

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 June 2026 21:33:55 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/26/1315

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/06/2026 9:33 PM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Land West Of Gatesmead Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex                 |
| Proposal:     | Proposed 49 new homes together with open space and associated infrastructure. |
| Case Officer: | Caroline Grist                                                                |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                            |
|----------|----------------------------|
| Address: | 4 Elm Close Haywards Heath |
|----------|----------------------------|

### Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

|           |                                                                                               |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comments: | We object to the proposed development DM/26/1315 and request that the application be refused: |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

1. The land was not part of the council's original list of designated sites, and has only been added to as adjacent authorities refused adequate development in their locality. This area should not be blighted due to our neighbouring authorities successfully playing hard-ball with their housing allocation.

2. Access via Gatesmead is not suitable - the initial portion of Birchen lane from Portsmouth Lane is not maintained by the council or anyone else as evidenced by the very poor state of repair which has existed for a long time. Gatesmead itself is easily blocked due to the narrowness of the road, and unsuitable for additional traffic. Adequate guaranteed provision for emergency access would be needed for these 49 extra properties and is not included in the proposal

3. Access is via a crossing over a public path which is well used along its entire length. This would have a detrimental impact on the amenity and on its use by local families. I understand that this path is not owned by the developer so how will permission be granted for them to use this route?

4. Ardingly reservoir already struggles to deliver adequate water supplies to local residents in times of stress, and these additional houses will exacerbate this issue without the implementation of an upgrade to the water supply arrangements. This area had one of the longest hosepipe bans in England last summer which stretched well into winter. With climate change impacting us all, this development is only going to make things worse. Hosepipe bans place unnecessary restrictions on local residents being able to successfully grow their own fruit and vegetables.

---

Kind regards