

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 September 2025 12:24:26 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1977

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/09/2025 12:24 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	21 Wivelsfield Road Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 4EF
Proposal:	Erection of two semi-detached dwellings with associated access, parking, landscaping and formation of new in - out driveway to serve existing host dwelling at 21 Wivelsfield Road.
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	50 St Edmunds Road Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir I am writing to strongly object to the planning proposal DM/25/1977 for the following reasons. 1 HEIGHTS and ELEVATIONS The plan does not indicate any heights or elevation data. The land on which the proposed building is sloped so there will

have to be a degree of levelling and maybe even a degree of abutment to prevent land slip. However this is outside of my knowledge base and is an observation as none of this appears to be covered in the planning documents.

2. PRIVACY The planning document does not give any indication of heights / elevation so it is difficult to be specific but as I see it the occupants of the proposed development will have clear view into my property, particularly bedrooms.

3 LOSS OF LIGHT.

These houses if constructed as per this document will put the rear of my property in pretty well permanent shade, bad enough in summer but even more so in autumn and winter.

4 NOISE.

The proposal would appear to be favouring air sourced heat pumps these are noisy as such it seems to me that for me not to be disturbed by their operation the houses would have to be further away from my boundary than the plan shows them to be. The parking for 21B is shown to be along the property boundary and is only a few feet from my bedroom, I have visions of being regularly woken by car doors and late night conversations.

5.ACCESS

Turning , difficult to see how vehicles from 21A or B can turn safely without encroaching on the "Host" parking area.

FIRE ACCESS In the event of a serious fire difficult to see how adequate resources could be bought to bear to quickly get a fire under control, statement from the fire service would be nice.

6 HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS

The host site has a well proportioned elegant Georgian house which in colour is a muted grey.

The entire garden site is a part of what a house of this size would have had when constructed, to reduce the size of the garden in my opinion is to effectively destroy part of the house.

The proposed houses do not blend well with the existing host building either in design or materials / colouring. It all seems overbearing as far as I can judge.

The developer makes much of the design blending with other houses in the area, this is irrelevant as they will only be visible to the immediate neighbours who would rather not see them at all.

It seems to me that in this proposal the houses are on the small side crammed into an area which is inadequate to hold them while creating the Biodiversity benefits required for a new development, I see this as over development of the site.

7 BIODIVERSITY STATEMENT.

This whole section is disingenuous.

Observation.

Any initiative to improve bio diversity is worth nothing if it cannot be guaranteed to remain post development,
It cannot be considered a gain if it is only replacing something which is already there.

This section attempts to show a diversity gain by moving plants around while hiding the fact that In the case of this application more diversity has been removed than added.

2 Baseline Conditions

The baseline conditions are not as stated. It states that the development area comprises overgrown grassland and scattered garden shrubs. While this statement is in part true it fails to mention that infact the development area was the remains of an orchard area with until a few weeks ago viable apple trees now taken down, as these provided food for various animals and birds a big bio negative, as I see nothing in this proposal to replace them.

3 Post-Development Enhancements.

Native Hedgerow planting.

There are or were hedgerows and large masses of Ivy on the North side of number 21 prior to the removal of the garage / workshop, probably about equal to the amount of new hedge being proposed to be planted.

Tree Protection and Management.

Yes the developer may well retain some trees but who will maintain them once sold.? The answer to that is that the new owner will likely find a reason to either prune them within an inch of their lives or chop them down completely, for most people trees too close to their residence are a pain for a whole variety of reasons.

How does the developer intend to guarantee the existence and sympathetic maintenance of the trees post development ?.

SuDS Features

This is a complicated subject but all we see in this proposal are

generalised comments and no data e.g quantity of water to be handled and an assumption that the remaining garden areas will absorb it all.

This section does not explain how a section of permeable path is going to help diversity, there is no explanation of how surface water will be channelled or stored?

I note another comment as regards water butt storage however nothing on the objective of a stored water system, no data on storage quantities overflow disposal etc.

From the Government manual :-

6.1 A 'approach' shall be adopted to ensure the surface water drainage system maximises biodiversity benefits throughout the development lifecycle.

6.2 The surface water drainage system shall add biodiversity value by:

- creating diverse, self-sustaining, resilient local ecosystems[footnote 34] which contribute to net gains in biodiversity
- supporting and promoting natural local habitat and species, for example, through local nature recovery strategies () [footnote 35]
- contributing to the delivery of local biodiversity strategies
- contributing to habitat connectivity

I would suggest that to achieve the above properly requires a bit of space for run off streams and collection pools and that in this case there is not adequate space to achieve it and while it may be possible to retain some moisture in the ground in and of itself it will not be enough for the frogs and toads to make a come back.

Wildflower Margins

The current margins have wild flowers, they also have nettles and brambles, blackberries, all very good for wildlife diversity and all likely to go if re-developed.

Diversity Conclusions

As far as I can see there is no diversity gain on this project only a diversity loss.

Kind regards