

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 August 2025 21:26:21 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 08/08/2025 9:26 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:	5 Ash Tree Street Crawley
----------	---------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Planning Application - SA22 Site Allocation I am writing to object to the current planning application for the site allocated under policy SA22 in the Mid Sussex District Council Site Allocations DPD (2022). My concerns are outlined below.



1. Goes Against the Adopted Planning Policy (SA22)

The site is allocated in the District Plan under policy SA22, which specifically states that vehicle access must come from Sycamore Lane. The developer's proposal, however, instead uses Woodlands Close as the access point-this directly goes against what has already been agreed in the adopted plan.

The planning documents do admit to this policy requirement but attempt to get around it by saying there are ownership issues. But difficulty securing land is not a valid reason to ignore a key part of the policy. In fact, the policy clearly says that if access from Sycamore Lane isn't possible, the site shouldn't be developed at all.

The fact that the developer has reportedly bought properties at 9 and 11 Woodlands Close for well above their market value suggests an effort to sidestep planning rules by using financial pressure-this is a worrying precedent.



2. Unsafe and Poorly Designed Access

The access layout being proposed causes real safety concerns. In particular, it would leave No. 13 Woodlands Close sandwiched between two access roads, which would seriously affect the safety and comfort of the residents.

Even more worrying is that the visibility splays don't meet the required safety standards for a 30mph road. According to their own Transport Statement:

- Southbound visibility: Only 32.3m (25% below the 43m standard)
- Northbound visibility: Only 37.6m (13% below standard)

These shortfalls raise real doubts about road safety and call the whole access design into question. It's unclear whether a Road Safety Audit has been done, but based on these figures, it seems unlikely it would pass in its current form.



3. No Deliverable Drainage Plan

The drainage proposal relies on routing surface water through the nearby Burleigh Woods estate. But the estate's Residents' Management Company (RMC) has already rejected this, and no legal agreement is in place.

Without formal permission, the site has no secure drainage

solution. Given that the area already suffers from drainage issues-including pollution incidents in the village pond-this is a major flaw in the application.



4. Local Infrastructure Can't Cope

Crawley Down is already facing pressure on its local services and infrastructure:

- The village GP surgery was rated "Inadequate" by the CQC in September 2023 and is currently under special measures. An extra 48 homes (roughly 120+ people) will only make things worse.
- Local roads-especially Kiln Road-are in poor condition and not designed for the extra 400 vehicle trips per day that this development could bring.
- Drainage systems are frequently overwhelmed, with emergency works and pollution incidents becoming common.
- Local schools and services are already stretched and don't have room to support more development of this size.

Contributions from the developer (e.g., via S106 agreements) won't solve these bigger, longer-term issues.



5. Misleading Claims About Community Engagement

The developer says they engaged with the local community, including the village football club. But Worth Parish Council and the club itself have confirmed that no such consultation happened.

This kind of misleading statement undermines trust in the planning process. Public consultation should be genuine-not just a box-ticking exercise.



6. Unauthorised Footpath Through Private Land

The plans also include a pedestrian path through the Burleigh Woods estate. But, again, no permission has been given by the RMC, and this route has already been rejected.

Including this link in the application despite clear objections shows a lack of respect for the legal and practical constraints of the area.



7. Errors in Public Notification

There's also confusion around the deadline for public comments. Site notices and the online portal list 15th August 2025 as the deadline, but letters sent to residents say 8th August 2025.

This inconsistency is likely to confuse people and may result in lost opportunities to comment. The council should clarify the correct date and make sure the public is given fair and accurate notice.

□

Conclusion

In summary, I strongly urge the Planning Authority to refuse this application. It:

- Conflicts with adopted policy on site access
- Raises serious safety concerns
- Lacks a legal or workable drainage solution
- Adds pressure to already overstretched infrastructure
- Fails to engage with the community properly
- Proposes pedestrian links that haven't been authorised
- Is marred by inconsistencies in public notification

This is not a sustainable or appropriate development for Crawley Down.

Kind regards