

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 January 2026 17:58:50 UTC+00:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3191

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 19/01/2026 5:58 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South Of Burleigh Lane Crawley Down West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved except for access from Burleigh Lane, for the erection of up to eight self-build/custom build dwellings, drainage and ancillary works.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	The Grange Sandhill Lane Crawley Down
----------	---------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Subject: Formal Objection - Planning Application for Eight Self Build Dwellings, Sandhill Lane, Crawley Down

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing to lodge a formal and strongly worded objection to the proposed development of eight self-build custom dwellings on Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down.

I live in a Grade II listed property built in 1740, situated close to the proposed site. This development poses clear and unacceptable risks to highway safety, local drainage capacity, the historic environment, and the rural character of the lane. These are not minor concerns-they are material planning issues that directly conflict with National and Local policy.

1. Highway Safety - Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane Cannot Support Additional Traffic

These are narrow, rural lanes with minimal passing opportunities. They already struggle with existing traffic. Introducing eight new dwellings-along with construction vehicles, service vehicles, and daily car movements-would create dangerous and unsustainable conditions.

These lanes are used by pedestrians, including young children and disabled people, dog walkers and horse riders. It is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured and this can only significantly add to the risk.

These lanes are simply not designed to accommodate this level of intensification. Any suggestion that it can safely absorb additional traffic is unrealistic and contrary to lived experience.

2. Drainage Infrastructure Is Already Inadequate

The drainage system in this area is not fit for purpose. Heavy rainfall routinely overwhelms the existing infrastructure, causing surface water to accumulate and erosion to the road surface and verges. Adding more hardstanding, roof area, and associated infrastructure will exacerbate flood risk for neighbouring properties, including mine.

This is a foreseeable and avoidable problem. The proposal does nothing to mitigate it.

3. Significant Harm to the Setting of a Grade II Listed Building

My home is a Grade II listed building dating from 1740, and its setting is fundamental to its historic and architectural significance. The rural, low density character of Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane are part of that significance.

The proposed development would introduce a cluster of modern dwellings, lighting, parking, and domestic activity that would irreversibly erode this historic setting. This is not compatible with

the preservation of a heritage asset. This is not a single dwelling application, this is the creation of an estate of modern houses in the environment of a protected building.

As I am sure you are aware, this is supported by key planning policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraphs 199-202: Great weight must be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Even "less than substantial harm" requires clear and convincing justification. There is no appropriate justification.
- Paragraph 200: Harm to the significance of a heritage asset-including through its setting-must be clearly justified.
- Paragraph 206: Development should enhance or better reveal heritage significance. This proposal does the complete opposite.

Mid Sussex District Plan

- DP34: Development must preserve and enhance the special character of listed buildings and their settings. This clearly does not do that.
- DP26: Development must respect local character, including heritage features and rural context. This clearly does not do that.
- DP12: The intrinsic character of the countryside must be protected. This clearly does not do that.

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan

- CDNP04: Development must respect the rural character of the village.
- CDNP05: Heritage assets and their settings must be protected. This clearly does not do that.

The proposal clearly conflicts with ALL of these policies. I have had enough of infringement on the very fundamentals of my Listed Property and this is a line that clearly should not be crossed.

4. Erosion of Rural Character

Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane are one of the few remaining parts of Crawley Down that retains a genuinely rural feel. The proposed development represents a substantial and inappropriate intensification that would permanently alter the character of these lanes and surrounding countryside.

This is not "infill." It is overdevelopment.

Conclusion

This proposal is incompatible with the physical constraints of Burleigh Lane and Sandhill Lane, the capacity of local drainage infrastructure, the protection of heritage assets, and the preservation of rural character. It conflicts with multiple national and local planning policies.

For these reasons, I urge you to refuse this application in full.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Kind regards