

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 08 February 2026 20:07:01 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/2626

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/02/2026 8:07 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	42 Hurst Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9NL
Proposal:	Subdivision of the existing residential plot to create 2no residential dwellings, alongside retention of existing dwelling. Amended drawings received on 26.01.2026.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	5 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	-----------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>I wish to object to the above planning application. I consider the proposal to be wholly inappropriate for this location and fundamentally contrary to adopted and emerging planning policy, the latest application having failed to deal with my concerns other than on an extremely superficial level.</p> <p>The development would result in unacceptable harm to the countryside setting, settlement separation, character of the area, residential amenity, biodiversity, and highway safety, and would</p>

represent an unjustified intensification of use through the introduction of two new dwellings, including a back-garden dwelling.

### 1. Intrusion into the Countryside and Erosion of Strategic Gaps

A key objection concerns the position of the new dwellings within land that forms part of the countryside setting between Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill. This area contributes directly to the narrow strategic gaps that prevent coalescence and preserve the distinct identity of these settlements.

Policy DP13 (Preventing Coalescence) seeks to resist precisely this type of incremental erosion. The proposal would extend the established building line into open land that currently performs an important landscape and settlement-separation function. This directly conflicts with Policy DP12 (Protecting the Countryside), which requires development outside built-up area boundaries to protect or enhance landscape character. The scheme cannot reasonably be described as conserving rural character.

### 2. Backland Development Contrary to the Established Pattern of Hurst Road

Hurst Road has a clear and consistent development pattern of linear frontage dwellings with long, undeveloped rear gardens. None of these plots have been subdivided to accommodate additional housing, and this absence of backland development is a defining characteristic of the area.

Introducing a dwelling hidden behind an existing house, served by a hard access track tightly constrained against neighbouring garden boundaries, would be entirely out of keeping with prevailing development. This is contrary to Policy DP26 and NPPF paragraphs 130 and 135, which require development to respond positively to local character and settlement pattern.

### 3. Unacceptable Intensification of Use

The addition of two new dwellings represents a substantial uplift in activity and intensity, materially affecting neighbouring occupiers. Policies DP26 (scale and intensity) and DP29 (noise and light pollution) are clear that development should not result in harm to adjoining residents. In this case, harm would be unavoidable.

In addition, the applicant's comparison between a pool house and a dwelling is misleading. A pool house is typically used intermittently and generates minimal activity. In contrast, a dwelling introduces permanent residential use, including daily vehicle movements, parking pressure, deliveries, refuse collection, external lighting, and continuous comings and goings.

### 4. Harm to Residential Amenity

---

The proposed access route for the back garden dwelling, running directly alongside existing garden boundaries, would significantly undermine the amenity of neighbouring properties that currently back onto quiet, open countryside.

Impacts would include:

- vehicle headlights shining into gardens and habitable rooms,
- noise from engines, doors and general activity throughout the day and evening,
- increased overlooking and activity where there is currently privacy,
- artificial lighting intruding into an area that presently functions as a dark and tranquil environment.

These effects conflict with Policy DP29 and NPPF paragraph 185, both of which seek to prevent unacceptable noise and light pollution.

#### 5. Precedent and Cumulative Harm

Approval of this proposal would establish a clear precedent for similar back-garden developments along Hurst Road. Over time, this would fundamentally alter the character of the area, normalising piecemeal intensification and eroding its rural-edge qualities.

The NPPF (paragraph 11(d)(i)) confirms that even where housing supply considerations apply, permission should be refused where the adverse impacts of development significantly outweigh the benefits. In this instance, the creation of the new dwellings do not justify the long-term and cumulative harm to character and amenity.

#### 6. Biodiversity Impact and Loss of a Dark Wildlife Corridor

The connected rear gardens along this stretch form an important habitat network used by a range of wildlife, including protected species. Increased lighting, vehicle movements and construction activity would disrupt nocturnal species and diminish the ecological value of the area.

Relevant policies include:

DP37 - Protection of Trees and Green Infrastructure

DP38 - Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity

NPPF paragraph 180 - refusal where significant biodiversity harm cannot be avoided

The submitted ecological information does not adequately assess the impacts on protected species or the loss of an established dark corridor.

---

## 7. Highway Safety Concerns

The site access lies on a busy section of Hurst Road that is frequently used by schoolchildren walking to and from two nearby schools. Introducing additional vehicle movements through a narrow and constrained access point would increase risk in an already sensitive location.

This conflicts with Policy DP21 (Transport) and NPPF paragraph 111, which requires refusal where development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

## 8. Sewage Treatment Plant Adjacent to Private Gardens

## 9. Policy Conflict and Overall Planning Balance

The proposal conflicts with a wide range of local and national planning policies, including:

DP13 - Preventing Coalescence  
DP12 - Protection of the Countryside  
DP26 - Character and Design  
DP29 - Noise, Air and Light Pollution  
DP21 - Transport  
DP37 and DP38 - Trees and Biodiversity  
It is also contrary to NPPF paragraphs 11(d), 130, 135, 180 and 185.

Plus additional concerns around sewage and unsubstantiated sustainability claims.

The scheme would cause clear and demonstrable harm to countryside character, settlement separation, residential amenity, biodiversity and highway safety, while delivering only minimal benefit.

## Conclusion

The proposed development represents an inappropriate and harmful intensification of the site through the creation of two new dwellings, including a four-bedroom dwelling within a rear garden. It would erode the countryside edge, undermine the strategic gap, harm amenity and ecology, and set an undesirable precedent for further garden development.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuses planning application DM/25/2626.

---

Kind regards