

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 April 2025 13:16:36 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0484

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/04/2025 1:16 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Site Of 60 Keymer Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 8AR
Proposal:	Mixed use redevelopment of the site comprising of ground floor commercial/community use and 26 No. new residential units on upper floors alongside associated parking and public realm improvements.
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	2 Dale Avenue Hassocks
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	If the local authority has any interest in environmental wellbeing, this proposal should be sent back to the applicant with an invitation to present a proposal of real merit, of design excellence, that enhances the village centre and delivers benefit for the community. It's far too critically important a site for there to have yet another mediocre building that benefits no one other than the developer.
-----------	--

It is perhaps not surprising that since the designer is based in New Zealand, there is little or no local design sympathy. The planning authority should insist that a more locally based and reputable architectural practice be instructed.

- 1) Suitability: As sites go, this is fine for a mixed retail/hospitality/residential development with parking.
 - 2) Considerable overdevelopment: It would be the biggest building in the village (sic) centre by some way and is definitely one storey too high.
 - 3) Adverse visual impact: Given its uniquely prominent position, the design needs to be of the highest quality as it will define the visual character of the village centre.
 - 4) Design: This must be sympathetic to its location and be a landmark building that we should be proud of.
 - 5) Bulk: The size and unprofiled elevations give it a massively overpowering effect that will dominate adjoining owners with its unacceptable bulk.
 - 6) Merit: The proposals are poorly thought out, and (perhaps not unsurprisingly) have no architectural merit. There is a need to totally rethink.
 - 7) Residential need: Any residential units must be absolutely, uniquely and properly affordable for young and 1st time buyers.
 - 8) Strain on local amenities: Given the excessive, unsuitable and algorithm driven (no established need and 'affordable' not catered for) housing given consent (against massive local objection) over the last decade, it's probably too late to deal with amenity pressure, but this will only exacerbate the situation.
 - 9) Traffic: When added to the many commuters now parking nearby, there will certainly be an increase in traffic movement in the most used area of the village, particularly at start and end of the school day.
-

Kind regards