

Steven King

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2025 11:47
To: [REDACTED]
Cc:
Subject: Re: OBJECTIONS to planning references DM/25/0014 DM/25/0015 DM/25/0016 and DM/25/0017

[REDACTED]
Thank you for your reply - our address is 15 Kiln Road, Crawley Down, RH10 4JY.

We're very close to the start of our road which leads to Grange Road straight onto the Turners Hill Road & the very worrying proposed & unsafe junction opposite Vicarage Road, extremely dangerous & difficult to get out of at the best of times, with vision impaired on the right from the Worth Way bridge & on the left from hedgerow, so you have to very slowly edge out of grange road onto the very busy Turners Hill Rd, it will be a nightmare with approx 700 EXTRA cars trying to get out from the development onto the TH Rd...

[REDACTED]
Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Steven King <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:15:12 AM

[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: OBJECTIONS to planning references DM/25/0014 DM/25/0015 DM/25/0016 and DM/25/0017

[REDACTED]
Thank you for your e mail re the above.

Please can I have your postal address so your comments can be registered.

Regards

Steven King, BSc (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI
Team Leader, Major Development
Development Management
01444 477556
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

Sent: 21 February 2025 12:18
To: Steven King <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>; planninginfo <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: OBJECTIONS to planning references DM/25/0014 DM/25/0015 DM/25/0016 and DM/25/0017

Good afternoon,

I wish to object in the strongest way possible, to these applications, - in total 350 new homes - a loss of 100 acres of farmland, that will flood our village with 1000 new residents & 700 cars exiting dangerously onto the already very busy Turners Hill Road.

The village already has to already endure huge HGVs, skip & recycling companies' lorries etc, thundering up and down the Turners Hill Road and I think it's safe to say that those types of vehicles that the residents have also had to put with for years, have been a contributory factor to the devastating situation Godstone village now finds itself in... They certainly haven't helped the road.

Crawley Down is a small village & due to several developments, including Hazel Rise most recently, but not forgetting the Burleigh Woods development too, we are already at breaking point with infrastructure that was never meant for 5500 - 6000 residents.

We have regular power cuts (some residents have had resort to buying their own generators), there is very little mobile phone signal and the rest of the utilities are creaking under the strain.

We are reliably informed that Crawley Down has not seen ONE PENNY of the S106 monies of around £3M paid to MSDC by developers that was supposed to have been used here in Crawley Down to improve the village (???) & so we are struggling badly and have been for many years, with one tiny Co-Op, a doctor's surgery that is already over full with patients are unable to get appointments (if the most vulnerable are 'lucky' enough to get one a few weeks ahead, patients are told they must travel to Burgess Hill or East Grinstead, when one is ill that's the last thing you want to be doing), we are often being told to either go to A&E or the Urgent Treatment Centre (both as we all are aware, also overstretched and the latter having recently had to reduce their opening hours due to safety concerns over insufficient staff), East Surrey Hospital regularly declaring critical incidents as it just cannot cope with the sheer numbers of people needing medical help - their A&E with people sitting on the corridor floors - again the huge Westvale Park development has brought around an extra 1500 residents to that local areas, yet the existing hospital has been expected to cope and this is the nearest hospital to Crawley Down, so how on earth is it going to provide emergency medical attention to an extra 1000?

Plus a 64 bedded care home is being built literally up the road from this development, whose residents are also going to need medical care and attention, in fact more so given their ages, and there's an application for yet another care home as part of these plans - why?

The approximate dozen care and nursing homes in the local area are not full and struggle to be, so why on earth would these 2 be any different (and in fact I've learnt that a previous one very close to this proposed one closed down a few years ago due to a lack of residents)

And alongside this huge number of extra residents in Crawley Down, a further 200 homes are going to be built on the Crawley Down road, plus 550 new homes on Imberhorne Farm - in total over the next 5 or so years mean another 3,000 residents using our already over-stretched medical services, congested roads and ageing schools.

The Star junction in Felbridge (that would be used to access local towns such as East Grinstead, Tunbridge Wells etc) was deemed by traffic surveys undertaken by the local councils whose area it comes under, as being OVER CAPACITY and that was a good while ago.

There are many Mid Sussex villages that have less residents than we have, Lindfield for example, and yet they have the facilities and infrastructure of a small town, including in terms of shops (new developments are supposed to be sustainable, with its residents able to access local facilities without having to use their cars, adding to already congested local roads and then there's the impact on the environment and people's health with the emissions coming from those vehicles)

Wates are certainly being 'economical with the truth' here when they give times that it would take to walk into the village where...ONE tiny grocery shop is situated, so small that 2 people cannot even go down one aisle at a time

Surely a Council has to demonstrate there is a NEED for developments like this to be built - how then is this the case here in Crawley Down where housing numbers have EXCEEDED those required - just WHO are these homes being built for? There is absolutely NO shortage of a variety of homes to suit a variety of budgets on all the home portals, Rightmove, On the Market, Zoopla etc.

Developers will mention "affordable housing" because they know it's their obligation to provide a small percentage, yet who are these homes affordable to? Certainly not the majority of young people these days who need a home, which is why a lot of the over priced new builds remain empty for sometimes up to a year - the demand for new housing is not there and this should be a huge factor in allowing the over developing in small villages like ours.

Finally, it is well known that whilst trying to gain Planning Permission, developers will claim there will be all sorts of improvements and facilities provided, yet these more often than not, never materialise.

2 prime examples of this are Westvale Park where TEN YEARS ON, "its residents are frustrated and disappointed that £40m of infrastructure and service improvements have never happened.

Developers were told last year to stop construction because the developers had failed to deliver important community facilities to support the development and its residents in a timely manner - they're still awaiting a GP surgery, a community hall (plus a promised shop and a road to connect the development's two halves...")

And another example is the much closer Heathy Wood development just up the road in Copthorne, where the residents have not long ago learnt that the school that the developers used, to act as an encouragement to buy homes there is, (of course) not going to be built or provided for them - if any PP is given to any developers, it's about time that developers be made to build the community facilities they've promised FIRST, before any housing is undertaken. After all Councils surely 'hold all the cards' in deciding whether to grant PP or not...

I would be grateful for an acknowledgement that this email and its very strong objections have been received, if an automatic one isn't already sent to all writing in.

Thank you for your time,

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any

attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.