

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 September 2026 22:51:25 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 10:51 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 as a resident of Walnut Close to register my objection to the above application. I have no objection in principle to appropriate development in the area. My concerns arise from the particular circumstances of this proposal, especially the proposed use of the private estate road, the practical implications of constructing a substantial new dwelling in this location, the demolition of existing buildings, the protected tree and the site's drainage arrangements.

1. Impact of the construction works on Walnut Close

The proposed development is considerably more than a minor alteration. The application proposes a new four-bedroom dwelling together with a detached two-car garage, with the new house having a stated total floor area of approximately 156m² and the garage a further 32.5m².

The applicant also confirms that a building contractor will be appointed to undertake the works.

I am concerned about the practical effect of carrying out these works from Walnut Close.

The access is through an established residential development rather than a road designed specifically to accommodate a building site. The works are likely to require excavation equipment, delivery vehicles, concrete wagons, skips, plant and numerous contractor vehicles over what could be a lengthy construction period.

Particular problems could arise when large vehicles need to stop on or manoeuvre along the access road. This could temporarily prevent residents from reaching or leaving their properties and could create difficulties for emergency access.

The planning application does not appear to provide sufficient detail about how this construction activity will actually be managed.

I therefore ask the Council to require the applicant to submit an appropriate site-specific construction logistics plan before works commence. This should establish, amongst other things, where construction vehicles will wait, how deliveries will be coordinated, what restrictions will apply to vehicle size and delivery times, and how uninterrupted access for existing residents will be maintained.

2. The private road and the existing easement

The applicant's Design and Access Statement acknowledges that the proposed property will use an existing right of access through Walnut Close and describes that right as being specifically for one house that has yet to be constructed.

There is a 2025 Deed of Easement governing this access. The deed contains conditions concerning the manner in which the Estate Road may be used, including restrictions concerning obstruction and access to other properties.

I appreciate that interpretation of an easement is ultimately a private legal matter. Nevertheless, the planning application

depends upon this access being available to the proposed new property, and the Council should be satisfied that the access arrangement shown on the plans is capable of being implemented.

In particular, I ask the Council to establish precisely how the new dwelling will acquire and retain the necessary rights to use the private road following the separation of the new 421m² plot from the existing property.

I would also ask the Council to take account of the restrictions within the easement when considering the proposed construction arrangements. Construction traffic should not result in the private road being routinely obstructed or used in a manner inconsistent with the rights granted over it.

3. Demolition of existing outbuildings and potential bat habitat

I have a particular concern about the proposed demolition of the existing outbuildings.

Bats are known to occur in the surrounding area and the existing buildings provide potential opportunities for roosting. The fact that bats have not necessarily been observed inside these particular buildings should not, in my view, be treated as evidence that they are not being used.

The application documents supplied with the application include a biodiversity net gain report, tree report and Design and Access Statement, but I have not identified a specific bat survey amongst the documents listed on the application form.

I therefore ask the Council's ecological adviser to consider whether the buildings proposed for demolition require a dedicated bat survey before any permission is implemented.

This should include consideration of the possibility of roosting bats within the existing structures and the effects of demolition, subsequent construction and new external lighting.

I would ask that demolition does not proceed until the Council is satisfied that the requirements relating to protected species have been properly dealt with.

4. Protected tree T25

There is also an unresolved issue concerning the protected oak tree identified as T25.

The applicant's own Design and Access Statement acknowledges that the tree's root protection area could extend beneath the proposed house.

The suggested solution is to use piled foundations. However, the same document states that arboricultural advice considers T25 to be dying and raises the possibility of removing it.

I do not believe that the current information provides sufficient reassurance that the tree can be safely retained throughout construction.

The potential impact isn't limited to the foundations themselves. Drainage installation, service trenches, excavation, construction machinery, storage of materials and repeated vehicle movements could all potentially affect the root protection area.

I therefore ask that the Council's tree officer reviews the proposal and confirms, before determination, whether T25 can realistically be retained and adequately protected throughout the entire construction process.

If removal is being contemplated because the tree is allegedly in poor condition, I would ask that this is independently verified rather than relying solely upon the applicant's statement.

5. Surface-water management

The submitted drainage drawing identifies existing areas of surface-water flooding close to the culvert.

The proposal includes approximately 174m² of roof area and a substantial attenuation system. The drainage design provides 9m³ of storage and limits the proposed discharge to approximately 0.9 litres per second.

Of particular relevance to neighbouring properties is the statement within the drainage design that, if the designed attenuation capacity is exceeded, water will flow towards the watercourse/culvert at the bottom of the garden.

The applicant's Design and Access Statement itself acknowledges that the site is susceptible to surface-water flooding.

I therefore ask the Council to establish where water will ultimately discharge during both normal operation and an exceedance event, and whether the receiving ditch and culvert can accommodate the additional flows without adversely affecting Walnut Close or surrounding properties.

This is particularly important given that the drainage drawing is marked "PRELIMINARY" and describes itself as design intent rather than a final construction design.

6. Foul drainage and separation of the new property

The application states that foul drainage from the proposed house will connect into the existing drainage system associated with 77 Dunstall Avenue, with pumping required.

The new house is nevertheless being created on a separately defined 421m² plot.

I would ask the Council to ensure that the proposed foul drainage arrangement is both technically satisfactory and capable of being maintained and operated once the new dwelling is separated from the existing property.

7. Overall concerns

Taken individually, some of these matters may be capable of being resolved through further information or planning conditions. Taken together, however, I do not consider that the current application has demonstrated that the development can be delivered without significant practical consequences for the existing residential community.

There are unresolved questions concerning the construction arrangements and private access, the effect of demolition on potentially protected bats, the ability to retain the protected tree, and the management of surface and foul water.

I therefore respectfully ask the Council to withhold planning permission unless these matters have been satisfactorily investigated and resolved.

If the Council is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that robust conditions are imposed to control construction activity, protect the private road and existing residents, safeguard T25, address protected species and secure the drainage arrangements.

I object to application DM/26/1690 on the above grounds.

Kind regards