

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 18 February 2026 22:58
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 18/02/2026 10:57 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:	6 The Spinney Hayward’s heath
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write to formally object to the above planning application. This objection is submitted by me, Philip Todd, as a local resident who would be directly affected by the proposal. I firmly believe that the town and its infrastructure cannot sustainably accommodate a development of this scale. My objection is based on the following grounds. 1. Site Allocation and District Plan Status The application site is not allocated in the adopted District Plan. Although it has been included in the Draft District Plan, this allocation was made despite previous recommendations that the site should be excluded. This allocation remains actively challenged and is currently subject to the Inspector's review.

Granting permission at this stage would therefore be premature and undermine the plan-led system.

2. Flooding and Drainage Concerns

The Scrase Stream / West Common Stream has a well-documented history of flooding, affecting Penland Road, Borde Hill Lane, Turners Mill, Burrell Road, and Mill Green Road. The relatively recent Penland Farm development has already worsened these problems.

Key concerns include:

The site consists largely of clay soil, which leads to regular standing water during autumn and winter.

Parts of the site lie within identified flood zones.

The removal of agricultural land will reduce natural water absorption.

The addition of 125 dwellings will significantly increase hard surfaces, accelerating surface water runoff into already flood-prone areas.

The proposed drainage strategy relies on attenuation basins, earth bunds behind gardens, and roads acting as overflow routes. This is a complex system that requires permanent maintenance and may fail during extreme weather events, which are becoming increasingly frequent.

I personally witnessed flooding within woodland areas and along Penland Road during the initial construction phase of the Penland Farm development, when water-absorbing topsoil was removed without adequate mitigation. This caused runoff issues and flooding, including impacts on Harlands Primary School grounds. Further development will only exacerbate these problems.

The proposed drainage solution is not sustainable and represents a long-term risk to both residents and the wider community.

3. Impact on Protected Wildlife

Ecological surveys confirm the presence of protected species on the site, including:

Dormice (legally protected)

Several species of bats, some of which are vulnerable

The development would result in the loss and fragmentation of habitat through the removal of grassland, hedgerows, and bat foraging areas.

While the applicant proposes mitigation at a later stage, experience from the Penland Farm development demonstrated that promised mitigation measures were not adequately implemented during construction. The applicant must clearly demonstrate that this site can be developed without harm to protected species, and that mitigation is realistic, enforceable, and deliverable.

4. Harm to the Countryside and the High Weald AONB

The site directly adjoins the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a nationally protected landscape.

An independent landscape assessment carried out in 2022 concluded that even a development of 60 dwellings would cause significant harm to the AONB and the character of the surrounding countryside. A proposal for 125 dwellings would result in substantially greater harm.

This development would:

Push urban form into open countryside

Create a harsh and permanent boundary between the town and a protected landscape

Increase noise, lighting, and activity in an area valued for its tranquillity

I regularly walk and drive along Borde Hill Lane and value its rural character. While the Penland Farm development has already altered this landscape, the proposed scheme would further urbanise the countryside and seriously harm the setting of the High Weald AONB.

5. Historic Environment and Archaeology

The proposal would cause harm to nearby historic buildings, including Sugworth Farmhouse and South Lodge. In addition, there is evidence of a Roman road crossing the site, which has not been adequately investigated.

Even where harm is described as "less than substantial," national policy requires this harm to be clearly justified by public benefits. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the benefits of this scheme outweigh the damage to heritage assets.

6. Highway Works and Roundabout Remodelling

The scheme requires significant remodelling of the roundabout serving Balcombe Road, Hanlye Lane, and Borde Hill Lane in order to provide access to the development.

These works would cause substantial disruption, negatively affecting local businesses, commuters, and the wider local economy. The repeated alteration of this junction further highlights the unsuitability of the site for development of this scale.

7. Pressure on Schools, Healthcare, and Local Services

A development of 125 dwellings is likely to introduce:

Approximately 350 new residents

Around 30-40 primary school-aged children

The application fails to demonstrate that local schools, GP surgeries, dental practices, or other essential services have sufficient capacity. Local services are already overstretched. My own GP surgery and local dentists are unable to accept new patients, and there is no evidence that additional demand can be accommodated.

8. Loss of Trees and Woodland

The proposal involves the removal of mature trees, including a significant English oak, as well as sections of woodland to facilitate the access road.

The applicant claims this is unavoidable, yet has not adequately explored alternative access arrangements. The loss of mature trees would significantly worsen both landscape and ecological impacts.

At Penland Farm, mature trees over 100 years old were removed at an early stage, causing irreversible harm to wildlife and local character. Repeating this approach demonstrates that the site is being over-developed.

9. Excessive Scale of Development

The council's own draft plan identified this site as suitable for up to 60 dwellings. The current proposal for 125 dwellings more than doubles this figure, without adequate justification.

This dramatic increase would greatly amplify impacts on flooding, infrastructure, landscape, and community wellbeing. The town already lacks a sustainable strategy to support current levels of development. Infrastructure such as drainage, water supply, community facilities, and leisure provision has not kept pace with growth.

As a result, the town experiences winter flooding and summer water shortages, including hosepipe bans, due to infrastructure designed for a settlement less than half its current size.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above - including unresolved flooding risks, harm to protected wildlife and heritage assets, unacceptable landscape impact, infrastructure shortfalls, and the excessive scale of development - I strongly object to this planning application.

I respectfully request that the Council refuse permission unless and until robust, credible evidence demonstrates that these issues can be fully and sustainably addressed.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Kind regards