

Steven King

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 07 February 2026 16:59
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 07/02/2026 4:58 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:	5 Coniston Avenue 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 Julie Marshall.</p> <p>I am directly affected by this proposal because I live on Coniston Avenue on the Penlands Green estate and our house is so close to the roundabout leading up to Borde Hill we can see it from our lounge.</p> <p>There are several reasons why this project should not be considered and why I am strongly against it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. You are destroying an area of outstanding natural beauty: <p>Have you ever driven from Borde Hill Lane towards Balcombe Road on a foggy morning and looked to your left? The view is extraordinary, peaceful and to be preserved. Every morning, it bring me peace and is a lovely way of starting a day!</p> <p>With 125 houses, you are destroying the local countryside character, you are creating a harsh boundary between town and protected landscape and I am not even going to think about the</p>

increase of noise, light near a protected area that is so tranquil and beautiful.

2. You are creating road disruption for local residents and creating an enormous and unsightly roundabout:

Have you considered how big the new roundabout is? It is likely to be three times the size of the existing roundabout. As mentioned in my introduction, I live very close to the existing roundabout and I do not want this enormous circus so close. It is unsightly, noisy, it will devalue the properties not to mention that the road will need to be closed for over 3 months and it will be a major disruption for residents, shops and businesses.

The Penlands Green estate has barely been constructed and yet you want to change again the landscape and road around it?

Borde Hill Lane is not a road fit for welcoming heavy traffic. It is narrow, with a weight-restricted bridge and flooding problems. Currently it is also full of potholes which are left open to gather water and become road hazards.

3. You are destroying protected wildlife:

The development will destroy their habitat - removing grassland, cutting through hedgerows, and removing bat feeding areas. The developers say they will "mitigate" this later, but at this stage they need to prove the site can be developed without harming protected wildlife. As someone who values local wildlife, I'm concerned that legally protected dormice and bats will lose their habitat.

4. You are putting additional pressure over services already at capacity:

When I moved to the area 4 years ago, I was not able to chose a GP as all GPs were oversubscribed. I therefore had to appeal to be able to register to a surgery. Everybody deserves to receive healthcare. Have you considered what will happen with 125 new houses? This means around 350 new residents with likely approximately 30-40 primary school age children who will fight to get a place for basic care and education.

The application doesn't show that local schools, GP surgeries, or other services have capacity for this many extra people. Local services are already stretched, adding 125 houses will only make it worse.

5. You are being deceived by the developer:

The council's own draft plan suggested up to 60 houses for this site. This application is for 125 houses - more than double. As far as I can see, the developer hasn't justified why so many more houses are needed or shown that the site can handle this many without causing problems. Once again, doubling the number of houses will dramatically increase the impact on our community and services that are already at breaking point.

For all these reasons, I object to this application and ask the council to refuse it.

Kind regards



Kind regards