

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 June 2026 16:13:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <caroline.grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1315

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/06/2026 4:13 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of Gatesmead Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed 49 new homes together with open space and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	15 Alder Way Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	There are a number of reasons why this development should not proceed : 1. A Definitive Map Modification Order application affecting this site has been undetermined by West Sussex County Council since 15 November 2021 - over four-and-a-half years. Until DMMO 3/22 is determined, the legal status of the alleged public right of way over or adjacent to the site is unresolved, and MSDC cannot properly determine a planning application that may prejudice that route. It is also used by many dog walkers, ramblers

and children. A road through this would make this route less safe.

2. Approximately 11 acres of open grassland would be destroyed. Local residents have recorded protected species on the site: black redstart (Schedule 1 protected, fewer than 100 UK breeding pairs), slow worm (also protected), alongside green and great spotted woodpeckers, buzzards, sparrowhawks and red kites. The applicant's submitted ecology evidence should be tested against an independent survey. Additionally, there are a couple of species of Deer that regularly graze on this land. The land also floods throughout the winter and is unsuitable for walking let alone building on. Subsidence is likely to be a real issue and there has been nothing in the plan to address this. In one area of the field there is a natural spring which comes to the surface in the winter when water levels in the water table get high.

3. All vehicular access to the proposed development is via Gatesmead, a quiet residential street not built for the traffic generated by 49 new homes, this is more homes than on the extension to Gatesmead in the 2018-20 Crest development. Highway safety, junction visibility, construction traffic, refuse vehicle access and the school run have not been adequately addressed. This is especially the case given that this end of Gatesmead is accessed by a single lane entry and exit point with a blind crest, the road cannot be widened at this point due to an ancient oak tree which has a TPO on it.

4. Wickham Farmhouse (late-16th-century, c. 1580) and Sunte House (Queen Anne, c. 1700s) are both Grade II* listed - a designation applied to only around 5.8% of listed buildings in England. The remnant countryside setting of both buildings forms part of why they are listed. The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and clear and convincing justification for any harm. The applicant's own consultants have admitted that development of this site "may affect the significance of these designated built heritage assets".

5. Local schools, GP services and drainage infrastructure are already under pressure. In 2025, we had a hosepipe ban that lasted from early summer right through the winter into 2026 and water levels became critical in the region. Nothing is being done to address this by forcing developers to build reservoirs and other critical infrastructure. The application does not adequately demonstrate that the additional demand from 49 new homes can be accommodated without further degradation of services for existing residents. Additionally, the stream that runs through this area and through the existing Gatesmead housing is often extremely full in the winter months, to the point of only just being able to contain the water within the banks and existing suds ponds. Additional hard standing and faster runoff will make this untenable and could flood existing residents land / gardens.

6. There has been no consideration on how the increase in residency and security of existing land ownership. I.e. provision of fencing to secure land owned in the areas around the new development from the additional foot fall that will come with 49 dwellings.

Given the significance of the site, the unresolved legal status of DMMO 3/22 and the impact on two Grade II* listed buildings, I object to DM/26/1315 and ask that the application be refused. If it is to be considered/determined, it is considered only by the Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers.

Kind regards