

From: Mark Bewsey <Mark.Bewsey@dhaplanning.co.uk>
Sent: 20 November 2025 16:08:17 UTC+00:00
To: "Steven King" <Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Marc Dorfman" <marc.dorfman@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>; "Neil Collins" <neil.collins@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>; "James Emery" <james.emery@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>; "Ian Humble" <ianH@catesbyestates.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Land East Of Lunce's Hill, Fox Hill, Haywards Heath - DM/25/0827

Hi Steven,

Thank you for your email, which is timely as I was about to write to update you all on our position. In light of the emerging Local Plan in Lewes and the site's draft allocation, it would seem sensible to convene another meeting to update you on our position with regard to the consultee comments and also to ensure that we are able to address any requirements of Lewes DC in particular with regard to the masterplanning of the wider Haywards Heath draft allocations. We have informed LDC's policy officers that we have futureproofed potential access through to the adjoining site to the north and from the outset we sought to ensure that this site could come forward in combination with others and we included wide ranging context plans within early vision documents and the design and access statement.

In terms of the consultee comments, taking these in turn as you have set out Steven:

Highways

We've still only received comments from WSCC, but nothing from ESCC which is very disappointing given that this application has been under consideration for many months now. Nevertheless, our highways consultants Stantec attended a meeting earlier in November with both ESCC and WSCC to discuss the application and to run through WSCC's comments. Teresa Ford of ESCC then raised further comments during the meeting which do not fully align with those of WSCC which is not ideal.

Stantec are advanced in terms of preparing a response to the WSCC comments and the feedback provided by ESCC in the meeting. It would be helpful to be able to explain this to you in a teams call because we are frustrated with the stance that ESCC are taking in some respects.

Tree Officer

Whilst we do not necessarily agree that T3 and T13 are veteran trees, the revised plans which are being prepared afford both trees the necessary buffer for Veteran Trees. Additionally, I can confirm that T3 is now proposed to be retained.

With regard to G29, we set out details of a no-dig construction. The initial comments request an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) which we would ordinarily expect to be conditioned. We would expect to submit an AMS to discharge the condition which would go into greater detail on how we will specifically mitigate the impact in enforceable language and have programs of construction with all the caveats and instructions the tree officer will want to see. It will also give the tree officer an opportunity to comment on our methodology, which is tied to the detailed design so wouldn't be appropriate at this stage.

Conservation Officer

The comments are noted and the inconsistencies between the plans will be rectified within the next submission. We do however dispute the suggestion that further details are required in order to assess the impact on the curtilage listed barn. We have sought to retain flexibility, leaving details to the reserved matters stage when we will be closer to identifying an end user. It is our position therefore that the assessment of the details can be carried out at the reserved matters stage.

Ecology

These comments are in hand and will be addressed within a revised package of information to be submitted in the coming weeks.

In addition, we are making substantial progress in addressing the drainage comments which have been raised.

Summary

I appreciate that we still need to address a number of items in response to consultee comments as summarised within this email. However we consider that we are making substantial progress and noting the emerging Lewes Local Plan, we are keen to discuss our position with you to ensure our next revisions fully reflect the expectations of both Councils. Could I therefore have details of your availability for a meeting next week?

Kind regards

Mark

Mark Bewsey MRTPI

Director

Office: 01293 221320

Mobile: 07593 441711

Email: Mark.Bewsey@dhaplanning.co.uk



Proudly supporting



Kent
01622 776226

Gatwick
01293 221320

London
020 3005 9725

Leeds
0113 323 6669

www.dhaplanning.co.uk

From: Steven King <Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 November 2025 14:33
To: Mark Bewsey <Mark.Bewsey@dhaplanning.co.uk>
Cc: Marc Dorfman <marc.dorfman@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>; Neil Collins <neil.collins@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>; James Emery <james.emery@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>
Subject: Land East Of Lunce's Hill, Fox Hill, Haywards Heath - DM/25/0827

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Dear Mark

I have been going through the application file and thought it would be useful to summarise where I think we are with various consultees who have asked for further information and/or changes to be made to the scheme.

WSCC Local Highway Authority (LHA)

The WSCC LHA provided comments on 6th May 2025 and 15th October 2025. In their last set of comments they asked for further information on the points highlighted in blue in their comments.

I would be grateful for an update on these points.

Tree Officer

Our Tree Officer has provided comments on 9th May 2025 and further comments on 16th October. You can see from her comments that the Tree Officer considers that tree T3 is a veteran and it should therefore be retained. She has also asked for further information in respect of group G29, specifically how this group will be protected.

I would be grateful for an update on these points.

Conservation Officer

Our Conservation Officer provided comments on 3rd October. With regards to the submitted plans, she has pointed out an inconsistency between the Masterplan and the illustrative Landscape Strategy in several respects relating to the extent of new planting, including the presence or other wise of additional planting between the barn and the listed farmhouse at Cleavewater. She has also asked for clarification on the retention of the boundary wall. The Conservation Officer is of the view that further detailed comments on works to convert the barn is not possible without further information.

I would be grateful for a response on these points.

Ecological Consultant

The Councils Ecological Consultant provided comments on 9th October 2025, asking for further information regarding bats and BNG.

I would be grateful for a response on these points.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Steven King, BSc (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI
Team Leader, Major Development
Mid Sussex District Council
01444 477556

Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk



Working together for a better Mid Sussex

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.