

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 May 2026 12:33:12 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 05/05/2026 12:33 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 117 and reducing the size of the proposed roundabout).
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 5 Orchard Way Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write to maintain and reinforce my previous objection (ref. DM/25/2129). Having reviewed the revised proposals, I do not consider that the amendments materially address the principal issues raised during the earlier consultation. My objections therefore remain, for the reasons set out below.

1. Quantum of development / alignment with the emerging plan
The reduction in dwelling numbers in the latest revision (125 to 117) is negligible and does not reflect the Council's draft plan position of approximately 60 homes. The revisions also do not demonstrate that earlier consultation responses have been meaningfully considered.

2. Highways, traffic impact and road safety

The proposed smaller roundabout does not resolve the likely increase in traffic volumes and associated congestion on the narrow local road network serving the site. The constrained nature of the surrounding roads also limits the feasibility of safe, continuous cycling provision. As such, the scheme continues to raise significant concerns regarding capacity and safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

3. Education provision and school capacity

West Sussex County Council has confirmed that local schools do not currently have sufficient capacity to accommodate additional demand arising from this development. While Section 106 contributions may be proposed, these do not guarantee that additional places (and any necessary expansions to facilities) will be delivered in a timely manner to meet the needs generated by the scheme.

4. Principle of development and prematurity

The site is not allocated in the current District Plan. Submitting an outline application ahead of any confirmed allocation appears premature and risks undermining due process, including the importance of an open and transparent plan-led public consultation process.

5. Water supply and infrastructure capacity

No clear, deliverable plan has been provided to demonstrate how sufficient water supply capacity will be secured to serve the development. The application documentation does not evidence committed investment or a defined programme for the infrastructure upgrades that would be required, and this remains a significant concern.

6. Flood risk and drainage

Concerns regarding flooding and flood risk have not been adequately addressed in the revised submission. In the absence of clear and robust evidence that existing and future flood risk can be appropriately mitigated, the proposal continues to give rise to critical and unresolved flood risk and drainage issues.

7. Heritage impact

Heritage harms remain unresolved. The applicant has not demonstrated that harm to heritage assets and their settings has been convincingly avoided, minimised, or clearly outweighed by public benefits, as required by national planning policy.

8. Landscape and character

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment indicates a noticeable adverse effect on the area, with effects projected to take up to 15 years to mitigate. Given the current rural setting and the sensitivity of the locality, further avoidance, mitigation and/or reduction of landscape and visual impacts is required.

9. Public transport and rail capacity

While the applicant indicates consultation with local bus operators, the revised submission does not provide sufficient detail or secured commitments to demonstrate that an enhanced bus service would be deliverable, convenient and used in practice. In particular, the proposed bus stop locations and service frequency raise concerns as to accessibility and likely uptake, which in turn limits the extent to which the scheme can reasonably rely on bus travel to mitigate additional car trips. In addition, there appears to be no assessment of the cumulative impact on rail capacity at Haywards Heath station, which is already subject to wider capacity pressures and is relevant to the sustainability of the proposed development.

Kind regards