

**Steven King**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2026 02:01  
**To:** planninginfo  
**Cc:** Steven King  
**Subject:** Objection to DM/26/0303 – Land North of Borers Arms Road, Copthorne  
**Attachments:** Maidenbower Infant School comments.pdf; Objection to 2025\_1376 and consultation 2026\_928 – land, ecology and protected species.eml

[REDACTED]  
Dear Planning Officer,

Please register this email as my updated formal objection to application DM/26/0303, Land North of Borers Arms Road, Copthorne. I stand by my previous comments made on 28th March 2026, as I feel most remain unresolved, despite further updates and information since.

I am an adjoining local resident. I understand that the stated consultation deadline was 14 August 2026. I would be grateful if this representation and its attachment could still be accepted and considered before the application is determined.

Attached is a copy of my detailed objection submitted to Tandridge District Council under consultation reference 2026/928. It concerns the same cross-boundary development and incorporates relevant matters arising from Tandridge application 2025/1376.

Please place the attached objection on the DM/26/0303 case file and treat its contents as forming part of this representation.

I recognise that education, transport, drainage and ecological documents have already been submitted. However, those documents do not appear to answer all the cross-boundary and site-specific matters set out below.

### **Relationship between the applications**

Mid Sussex's consultation letter to Tandridge dated 24 July 2026 confirms that revised highway plans and supporting information were received on 23 July 2026.

This establishes that Tandridge reference 2026/928 is a consultation concerning DM/26/0303 rather than a replacement for Tandridge application 2025/1376.

However, it remains unclear whether all relevant representations and technical consultee responses submitted under 2025/1376—including Surrey Wildlife Trust's responses—have been transferred to Mid Sussex and will be considered when determining DM/26/0303.

Please confirm that Mid Sussex has received and will consider the complete relevant record from both Tandridge references.

### **Schools and cross-boundary education**

Surrey County Council's education statement estimates that the development would generate 112 school-age children and seeks total contributions of £2,709,038, comprising:

- £250,323 for 18 early-years places;
- £1,277,177 for primary education; and
- £1,181,538 for secondary education.

Surrey identifies Oakwood School as the intended recipient of the secondary contribution. However, the early-years location would be determined later, and the primary contribution is described generally as maintaining "latent capacity" in the existing Tandridge school estate.

This does not demonstrate that suitable mainstream places would be available in Copthorne.

The development would physically extend Copthorne, use a Copthorne address and be accessed through the village. The effect on education should therefore be assessed using evidence about Copthorne's mainstream schools, including those administered by West Sussex County Council.

The Headteacher of Maidenbower Infant School has stated that Copthorne schools are already oversubscribed and that Maidenbower regularly admits between four and six children each year who were unable to obtain a place at a Copthorne school.

Aurora Redehall School in Smallfield must not be counted as available mainstream capacity. It is specialist provision. Admission requires an Education, Health and Care Plan, formal consultation by the relevant local authority, an individual assessment confirming that the school can meet the child's particular needs and agreed funding.

I have not found a coordinated assessment from Surrey and West Sussex that addresses these matters. Please obtain confirmation of:

- the number and age range of children expected from the development;
- which mainstream schools those children would realistically attend;
- current and forecast capacity at Copthorne's schools;
- existing overflow and in-year admission pressures;
- whether Maidenbower's regular admission of displaced Copthorne pupils has been reflected in the forecasts;
- whether any specialist or EHCP-only schools have been included in the capacity assessment;
- confirmation that Aurora Redehall has not been counted as general mainstream capacity;
- the cumulative effect of other committed developments;
- whether additional classrooms or school expansion would be required;
- the particular projects to which the early-years and primary contributions would be applied;
- how and when the necessary places would be delivered; and
- whether contributions collected in Surrey could fund provision in West Sussex where some of the demand is likely to arise.

A financial contribution should not be treated as adequate mitigation unless it is connected to an identified and deliverable project capable of providing suitable mainstream places when required.

If children cannot obtain places in Copthorne and must travel elsewhere, the resulting school journeys must also be included in the transport assessment.

## **Highway and pedestrian safety**

West Sussex County Council's earlier highway response states that the development is predicted to generate 133 two-way vehicle trips during the morning peak and 110 during the evening peak.

It concluded that the Borers Arms Road/Copthorne Bank junctions would operate within accepted capacity thresholds and that the development would not cause a "severe" effect on the highway network.

However, that response predates the revised highway plans received on 23 July 2026. I have not found a published final highway-authority response confirming that the revised design is acceptable.

The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit reportedly recommended a pedestrian refuge or shorter crossing at the widened access, together with a minimum two-metre footway. The designer's response reportedly retains a crossing exceeding ten metres to accommodate large vehicles and reduces the footway to approximately 1.5 metres near Units 4 and 12.

Please obtain an updated highway-authority response addressing:

- whether the revised plans comply with the Road Safety Audit recommendations;
- the safety of the proposed crossing;
- the reported reduction of the footway to approximately 1.5 metres;
- the reason for any departure from the recommended two-metre width;
- the needs of children, wheelchair users, mobility-scooter users and parents with pushchairs;
- whether school and overflow journeys have been included;
- the reported RFC above 1.0 at the A2220/Copthorne Common Road roundabout;
- the assumptions, committed developments, predicted queues and delays used in the modelling; and
- any practical mitigation required.

The Road Safety Audit also reportedly lacked complete information about landscaping, levels, gradients, pavement construction, drainage and signage. Those details should be supplied and reviewed before the access design is accepted.

## **Parking**

The transport material reportedly identifies the loss of eight spaces serving the existing employment area while referring to 64 spaces associated with the proposed commercial floorspace.

Spaces required for the new commercial development cannot also be treated as replacement parking for existing businesses.

Please require a schedule separately identifying:

- existing lawful parking spaces;
- spaces lost;
- genuine replacement spaces for existing businesses;
- spaces required for the new commercial floorspace;
- residential and visitor spaces;
- accessible spaces; and
- cycle parking.

## **Drainage and Thorne Copse**

The Flood Risk Assessment reportedly records:

- soils with impeded drainage;
- groundwater encountered at approximately 1.85 metres and 2.5 metres below ground level;
- failure of all four soakaway tests; and
- a conclusion that soakaway drainage is not viable.

This information has been supplied, but it does not by itself establish that seasonal groundwater, exceedance routes, downstream effects and the suitability of Thorne Copse have been adequately resolved.

Thorne Copse and the surrounding land are known locally to become wet and waterlogged. It also appears in the later material, although it was not included within the original application boundary as I understood it.

Please confirm:

- why Thorne Copse has been included;
- whether it forms part of the application site;
- whether it is intended as public open space, drainage, ecological mitigation or biodiversity net gain;
- whether seasonal groundwater monitoring has been undertaken;
- whether it would be safely accessible and usable throughout the year;
- whether accessible paths could be provided without damaging its habitat;
- the effects on adjoining and downstream properties;
- the proposed extreme-rainfall exceedance routes;
- whether drainage works would increase flood risk elsewhere;
- whether the land is legally available for the proposed purpose; and
- how its long-term management and maintenance would be secured.

Thorne Copse is regularly used by deer. Although that does not prevent development, it is relevant evidence of wildlife movement and habitat connectivity and should be considered when assessing roads, lighting, fencing and public access.

### **Ecology, protected wildlife and biodiversity net gain**

The attached Tandridge objection sets out the ecological concerns and applicable legal protections in detail.

Surrey Wildlife Trust formally objected to the proposal and identified concerns including:

- destruction of approximately 60% of Copthorne Meadows SNCI;
- loss of around half of its best lowland-meadow grassland;
- loss of lowland mixed deciduous woodland;
- failure properly to demonstrate the mitigation hierarchy;
- outdated or incomplete protected-species evidence;
- the absence of detailed invertebrate surveys;
- possible habitat degradation; and
- unresolved biodiversity-net-gain calculations.

The biodiversity metric reviewed by Surrey Wildlife Trust reportedly showed a 63.68% on-site habitat-unit loss and a remaining 22.69% habitat-unit loss even after the identified off-site scheme was included.

I have not found a later published response from Surrey Wildlife Trust withdrawing its objection or confirming that these matters have been resolved.

Please confirm that Mid Sussex has received and considered:

- Surrey Wildlife Trust's full responses under Tandridge application 2025/1376;
- all ecological information submitted under Tandridge references 2025/1376 and 2026/928;
- any updated badger, bat, dormouse, great-crested-newt, reptile, amphibian and bird surveys;
- any botanical and seasonal invertebrate surveys;
- any investigation of possible habitat degradation;
- a corrected statutory biodiversity metric;
- evidence distinguishing on-site from off-site biodiversity provision;
- legal arrangements securing any off-site gains; and
- the likely ability to satisfy any applicable European Protected Species licensing tests.

Protected-species surveys should not be deferred until after permission where their results could alter the layout, access, lighting, drainage or amount of developable land.

## **Conclusion**

Information has been submitted on education, highways, drainage and ecology, but the principal cross-boundary, ecological and deliverability questions have not been shown to have been resolved.

Before determining DM/26/0303, I ask Mid Sussex District Council to satisfy itself that:

- the relevant Tandridge representations and consultee responses have been received and considered;
- Copthorne's mainstream school capacity has been properly assessed;
- specialist EHCP provision has not been counted as mainstream capacity;
- education contributions are linked to suitable and deliverable projects;
- safe and accessible pedestrian routes would be provided;
- the revised highway plans have received a complete and current highway-authority review;
- school-related traffic and junction capacity have been fully assessed;
- parking provision has been accurately calculated;
- groundwater and drainage risks have been addressed;
- the purpose and suitability of Thorne Copse have been established;
- the protected-species evidence is complete and current;
- Surrey Wildlife Trust's objections have been resolved; and
- the statutory biodiversity-net-gain requirement can lawfully and practically be delivered.

If these matters remain unresolved, I ask Mid Sussex District Council to refuse the application or defer determination until the necessary evidence has been provided and independently reviewed.

Please acknowledge receipt and confirm that:

- this email has been registered as an objection to DM/26/0303;
- the attached Tandridge objection has been placed on the case file;
- the attachment will be considered in full before determination; and

- the relevant representations and technical responses submitted to Tandridge will be taken into account.

Yours sincerely,



Attachments:

1. Copy of objection submitted to Tandridge District Council under reference 2026/928.
2. Objection made by Headmistress of Maidenbower Infant School.