

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 April 2026 20:56:47 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/26/0682

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/04/2026 8:56 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Hurst Farm Hurstwood Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Reserved Matters Application Pursuant to Outline Planning Permission Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Reference: DM/25/1630, Lewes District Council (LDC) Reference: LW/2510707 at Hurst Farm, for appearance, layout, scale and landscaping only.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	8 Greenhill Park Haywards Heath
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Formal Objection to Planning Application DM/26/0682
-----------	---

I wish to formally register my strong objection to the above application. The proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character of the area and the residential amenity of existing

occupants, and conflicts with adopted planning policy.

My objections are summarised below:

☐

1. Conflict with the Adopted Neighbourhood Plan

The Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate Parcel 4 for housing.

Policy L3 designates this land as open space to safeguard the rural setting of the town.

Policy H1 restricts housing allocations to Parcels 1, 2 and 3.

Parcel 4 is identified as land subject to developmental constraint.

The proposal is therefore in direct conflict with the adopted, democratically approved plan.

☐

2. Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity

The development would result in significant harm to neighbouring amenity:

Direct overlooking from five dwellings with principal habitable room windows facing existing properties, as confirmed in the applicant's Design and Access Statement.

Clear and intrusive loss of privacy, with views into multiple habitable rooms.

Overbearing impact due to dwelling heights approaching 8m, resulting in a material loss of outlook and an oppressive sense of enclosure.

The omission of the Parcel 4 street scene (C-D) further limits proper assessment of these impacts.

☐

3. Conflict with Local Plan Policy

The proposal fails to comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Council Local Plan, which requires development to avoid significant harm to residential amenity, including impacts on privacy, outlook, and environmental quality.

☐

4. Inadequate Buffer to Ancient Woodland

The proposed buffer is insufficient and contrary to the position of

the Woodland Trust, which recommends a minimum 30m buffer.

Failure to meet this requirement risks harm to ancient woodland and conflicts with national planning policy.

□

5. Harm to Countryside Character

Parcel 4 forms part of the rural setting of Haywards Heath.

Its development would:

Extend the urban edge into open countryside
Erode landscape character

This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 174 and HHNP Policy L3.

□

6. Infrastructure Constraints

Local services and infrastructure are already under pressure.

The application fails to demonstrate:

Adequate capacity in healthcare and community services
Sufficient water supply infrastructure, despite existing issues with pressure and restrictions

This conflicts with NPPF requirements for sustainable development supported by adequate infrastructure.

□

7. Noise and Disturbance

The proposal would introduce a substantial increase in noise and activity in an area that is currently quiet and open, to the detriment of existing residents.

□

8. Highway Safety

Access via Hurstwood Lane is constrained by:

Narrow widths and restrictions
Adjacent ancient woodland preventing widening

The route is unsuitable for increased traffic and construction vehicles, raising significant safety concerns.

□

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and would cause unacceptable harm. I respectfully request that the application be refused

Kind regards