

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 February 2026 15:33:09 UTC+00:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
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 3:33 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:	10 Aster Way Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The proposed development is contrary to the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 and the National Planning Policy Framework and should be refused due to the unacceptable harm it would cause to the countryside, highway and pedestrian safety, biodiversity, drainage, infrastructure capacity, and residential amenity.

1. Principle of Development and Landscape Harm

The proposed development of up to 125 dwellings would represent an inappropriate and unsustainable urbanising incursion into the countryside, resulting in the permanent erosion of rural character, openness, and the established settlement edge of Haywards Heath.

In accordance with national and local policy, great weight must be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the setting of an AONB. The harm arising from the scale and form of development proposed is not outweighed by any demonstrated public benefit.

2. Outline Application and Lack of Certainty

The application is submitted in outline form with all matters reserved except access. In a sensitive countryside location, the absence of detail regarding layout, scale, appearance, density, and landscaping prevents a proper assessment against District Plan policies relating to landscape impact, design quality, and residential amenity. Granting permission in principle would therefore be premature and unjustified.

3. Highway Design, Pedestrian Safety, and Sustainable Transport

The proposal includes a significantly enlarged, multi-lane roundabout introduced onto a rural road network comprising single-lane country roads. This represents an incongruous and urbanising form of development and raises serious concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety.

To access local amenities and the railway station, pedestrians would be required to cross multiple arms of a large, multi-lane roundabout, resulting in up to four separate road crossings. This design is inherently pedestrian-hostile, prioritises vehicular capacity over vulnerable road users, and fails to promote safe, convenient, and sustainable modes of travel, contrary to District Plan and NPPF objectives.

4. Traffic, Environmental, and Amenity Impacts

The completed development would generate a permanent increase in traffic along Balcombe Road and the wider highway network, exacerbating congestion, noise, and air quality impacts. Local roads already suffer from poor surface conditions, which would be further degraded by increased traffic volumes, with no adequate or secured mitigation identified.

5. Biodiversity and Drainage

The site supports wildlife associated with the stream corridor and surrounding open land. The permanent loss of countryside, combined with increased lighting, traffic, and activity, would

fragment habitats and disrupt ecological networks, with insufficient evidence that long-term impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Parts of the site are marshy and indicative of a high water table. The submitted drainage strategy fails to demonstrate that surface water can be safely managed over the lifetime of the development or that downstream flood risk will not be increased.

6. Infrastructure Capacity and Residential Amenity

The addition of up to 125 dwellings would place sustained pressure on local schools, healthcare provision, and community infrastructure, which are already constrained. The proposal also results in a permanent increase in activity, noise, and vehicle movements, leading to an unacceptable loss of residential amenity for nearby occupiers.

Conclusion

The proposal represents inappropriate development in the countryside, causes unacceptable harm to the setting of the High Weald AONB, introduces an unsafe and pedestrian-hostile highway design, and fails to adequately address impacts on biodiversity, drainage, infrastructure capacity, and residential amenity.

The cumulative harm arising from the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweighs any public benefits. Planning permission should therefore be refused.

Kind regards