

## Hamish Evans

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 July 2026 15:47  
**To:** Hamish Evans  
**Cc:** planninginfo; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning application objection (DM/25/0958)

Dear Mr Evans,

I wish to object to the above planning application as the occupier of 45 Cuckfield Road.

I support the principle of converting the former church into residential accommodation and recognise that Permission in Principle (DM/25/0958) established the acceptability of up to six dwellings. Indeed as the next door neighbour (number 44 cuckfield road) I am keen to see the building being used as it is pretty unkempt and overgrown with life having been left empty for a few years now. However, matters including layout, scale, parking, amenity and neighbour impact were specifically reserved for this stage, and I do not believe the submitted proposal demonstrates that six units can be accommodated without significant adverse impacts.

### Parking and Highway Safety

The proposal comprises six flats (12 bedrooms) with an estimated occupancy of 22 residents, yet provides only four existing parking spaces and no visitor parking. West Sussex Highways' consultation response identifies a requirement for 12 spaces using its Parking Demand Calculator, leaving an eight-space deficit.

This concern is consistent with earlier comments from the Parish Council, which highlighted existing parking pressures and road safety concerns on Cuckfield Road, including the fatal cyclist collision in February 2024. I would also ask the Council to clarify why the Section 106 transport calculations appear to assume no net parking requirement despite the identified shortfall.

In addition, vehicles would be required to reverse directly onto Cuckfield Road adjacent to a bus stop, raising further highway safety concerns.

### Amenity Space

Although each flat is shown with a private garden and there is a shared garden, the application provides no measurements for any of these areas. Without this information it is impossible to assess whether the development complies with the Council's amenity standards.

The proposed side gardens for five of the six flats would also place outdoor activity much closer to neighbouring properties than the established pattern of rear gardens, increasing the potential for noise and loss of residential amenity.

### Cycle and Refuse Storage

The application shows small cycle and bin stores but does not specify storage capacity. There is no evidence that sufficient cycle parking or refuse facilities have been provided for six households, and

the application itself confirms that recycling arrangements have not been agreed. It is also unclear whether refuse vehicles can safely access and service the site.

### Privacy

Several windows are positioned close to neighbouring boundaries, including those facing habitable rooms, and rooflights overlook adjacent gardens. Similar concerns were raised by neighbouring residents during the earlier application but do not appear to have been adequately addressed. Appropriate mitigation, such as obscure glazing, higher cill levels or revised window positions, should be required if permission is granted.

### Conclusion

In my view, the applicant has not demonstrated that this site can accommodate six dwellings without unacceptable impacts. The significant parking shortfall identified by the highway authority, together with the absence of adequate information regarding amenity space, cycle parking and refuse provision, means the proposal has not been shown to comply with relevant planning policies.

I respectfully request that the application is refused or deferred until the necessary evidence is provided to demonstrate that the development is appropriate and deliverable.

Yours,



Owner/occupier of 44 Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint