

Katherine Williams

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 24 July 2025 13:15  
**To:** Katherine Williams  
**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 24/07/2025 1:14 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 Hornbeam Place Crawley Down Crawley
----------	---------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Land North of Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down [DM/25/1593]</p> <p>To: Mid Sussex District Council Planning Department</p> <p>From: [REDACTED] 3 Hornbeam Place, Crawley Down, West Sussex, RH10 4AQ</p> <p>Date: 24th July 2025</p> <p>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 (class C3)</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the above planning application on multiple grounds relating to access arrangements, infrastructure capacity, and planning policy compliance. The proposed development represents an inappropriate deviation from established planning allocations and would create significant adverse impacts on existing residents and local infrastructure.</p>



## PRIMARY OBJECTIONS

### 1. UNAUTHORIZED DEVIATION FROM ALLOCATED ACCESS ROUTE

#### Policy Violation:

- The Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD (2022) specifically allocates this site as SA22 with the explicit requirement to "Provide access from Sycamore Lane"
- The Transport Statement (Section 2.15) acknowledges this requirement but proposes access via Woodlands Close instead
- This represents a fundamental departure from the adopted development plan without proper justification

#### Procedural Concerns:

- The developer's inability to secure access via Sycamore Lane due to "land ownership issues" does not justify circumventing established planning policy
- The acquisition of properties 9 and 11 Woodlands Close at allegedly above-market rates appears to be a deliberate strategy to force through an unsuitable access arrangement
- This sets a dangerous precedent for developers to ignore planning allocations through aggressive acquisition tactics

### 2. INADEQUATE AND UNSUITABLE ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

#### Traffic Island Effect:

- The proposed access arrangements will create an unacceptable "traffic island" situation for existing residents
- Properties on Woodlands Close will be surrounded by development traffic from both the existing Burleigh Woods estate and the proposed new development
- This represents a significant deterioration in residential amenity and quality of life

#### Visibility and Safety Concerns:

- The Transport Statement acknowledges substandard visibility splays (Section 4.4):

Required sightlines: 2.4m x 43m for 30mph limit

Achieved to south: only 32.3m (25% below standard)

Achieved to north: 37.6m (13% below standard)

- These deficiencies pose significant road safety risks

- Unauthorized Footpath Connections:

The proposals assume pedestrian access via the existing Burleigh Woods estate. No evidence of consultation or agreement with the landowners of these connection routes. This represents presumptuous planning without proper legal foundations

### 3. INADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY

#### Healthcare Services:

- Crawley Down Health Centre was rated "inadequate overall" by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in September 2023
- The practice was placed into special measures due to inability to meet patient demand and access issues
- No documented improvement has been achieved to date
- The addition of 48 households (approximately 120+ residents) will exacerbate existing healthcare capacity problems

#### Highway Infrastructure:

- Kiln Road, the primary approach to Woodlands Close, is in a continuously dangerous state of disrepair
- The road surface requires complete resurfacing and poses safety risks to both vehicles and cyclists
- No provision has been made in the application for addressing these existing deficiencies
- Additional traffic from 48 dwellings will worsen the deterioration

#### Local Amenities:

- The village lacks sufficient amenities to support additional residential development of this



scale

- Existing services are already under pressure from previous development
- No assessment of cumulative impact on village infrastructure

#### 4. POLICY AND PROCEDURAL FAILURES

- Departure from Development Plan:
- The proposal directly contradicts the adopted Site Allocations DPD requirement for Sycamore Lane access
- No compelling planning justification has been provided for this departure
- The application should be refused or deferred pending proper access via the allocated route

Consultation Deficiencies:

- Inadequate consultation with affected neighboring landowners
- Assumptions made about access arrangements without proper legal agreements
- No meaningful engagement with existing Woodlands Close residents
- False claims regarding community consultation: The developer has sent notifications to local residents claiming to have held discussions with local community groups, including the local football club, but these discussions did not actually occur
- No evidence has been provided to substantiate these consultation claims
- This demonstrates a "development at any cost" approach lacking integrity and proper community engagement

Environmental Impact:

- Insufficient assessment of impact on existing residents' quality of life
- No proper consideration of the "traffic island" effect on existing properties
- Inadequate assessment of cumulative traffic impact on local road network

#### 5. MISLEADING CONSULTATION CLAIMS AND LACK OF INTEGRITY

False Community Engagement:

- The developer has made unsubstantiated claims about consultation with local community groups
- Notifications sent to residents specifically claimed discussions had taken place with organizations such as the local football club
- Investigation has revealed that these claimed discussions did not actually occur
- The developer has failed to provide any evidence to support these consultation claims

Pattern of Concerning Behaviour:

- The false consultation claims combined with the aggressive property acquisition strategy demonstrate a "development at any cost" approach
- This pattern of behaviour raises serious questions about the developer's integrity and commitment to proper planning processes
- Such misleading statements to the local community undermine trust in the planning process
- This approach suggests a willingness to circumvent proper procedures and community engagement requirements

Impact on Planning Process:

- Misleading consultation claims may have influenced local opinion and the planning assessment
- Proper community consultation is a fundamental requirement of the planning process
- The developer's approach 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

#### SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

- Technical Deficiencies in Transport Statement
- Substandard Visibility Splays: The applicant's own evidence shows sight lines below required standards
- Assumptions About Third-Party Land: Footpath connections assumed without legal basis
- Inadequate Highway Assessment: No proper evaluation of Kiln Road deficiencies



#### Planning Policy Conflicts

- Site Allocations DPD: Direct contradiction of Policy SA22 access requirements
- Neighbourhood Plan: Potential conflicts with Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan policies
- NPPF Compliance: Fails to demonstrate safe and suitable access for all users
- Consultation Requirements: Misleading claims about community engagement violate planning consultation standards

#### REQUESTED ACTION

- I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council:  
REFUSE this planning application on the grounds outlined above
- Require the applicant to pursue access via Sycamore Lane as allocated in the adopted Development Plan
- Conduct a proper assessment of cumulative infrastructure impacts including healthcare capacity
- Ensure proper consultation with all affected parties before any revised application

This application represents an inappropriate attempt to circumvent established planning policy through aggressive property acquisition tactics and misleading consultation claims. The developer's pattern of behaviour, including false statements about community engagement and the acquisition of properties at above-market rates to force through unsuitable access demonstrates a concerning "development at any cost" approach that lacks integrity and proper regard for planning processes.

The proposed access arrangements are substandard, unsafe, and would cause significant detriment to existing residents. The local infrastructure is already inadequate to support additional development of this scale, and the developer's misleading approach to community consultation has denied residents proper opportunities for meaningful input.

The application fails to meet the requirements of the adopted Development Plan and should be refused in its current form. Any future application should comply with the allocated access arrangements via Sycamore Lane and include proper infrastructure assessments and improvements.

I trust you will give these serious concerns proper consideration in determining this application.

---

Kind regards