

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 September 2026 22:48:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1690

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/09/2026 10:48 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	77 Dunstall Avenue Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 8PJ
Proposal:	Proposed demolition of various outbuildings and erection of a 4 x bedroom part two storey detached house with a detached 2 bay garage and two parking spaces
Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	1 Walnut Close Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to object to planning application DM/26/1690 for the construction of a new four-bedroom dwelling and detached garage to the rear of 77 Dunstall Avenue. I live close to the proposed development and am particularly concerned about the effect the proposal would have on the existing residential environment, the private access through Walnut Close, the mature trees and ecology of the site, and surface-water management.

I appreciate that the proposal is described as completing a house that was envisaged when Walnut Close was originally developed. However, the fact that the site was previously considered for development does not, in my view, remove the need for the Council to assess the effects of the development that is now actually being proposed.

1. The effect of construction on Walnut Close

The most immediate concern is the construction period.

The application proposes a substantial four-bedroom house of approximately 156m², together with a detached two-bay garage. The applicant also confirms that the existing outbuildings will be demolished before the new development is constructed.

This is therefore likely to involve a significant period of construction activity, including deliveries of building materials, plant, skips, excavation equipment, contractor vehicles and potentially larger delivery vehicles.

Walnut Close is an established residential development rather than a purpose-built construction access road. Increased vehicle movements and construction activity would inevitably affect residents during the works.

I am particularly concerned about:

- * large vehicles accessing the site;
- * delivery vehicles waiting or unloading;
- * skips and building materials being placed on or close to the access road;
- * contractor vehicles occupying available road space;
- * damage to the privately maintained road;
- * obstruction to residents and visitors;
- * noise, dust and general disturbance.

I believe these matters should be properly assessed before planning permission is granted rather than being left entirely to be resolved once construction has commenced.

If permission is granted, I would ask that a detailed Construction Management Plan is required before any works begin. This should establish the construction route, maximum vehicle sizes, delivery arrangements, working hours, contractor parking, storage of materials, positioning of skips and measures for protecting Walnut Close from damage.

2. Access arrangements should be clearly established

The applicant's Design and Access Statement describes the

proposal as the "missing house" from the earlier Walnut Close development and states that a right of access exists over Walnut Close for the benefit of 77 Dunstall Avenue for one house yet to be built.

The proposed development would create a completely separate four-bedroom dwelling with its own garage and parking.

The application therefore needs to demonstrate clearly how the access arrangements will operate in practice, particularly during construction and following the subdivision of the existing property.

I understand that the interpretation of private rights and easements is ultimately a legal matter. Nevertheless, the existence and terms of the access arrangements are relevant to understanding how the proposed development will function and how construction traffic will be accommodated.

The Council should be satisfied that the proposed development can operate without compromising the ability of existing residents to use Walnut Close safely and conveniently.

3. Demolition of the existing outbuildings and bats

I am concerned that the proposal involves demolition of existing buildings in an area containing mature trees and established garden habitat.

The application documents identify mature trees and other natural features on the site. Design and access.pdf The application also proposes demolition as part of the development.

I cannot establish from the submitted documents that a dedicated bat survey has been undertaken in relation to the buildings proposed for demolition.

This is important because Natural England's current planning guidance specifically advises that surveys should be considered where development involves demolition of buildings that could contain bat roosts. All bat species are legally protected, and the absence of previous records does not demonstrate that bats are absent.

I am not suggesting that bats are definitely present. My concern is that the potential has not been adequately demonstrated to have been investigated before demolition is permitted.

I therefore ask the Council to require an appropriate ecological assessment/bat survey before determining the application, particularly given the combination of existing buildings, mature trees and established garden habitat.

Any required mitigation, timing restrictions or licensing requirements should be established before demolition takes place.

4. The protected oak tree T25 requires careful consideration

The application itself raises concerns about the relationship between the proposed building and protected tree T25.

The Design and Access Statement acknowledges that the tree's root protection area may extend into the footprint of the proposed house. It proposes pile foundations as a means of avoiding damage to the roots, while also stating that arboricultural advice suggests the tree is dying and that its removal could potentially be considered.

This seems to leave an important question unresolved.

If the tree can be retained, the Council should be satisfied that its roots, canopy and long-term health will not be compromised by:

- * piling and foundation construction;
- * excavation;
- * drainage installation;
- * service trenches;
- * construction traffic;
- * changes to ground levels; or
- * changes to the surrounding soil and drainage conditions.

Conversely, if the tree is genuinely unsafe and needs to be removed, that should be independently established rather than effectively becoming an incidental consequence of the development.

I therefore ask the Council's arboricultural officer to assess T25 and its root protection area independently before the application is determined.

5. Surface-water flooding and drainage

The application acknowledges that although the site is outside Flood Zones 2 and 3, it is at risk of surface-water flooding. Design and access.pdf

This makes the drainage arrangements particularly important.

The proposed drainage strategy includes approximately 9m³ of attenuation storage, a controlled discharge rate of approximately 0.9 litres per second, and an exceedance route towards the watercourse/culvert at the bottom of the garden.

Given the existing drainage infrastructure serving Walnut Close, I believe the Council should consider the new drainage system in

the context of the wider drainage network rather than assessing the proposed house in isolation.

In particular, I would ask the Council to establish:

- * exactly where the proposed surface water will discharge;
- * whether the receiving watercourse and culvert have sufficient capacity;
- * whether the existing drainage infrastructure can accommodate the additional development;
- * what happens if the attenuation system becomes full;
- * where excess water will travel during an extreme rainfall event; and
- * whether the proposed system has been demonstrated to work under the relevant climate-change allowance.

The submitted drainage drawing itself describes the drainage design as preliminary and subject to further approval. I therefore do not believe that the drainage arrangements should simply be assumed to be satisfactory without the necessary technical confirmation.

6. Impact on the existing residential environment

The application describes the proposed house as having a "benign effect on neighbour amenity".

I do not think neighbour amenity should be considered solely in terms of overlooking, building height and separation distances.

The effect of introducing another dwelling into an established private residential environment also includes the practical consequences of:

- * additional vehicle movements;
- * construction activity;
- * deliveries;
- * noise;
- * lighting;
- * waste collection;
- * maintenance of access;
- * drainage; and
- * the long-term use of the new access.

These effects are particularly relevant because the proposed property sits immediately adjacent to an established residential development and relies upon the existing access arrangements through Walnut Close.

7. Conclusion

I recognise that the application is for a single dwelling and that the

proposed building has been designed to fit within the surrounding residential area.

However, I do not believe that the application has yet demonstrated that the development can proceed without unacceptable consequences for the existing residents and environment.

My principal concerns are:

1. the impact of construction traffic and deliveries on Walnut Close;
2. the need for a properly controlled construction management arrangement;
3. the practical operation of the existing access arrangements;
4. the lack of clear evidence regarding bats and other ecological constraints associated with demolition;
5. the relationship between the proposed development and protected tree T25;
6. the adequacy and deliverability of the proposed surface-water drainage system; and
7. the cumulative effect of these issues on the existing residential environment.

I therefore object to application DM/26/1690 and ask the Council to carefully assess these matters before reaching a decision. In particular, I would ask that the necessary ecological, arboricultural, access and drainage information is established before permission is granted, rather than relying on matters being resolved retrospectively through conditions.

Kind regards