

Stefan Galyas

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 14 December 2025 18:21
To: Stefan Galyas
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/2884

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 14/12/2025 6:20 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To 48 Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 1UQ
Proposal:	Erection of a dwelling house on land adj to 48 Wickham including solar panels to the roof
Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	56 Wickham Way Haywards Heath
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>Planning Objection - Proposed Development at No. 48 Wickham Way</p> <p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed development at No. 48 Wickham Way on the following grounds:</p> <p>---</p> <p>1. Loss of Privacy, Outlook, and Residential Amenity The scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would significantly affect the privacy and outlook from the rear of neighbouring properties. The size and positioning of the development would result in an overbearing presence, contrary to the requirement to protect residential amenity.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Conflict with Policy DP26 - Character and Design Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan requires new development to integrate with its surroundings, respect local character, and maintain the rhythm and spacing of existing streets.</p>

- The proposed dwelling does not reflect the established spacing pattern of Wickham Way.
- It would appear visually squeezed into the plot, disrupting the established streetscape.
- The proposal represents overdevelopment and fails to protect the verdant, low-density character of the road.

Noise Pollution and Construction Impact

Residents have already endured 3-4 years of continuous construction noise, heavy vehicle movements, and disruption from the extensive works at No. 48.

A self-build project of this scale is likely to extend the construction period to 6-7 years in total, which is unreasonable and harmful to the amenity of neighbours.

4. Policy DP21 - Transport and Road Capacity

Policy DP21 requires developments to demonstrate that local roads can safely accommodate additional demand.

- Wickham Way is a privately owned, narrow road with poor visibility and tight turning areas.
- It already requires constant and costly maintenance by residents.
- Additional vehicle movements (cars, deliveries, construction traffic) would worsen congestion and safety risks.
- The road lacks pavements so safety risks need to be managed

The applicant as far as I can see has not consulted the road owners or addressed the impact on road sustainability.

5. Parking and Access Concerns

The proposal raises several serious issues:

- The existing parking at No. 48 is already at capacity.
- The new dwelling requires additional parking provision that the site cannot realistically accommodate.
- The proposal involves demolishing the existing garage, leaving the current four-bedroom house with no off-street parking, forcing more cars onto an already congested private road.
- The plans rely on alterations to land not owned by the applicant including:
 - An unauthorised driveway constructed across third-party land.
 - Proposed widening of access over land the applicant does not control.

These matters undermine the deliverability of the proposal.

6. Removal of Mature Fir Trees

The application refers vaguely to the "removal of mature fir trees," but these trees are:

- A defining landscape feature of Wickham Way.
- Visible from as far as Clare Hall, nearly a mile away.

Their removal would significantly harm the green, leafy character of the road.

The justification given that they interfere with overhead cables not true as the cables could be buried rather than removing landmark trees.

7. Failure to Respect the Mid Sussex Design Guide

The Mid Sussex Design Guide requires development to reflect:

- Local character
- Scale
- Density
- Landscape features

This proposal fails on all counts:

- It introduces a high-density form of development into a low-density road.
- It constitutes cramming or over-intensive use of the plot.
- It disrupts the established pattern of generous spacing between dwellings.
- It removes important landscape features (mature trees).

8. Backland / Garden-Grabbing Development

The proposal effectively creates a backland development within what is currently garden space. This type of development is discouraged because it:

- Erodes the spacious character of residential areas.
- Creates cramped, awkwardly positioned dwellings.
- Harms the visual and environmental quality of the neighbourhood.

9. Cumulative Impact on Residents

Residents have already endured years of disruption from previous extension works at No. 48. Adding another multi-year construction project would:

- Prolong noise and disturbance.
- Increase pollution and heavy vehicle traffic.
- Further damage the private road surface.
- Create ongoing safety risks for pedestrians.

The cumulative impact is unacceptable.

Conclusion

The proposal conflicts with multiple policies of the Mid Sussex District Plan, including DP21* and DP26, as well as the Mid Sussex Design Guide. It represents overdevelopment, harms local character, removes important landscape features, and places unreasonable burdens on residents and the privately maintained road.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application be refused.



Kind regards