

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 13 February 2026 18:56
To: Steven King
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/02/2026 6:56 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	46 Wickham Way Haywards Heath
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	UPDATED OBJECTION - Supersedes Previous Representation

Dear Sir/Madam

Following a detailed review of the submitted documentation and consultation responses, I write to object to planning application DM/25/3129. In determining this application, the Local Planning Authority is required to be satisfied that the site is suitable for the proposed development and that it can be delivered without unacceptable environmental, infrastructure, or amenity impacts. However, it is notable that several statutory consultees have identified unresolved matters requiring further information, mitigation, or design revision. Taken together, these responses raise legitimate and material planning concerns as to whether the development has yet been demonstrated to be acceptable in planning terms.

LANDSCAPE IMPACT AND DEVELOPMENT SCALE

The Council's independent landscape advisor concludes that the effects of the proposed

development have been "underassessed" within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and states that the overall effect "should have been major adverse." The consultee further disagrees with the applicant's susceptibility judgements, identifies visible encroachment toward the National Landscape, and considers the proposed buffer to be inadequate. Importantly, the response characterises the scheme as "overdevelopment of this sensitive site" and recommends that the western-most parcel be wholly omitted from the proposals.

These findings suggest that the scale of development proposed may exceed the landscape's capacity to accommodate it without material harm.

ACCESS, HIGHWAY SAFETY AND TRANSPORT EVIDENCE

The Highway Authority advises that "more information is required" before the transport impacts can be fully assessed and notes that no transport vision has been provided within the submitted Transport Assessment. A vision-led strategy, additional mitigation measures, and a monitoring framework are requested, indicating that the current submission does not yet demonstrate policy-compliant transport planning.

Furthermore, the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit identifies multiple design concerns, while the Authority highlights significant level differences requiring considerable earthworks to facilitate the proposed access. Given that access is a fundamental component of the outline application, the absence of settled and fully evidenced highway arrangements raises legitimate concerns regarding whether safe and sustainable access has been conclusively established.

The Authority also notes that local bus provision is limited, with services operating only once every two hours, and requests that the applicant explore ways of improving this. This reliance on future transport enhancements introduces further uncertainty.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND GOOD ACOUSTIC DESIGN

Environmental Health advises that a number of dwellings would fail to achieve recognised internal noise standards with windows open and makes clear that the Council "will not accept a design that relies by default on closed windows or mechanical ventilation" to secure acceptable living conditions. The response further states that without demonstration of a robust Good Acoustic Design process, the detailed scheme would not be supported.

This indicates that key aspects of residential amenity remain unresolved and raises concern as to whether the site can deliver a high-quality living environment without reliance on mitigation that has yet to be demonstrated.

WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERABILITY

Southern Water advises that additional foul flows "may lead to a minor increased risk of impact on the sewer network" and that occupation should be phased to align with the delivery of any required network reinforcement.

This reliance on future infrastructure upgrades suggests the development may be infrastructure-dependent rather than infrastructure-ready, raising reasonable questions regarding certainty and deliverability.

MINERAL SAFEGUARDING POLICY CONFLICT

The County Planning Authority confirms that the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and notes that no Mineral Resource Assessment has been provided despite policy requirements. The consultee further advises that sterilisation of the mineral resource will "inevitably occur" as a result of the proposed development.

In the absence of the required assessment, it is unclear whether the proposal complies with safeguarding policy or whether the loss of a potentially valuable resource has been properly justified.

TREE LOSS AND ACCESS CONSTRAINTS

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that the removal of Tree 50, a mature English oak, is "regrettable but unavoidable, given access requirements." The need to remove an established landscape feature in order to facilitate the highway layout raises concern that the access strategy may be driving environmental harm rather than responding sensitively to the existing landscape.

CUMULATIVE PLANNING CONCERNS

While each of the matters above is individually significant, it is their cumulative effect that is particularly concerning. Repeated requests from consultees for further information, additional mitigation, and future infrastructure intervention suggest that important aspects of the site's environmental and technical suitability remain unresolved.

Planning decisions should be grounded in confidence that development can be delivered without unacceptable harm. Where multiple professional consultees identify underassessment, infrastructure dependency, or incomplete evidence, it is reasonable to question whether that confidence has yet been established.

In light of the scale of the proposal and the number of outstanding technical matters identified by professional consultees, it is respectfully submitted that the Local Planning Authority must be confident that the development has been fully demonstrated to be suitable before granting permission. Where important environmental, infrastructure, and design considerations remain unresolved, a precautionary approach is both reasonable and consistent with the Authority's responsibility to secure sustainable development. I therefore respectfully request that these matters are given careful weight in the determination of this application.

Yours faithfully


46 Wickham Way
Haywards Heath
RH16 1UQ

Kind regards