

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 April 2026 12:56:48 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 17/04/2026 12:56 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 117 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access. (Amended plans and supporting statements received 15th April reducing the number of proposed dwellings to up to 117 and reducing the size of the proposed roundabout).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: The Orchard Broad Street Cuckfield Haywards Heath West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I object to the above application for the following planning policy reasons. While the application site broadly corresponds with Site Allocation DPA7 (Land east of Borde Hill Lane, Haywards Heath) in the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039, the proposal as currently submitted fails to demonstrate adequate compliance

with the requirements and intent of the emerging Local Plan and relevant development management policies.

1. Highways Capacity and Sustainable Transport

The application fails to adequately demonstrate that the local highway network, in particular Borde Hill Lane, Balcombe Road, and surrounding junctions, can safely and efficiently accommodate the level of traffic likely to arise from up to 117 dwellings.

While access arrangements are included at outline stage, there is insufficient evidence that:

- The cumulative traffic impact of this development, when considered alongside other growth proposals in and around Haywards Heath, would not result in severe residual impacts, contrary to the NPPF.
- Safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle connectivity to existing services, schools, and employment areas would be delivered in a manner consistent with sustainable transport objectives.

The proposal therefore risks promoting car dependent development rather than genuinely sustainable growth, conflicting with Local Plan objectives that seek to prioritise accessibility, modal shift, and integration with existing settlements.

2. Education Capacity and Phasing

The application does not sufficiently address the impact of the proposed development on primary and secondary school capacity in the Haywards Heath area.

No clear evidence is provided to demonstrate that:

- Existing education provision has capacity to absorb the additional demand arising from up to 117 dwellings; or
- Necessary education infrastructure would be delivered in an appropriate timescale to align with occupation of the development.

Reliance on future Section 106 negotiations without a robust, upfront infrastructure assessment creates uncertainty over deliverability and risks placing pressure on already constrained local services, contrary to the infrastructure led approach expected by the Local Plan.

3. Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk

Given the scale of development proposed and the site's edge of settlement location, it is essential that surface water drainage and flood risk are comprehensively addressed.

At outline stage, however, the application lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate that:

- Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) can be accommodated on site without downstream flood risk or adverse effects on neighbouring land;
- Long term maintenance and management arrangements for drainage infrastructure are deliverable and secure.

The absence of clear drainage strategy detail undermines confidence that the development can be delivered safely and sustainably and conflicts with Local Plan and national policy requirements relating to flood risk and climate resilience.

4. Utilities and Health Infrastructure

The application, to support the scale of residential development proposed, does not provide adequate clarity on the capacity of:

- Foul drainage networks
- Water supply infrastructure
- Primary healthcare provision

Plan led growth requires coordination between land use and infrastructure provision. Proceeding in the absence of clear evidence that utilities and health services can be expanded or reinforced in step with development risks placing undue strain on existing provision and is inconsistent with sustainable development principles.

5. Green Infrastructure, Open Space, and Community Facilities

While the application refers in general terms to landscaping and open space, there is insufficient detail at outline stage to demonstrate that:

- Policy compliant green infrastructure will be delivered with meaningful functionality rather than residual land;
- Open space provision will meet both quantitative and qualitative Local Plan requirements;
- The development will be integrated into wider green and blue infrastructure networks rather than functioning as a disconnected edge of settlement extension.

Without this clarity, it cannot be concluded that the proposal would deliver the level of placemaking and environmental enhancement expected for a strategic allocation site.

6. Prematurity and Infrastructure Coordination

Taken together, the unresolved infrastructure matters outlined above indicate that the application is premature.

While the site is identified in the emerging District Plan, allowing development to proceed in advance of plan adoption risks:

- Undermining coordinated infrastructure planning;
- Diluting the Council's ability to ensure comprehensive, joined up delivery across allocated sites;
- Prejudicing the outcomes of the Local Plan examination in relation to infrastructure phasing and cumulative impact.

So, to summarise, in the absence of robust and policy compliant evidence demonstrating that transport, education, drainage, utilities, and green infrastructure can be delivered in a timely, coordinated, and sustainable manner, the application fails to satisfy the infrastructure led development principles of the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan and the NPPF. The proposal should therefore be refused or deferred pending submission of a comprehensive infrastructure strategy aligned with the Local Plan.

Kind regards