

## Steven King

---

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 08 February 2026 08:41  
**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 08/02/2026 8:41 AM.

### 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:	20 Fairfield Way Haywards Heath
----------	---------------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>This objection is submitted by Robin Brookes. I am directly affected by this proposal because living on Fairfield Way, my property directly borders the fields where the proposed development is due to take place and we use the Balcombe Road, Borde Hill lane daily.</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed development (DM/25/3129) Proposal for 125 houses on land east of Borde Hill Lane/north of Balcombe Road, Haywards Heath</p> <p>I strongly believe this application raises significant planning, environmental, infrastructure, and community concerns which have not been adequately addressed. My objections are outlined below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The site is not currently allocated within the adopted District Plan. While it has been included in the Draft District Plan, this inclusion remains contested following previous recommendations that the site should be excluded. As the Draft Plan is still under review by the Planning Inspector, it should not be afforded significant weight at this stage. Granting permission prematurely would undermine the plan-led approach to development.</li><li>2. I have serious concerns regarding flooding. The Scrase Stream/West Common Stream already causes flooding along Penland Road, Borde Hill Lane, Turners Mill, Burrell Road, and Mill Green Road. The site itself consists of clay soil which is known to result in seasonal standing water and localised flooding during autumn and winter months. Furthermore, parts of</li></ol>

the site are already located within designated flood zones. The addition of 125 houses would significantly increase impermeable surfaces such as roads, driveways, and roofs, resulting in increased surface water runoff into areas that are already vulnerable. The proposed drainage solution involving attenuation basins, earth bunds, and the use of roads as overflow pathways is highly complex, reliant on continuous maintenance, and presents a significant risk during extreme weather events.

I have personally witnessed flooding on the Balcombe Road and the areas surrounding the Scrase and West Common streams, and I am extremely concerned that this development will exacerbate an already serious issue.

3. Ecological surveys have confirmed the presence of legally protected species including dormice and multiple species of bats, some of which are classified as vulnerable. The development would result in the loss of grassland habitats, fragmentation of hedgerows, and removal of bat foraging and commuting routes. At this stage, mitigation proposals are insufficient, and the developer has not demonstrated that the site can be developed without unacceptable harm to protected wildlife. As someone who values local biodiversity, I am deeply concerned that these protected species will lose vital habitat.

4. The proposed development would have a harmful impact on the countryside and the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which is a nationally protected landscape. An independent landscape assessment conducted in 2022 concluded that even a development of approximately 60 dwellings would cause substantial harm to landscape character. The proposed 125 dwellings would significantly intensify this harm. The scheme would extend urban development into the countryside, create an abrupt urban edge adjacent to protected landscape, and introduce increased noise, lighting, and activity levels that are inconsistent with the tranquillity of the AONB. I regularly drive along Borde Hill Lane and greatly value its rural character. This proposal would urbanise the surrounding countryside and damage the setting of the High Weald.

5. The development would cause harm to designated heritage assets including Sugworth Farmhouse and South Lodge. In addition, there is evidence suggesting the presence of a Roman road within the site which has not been fully investigated. National planning policy requires that any harm to heritage assets, even if classified as less than substantial, must be outweighed by clear public benefits. The applicant has not adequately demonstrated that such benefits exist. Our local heritage should be preserved and protected for future generations.

6. The proposed remodelling and expansion of the roundabout at Balcombe Road, Hanlye Lane, and Borde Hill Lane raises serious highway and community concerns. Previous works to this roundabout resulted in prolonged road closures lasting over three months, significant disruption to residents and local businesses, and forced diversions along unsuitable routes including Copyhold Lane, which is narrow, weight-restricted, and prone to flooding. The proposal to enlarge the roundabout does not appear justified, particularly as the surrounding rural road network cannot be widened to accommodate increased traffic flows. Furthermore, it would increase light pollution and urbanisation of the area. During previous roundabout works, I personally experienced horrendous traffic jams in both directions, up and down the Balcombe Road, which creates heavy traffic on alternative routes through the villages of Lindfield & Cuckfield, repeating such disruption alongside several years of construction traffic would be unacceptable.

7. There are serious safety concerns regarding increased traffic volumes and pedestrian footfall along roads and pathways that are not designed to accommodate significant additional domestic or construction-related traffic. Many of the surrounding roads are narrow rural lanes with limited pavement provision, restricted visibility, and insufficient capacity to safely manage increased vehicle movements, construction vehicles, and pedestrian activity. Increased traffic would significantly raise the risk of accidents for residents, walkers, cyclists, and school children using these routes. The application does not demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be maintained throughout the construction phase or once the development is occupied.

8. The proposal fails to demonstrate that local infrastructure can accommodate the increase in population. A development of 125 dwellings is likely to introduce approximately 350 new residents, including an estimated 30-40 primary school aged children. The application does not provide sufficient evidence that the local schools, GP surgeries, or community services have the capacity to accommodate this level of growth. Local services are already under pressure. For example, The Dolphins Practice is already under immense strain with the number of residents it manages, Harlands school is at maximum capacity and Penland Road is already at peak usage during school drop off and pick up times.

9. The development would result in the loss of important trees including a mature English oak and areas of established woodland required to create the proposed access road. Mature trees

are irreplaceable within human timescales and provide significant ecological, landscape, and amenity value. The applicant has not demonstrated that alternative access arrangements have been properly explored, and the removal of these trees further highlights the overdevelopment of the site.

Finally, the scale of development is excessive. The council's own draft allocation suggested approximately 60 dwellings on this site. This application proposes 125 dwellings, more than doubling the anticipated density. The applicant has not adequately justified this substantial increase or demonstrated that the site can accommodate this level of development without significant environmental, infrastructure, and community harm. The increase from 60 to 125 dwellings would dramatically intensify the negative impacts on the surrounding area.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that planning permission for this application be refused.

For all these reasons, I object to this application and ask the council to refuse it until there is proper evidence that flooding, wildlife, heritage, and infrastructure concerns have been properly addressed.

Yours sincerely,

  
20 Fairfield Way  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1UT

---

Kind regards