

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 10:36:43 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 22/06/2026 10:36 AM.

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:	13 Alder Way Haywards Heath
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to object against the proposed development of 49 houses on the land known as Wickham fields. I have walked this land several times a week with my dog ever since moving into the area 7 years ago. It has always been publicly accessible and a very popular site for dog walkers. If this land were to be developed on, then all these walkers would be forced to use the surrounding woodland (mostly owned by Haywards Heath golf club) to exercise their dogs. This is established ancient woodland and the increased presence of dogs would cause significant damage to

wildlife and habitat. Once ancient woodland is gone it is gone forever.

This development would destroy approximately 11 acres of open grassland. Local residents have recorded protected species on the site, namely 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. This development would also adversely affect the surrounding woodland, as discussed above. I would be heartbroken to see this wildlife that I enjoy and appreciate so much lost.

The proposed access to the new development goes over a stretch of land that has undetermined access (see DMMO 3/22). This has been undetermined since November 2021. If this development were to go ahead and then access is deemed to be illegal, how on earth are residents of the new houses going to access their property? The only other way in is via Wickham Way which is a private road and I highly doubt the residents of this road would agree access to an entire housing estate. I certainly wouldn't. Current access to Gatesmead (in the Birchen Oak estate) is already via a single track hump connecting it from old Gatesmead. Visibility of oncoming traffic over this hump is poor, and an increase in traffic will pose an increased danger of head on collisions to existing users. Goodness knows how construction traffic would navigate this without causing chaos and damage. The two Grade II* listed buildings which are adjacent to the fields under threat add delightful character to the area, and to stick a new build development next to these would cause untold stress to the owners and completely ruin their charm. Grade II* listed is 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". Local infrastructure, such as doctors and Princess Royal hospital are already at capacity. Water supply is at a premium, South East Water are constantly sending emails on how stretched the drinking water supply is. All these new homes will aggravate this even further.

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

Kind regards