

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 August 2025 12:05:22 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1593

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/08/2025 12:05 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Woodlands Close And Land To The North Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down Crawley West Sussex RH10 4JZ
Proposal:	The demolition of numbers 9-11 Woodlands Close together with the demolition of other existing buildings on site and erection of 48 dwellings (Use Class C3) with open space, landscaping, car parking and associated infrastructure including provision of internal access roads and access road onto Woodlands Close.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 SYCAMORE LANE CRAWLEY DOWN
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Re: Objection to Planning Application for the demolition of number 9-11 Woodlands Close together with the demolition of other existing buildings on site and erection of 48 dwellings I am writing to object to the above planning application for several reasons associated to

infrastructure capacity, access, and compliance with planning policy and MSDC Plan. The proposed development is not only a deviation from the MSDC Plan allocations but would adversely impact on local residents and lack of infrastructure in the village be it amenities (doctor or schools) or roads and drainage as below objections.

1. Access arrangements are inadequate

The proposed access arrangements makes no 13 Woodlands Close an island between two access roads as such is very detrimental to the residents quality of life. Furthermore The Transport Statement notes sub-standard visibility splays. It states it requires sightlines to achieve 2.4m x 43m for 30mph limit. However its achieves only 32.3m which is 25% below standard. To the south and 37.6m to the north being 13% below standard

This reduction represents unacceptable risk and suggest a RSA will not support this.

2. Misleading marketing literature & consultation claims

The developer has made unsubstantiated claims about consultation with local community Groups. Letters sent to residents specifically claimed discussions had taken place with organizations such as the local football club. From discussion with WPC and the football club revealed that discussions did not actually occur. This is characteristic of the land promoter using false

rhetoric in marketing literature. The false consultation claims combined with the aggressive property acquisition strategy demonstrate a "development at any cost" approach. Consultation with the community is fundamental to the planning process and as yet this has not happened so it a deviation of procedure and frankly dishonest and does not comply with both the spirit and requirements of planning

consultation procedures. Misleading statements to the local community undermine trust in the planning process. These dishonest statements appear to be a direct attempt to bypass planning procedure and sway opinion based upon falsehoods. Proper community consultation is a fundamental requirement of the planning process and the promoters false information has denied the community genuine opportunities for meaningful input. This represents a failure to comply with both the spirit and requirements of planning consultation procedures.

3. Footpath Connections into Burleigh Woods estate not agreed with RMC:

The proposals shows a pedestrian access via the existing Burleigh Woods estate. This scheme has been rejected as will the access into our estate.

4. Surface Water Drainage.

The drainage strategy assumes discharge of drainage through the Burleigh Woods estate. We have rejected access to this proposed development due to concerns about drainage amongst other reasons. As such the proposed site does not have a viable surface water strategy.

5. Village infrastructure.

Crawley Down Surgery was rated "inadequate overall" by the Care Quality Commission in September 2023 and has been placed on special measures. S106 monies are unlikely to resolve the fundamental issues with the surgery, facilities and measures and will not support an additional 48 households (approximately 120+ residents). Kiln Road is in a bad state of disrepair and only be made worst by the construction and additional 48 homes and 100 cars. 400 car movements a day. Furthermore, the village has insufficient amenities to support additional these additional homes not to mention the drainage in the village being repaired almost daily with regular contamination of the village pond where this development will eventually drain.

6. Access Route

The Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD (2022) specifically allocates this site as SA22 and states to "Provide access from Sycamore Lane". The RMC of Burleigh Woods has rejected this access. The MSDC Plan removed access from Woodland Close due to highways concerns and due to aggressive development. The Transport Statement (Section 2.15) acknowledges this requirement but proposes access via Woodlands Close instead. This is a massive departure from the adopted development plan without proper justification. The MSDC plan recommends that is access cannot be gained from Sycamore lane then the allocation should be removed. The inability to secure access via Sycamore Lane due to "land ownership issues" is not justification for deviation from the MSDC Plan and planning policy. does not justify circumventing established planning policy. The purchase of properties 9 and 11 Woodlands Close at allegedly £1million above-market rates appears to be a deliberate strategy to force through an unsuitable access arrangement Flouting the MSDC plan decisions and creating a concerning precedent for developers to ignore planning allocations through aggressive development.

7. In correct sates on 'Notifications of Planning Application's.

the 'Notifications of Planning Application' on the planning portal and as pinned to posts and walls near the development state comments need to be received by 15th August 2025. However, The notification received the post states that comments need to

be received by 8th August 2025. Therefore, incorrectly advertised. As such I feel that some people may miss the opportunity comment/object. This administrative error is unforgivable and unclear and as such this process of consultation should be halted and investigated..

Kind regards