

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 July 2025 13:41:00 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1549

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/07/2025 1:40 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To The Meadows Little Park Farm Marchants Close Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9UZ
Proposal:	Single proposed dwelling
Case Officer:	Anna Tidey

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	North End House Marchants Close Hurstpierpoint
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We object to the application.

3:15 of the Planning Statement declares the land use as residential garden - this is contrary to approved landscaping plans 1166-21-02d for the site under DM/21/2367 and the further roof space development of DM/22/0204, which clearly marks the curtilage boundary as close to the Meadows building, with land outside as designated "paddock grass: area of retained modified grassland" and was adopted in Condition 15 of planning.

The application DM/25/1549 sites the single proposed dwelling outside the curtilage of The Meadows house (also referred to as Meadowview) and in the designated paddock land. This would indicate the land use is agricultural, and we can confirm there is no indication of use as garden through the lack of planting, play or outdoor equipment, use or close mowing in the 2 years the Meadows/Meadowview has been occupied.

The application DM/25/1549 sites the single proposed dwelling within the Construction Exclusion Zone outlined in Tree Protection Plan 1166-21-04a adopted in the approved plans DM/21/2367 and DM/22/0204, and included as Condition 16 of planning approval. This condition has not been discharged or removed.

We believe the comments made by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State in Appeal Decisions APP/D3830/W/20/3261897 & APP/D3830/W/20/3271183 still stand in regards to further development being detrimental to DP12 and DP34.

This is replicated in the multiple planning refusals and appeals dismissed on the location.

Kind regards