP20 (Securing Infrastructure) and Policy DP42 (Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment) of the Mid Sussex District Plan. My

---

understanding is that planning permission should not be granted on the assumption that a third-party consent will be obtained later, unless there is clear evidence it already exists or is guaranteed.

Figure 3 of the Drainage Strategy highlights the significant difference in elevation between the proposed site and Bowden Way. The proposed building would be positioned approximately 10-15meters higher than the adjoining street and neighbourhood dwellings. At a separation of approximately 16meters (Planning Layout drg no: 696.025.004), the inclusion of over seven upper-floor windows would result in a direct and sustained overlooking of neighbouring homes and private gardens. This elevated relationship would cause a serious loss of privacy and residential amenity, contrary to Policy DP26 and National Planning Policy, which require a high standard of amenity for existing residents. The elevated siting would also create an overbearing and visually dominant form of development when viewed from neighbouring properties. The reliance on landscaping does not adequately address the fundamental issue of overlooking arising from the significant difference in ground levels.

I ask the council to please review these key points as I believe it clearly shows how this development fails to deliver on council-level and national-level policies.

---

Kind regards