

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 February 2026 12:20:09 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 12:20 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:	Limans Balcombe
----------	-----------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I formally object to the planning proposal for 125 dwellings on land at Borde Hill on the following grounds: 1. Drainage and flood risk: The proposal raises serious concerns regarding flood risk despite the proposed attenuation ponds. The downstream impact has not been adequately assessed. Not only will there be an impact for the new and existing homes in the area but also a potential impact for the London to Brighton rail line embankment.

2. AONB and greenfield site: Whilst this site is not part of the AONB, it does border it, providing a vital habitat for wildlife such as red kites. Why is this developer not considering brownfield sites, if they must build more homes, rather than destroying yet more beautiful green, rural spaces.

3: Water supply: This area has been under a hosepipe ban for 6 months, and the area frequently has low water pressure and supply issues. Building more homes without considering how water companies are going to address this issue is simply negligent.

4: Infrastructure: As always, there is no consideration of the impact of more dwellings on vital infrastructure - particularly availability of health services such as NHS dental, GP and hospital services - and the stress that current services are already under. This area simply cannot accommodate more housing and greater population.

5: Roads and traffic: The Penland estate has already placed strain on the local roads, all of which are in a terrible state of repair. Further developing this area will cause further congestion, noise and pollution in an area which is already hazardous to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

---

Kind regards