

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 18:41:35 UTC+01:00
To: "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3021

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 13/04/2026 6:41 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The West Of Courthouse Farm Copthorne Common Copthorne West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the erection of residential dwellings (Use Class C3), including associated parking, outdoor amenity space, landscaping and drainage, with all matters reserved except for the new access proposed from Copthorne Common Road. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION submitted 10th and 25th March 2026 in reselect of a FRA and drainage strategy, green ring strategy drawing, cross sections, response to consultations, road safety design audit and district licence report,
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Whitegate Cottage, Copthorne Common, Copthorne

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	These observations are submitted to reinforce our objections raised on the 22/12/25. 1.0 Detrimental change to the appearance of the area. Contrary to

Policies DP12 & DP 26

The primary objective of the District Plan DP 12, with respect to the countryside, is to secure its protection by minimising the amount of land taken for development and preventing development that does not need to be there. The local neighbourhood plan seeks to prevent development south of the A 264, thereby preserving the views to common land & the wider countryside. The site is not allocated under either the district or neighbourhood plans for development.

Any development on Courthouse Farm will have a direct visual impact, undermining the rural feel & characteristic of the area contrary to DP 26.

2.0 Highway safety concerns Safety concerns with proposed new entrance onto A264. Policy reference DP21

2.1 Despite feedback from WSCC Highways that a "Ghost Island" at the proposed entrance would work, we remain sceptical. Desk top studies carried out for other local developments have been proven, in reality, to be unworkable.

2.2 Interference with traffic flows. The proposed entrance is close to an existing pedestrian crossing which when in use has a severe impact on traffic flows. This issue would be exacerbated with the additional vehicle movements from the proposed development.

2.3 Increased Traffic Volume. The proposed access from the development would mean a significant increase in number vehicles joining an already congested A264, adding to noise & pollution levels.

3.0 General commentary

3.1 There is a lack of infrastructure in the village to support this development, schools, GP Surgery, roads, footpaths, cycleways - see DP20. It is illogical to continue to allow developments to be constructed before installation of sufficient infrastructure.

3.2 There is a lack of connectivity to the village, from Courthouse Farm, without the use of vehicles for individuals, families or OAPs. The proposed development is remote from the village & its community would have difficulty in being integrated into village life. Contrary to Policy 21 transport & sustainability aspirations.

3.3 The southern side of the A264 doesn't have sufficient utilities, electricity, gas or water. The disruption required to bring in services would have a disastrous environmental impact. Contrary to DP42

3.4 The drainage (FRADS) report prepared by BdR (section 10.3.11) indicates that a pumped land drainage solution is required. This is not sustainable.

An important drainage ditch, that is culverted under our property, discharges into Courthouse Farm. This is not shown on any drawings & is not mentioned within the report. Any pump failure will result in our house being flooded. This risk is not acceptable. Surface water from Courthouse Farm feeds into ditches & drains into the Brook in Newtown. Newtown & local sections of the A264 already flood on a regular basis. The proposed development will create a significant increase in surface water discharge.

3.5 The additional information (Green Ring Strategy drawing) regarding the mitigation of the loss of the "green ring" lacks credibility. The existing bund adjacent to the A264 is sparsely populated with existing trees, the majority of which are coming to the end of their nature life. This bund offers limited visual protection. The elevations of the proposed buildings will be totally visible when viewed from the western approaches. The proposed development will displace wildlife & create extensive light pollution.

3.6 The Applicant, Option Two Developments Ltd, latest filed financial accounts, as at 31/12/24, show a substantial loss. The presumptuous & irregular manner in which this application has been submitted, with the lack of transparency & community engagement, raises significant questions as to the true intention of the Applicant. In order to protect the community, & infrastructure, the planning system needs to safeguard against speculative planning.

Kind regards