

Appeal 6005671

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Inquiry
Appeal site	Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, RH17 7QL
Agent contact details	Steven Brown s.brown@woolfbond.co.uk 01189884923
Local planning authority	Lewes District Council
Application number	LW/24/0820

[Download interested party comments \(PDF\) \(/manage-appeals/6005671/interested-party-comments?pdf=true\)](/manage-appeals/6005671/interested-party-comments?pdf=true)

[Download interested party comments documents \(ZIP\) \(/manage-appeals/6005671/download/back-office/documents/third-party-comments\)](/manage-appeals/6005671/download/back-office/documents/third-party-comments)

Interested party 1

Comments

I would like to add to my previous detailed comments on this planning application.

I find it abhorrent that the developer sees fit to bypass the Lewes district council planning process managed by people who have been voted into their positions to represent the local people.

I have yet to see any assessment of the need for more houses in the village. The fact that house sales in the village (both new build and existing houses) have all but ground to a halt suggests there is not a need. The price of the houses no doubt suppresses demand (£800k is hardly affordable except to people moving down from London.

The village had a hosepipe ban yet again this spring/summer which was only lifted in December. We also had a period of low pressure but not as bad as some areas. This is not new. We have had these bans on a regular basis for as long as I have lived in the village (37 years). How therefore can we even consider building even more houses in the area. If South East Water are suggesting otherwise then they are obviously being economical with the truth. Like wise the sewage system cannot cope with the waste produced in the current houses. Tankers are a regular feature at the pumping stations in the village to remove excess waste but God knows where they empty these tankers? Probably in the local rivers. Residents of Charters Gateway can testify that sometimes even this is not enough as they have had raw sewage coming back up into their house in the showers and washbasins.

Flooding is an issue in parts of the village particularly the Eastern Road area near the village hall and the fields Taylor Wimpy are proposing to build on. The Taylor Wimpy answer to prevent their new houses flooding is to raise the building site up which of course will redirect the surface water towards existing properties.

The developers have painted a very "idealistic" countryside lifestyle picture of the village but the facts are

1. Local GPs are not taking on anymore patients
2. No NHS dentists are available locally
3. The local primary school is overcapacity and already teaching in the corridors
4. The roads are clogged up at peak times and falling apart with potholes and flooding. No traffic survey has been produced to support the new builds
5. The village is deemed to have good transport links but we have a total of 6 small buses a day with 3 on a Saturday and none on a Sunday through the village
6. Wivelsfield Railway Station is 3 miles away and has no parking facilities. Haywards Heath railway station is 4 miles away and the car park is full most days.
7. Cycling to the nearest employment and shopping areas is only for the very brave or very foolish due to the traffic volume and speed of vehicles.
8. All the new houses proposed in the village (and there are at least 4 other proposals that I can think of) are not being adopted by the local authority but

the service fees are not being made public up front and are of course are not regulated.

I would be obliged if you would take the above, and all the other comments made by over 1000 other people, into consideration when considering this planning application [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 2

Comments

I have previously submitted comments on this planning application but I wish to add more.

I have yet to see any assessment of the need for more houses in the village. Not only are most new houses expensive but in addition most families will need to fund at least 2 cars owing to poor public transport (see below). Not ideal in the current global situation.

The supply of water and removal of waste water has become a major issue in the area. This development will clearly worsen the situation

The village had a hosepipe ban yet again last spring/summer which was only lifted in December. We also had a period of low pressure. This is not new. We have had these bans on a regular basis for as long as I have lived in the village (37 years). How therefore can we even consider building even more houses in the area. If South East Water are suggesting otherwise then they are obviously being economical with the truth.

The sewage system cannot cope with the waste produced in the current houses. Tankers are a regular feature at the pumping stations in the village to remove excess waste. Residents of Charters Gateway can testify that sometimes even this is not enough as they have had raw sewage coming back up into their house. There is sometimes an unpleasant stench near the pumping station even during periods of dry weather

Flooding is an issue in many parts of the village particularly, but not exclusively, the Eastern Road area near the village hall and the fields Taylor Wimpey are proposing to build on. The Taylor Wimpey solution to prevent their new houses flooding is to raise the building site up which of course will redirect the surface water towards existing properties.

The developers have painted a very "idealistic" countryside lifestyle picture of the village but the facts are

1. Local GPs are not taking on anymore patients
2. No NHS dentists are available locally
3. The local primary school is overcapacity.
4. The roads in Wivelsfield Green, namely Green Road, North Common Road and South Road are clogged up and falling apart with potholes and flooding. All three are currently used as 'rat runs' as other roads in the surrounding areas are clogged up. The Cala development on Ditchling Road is now starting to make the situation worse. No traffic survey has been produced to support the new builds nor useful improvements in infrastructure proposed.
5. The village is deemed to have good transport links but we have a total of 6 small buses a day with 3 on a Saturday and none on a Sunday through the village. The erection of new bus shelters by developers will not help.
6. Wivelsfield Railway Station is 3 miles away and has no parking facilities. Haywards Heath railway station is 4 miles away and the car park is full most days as is the car park at Burgess Hill.
7. Cycling to the nearest employment and shopping areas is not advisable owing to the road conditions and traffic levels. There are no cycle lanes.
8. All the new houses proposed in the village (and there are at least 4 other proposals that I can think of) are not being adopted by the local authority but the service fees are not being made public up front and are of course are not regulated. So, yet another cost for any purchaser.

I would be obliged if you would take the above, and all the other comments made by over 1000 other people, into consideration when considering this planning application [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 3

Comments

I strongly object to this planning appeal.

The proposed development of 150 additional dwellings would have a significant negative impact on the local area, particularly in relation to traffic

and the natural environment.

Downsview Drive is already heavily used as a cut-through road and experiences high levels of traffic, especially during rush hour. Adding 150 more dwellings would inevitably increase the number of vehicles using the road, making congestion and traffic noise worse and increasing risks for pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists, and residents. The existing road network does not appear suitable to cope with such a large increase in traffic.

I am also concerned about the loss of green space, trees, wildlife habitats, and the overall character of the area. Development on this scale would result in unnecessary destruction of nature and would reduce biodiversity in the local environment.

In addition, a development of this size is likely to place additional pressure on local services and infrastructure, including schools, GP surgeries, parking, drainage, and public transport. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 4

Comments

FORMAL OBJECTION TO APPEAL

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Section 78 Appeal

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/P1425/6005671

Site: Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, East Sussex

Proposal: Outline application for up to 150 dwellings with associated works

Appellant: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

1. Introduction

This submission sets out a strong objection to the above appeal.

The proposal represents unsustainable, car-dependent expansion into open countryside, failing to respect the intrinsic rural character of Wivelsfield Green and failing to meet fundamental requirements of national and local planning policy.

It is not an isolated case, but part of a cumulative pattern of speculative development across rural East Sussex, placing intolerable pressure on infrastructure, landscape, water resources, and community cohesion.

2. Conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The proposal is in clear conflict with key provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Paragraph 180(b): Fails to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside

Paragraph 174: Does not contribute to or enhance the natural and local environment

Paragraph 167: Fails to ensure development is safe from flood risk for its lifetime

Paragraph 185(c): Fails to protect valued landscapes and public rights of way

Paragraph 49: Relies on inadequate and outdated evidence

The development fundamentally prioritises volume housing delivery over policy-compliant, sustainable placemaking.

3. Unsustainable Development and Car Dependency

The scheme proposes a car-dependent estate disconnected from adequate services, employment, and infrastructure.

No safe, continuous pedestrian or cycle network

No direct safe route to the primary school

Reliance on constrained rural roads

Increased congestion at already stressed junctions

The development would generate hundreds of additional daily car movements, worsening congestion, safety risks, and emissions.

This directly conflicts with national policy promoting sustainable transport and reduced reliance on private vehicles.

4. Infrastructure Deficit and Systemic Pressure

The proposal fails to address the real-world capacity of local infrastructure,

including:

- Road network already operating at or near capacity
- Public transport reliant on uncertain, time-limited funding
- School capacity and transport provision already under strain
- Water infrastructure, with recent local failures demonstrating fragility
- Recent events in nearby areas, including extended water supply failures, highlight the unsustainable strain being placed on essential services.
- There is no credible evidence that infrastructure can support this scale of development.

5. Flood Risk and Drainage Failures

The Flood Risk Assessment is fundamentally flawed:

- Relies on unvalidated modelling, not calibrated to observed flooding
- Assumes infiltration in heavy clay soils, contrary to local evidence
- Proposes raised land levels, displacing water elsewhere
- Depends on culverts and pipes functioning perfectly, ignoring blockage risk
- Accepts roads as flood pathways, effectively designing in flooding

This approach conflicts with:

NPPF §§159–167

Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk

Established best practice requiring avoidance of risk, not engineered workaround

The application fails to demonstrate lifetime safety or no increased risk elsewhere.

6. Landscape Harm and Loss of Rural Character

The site lies outside the settlement boundary and forms part of the open rural setting of Wivelsfield Green.

The proposal would result in:

- Urbanisation of open countryside

- Loss of rural character and visual openness

- Harm to long views and public rights of way

- Suburban encroachment inconsistent with village scale

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is outdated and not reflective of the revised scheme, including raised land levels and reconfigured drainage.

Mitigation planting cannot compensate for permanent landscape change.

This is in direct conflict with NPPF §§174 and 180.

7. Heritage Impact

The application fails to provide an updated Heritage Impact Assessment, despite material changes to layout and drainage.

- No assessment of impacts from re-profiling land or engineered features

- No updated analysis of setting or historic landscape character

This undermines informed decision-making and conflicts with NPPF §§189–199.

8. Procedural and Evidential Failures

Across all technical areas, the application relies on:

- Outdated reports

- Assumed baseline conditions

- Unverified modelling

- Deferral of critical matters to later stages

This is contrary to NPPF requirements that planning decisions be based on robust, up-to-date evidence.

Outline consent should not be granted where fundamental issues remain unresolved.

9. Highways Concerns

The withdrawal of the highways objection by East Sussex County Council is premature and unsupported.

Key issues remain:

- Absence of a Non-Motorised User Audit

- Substandard and inconsistent footway provision

- Unsafe routes for schoolchildren

- Increased congestion at already constrained junctions

Reliance on modelling using limited and previously challenged data
Deferral of critical design elements to post-consent stages
The conclusion that impacts would not be “severe” is not credible.

10. Failure of Planning Balance

The proposal is justified primarily on housing delivery, yet:
It does not deliver the right homes in the right places
It is developer-led rather than plan-led
It imposes significant environmental and infrastructure harm
The adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole.

11. Conclusion

This proposal represents:
Unjustified expansion into open countryside
Erosion of rural character and landscape
Unsafe and unsustainable development
Inadequate infrastructure planning
Failure to comply with national and local policy
It is part of a broader pattern that risks transforming rural communities into car-dependent suburban extensions, without the infrastructure, services, or planning integrity required.

12. Recommendation

For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.
The application fails to demonstrate:
Safe and sustainable development
Compliance with the NPPF
Protection of countryside character
Adequate infrastructure provision
Robust and reliable evidence
The Planning Inspectorate is therefore respectfully requested to refuse the appeal. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 5

Comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 150 new homes in Wivelsfield Green.

While I recognise the need for new housing, this proposal represents an unsustainable level of growth for a village that is already experiencing significant strain on its infrastructure and local services.

Firstly, the local road network is already operating beyond its intended capacity. Roads such as Hundred Acre Lane are frequently congested, and traffic levels in surrounding areas, including routes toward Ditchling, are already excessive. The addition of 150 new homes will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in traffic, exacerbating congestion, increasing journey times, and raising safety concerns for both drivers and pedestrians. Furthermore, road conditions are already poor, and additional usage will accelerate their deterioration.

Secondly, local services are unable to accommodate further demand. Schools in the area are at or near capacity, and there is no clear provision within this proposal to address the additional need for school places. Similarly, GP surgeries and healthcare services are already overstretched, with existing residents facing difficulty accessing timely care. Local shops and amenities are also limited and would struggle to support a significant increase in population.

The scale of this development is disproportionate to the size and capacity of the village. Sustainable development requires that infrastructure and services are improved in advance of, or at the very least alongside, any significant

housing growth. In this case, there is insufficient evidence of meaningful investment in transport, education, or healthcare infrastructure to support the proposed expansion.

In its current form, the proposal risks placing unacceptable pressure on the village, to the detriment of existing residents' quality of life and the overall sustainability of the area.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to refuse this application unless and until adequate infrastructure improvements and service provisions are secured.

Yours faithfully,
Emil Pruden
33 Charters Gate Way, RH17 7EW [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 6

Comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 150 new homes in Wivelsfield Green.

As a resident of the village, I am concerned about the cumulative impact of continued development on both the safety and sustainability of our local area.

While some roads are already experiencing high traffic levels, I would like to highlight the specific importance of Hundred Acre Lane. Although it is not currently heavily congested, it is widely used by residents for horse riding, running, cycling, and walking. Its relatively low traffic levels at present make it a valued and safer route for these activities. A significant increase in vehicle movements as a result of this development would fundamentally change the nature of the lane, creating serious safety risks for those who rely on it for recreation and exercise.

Traffic in surrounding areas, including routes towards Ditchling, is already problematic, and additional vehicles from 150 new homes would inevitably exacerbate these issues. Increased traffic would also contribute to the deterioration of road conditions, which are already a concern in the area.

Furthermore, local services are not equipped to accommodate this level of growth. Schools are at or near capacity, making it difficult for families to access local education. GP surgeries and healthcare services are already under strain, with increasing difficulty in obtaining appointments. Local shops and amenities are limited and would struggle to support a significant increase in population.

Crucially, this proposal does not appear to be supported by adequate infrastructure improvements. Sustainable development requires that road safety, healthcare provision, and educational capacity are addressed alongside any housing expansion. In this case, there is insufficient evidence that such provisions will be made.

The scale of this development is disproportionate to the size and character of the village and risks undermining both the safety of residents and the quality of life within the community.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuse this planning application.

Yours faithfully,
Jennifer Pruden
33 Charters Gate Way, RH17 7EW [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 7

Comments

I am strongly against this development for the following reasons. Wivelsfield Green would be swamped of new houses making it no longer a 'village'. There is no infrastructure in place to support such huge developments. Roads are in a terrible condition and already too busy. We have already seen the impact from the newly built developments in this village. The local school is already oversubscribed and the water company has no forward plan on how to furnish the supply of water to all these homes when there is always trouble with water shortages in this area where we all have to rely on Ardingly reservoir. This has to be a major consideration please! The environmental impact is huge. The loss of trees, hedgerows, wildlife cannot be underestimated when large swathes of our beautiful countryside is decimated.

Once gone this can never return and this has to be stopped and has to be another major consideration.

The huge Cala development of 93 homes has been a catastrophe for local people and the impact of residents lives cannot be underestimated.

This was once a beautiful village but soon, if allowed, will just be part of Haywards heath sprawl with its identity gone just so housing developers get richer.

This area, strategically and environmentally cannot take another 400 plus new homes. This will KILL Wivelsfield Green which has already taken its fair share of new houses. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 8

Comments

Please see the attached letter

Supporting documents

[Planning appeal objection- LAPP:P1425:6005671.pdf \(/published-document/218061c9-2d84-45de-95f7-8f9c1acaf2a3\)](#)

Interested party 9

Comments

I'm submitting flood risk evidence to illustrate that the planning application increases a flood risk in th area

Supporting documents

[Flooding Risk Evidence part 1 \(Compressed\).pdf \(/published-document/de3a0e12-4574-4047-9be6-af54a4af4610\)](#)
[Flooding Risk Evidence Part 2 \(Compressed\).pdf \(/published-document/21850d24-3af3-49cc-9860-d0755cbf2443\)](#)

Interested party 10

Comments

I write in reference to the proposed development of 150 houses to the South of Green road in Wivelsfield Green, which I am fiercely opposed to. There are a number of points I would like to object to:

1. Wivelsfield Green is an unsustainable location and any development would be heavily dependent upon private motor cars. The bus service is Wivelsfield Green is extremely limited, and the recent flex bus service was cancelled. The nearest train station is 2 miles away and has no parking. With the mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses in the proposed development this would realistically produce a high number of 2 car households which would add another 250+ cars to an already overcrowded Green Road.

2. The water supply in the area is extremely limited and just last summer we were under drought restrictions, when the Ardingly reservoir ran dry and couldn't service the water supply needs of the existing houses without adding more.

3. The area regularly floods as the clay based nature of the land when saturated cannot be absorbed and existing drainage systems are overwhelmed and this causes flooding for existing residents, without adding more houses and concreting over vast swathes of countryside which will only make matters even worse.

4. The sewerage system is currently at, or over capacity. We have had regular occurrences where the local sewage pumping station has been overwhelmed which causes sewage to pollute the river Adur. This has also caused existing residents to have toilets back up and require manual pumping out. We have

had occurrences where 3 sewage tankers are working around the clock to pump out sewage and take to be disposed of elsewhere. When this happens this necessitates closing a lane on Ditchling road for tanker parking and this causes traffic chaos on Ditchling road, Wivelsfield Road and Green road. At busy times of day, you simply can't get out of the village.

5. Lack of services. Wivelsfield Green is poorly served with amenities. It has a village store, incorporating a post office, It has a pub and a primary school and that is it. The primary school is over subscribed and is over capacity. It is already having to accommodate Children in Portacabins, despite only being built in 2007. It quite clearly can't cope with existing demand let alone adding another 150 homes, many of which will have families with children looking for places at an over subscribed school. The nearest doctors surgeries are in West Sussex and Wivelsfield Green is out of catchment for them and they won't accept patients from East Sussex. The nearest useable surgery is therefore in Newick and this practice is oversubscribed and it's near impossible to get a GP appointment. There is no Dentist, no hair dresser, no Optician, or any other offering at all. There is no secondary school. The nearest secondary schools are in Chailey, Burgess Hill or Haywards Heath. Bus transport is difficult for any of these areas as the bus service doesn't start in Wivelsfield Green until 9.30am which is after the school day has started.

6. Wivelsfield Green is a village of 2 halves. The eastern and Western sides of the village are separated by green fields on either side of Green Road. This is where the war memorial sits and it has historical value. Settlements have been here for thousands of years and the area marks one of King Alfred's hunting grounds. There are several heritage properties along Green Road which would be permanently damaged by this proposal; Baldings, Jenners and Botches to name a few. Removing the green spaces between the 2 sides of the village would irretrievably damage the fabric of the village.

7. Wivelsfield Green is a village of 360 homes. It's not just this development of 150 further homes but when taken in context of the myriad of other proposals, either recently built, under construction, in planning or awaiting decisions that threatens to overwhelm and destroy this lovely rural village. The Cala homes development on Ditchling road had to pause construction as many of the homes built there remain unsold. It's the same on the old Travis Perkins site, where 3 bedroom homes remain unsold. There are further proposals on land North of Green Road, on North Common Road, Golf Course farm, South Road, Ditchling road and the old Travis Perkins site. All of these new builds threaten to turn an old village of 360 homes into a sprawling town of over 1,000 homes with no amenities, no water, which will flood and pollute the rivers with ever increasing amounts of sewage. This is as well as adding well over 1,000 extra cars to already over crowded roads due to its unsustainable location. Wivelsfield was designated to supply an additional 30 homes, and has already more than delivered on this commitment. Any more will simply ruin the area and saddle the new home owners with properties that they can't sell, due to the many risks associated with this and other developments which are all detailed in this letter of objection. This proposal should not be judged in isolation. This needs a strategic review of the whole village and where housing and in what numbers should be placed.

8. The existing road network is ridiculously overcrowded. Large vehicles travelling through the village at speed, parked cars on Green road, causing traffic blockages and people in a rush attempting dangerous manoeuvres to get past. Adding all these extra houses only makes matters worse and creates a dangerous environment. It was only this year that we had a Child on his way to school was hit by a car in the village. This simply isn't safe or responsible to add all these extra houses.

9. The homes on the South side of Green Road, the Eastern side of Eastern Road, Woods Cottage, Old Wheel Cottage and Oak Cottage on Eastern Road all enjoy a countryside view and aspect across green fields. This would be replaced with a ghastly housing estate, with associated noise, construction damage etc. Woods Cottage in particular is surrounded by fields and this would be replaced with a housing estate. This is simply unfair.

10. The road surfaces in Wivelsfield are in a very poor state, mainly because of the constant traffic on them, there are pot holes, patched up repairs, protruding and sometimes sunken drainage ironworks. The pavements are on one side of the road only and are narrow and with poor surface quality. This isn't suitable for walking or for wheeling. It is dangerous to walk down these roads at certain times. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 11

QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Hello,

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/P1425/6005671.
Site: Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, East Sussex.

REPRESENTATION & EVIDENCE

Because of the restriction and rejection of my representation to the Planning Inspectorate using the Planning Portal on 20 April, I now submit my representation and evidence in split format.

I note that representations must be given by 24th April 2026.

Notwithstanding that an EIA is deemed unnecessary, it does not indicate that the adverse impact on nature, landscape and the environment can be ignored. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) remains relevant. Consideration does need to be given to the sensitivity of the site.

Since submitting a representation about planning application LW/24/0820, NPPF has been amended. Therefore, my initial representation is updated as follows, including the evidence provided to Lewes District Council.

1. SITE SUITABILITY — Policy Prioritising Brownfield Land Development

The application site is within National Character Area (NCA) 121 the Low Weald.

Government planning policy, and as outlined in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) Paragraphs 103, 124 and 125. c), is to prioritise brownfield land for new housing development. As valued countryside, the application site setting is designated for its biodiversity importance and wildlife habitats. Policy and designation that under regular planning considerations would exclude housing development as proposed by Planning Application LW/24/0820.

Consideration of siting housing development on local brownfield land ought to be prioritised instead of countryside important for its conservation value and tackling climate change.

2. VALUE OF CONSERVATION, TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE & BIODIVERSITY DECLINE, and the LOCAL ECONOMY

NPPF Chapters 14 and 15. "Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change" & "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment".

Given site chosen for proposed development rigorous scrutiny is necessary. The proposed housing development siting is in a countryside setting and would adversely impact ancient woodland, present since 1600, West Wood, north-west of Woodlands Farm. Also, nearby is Ditchling Common Country Park (SSSI). Ancient woodland and the country park are important sites in the context of habitats and ecosystem services locally.

National policy government's "Environmental Improvement Plan 2025" involves strengthening statutory safeguards to improve management for nature and prevent degradation and restore or create wildlife rich habitat.

Asserted by DEFRA some of the important site-specific factors, concerning the local environment, habitats and wildlife –
<https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>.

These include a) Woodland Priority Habitat Network,

b) Priority area for Countryside Stewardship measures addressing Brown Hairstreak butterfly habitat issues. Protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework.

- c) Priority area for Countryside Stewardship measures addressing Lapwing habitat issues, Farm Wildlife Package NCA,
- d) Priority woodland habitat creation designed for targeted S41 priority species,
- e) Ancient woodland,
- f) Countryside Stewardship Agri-Environment Scheme,
- g) Listed Building ~ Jenners, Green Road, Wivelsfield Green NHLE 1223059.

Any planning application for housing development at this site, reference LW/24/0820, requires detailed appraisal of the impact on nature, the environment, heritage assets and the local economy, a case in point the protected species present.

The countryside is not without value, having the capacity to mitigate the adverse effects of climate change and biodiversity decline.

Conservation, climate and ecosystems are important planning considerations, NPPF paragraphs 8 c), 103, 125 b) & c), 139, 162, 187, 198.

Attached evidence:

ESCC Landscape area-14-western-low-weald
 Defra Designated Areas Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
 Site context-ref_APP-P1425-6005671 [Close](#)

Supporting documents

[ESCC Landscape area-14-western-low-weald.pdf \(/published-document/12002860-eb85-4d9b-ad7a-01e91efb6f4a\)](#)
[Site context-ref_APP-P1425-6005671.pdf \(/published-document/e3f49ff6-03e1-49a7-b3aa-19aaeb5c5b22\)](#)
[Defra Designated Areas Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671.pdf \(/published-document/69489275-0e79-4a76-9b20-5788c30be2f7\)](#)

Interested party 12

Comments

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/P1425/6005671.
 Site: Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, East Sussex.

3. LANDSCAPE APPRAISAL – EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

Lacking from the Appellant's proposal is an appraisal of the consequences of the impact of the built-up development on the immediate landscape. The proposed development would adversely affect the amenity given by the present surroundings at the application site.

"Unspoilt and distinctive rural character with few intrusive features and no large urban areas. Scattered tree features including distinctive mature oaks, tree belts, woods, parkland (Ditchling Common) and hedgerow trees give an impression that the area is well wooded."

The development proposed would detract from this public amenity.

Source: <https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/landscape/landscape>

Also, evaluated by Natural England:
<https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/12332031>

"National Character Area (NCA) Profile:121 Low Weald (NE450)"

Account needs to be taken of NPPF paragraphs 20. d), 135 and 162.

4. NATURE and RECREATION

Nature would suffer from the built-up development proposal.

Application LW/24/0820 underplays proposed development's adverse consequence on wildlife and the natural environment. Fragmentation of the site will interrupt the connectivity of the environs. The constriction of wildlife movement would result in declining biodiversity; limiting of species that are

able to endure the impact of new-build development.

Differences in temperature will exist between the built environment and the countryside upsetting a natural balance.

Woodland habitat as existing at application site LW/24/0820 has a critical role in supporting biodiversity. The historical degradation of woodland habitat in Sussex means that remaining woodland is even more valuable and an important element in conserving the natural environment, as envisaged by NPPF paragraphs 20. d), 187 and 193.

The 2021 Environment Act strengthened the “biodiversity duty” for all. And a duty that “requires all public authorities in England to consider what they can do to conserve and enhance biodiversity”, including through the planning system.

The Appellant makes no reference to or use of the National Biodiversity Network Atlas (NBN), supported by Natural England. Extensive data has not been used by the Appellant to evaluate consequential harm, e.g. no account taken of impact on pollinator species: bees, butterflies, moths et alia. Pollinator species perform a crucial part in the local economy, both to farming and honey production.

Appellant’s ecological assessment does not cover every season of the year.

Presence of wildflowers perform an important role in biodiversity. Bluebells are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. Presence of the lesser celandine, pilewort (*Ficaria verna*) provides an important nectar source for queen bumblebees and other pollinators emerging from hibernation, and other early insects. Also, cow parsley is important for a variety of insects, including bees and hoverflies, as it is an early source of pollen. It is also a food plant for the moth *Agonopterix heracliana* and a nectar source for orange-tip butterflies.

Application site provides the Brown Hairstreak with favourable habitat of sunny woodland rides and hedges. Caterpillars of the Brown Hairstreak glow under UV light, which can help conservationists track this elusive butterfly. Classified by Section 41 as a species of principal importance: NERC Act and GB Red List (2022) vulnerable; with butterfly conservation priority high.

Proposed housing development would introduce predatory species such as domestic cats into the area. A significant threat to wildlife, which has not existed hitherto.

Introducing pets to the area will have a detrimental impact on the local wildlife especially dormice and birds. The British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) estimates that cats kill around 55 million birds in the UK each year alone. As per DEFRA’s explanation of government policy, LPAs have a duty to further provision for protection of and restoration of habitats for wild birds. This will help to make sure there are healthy populations of wild birds in their natural habitats across England and Wales. Protecting nature and tackling climate change go hand in hand.

Complying with the biodiversity duty —
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/complying-with-the-biodiversity-duty>

The purpose of government policy is to preserve, manage and re-establish habitat that is large and varied enough for wild birds to support and sustain their populations in the long-term, and avoid any pollution or deterioration of wild bird habitat.

Conserving natural environment contributes to tackling biodiversity decline and climate change. Trees contribute to air quality and have a role in helping to reduce the amount of carbon in the atmosphere, to store it and to enhance wildlife.

Over recent decades a serious decline in breeding farmland birds has taken place: 61% between 1970–2023. Whilst most of these declines occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s, declines are ongoing and there is a significant short-term decline of 9% between 2018–2023.

Nature and flourishing ecosystems play an important role in public health. The benefit of experiencing nature to our wellbeing is well-documented. Therefore, in the interests of our wellbeing it is important that nature continues to flourish.

Proposed housing development is not compliant with NPPF paragraphs 187,

193, 195 and 198, concerning land use, recreation, wellbeing and effects on the natural environment.

Attached evidence:

NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_Hedgehog record

NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_common Toad record

NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield Bluebell record

NBN record_Wivelsfield Green_cow parsley [Close](#)

Supporting documents

[NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_Hedgehog record.jpg \(/published-document/8d683602-c963-4bfb-bfd1-80102b051d7c\)](#)

[NBN record_Wivelsfield Green_cow parsley.png \(/published-document/bfc8c477-31ec-4926-b719-f6ba228406c9\)](#)

[NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield Bluebell record.png \(/published-document/acb686e5-e81c-4196-af35-f77e23d2f448\)](#)

[NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_common Toad record.jpg \(/published-document/785337c7-c2fa-4ca5-b280-fde9e7e2145f\)](#)

Interested party 13

Comments

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/P1425/6005671.

Site: Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, East Sussex.

5. SUSSEX BORDER PATH — Scaynes Hill to Ditchling

<https://www.sussexborderpath.co.uk/routesns.htm>

Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000:

The loss of amenity would be felt by users of the footpaths.

Public rights of way need to be kept open and unobstructed. Proposed development impinges on the Sussex Border Path, including the local PROWs reference WSM/1/1, Wivelsfield Green, and WIV/30. Section 7 of DEFRA's Rights of Way (PROW) Circular (1/09), the impact of planning application LW/24/0820 on PROWs counts as a material planning consideration.

Users (of PROWs) would, under the applicant's proposal, experience a profound change, as they would traverse through a suburban housing estate rather than pleasing countryside. Public footpaths in the countryside provide pleasurable amenity and recreational activities. Proposals for this development on a site affecting above public rights of way give rise to legitimate concern.

The need for adequate consideration of the rights of way before the decision on the planning application is taken. And in the event of planning permission being granted, need for the public right of way to be kept open and unobstructed.

Building over a PROW would be improper under section 130(1) of the Highways Act 1980. Highway authorities are under a duty to assert and protect the rights of the public to use and enjoy those public rights of way for which they are responsible. The public are entitled to expect that all rights of way will be kept open and available for use.

The effect of development on a public right of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission.

6. POLLUTION and IMPAIRMENT of NATURAL CAPITAL

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 187 is clear about recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services.

Current and previous housing development in the locality has led to cumulative deterioration in natural capital. NPPF paragraph 198 sets out the planning criteria regarding location, impact on the natural environment, pollution and health.

Pollution is identified as a pressure to the biodiversity of Sussex, because high levels of air pollution led to the loss of species through soil acidification and eutrophication.

NPPF Paragraphs 8 c) and 198 have relevance. Extent of Appellant's proposal

would result in additional pollution harmful to air quality. Therefore, important to take into account activities and traffic generated as material planning considerations.

REFERENCES & SUBMITTED EVIDENCE:

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).
Red List for Great Britain.
Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.
UK Government Environmental Improvement Plan 2025.
Environment Act 2021 — amendment to Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006.
Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act for England and Wales 2000.
Complying with the biodiversity duty, DEFRA — Published 17 May 2023.
National Character Area (NCA) Profile:121 Low Weald (NE450)
Natural England: - "State of Natural Capital Report for England 2024: Risks to nature and why it matters", published 9 October 2024.
National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF 2024.
Defra Designated Areas Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Site context-ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Defra Terrain View_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Defra Site Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Site Setting Defra_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
ESCC_Landscape area-14-western-low-weald
East Sussex County Council_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_Hedgehog record
NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield_common Toad record
NBN Atlas_Wivelsfield Bluebell record
NBN record_Wivelsfield Green_cow parsley

Consequently, my request is that above concerns about the Appellant's proposal for built-up development at Wivelsfield Green are given due consideration as defined by NPPF 2024 and the referenced material.

Kind regards,
Colin Page 20 April 2026

Attached evidence:
East Sussex County Council_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Defra Site Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671
Site Setting Defra_ref_APP-P1425-6005671 [Close](#)

Supporting documents

[Site Setting Defra_ref_APP-P1425-6005671.pdf \(/published-document/ac97a293-a3ef-433f-8db5-161bf595c3d0\)](#)
[East Sussex County Council_ref_APP-P1425-6005671.pdf \(/published-document/b223557a-805d-468e-9f16-9c7ed85407e8\)](#)
[Defra Site Map_ref_APP-P1425-6005671.pdf \(/published-document/323b11a6-8bc2-41b8-8654-f34d54d873e4\)](#)

Interested party 14

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[NTWT Appeal submission 23rd April 2026.pdf \(/published-document/7fd1a2d7-eee6-48e2-a989-3b372bc06326\)](#)

Interested party 15

Comments

THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Hello,

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/P1425/6005671.
Site: Land South of Green Road, Wivelsfield Green, East Sussex.
SUBMISSION of EVIDENCE

Reference the objections re Planning Application LW/24/0820 submitted to Lewes District Council and the representations given to the Planning Inspectorate regarding APP/P1425/6005671, to support those objections and comments now attached the following Research Report published by NATURE ENGLAND.

<https://nbn.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/NERR137-Edition-1-State-of-Natural-Capital-Report-for-England-2024-Risks-to-nature-and-why-it-matters.pdf>

State of Natural Capital Report for England 2024: Risks to nature and why it matters Natural England Research Report NERR137.
Published 9 October 2024.
This report can be downloaded from the Natural England Access to Evidence Catalogue. (as attached)

Kind regards,
Colin Page [Close](#)

Supporting documents

[Ref-APP-P1425-6005671_NERR137_State of Natural Capital_Report England-2024_Risks-to-Nature.pdf \(/published-document/a7f12530-7686-43b4-9d5b-786467911612\)](#)
