

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 05 January 2026 07:59:08 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/3191

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/01/2026 7:59 AM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved except for access from Burleigh Lane, for the erection of up to eight self-build /custom build dwellings, drainage and ancillary works.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address: HOLLY COTTAGE SANDHILL LANE CRAWLEY DOWN

### Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Darren Ward  
Holly Cottage  
Sandhill Lane  
Crawley \Down  
West Sussex  
RH10 4LD

05 January 2026

Objection - DM/25/3191 - Outline application with all matters reserved except for access from Burleigh Lane, for the erection of up to eight self-build /custom build dwellings, drainage and ancillary works. Land To The South Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down West Sussex.

### Summary

I object to this application for 8 individual building plots to the south of Burleigh Lane.

Firstly the basis of the objection centres around the Crawley down Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2031 that was fully adopted in 2016. That the plan was adopted means that:

#### Legal status of an adopted neighbourhood plan

An adopted neighbourhood plan has the same legal status as a local plan once it has been approved at a referendum. \*\*This means that it becomes part of the statutory development plan for the area and carries legal weight in the planning process.

Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan\*\*, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The adoption of a neighbourhood plan ensures that the community's vision for development is considered and can influence planning decisions.

So according to government and council guidelines and regulations, planning decisions must be made within the guidelines set out in the adopted neighbourhood plan and any application that contravenes these legal guidelines must be refused. It will be shown that this application for 8 individual building plots does indeed contravene the adopted Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan in several areas thus necessitating its refusal. What is more, this neighbourhood plan is the basis of democracy, it was voted in by the whole village and if we are to ignore its guidance, then this sets a dangerous precedence of running roughshod over democratic principles and the will of the residents of the village as a whole.

### Detailed Objection

1. Site Outside Built Up Area Boundary. Any site that lies outside the village Built Up Area Boundary as defined by Figure 7 of Page 26 in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan 2016 (CDNP) is the countryside, and the CDNP with absolute clarity gives protection to the countryside to prevent this very type of development. The extract below is from Page 56 of the CDNP and is the definition of the Built up Area Boundary. It can be seen from the two starred texts that a large site of 8 houses on virgin greenfield land is in direct contravention of the aim of the CDNP to limit urban sprawl,

to preserve green spaces and to protect the countryside. It also states that for land outside the built up area boundary, only uses appropriate to countryside location are acceptable. The building of 8 houses on virgin green fields outside the built up area is not applicable to the countryside location, is in the protected countryside outside the built up area in direct contravention to the CDNP and should be refused.

Crawley Down is a settlement with strong development pressures. \*\*As such, there is a clear need for a distinction between the built form of the main settlement where certain forms of development are likely to be appropriate and the countryside, where protection and enhancement are of most importance. The Built Up Area Boundary provides that distinction.\*\*

It is not simply a means of showing the limits of existing development, as some developed areas lie outside it and some undeveloped areas lie within it.

Those areas included within the Built-up Area Boundary must be sustainable and conform to relevant local and national policy to ensure the most appropriate use of land.

\*\*Outside the boundary only uses appropriate to a countryside location are acceptable.\*\*

Development that is close to but physically separate from the built-up area should not be included within the built-up area boundary (including ribbon and fragmented development). This is to maintain a strongly defined boundary and to avoid areas of countryside from being unnecessarily included within the BUAB.

2. DMH Stallard, Planning Statement Planning application paragraph 4. As in Paragraph 1 above, the council have also taken the view that the development is unacceptable as it is outside the Built Up Area; see Paragraph 4.2 below from the DMH Stallard planning statement submitted on behalf of the applicant. So once more this is further evidence that this application should be refused and the applicant has already been made aware of this.

4.1 DMS Stallard on behalf of the Applicant has sought pre-application advice from MSDC for this scheme. A formal request for advice was submitted on 14 April 2025. A site meeting with the planning officer was held on 21 May 2025 and a formal letter of advice subsequently issued on 11th June 2025 (MSDC ref: DM/25/1003). Separate pre-application advice was also secured from West Sussex County Council acting as highways authority on 12 October 2023.

4.2 The advice provided by MSDC indicated that whilst the \*\*proposed development is considered unacceptable\*\* in principle

---

by the Council as it is located outside the defined built-up area boundary set out in the District Plan, nevertheless the development needs to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The advice notes that if the development is found to be sustainable, this would weigh heavily in favour of the granting planning permission under the tilted balance exercise set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

3. Contravention of CDNP08 - Page 33. Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan, Page 33, CDNP08 addresses the requirement of planning decisions to limit the spread of the urban environment at the expense of the countryside. It states that:

CDNP08: Prevention of Coalescence, states that development outside the village boundary will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that: a. It does not detract significantly from the openness and character of the landscape. b. It does not contribute to 'ribbon development' along the roads or paths linking the village to neighbouring settlements of Copthorne, Felbridge, Turners Hill and Crawley. c. It does not significantly reduce the gaps between the village and neighbouring settlements of Copthorne, Felbridge, Turners Hill and Crawley.

So not only would this development be outside the Built Up Area as discussed in Paragraph 1, but would detract from the openness and character of the area and would constitute urban sprawl into the protected countryside. This development would also cross for the first time over the natural demarcation between the built up area north of Burleigh Lane and the virgin countryside which is to the South of Burleigh Lane. Given there is also planning permission for 48 new build houses on the north side of Burleigh Lane (DM/25/1593) almost directly opposite to this planning application, that if this application was also granted, these two large blocks of housing spanning both sides of Burleigh Lane would make the area undisputedly urban and completely change its rural nature. This natural boundary of Burleigh Lane was selected as the limit of the built up area, as south of Burleigh Lane where this application is sited is green, it is definitely countryside and building upon it would markedly change the nature of the whole area. To cross over this natural demarcation between village and countryside would also set a dangerous precedence for future building on green field sites along the south of Burleigh Lane that the CDNP and the Localism Act 2011 aims to protect.

It is readily apparent that this development would also be detrimental to the local habitat (CDNP paragraph 54) and again closes the Turners Hill Gap.

The green fields around Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane are one of the last rural lanes left in the village and are footpaths where people enjoy the rural setting, and allowing a new development on

---

the south side of it would severely detract from its rural nature which again contradicts the CDNP, and again to reiterate would set a worrying precedent for the substantial area of green land in and around Sandhill and Burleigh Lanes that essentially makes up the majority of the Turners Hill Gap, to be built upon.

4. Infill housing. The applicant is attempting to split his land once more, he has already carved up his garden to build Orchard House (application DM/19/1899) and was rewarded handsomely for the plot, and now it can be seen that once more the applicant is motivated by money, and cares little for green spaces, the environment, legacy for future generations and the rule of planning law. This application for infill housing contravenes the CDNP on Page 58 where in the definition of infill, it states that Infill is Additional dwelling(s) within the built up area boundary, typically on brownfield sites or garden splits and that infill does not apply to development in the countryside. So the applicant is attempting to split his land into parcels for development which again is in contravention of the CDNP.

Aside from representing a concerning urban sprawl into the countryside, this development would again also set a worrying precedence to enable this landowner and other large land owners on the South side of Burleigh Lane to start parcelling more of their land and build more and more developments.

It is our duty to protect green spaces for future generations. It was essential during the pandemic for the public to access green spaces and woodland and it was well documented the positive effect that these spaces have on the wellbeing of all.

5. Pressure on Private Roads. Sandhill Lane and Burleigh Lane are both private roads maintained at private expense by those living on the lanes, but are both also public footpaths. With the developments that have been allowed along the lane, the road has become potholed and very busy. These large potholes can cause drivers to swerve and this is an obvious danger to pedestrians enjoying their right to walk on the public footpaths and enjoying the green spaces, and it is the responsibility of mid sussex council to ensure the safety of pedestrians. The increased traffic caused by 8 dwellings being built over a protracted period as well as the traffic caused by 8 extra houses, poses an unacceptable risk to pedestrians. Currently Burleigh Lane has 7 houses on it, more than doubling its number to 15 by adding 8 more is an unacceptable demand on this small, private lane and public footpath.

6. Pressure on Village Infrastructure. Given the number of developments around Burleigh Woods and Kiln Lane (parcels 46 and 51 on Figure 4, Page 16 of the CDNP), 48 houses to the north of Burleigh Lane (DM/25/1593), and the application for 350 houses on Huntsland Farm land off Turners Hill Road

---

(DM/25/0015 and DM/25/0016), the village and area is at capacity, the infrastructure is creaking, and conurbations are starting to meet which severely affect the rural nature of the area; these extra houses will worsen the burden. Given the number of new build houses in the village, these 8 extra houses are also not essential to relieve any housing shortage and what is more, this vast number of new builds have made the preservation of green spaces like this land along the south of Burleigh Lane vital, as they are a treasured and vital rural escape that would be destroyed if this development were permitted. Paragraph 6 of the CDNP repeatedly reiterates that the village services are at capacity and these developments together only increase this burden.

### Conclusion

From Paragraph 52 of the CDNP:

The rural setting of Crawley Down with its surrounding patchwork of open fields, shaws and woodland is of great importance to residents, and is one of the main reasons that outsiders wish to move into the Village. The 2013 Neighbourhood Plan survey highlighted that the preservation of the village identity and restriction of development on local gaps between Crawley Down and neighbouring communities to prevent sprawl and preserve the village setting are overwhelming concerns for most of our residents.

If this planning application is granted, it would undoubtedly mark a watershed moment in the urban sprawl outside the defined Built Up Area, open a pandoras box of development south of Burleigh Lane and erode our dwindling countryside changing forever the character of this rural land.

Once more I object to this planning application and request that it is refused.

Kind regards

Darren Ward

---

Kind regards