

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 September 2026 15:59:57 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/26/2214

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/09/2026 3:59 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land East Of Keymer Road And South Of Folders Lane Broadlands Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	Variation of Condition No: 33 relating to planning application DM/22/3049 - to allow for design changes. The proposed new drawings reflect changes made on only the Thakeham parcels (Build Phase 1: Access Road and Northern Land phase only).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 1 Nettle Drive Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to formally object to Planning Application DM/26/2214, specifically the proposed amendments to the previously approved scheme under DM/22/3049. My principal concern is the proposed change in the housing mix and the move towards larger properties with a greater number of bedrooms.

Although the overall number of dwellings may not be increasing, replacing smaller homes with larger three, four and five-bedroom properties has the potential to increase the number of people living within this part of the development. In turn, this is likely to increase car ownership, parking demand and the number of vehicle movements generated by the development.

This is particularly concerning because, at present, there is only one access route into and out of the development. A potential alternative access through Broadlands did not materialise, meaning that all residential traffic is effectively concentrated through a single access route.

As a result, any increase in household size, car ownership or vehicle movements arising from the proposed amendments will be channelled through the same route. This places even greater importance on properly assessing the traffic impact of increasing the number of larger homes and additional bedrooms within the development.

This is particularly relevant to residents whose homes are situated along the route used to access and leave the development. Additional cars do not simply affect the development itself; they result in more vehicle movements past residential properties and place further pressure on the surrounding road network, including Folders Lane and Keymer Road.

The development was originally considered and approved on the basis of a particular mix and scale of housing. I am concerned that allowing the developer subsequently to increase the size and bedroom capacity of a number of properties materially alters the impact of that approved scheme.

The application itself identifies an increase of 20 bedrooms across the amended parcels. In my view, the implications of those additional bedrooms should not be considered simply as an internal design change. More bedrooms provide capacity for larger households, which can reasonably be expected to create additional pressure on:

- vehicle movements and traffic through the development;
- residential parking and visitor parking;
- the single access route currently serving the development;
- surrounding roads and junctions;
- schools, healthcare and other local infrastructure; and
- the general residential environment for people already living alongside the development.

I am also concerned about the reduction in the proportion of smaller two-bedroom homes. One of the benefits of a mixed development should be the provision of a genuine range of

property sizes. Moving away from smaller properties towards larger houses changes that balance and potentially reduces the availability of homes suitable for smaller households, first-time buyers and downsizers.

The cumulative impact is important. These amendments should not be considered solely as a series of individual house-type changes. Taken together, they alter the housing mix, increase the number of bedrooms and potentially increase the population and traffic generated by this phase of the development.

As somebody directly affected by vehicles travelling through this area, I am particularly concerned about any amendment that could lead to further traffic movements past residential properties. The development is already substantial, and with only one current access route serving the site, any additional traffic generated by larger households will be concentrated through the same route.

Residents should be able to rely upon the impacts assessed when the original scheme was approved rather than face a gradual intensification of the development through subsequent amendments.

I therefore ask Mid Sussex District Council to refuse the proposed variation unless the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate that the increase in larger homes and additional bedrooms will not result in an unacceptable increase in traffic movements, parking pressure or demand upon local infrastructure.

I would also ask the Council to ensure that the cumulative impact of these amendments is fully assessed, taking particular account of the fact that the development currently relies on a single access route, rather than treating the changes simply as minor alterations to individual properties.

Kind regards