

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 11:34:40 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 11:34 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: 21 Portsmouth Lane Lindfield Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write in objection to the above planning application DM/26/1315. While the site may seem ideal to the opportunistic eyes of the developer, building on it would represent the destruction of green space vital to the community and a detriment to local services and infrastructure already under enormous pressure. You will be aware that there is a long-standing underdetermined Definitive Map Modification Order application (DMMO 3/22) concerning an alleged public right of way across the west side of

the site. This alleged route and variations of it are used by dozens if not hundreds of people every day as can be seen from even a brief time spent on site. Until the DMMO application is resolved and the status of the alleged right of way determined, a planning application for the site must not be considered.

Public rights of way represent vital access to green space and the countryside for all, as inconvenient as they may be to the onward march of development. Once they are lost they are gone forever. It is vital that the proper process be followed to determine the status of this alleged route before an application to build over it is considered for approval. Any offer from the developer to ameliorate the issue by designing the development around any route cannot be considered until the legal status and position of the route is known.

The Wickham Fields area itself is an unspoilt area of open grassland vital to the community as an oasis among multiple existing developments. I and my family walk through the area daily and its loss would have a significant impact on our enjoyment and leisure. Rights of way cross the neighbouring golf course and in a hollow way to the east of the site but these are no substitute for open land, and in the case of the golf course, walkers are constantly reminded by signage that their right of access is an inconvenience and potentially unsafe. There are no other areas of public green space of comparable character within a similar distance which is why we make such frequent use of this one.

The site is also plainly unsuitable for access via Gatesmead and Birchen Lane as has been proposed. Gatesmead is a quiet, winding residential street and its eastern part is already in very poor condition due to existing traffic, to say nothing of the additional burden such a development would introduce. A section of the western part of the road is single-lane with priority signage. The idea of heavy construction traffic using this road to access the site for the duration of works is utterly absurd. It would be a blight on residents of that road, many of them families with children, and a significant safety hazard. I can speak from direct experience on this issue as a resident of Portsmouth Lane where we are subject to the appalling noise and vibration of dozens of HGVs passing at unsafe speeds to and from the aggregates depot at Ardingly every day. The thought of dozens of additional heavy vehicle movements potentially passing our house every day for multiple years during construction is a grim one.

Additionally the junction of Birchen Lane with Portsmouth Lane has poor visibility to the north and the introduction of additional daily movements of 50-100 new residents' vehicles would create its own safety issues. Portsmouth Lane itself is also a heavily used road, especially at rush hour, a situation which would be further worsened by the increased traffic from this development.

I note also the presence of two Grade II* listed buildings near the site. An important part of their character is their situation in the context of the open land of Wickham Fields as this represents a contemporary unspoilt remnant of the past and one that can be appreciated in a single short walk. Once lost or curtailed, these assets are gone forever.

Lastly as a downstream resident of the site I can attest to the state of local drainage infrastructure. The stream running north of the site on the parish boundary flows along the border of our property, frequently runs high and has flooded the road and adjoining areas on at least occasion in recent years. Heavy rain already causes huge pools of water to accumulate at the bottom of Portsmouth Lane where the stream passes beneath it. Building over swathes of land with houses and tarmac is a well-known contributor to flooding as runoff increases and the ability of the ground to absorb it is reduced. The existing drainage is clearly already under strain and development of the upstream Wickham Fields site, with surface water draining into this stream, would clearly directly worsen this situation and lead to increased flooding.

In summary, I object to DM/26/1315 for these reasons and ask that the application be refused. If the application is to be determined I ask for it to be considered by the Planning Committee given the unresolved legal status of DMMO 3/22 and the significance of the site. I appreciate the need for new housing but cannot accept that this site is a good candidate for development given the outsize impact this would have.

Kind regards