

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 September 2026 09:57:14 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <susan.dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2178

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/09/2026 9:57 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between 149 And 161 College Lane Hurstpierpoint West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection 6no. dwellings with associated access, landscaping, parking and areas of open space.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Goldings , 1 College Place College Lane, Hurstpierpoint Hurstpierpoint

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION DM/26/2178 Land Between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint - Proposed 6 Dwellings I am writing to formally object to Planning Application DM/26/2178 and request that planning permission is refused. I ask Mid Sussex District Council to take the following matters fully

into consideration when determining this application.

1. Climate change, drainage and flood risk

The proposal would result in the permanent loss of open land and the introduction of additional buildings, access roads, driveways and other impermeable surfaces.

Increasing the amount of tarmac, concrete and hardstanding will increase surface-water runoff and place additional pressure on existing drainage infrastructure. This is particularly concerning given the flooding, drainage and sewerage problems already experienced in Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common.

At a time when planning decisions should be responding to increasing climate risks, further development that removes natural land capable of absorbing rainfall and increases pressure on drainage infrastructure requires particularly careful consideration.

The application should therefore be assessed in terms of cumulative surface-water runoff, drainage capacity, flood risk and the long-term effects of climate change, rather than considering these six dwellings in isolation.

2. Irreversible loss of open land, nature and wildlife habitat

The proposed development would permanently change land that currently contributes to the open rural character of this part of Hurstpierpoint.

The loss of established vegetation, habitat and open land would further fragment wildlife corridors and diminish the ecological value of the area. Green and agricultural land cannot simply be replaced once it has been built upon. The loss is effectively permanent.

The proposal should therefore be assessed against the relevant policies of the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, including those intended to protect the area's landscape, biodiversity, green spaces and distinctive rural setting.

3. Increasing pressure on local infrastructure and public services

There are serious concerns about whether local infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate yet more residential development.

Local GP services are already under considerable pressure, while local primary schools face constraints on available classroom capacity. There are also continuing concerns regarding the capacity and resilience of the local sewerage and drainage infrastructure.

These matters cannot reasonably be dismissed simply because this application proposes only six dwellings. Six additional homes

add to an existing and cumulative development burden. When considered alongside other approved and proposed schemes in the area, the impact on infrastructure and public services becomes considerably more significant.

4. Highway and pedestrian safety

College Lane is extremely narrow and has significant sections without a continuous pavement. This creates an inherently difficult environment for pedestrians, including children, elderly residents and young people walking to and from local schools and other facilities.

The proposed development would introduce yet another access point and additional vehicle movements onto this road. These concerns are heightened by the recently approved DM/24/1139, comprising seven dwellings at 147-149 College Lane, immediately adjacent to the application site. The delays and dangers caused by this building site are already evident.

The cumulative impact of these developments on traffic movements, visibility, road safety and pedestrian safety must therefore be properly assessed.

There is also further development pressure along College Lane, including the proposed 75-home Land East of College Lane scheme. These developments should not be assessed as though each exists in isolation when they will all place huge additional pressure on the same local road network.

5. Significant planning history

The planning history of this site and the surrounding area is highly relevant.

The previous application relating to the same 149-161 College Lane site, associated with appeal APP/D3830/W/14/3001881, was refused approximately 12 years ago.

There is also the planning history associated with 13/01250/FUL, concerning the substantially larger proposal for 81 dwellings on College Lane, which was refused following appeal.

The current proposal should therefore not be considered in isolation. The Council should carefully consider what has materially changed since those earlier decisions and whether the planning principles and concerns underlying those decisions remain relevant today.

6. Private financial gain versus the public cost to the community

There is also a fundamental concern about the balance between private financial gain and the permanent costs imposed on the existing community.

The conversion of open and agricultural land to residential development can generate substantial financial uplift for landowners and developers. However, the financial benefit is largely private, while many of the consequences are borne collectively by existing residents and the wider public.

Residents are left to absorb the consequences of increased traffic, pressure on schools and healthcare, additional demand on drainage and sewage infrastructure, loss of wildlife habitat, increased surface-water runoff, loss of open countryside and the gradual erosion of the village's character.

It is difficult for residents not to question whether the continued release of individual parcels of open land for development is effectively allowing private interests to profit from the loss of a community asset, while the long-term environmental, infrastructure and quality-of-life costs are passed to those who already live here.

This is particularly concerning where development is taking place incrementally. A developer may argue that six dwellings represent only a small addition, but the cumulative effect of repeatedly allowing small developments is far more substantial. The community loses another piece of open land each time, while the financial benefit of that land being granted residential use accrues to those developing or selling it.

The Council should therefore ensure that the interests of the existing community are not subordinated to the financial interests of those seeking to develop the land. The claimed benefits of six additional homes must be weighed against the permanent and cumulative public costs of losing this open land.

7. Harm to the character and identity of Hurstpierpoint
Hurstpierpoint derives much of its distinctive character from its compact historic village core and its relationship with the surrounding open countryside.

The remaining open land along this part of College Lane provides an important transition between the built-up area and the wider rural landscape. Incremental development risks progressively destroying that distinction.

The issue is not simply whether six individual dwellings would appear acceptable when viewed in isolation. The more important question is what the cumulative effect of successive developments will be on the character, appearance, landscape setting and identity of the village.

8. Risk of piecemeal development and urban sprawl
I am particularly concerned that approval of DM/26/2178 would create a precedent for further piecemeal residential development

along this stretch of College Lane.

The land between the existing built-up area and Hurstpierpoint College is currently open and, in places, used for cattle grazing. If individual parcels continue to be developed incrementally, agricultural and open land could gradually be converted to residential use.

Over time, this risks creating a continuous built-up corridor extending towards Hurstpierpoint College and effectively swallowing up the remaining separation between the village and the countryside.

This would fundamentally alter the character, appearance, landscape setting and land-use pattern of this important part of Hurstpierpoint.

The fact that this application is for only six dwellings should not obscure the wider consequences of allowing further residential development in this location.

Conclusion and requested decision

For all of the reasons set out above, I formally object to Planning Application DM/26/2178 and request that Mid Sussex District Council REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the proposed six dwellings.

I ask the Council to give particular consideration to:

the irreversible loss of open and agricultural land;

the loss of biodiversity, habitat and wildlife corridors;

increased surface-water runoff and drainage/flooding risks;

the capacity of existing sewage and drainage infrastructure;

pressure on local schools, healthcare and other public services;

the narrow nature of College Lane and the lack of continuous pavements;

pedestrian and highway safety;

the cumulative impact of DM/24/1139 and other existing and proposed developments along College Lane;

the relevant previous planning history, including APP/D3830/W/14/3001881 and 13/01250/FUL;

the impact on the character and rural setting of Hurstpierpoint;

the disproportionate balance between private financial benefit and the public costs imposed on the community; and

the precedent that approval would create for further piecemeal development and the progressive loss of the remaining open land towards Hurstpierpoint College.

If this development is permitted, I am deeply concerned that it will open the floodgates to further piecemeal development, with each individual application being presented as a small and acceptable addition while the cumulative effect is the gradual destruction of the open landscape around Hurstpierpoint.

What is currently open land used for agriculture and cattle grazing could progressively become residential land, creating an increasingly continuous built-up corridor towards Hurstpierpoint College. Once this land is lost, it cannot realistically be recovered.

The Council must therefore look beyond the immediate six dwellings and consider the cumulative impact of development, the precedent being established, who financially benefits from the change of land use, and who will ultimately bear the environmental, infrastructure and social costs.

Finally, given the planning history, cumulative development pressures, highway and pedestrian-safety concerns, infrastructure constraints and the wider implications for the character of the village, I request that DM/26/2178 is referred to the Mid Sussex District Council Planning Committee for determination rather than being decided under delegated powers.

Requested decision: REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION.

Kind regards