

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 February 2026 14:19:45 UTC+00:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <stefan.galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2884

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 2:19 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To 48 Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 1UQ
Proposal:	Erection of a dwelling house on land adj to 48 Wickham including solar panels to the roof (Amended plans received 21.01.25)
Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas

[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Comments: This application was initially made in November 2025, it was withdrawn in December 2025 prior to a decision being made.

The application has been resubmitted in January 2026, presumably altered to address the objections submitted.

I note that planning applications relating Wickham Way, and around, do not normally generate any comments, this application is clearly very different.

Alterations between the first and second application appear to be limited to the addition of some spin that trees are bad and that we'd all be better off if they were replaced with concrete. The very real issues raised in objections to the initial application remain.

My comments are as follows:

- 1 - the application is called 'land adjacent to no 48'. The land is the garden of no 48, so the land is in fact adjacent to no 52. The title of the application is misleading as to where the developer wants to build the house, as the title implies that there is spare land adjacent to no 48 to develop, which there is not.
 - 2 - vehicle (and presumably foot) access to the new house is not possible as shown on the plan. Alteration to, and over land, owned by another party is required to achieve the access shown. The applicant has no permission from the landowner to achieve this access or make the shown alteration.
 - 3 - parking: the justification does not say that parking will be adequate, just that it will be 'upgraded'. The Plan shows that this is not the case. Parking provision will be reduced from that which exists today. Parking will not be nearly adequate when the provision required for another four bedroom house, on the same footprint of the existing parking (generally fully utilised), is considered. Due to the proposed demolition of no 48's garage the proposal offers less parking provision for two houses than exists today for one house.
 - 4 - the justification says 'adequate side spacing is maintained, respecting the rhythm and verdant character of Wickham Way' - This is of course opinion, but not an accurate one. It will be obvious that a house has been squeezed into the line of houses. The spacing and presentation will be significantly different from the rest of the road. It will look condensed and odd compared to the rest of the road, and to similar nearby residential private roads of a similar age and character.
 - 5 - the justification says 'removal of mature fir trees', this does not convey the size and significance of these trees. They are approximately 10-13m tall and are a significant feature on Wickham Way that have been here for longer than any of the residents. These trees are so large that they can be seen from outside Clare Hall, some 1.5 km away.
 - 6 - the overhead utility cables that the trees are said to be in the way of can be buried; avoiding the need to kill the trees.
 - 7 - I support the comment from Haywards Heath Town Council, dated 15th December 2025, that TPOs should be considered for the mature fir trees.
 - 8 - the plants proposed in the planting addendum dated 21st January are invasive (the applicant states that this is a bad thing in the revised planning application with regards to the mature trees).
 - 9 - I note from the Self Build and Custom statement that the applicant intends to move into the new house as their primary residence.
-

10 - I note that the site notice is not erected outside No 48, it is outside of No 39 and opposite No 46, so it is not on the correct side of the road or outside of the land that the applicant wants to develop.

Kind regards