

Application Reference: DM/26/1306

Site Address: Pascotts Farm, Snowdrop Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2QE

Proposal: Erection of two detached two-storey dwellings with detached double garages, hard/soft landscaping, and highway crossovers.

Dear Case Officer,

OBJECTION: Material Planning Considerations and Technical Infrastructure Failures regarding Application DM/26/1306

I am writing to formally log my strong objection to the proposed residential development at Pascotts Farm, Snowdrop Lane. While I am writing as a supportive member of the wider community, this representation explicitly amplifies the valid concerns of the immediate, close neighbours whose residential amenity and local environment stand to be permanently compromised by this unsustainable scheme.

A detailed review of the applicant's own submission documents—specifically the **EAS Ltd Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (June 2025)**—alongside the **Southern Water consultation response (Ref: DSA000054462)** reveals fundamental, insurmountable technical conflicts with local and national planning policy.

I urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission based on the following material considerations:

1. Severe Foul Sewage Infrastructure & Environmental Pollution Risks

The development proposes a private package treatment plant discharging effluent to sub-soil irrigation. However, a critical conflict exists between the statutory requirements and the site's physical geography:

- **Failed Physical Testing:** Paragraph 5.3 of the applicant's EAS Ltd report explicitly admits that physical percolation testing carried out on-site on 12 May 2025 **failed completely**, stating "*no significant infiltration was observed*" due to the low permeability of the underlying Upper Tunbridge Wells Sand / Weald Clay.
- **Failure to Meet Statutory Criteria:** Southern Water's formal response states that the Environment Agency must be consulted regarding discharging effluent to sub-soil irrigation. Under binding environmental regulations, sub-soil irrigation is scientifically unviable in ground with zero absorption capacity.
- **Policy Conflict:** Forcing foul effluent into impermeable clay will result in the surface pooling of wastewater, causing severe public health hazards and an illegal pollution pathway directly into the nearby Scrase Stream catchment. This represents a direct violation of **Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP29 (Environmental Protection)** and **NPPF Paragraph 180**, which seek to prevent development from contributing to unacceptable levels of water pollution.

2. Deficient and Speculative Surface Water Strategy

Because the soil cannot absorb water, the EAS Ltd report shifts entirely to an engineered attenuation storage system controlled by a mechanical vortex valve. This strategy relies on unverified, failing off-site infrastructure:

- **The "Ghost Ditch" Reliance:** Paragraph 4.2 of the applicant's report admits that the downstream drainage ditches *"once existed... however these are heavily overgrown and poorly defined."* The developer is planning to discharge intensified surface water run-off into a non-functioning, neglected ditch network.
- **Third-Party Trespass & Civil Constraints:** Paragraph 4.1 acknowledges that managed water must flow *"across the adjacent site"* to eventually reach the Scrase stream. The applicant has failed to demonstrate any legally binding easement or right to discharge intensified, engineered runoff across third-party land. Without this, the surface water strategy is a legal fiction.
- **Policy Conflict:** Relying entirely on underground storage crates controlled by a vortex valve transfers a permanent flood risk to the local community. If the system blocks or encounters a severe storm event, it will cause immediate overland flooding onto Snowdrop Lane. This fails to meet the strict requirements of **Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP41 (Flood Risk and Drainage)** and **NPPF Chapter 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change)**, which mandate that development must not increase flood risk elsewhere.

3. Protection of Countryside Character and Landscape Encroachment

The application site sits strictly outside the designated Built-Up Area Boundary for Lindfield and Haywards Heath:

- **Policy Conflict:** The proposal represents sporadic, luxury residential sprawl in the open countryside, directly undermining **Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of Countryside)** and **Policy DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside)**.
- **Landscape Impact:** The addition of two large, prominent, two-storey detached dwellings and sprawling double garages will permanently erode the landscape's openness, directly conflicting with **NPPF Paragraph 180(b)** regarding the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

4. Direct Conflict Between Promised Landscape Screening and Public Sewers

The developer has attempted to placate close neighbours by promising extensive "soft landscaping" and tree planting to screen these commanding two-storey houses:

- **Infrastructure Constraints:** Southern Water's consultation response places strict legal restrictions on tree planting near public sewers, rising mains, and water mains to prevent root damage. Southern Water has flagged that unmapped public sewers likely cross this specific development footprint.
- **Policy Conflict:** Because Southern Water's statutory protections render the developer's promised visual screening legally unachievable, neighbours will be left fully exposed to severe overlooking, a loss of privacy, and dominant overbearing structures. This directly violates **Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP26 (Character and Design)**, which requires development to protect the residential amenity of adjacent neighbours. It also fails to safeguard the setting of nearby heritage assets

(including the Grade II Listed Lyoth Cottage), breaching **NPPF Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment)**.

5. Severe Impact on Highway Safety (Snowdrop Lane)

Snowdrop Lane is a narrow, restricted, semi-rural lane completely devoid of pedestrian footways or street lighting:

- **Highway Risks:** The addition of two large family homes, alongside two new independent highway crossovers, will intensely multiply vehicular movements. The intensified traffic during both the construction phase and standard occupancy poses an unacceptable danger to pedestrians, cyclists, and existing motorists.
- **Policy Conflict:** This severe impact on a restricted rural lane creates an unacceptable hazard, failing the safety tests set out in **Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP21 (Transport)** and **NPPF Paragraph 115**, which stipulates that development should be prevented or refused on highway safety grounds.

Conclusion

The applicant's submission is fundamentally flawed. Their own engineering data proves the land cannot absorb wastewater, their drainage strategy relies on broken infrastructure outside their ownership, and statutory constraints render their visual landscaping mitigation impossible.

The Mid Sussex District Council maintains a robust five-year housing land supply; there is absolutely no planning justification to sacrifice this sensitive countryside site for a technically unviable overdevelopment.

I respectfully request that the Planning Department refuses application DM/26/1306.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted]
Address: 6, Oldfield Drive RH17 7TF

[Redacted]