

FORMAL OBJECTION

Planning Application DM/26/2178

Land between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex

Proposal: erection of six dwellings with associated access, landscaping, parking and open space.

Objector	
Address	2 College Place, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint BN69AF
Application	DM/26/2178
Date	17 September 2026

1. Executive summary

I object to DM/26/2178 on specific land-use, highway, settlement-form and infrastructure grounds. The objection is not to housing in principle. It is that this particular proposal has not demonstrated that six additional dwellings can be accommodated on this countryside-edge site without unacceptable incremental urbanisation, further pressure on an intrinsically constrained lane, and cumulative effects with development already committed immediately adjoining the site.

The applicant's own material confirms three matters of particular importance. First, the site is outside the defined built-up area and within the countryside. Secondly, there is no dedicated footway on College Lane in the vicinity of the site; the Transport Statement proposes that future residents walk within the carriageway. Thirdly, the applicant relies materially on the seven dwellings permitted immediately to the south under DM/23/1139 to characterise the present site as 'infill'.

A central issue is consistency. The applicant relies materially on the seven dwellings permitted immediately to the south under DM/23/1139 to convert what was previously countryside at the settlement edge into an alleged 'infill' context. If that permission is material enough to alter the planning character of the present site, it is equally material when assessing cumulative traffic, pedestrian demand, equestrian interaction, drainage and settlement-form effects. It should not count in favour of the proposal when defining the site's context but disappear from the assessment when its consequences are considered.

There is a wider planning concern. Successive small permissions can progressively move the apparent settlement edge: one development changes the baseline, and the altered baseline is then relied upon to justify development of the next parcel. That is precisely why countryside, settlement-pattern and cumulative-impact policies must be applied to the proposal as a whole rather than treating each six- or seven-dwelling scheme as an isolated event.

The application should be refused unless the Council can demonstrate, on robust site-specific evidence rather than broad averages or assumptions, that the proposal meets the current policy tests for development outside settlements; provides safe and suitable access for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians; properly assesses peak-period and cumulative highway conditions; demonstrates adequate foul-sewer capacity; and does not produce unacceptable incremental urbanisation or infrastructure pressure.

2. Principal grounds of objection

The grounds below are framed as planning considerations capable of being tested against the development plan, national policy, the submitted technical evidence and relevant decision history. Anecdotal evidence is identified as such.

A. Development outside the built-up area / claimed 'infill'

The Planning and Heritage Statement expressly acknowledges that the site falls within the countryside where additional housing is not normally accepted. It also records the Council's pre-application view that the site lies outside the built-up area and would ordinarily conflict with countryside restraint policy. The applicant's case is that the recent permission for seven dwellings immediately to the south changes the context sufficiently for the site to be regarded as limited infilling within a group of houses under NPPF Policy S5. That proposition requires careful scrutiny against the actual form of the site, particularly the eastward projection of development away from the College Lane frontage and the resulting relationship with the wider open land.

B. Incremental ribbon/backland development and erosion of the countryside edge

The proposal should not be characterised as the simple filling of a small frontage gap. The layout extends residential built form eastwards behind the established College Lane frontage and, when read with the seven dwellings already permitted immediately to the south, produces a materially more urban development pattern at the edge of Hurst Wickham. The aerial plan at Appendix A demonstrates the resulting fragmentation and the changed relationship between the remaining undeveloped land and the settlement.

The made Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan is expressly concerned with development which, individually or cumulatively, causes coalescence or changes settlement pattern in a way that urbanises local character. The planning issue is therefore not whether six houses alone would merge settlements. It is whether another discrete residential incursion into the countryside contributes to the incremental urbanisation and fragmentation that the plan seeks to avoid.

This concern is reinforced by previous appeal decisions in the College Lane/Hurst Wickham area. In the 2014 called-in decision concerning 81 dwellings off College Lane, the Secretary of State accepted that the Local Gap continued to perform an important planning function and that additional built development would cause a small but significant loss of openness. In 2018, appeals for ten and six dwellings at Hurst Wickham Barn were dismissed; the Inspector found that development extending into formerly open land would erode the clear edge to Hurst Wickham and introduce an uncharacteristic backland/suburban form. Those decisions concern different sites and policy circumstances and are not determinative of DM/26/2178, but the identified planning principles - protection of openness, the clear settlement edge, rural character and resistance to uncharacteristic backland urbanisation - are directly relevant to the present assessment.

C. Pedestrian accessibility and highway safety

The Transport Statement states that there are no dedicated footways along College Lane within the vicinity of the site. It records that the formal footway begins approximately 640 metres to the south and that the nearest bus stops are approximately 1.2 km away. The proposed solution is that future residents walk within the carriageway. In practice, pedestrians frequently have to step onto the verge to allow vehicles to pass because of the restricted carriageway width. Parked vehicles further reduce the usable width, while bends and vegetation restrict forward visibility in a number of locations.

The constraint is independently recognised. Hurstpierpoint College's own visitor guidance recommends that visitors do not use College Lane because it is narrow. The Parish Council's highways work has separately identified traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and parking at College Lane/Hurst Wickham as matters requiring intervention and has described College Lane/Malthouse Lane as a quiet country lane with numerous hazards, where in places a speed materially below 30 mph may be safer.

The connected lane network is also regularly used by horse riders. Established stables/liveries exist around Malthouse Lane, and planning evidence considered by Mid Sussex has recorded horses and riders travelling along Malthouse Lane between bridleways. Local residents and riders additionally report incidents of impatient or aggressive driving and uncomfortable vehicle/horse interactions. Those reports are acknowledged to be anecdotal and are not presented as verified collision statistics. The established equestrian use, however, is not anecdotal and should be expressly considered as part of the vulnerable-road-user assessment.

D. Use of average traffic flow to justify carriageway walking

The Transport Statement relies on a two-way Average Annual Weekday Traffic figure of 1,214 vehicles and converts this to an average of about 50 movements per hour, comparing that average with Manual for Streets shared-surface guidance. College Lane is not a purpose-designed shared-surface street and its operation varies materially through the day. The photographs at Appendix B show queues, opposing traffic and restricted usable carriageway width during busy conditions. The assessment should address school arrival/departure peaks, the increasing volume of on-street parking, recurrent obstruction at the locally recognised narrow section, and bends with restricted forward visibility.

E. Cumulative effects of the seven committed dwellings

The applicant repeatedly relies on DM/23/1139 as a material reason why the present proposal should be accepted. Planning Practice Guidance on Transport Assessments states that cumulative impacts from other committed development should receive appropriate consideration. The seven permitted dwellings immediately adjoining the site are an obvious committed development and should be incorporated consistently in the assessment of transport, pedestrian demand, drainage and landscape effects.

F. Foul sewer capacity

The Flood Risk Assessment identifies a single 300 mm vitreous-clay foul sewer in College Lane. For the six proposed dwellings it calculates an average foul flow of 0.05 l/s and states only that it is 'anticipated' that the sewer would have capacity. That is an assumption, not evidence of downstream hydraulic capacity. Residents and the adjoining farmer report repeated sewage escape onto land at Clayton Wickham Farm, including foul material visible in the field. The Council's previous consideration of the adjoining seven-house scheme expressly recorded members' concern about the existing sewage-management problem on College Lane, but relied on the absence of objection from Southern Water and the drainage engineer. A statutory right to connect does not demonstrate that the downstream network is operating satisfactorily. A site-specific hydraulic-capacity response from Southern Water should therefore be obtained before determination, expressly addressing the existing reported incidents and cumulative loading from committed development. The separate Water Capacity Note concerns potable water supply, not foul-sewer capacity.

G. Residual land, fragmentation and settlement form

The aerial plan illustrates the cumulative spatial issue particularly clearly. The seven-house scheme immediately adjoining the site is already committed. The current application would develop a further parcel and leave residual undeveloped land increasingly enclosed by residential development. No assumption is made that the residual land will itself be developed. The present harm to be assessed is the fragmentation created now: successive permissions alter the geometry of the settlement edge, extend domestic curtilages and associated activity into the countryside, and weaken the legibility of the boundary between settlement and open land.

This is a classic cumulative settlement-form issue. The Council should resist an analysis in which each small parcel is considered harmless because the adjoining parcel has already been developed. That approach risks allowing the countryside edge to migrate incrementally without any single decision confronting the combined change.

H. Relationship with emerging strategic planning

Mid Sussex's current District Plan evidence library includes proposed allocations at Land east of College Lane and South of Hurst Wickham Barn. That emerging strategic work is relevant context because it demonstrates that this corridor is being considered for further growth. If further development is to occur, pedestrian/cycle connectivity, drainage, landscape structure and the permanent settlement edge should be addressed coherently rather than through disconnected small sites that individually avoid strategic infrastructure obligations.

3. Detailed assessment

3.1 The applicant's own case confirms that the site is countryside

The Planning and Heritage Statement is clear that the application site lies outside the built-up area. At section 7.2 it states that the site 'falls within the countryside where additional housing is not normally accepted'. It reproduces the pre-application position that the proposal would ordinarily conflict with countryside restraint policy, before advancing the argument that the adjacent permission enables the site to be viewed as infill.

That is a material concession. The starting point is therefore not an established residential infill plot within the settlement but countryside outside the built-up area. The Council should identify expressly which current national and development-plan policy test it considers satisfied, and explain why the full depth and form of this six-dwelling layout constitutes limited infilling rather than a further outward/backland extension of residential development.

This is important because the planning balance should begin with the site's actual policy status, not with an assumption that the adjoining permission has automatically moved the settlement boundary. The Council should identify expressly which part of NPPF Policy S5 is relied upon and why this six-dwelling layout, including its eastward depth, constitutes "limited infilling within groups of houses" rather than a further extension of built form into countryside.

3.2 Reliance on DM/23/1139 must work both ways

The Planning and Heritage Statement states that the permitted seven dwellings immediately to the south are a central material consideration and says that the current proposal would "complete the gap" between existing and approved development. The adjoining permission is therefore not peripheral to the applicant's case; it is one of its foundations.

It follows that DM/23/1139 must also be treated as committed development in the technical assessments. A coherent decision cannot rely on those seven dwellings to establish an 'infill' context while assessing traffic, pedestrian pressure, drainage and landscape change as though those dwellings did not exist.

3.3 Previous decisions demonstrate longstanding sensitivity to settlement-edge development

The planning history deserves substantial attention because this is not an area in which the countryside/settlement-edge issue is novel.

The applicant's own Planning and Heritage Statement records that application 14/03359/FUL for three detached dwellings on the present site was refused in November 2014 and that the subsequent appeal was dismissed in May 2015. The applicant identifies the main appeal issues as including character and appearance and whether the site was accessibly located in relation to services. The policy framework has changed since 2015, so that decision cannot simply be transplanted to the present application; however, the physical characteristics of College Lane, the site's countryside-edge position and the underlying accessibility constraints remain material considerations which the Council should compare expressly with the Inspector's findings.

There is also a wider and consistent appeal history around College Lane. The Secretary of State refused 81 dwellings off College Lane in 2014 (APP/D3830/V/14/2211499), accepting the importance of the Local Gap and the effect of built development on openness. In 2018, the Inspector dismissed both a ten-dwelling and a six-dwelling scheme at Hurst Wickham Barn (APP/D3830/W/17/3191742 and APP/D3830/W/18/3194173). The Inspector found that the schemes would intrude into open land, erode the clear edge to Hurst Wickham, and introduce a relatively dense and uncharacteristic backland form. Again, those sites and proposals differ from DM/26/2178; the relevance lies in the repeated recognition by decision-makers that settlement edge, rural character, openness and backland urbanisation are substantive planning considerations in this immediate College Lane context.

3.4 Walking in the carriageway is a substantive accessibility issue

Transport Statement sections 3.8-3.12 confirm that no dedicated footway exists close to the site. The statement proposes that residents can walk within the carriageway and notes that formal footway provision begins approximately 640 metres south. In practice pedestrians frequently have to step onto the verge when vehicles pass because there is insufficient width for comfortable simultaneous passage. The road is winding in a number of locations, reducing forward visibility. These are conditions in which additional vehicle movements increase conflict with vulnerable road users.

The route is also used by equestrians. Malthouse Lane contains established stables and livery uses, including Maltings Farm and stabling at Kent's Farm. Planning evidence considered by Mid Sussex in 2024 recorded three liveries within 1 km of a Malthouse Lane site and horse riders moving between bridleways along Malthouse Lane. Local riders have also raised concerns publicly about driver behaviour on these lanes. Such reports are contextual evidence rather than formal collision statistics, but they reinforce the need for an assessment that expressly considers equestrians as vulnerable road users.

The question is not simply whether people are legally able to walk or ride in the road. It is whether the route is safe and realistic for children, older people, people with limited mobility, adults accompanying young children, cyclists and horse riders. The made Neighbourhood Plan already identifies traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and parking in College Lane, Hurst Wickham as a local concern.

The question for the Council is not simply whether people are legally able to walk in the road. It is whether the route is safe, attractive and realistic for the full range of likely residents, including children, older people, people with limited mobility and adults accompanying young children. The made Neighbourhood Plan already identifies "traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and parking in College Lane, Hurst Wickham" as a local concern. This is therefore a recognised characteristic of the area, not a newly raised objection.

3.5 The 50-vehicles-per-hour argument requires caution

The Transport Statement records ATC surveys from 10-17 March 2025 and derives an AAWT of 1,214 two-way vehicles. It then divides this to approximately 50 vehicles per hour and compares the result with a Manual for Streets shared-surface threshold. That arithmetic is not an adequate description of how College Lane actually operates.

The photographs at Appendix B show queuing, opposing flows and vehicles occupying much of the available carriageway during a recent busy period. On-street parking further reduces effective width and creates alternating one-way sections. The locally recognised 'narrow bit' already causes vehicles to wait for one another and generates intermittent queues. Bends and vegetation restrict forward visibility in places. These conditions are materially different from a purpose-designed shared surface carrying a steady 50 vehicles per hour.

The relevant issue is the intensity and interaction of movements at the times when the network is under greatest pressure, particularly Hurstpierpoint College arrival and departure periods. The College confirms that its Senior School and Sixth Form entrance is on College Lane and its Junior/Senior Prep entrance is on Chalkers Lane. The Council should examine the raw ATC profile by time of day and the photographic evidence rather than allow a 24-hour average to smooth away the conditions that create conflict.

The Council should not treat that calculation as establishing that College Lane functions as an acceptable shared surface. Manual for Streets principles concern the design and operation of streets; College Lane has not been designed as a pedestrian-priority shared surface. More importantly, an average can conceal short periods of substantially different conditions. The submitted traffic photographs should therefore be considered as evidence of the road's actual operation at busy times, alongside the raw ATC data and school-related peaks.

3.6 Public transport accessibility is limited by the walking connection

The Transport Statement places the nearest bus stops approximately 1.2 km from the site, an 18-minute walk, and Hassocks station approximately 2.7 km away. The quality and safety of the first part of that walking journey is therefore fundamental. A bus service cannot make a site sustainably accessible if reaching it requires a substantial walk along a road with no dedicated footway in the immediate vicinity.

3.7 Foul drainage evidence is not equivalent to a capacity confirmation

The Flood Risk Assessment proposes a gravity foul connection to the existing 300 mm College Lane sewer. Section 12.4 estimates only 0.05 l/s from the six dwellings and states that capacity is 'anticipated'. No equivalent site-specific Southern Water consultation response confirming capacity for DM/26/2178 is identified in the submitted pack reviewed.

There is relevant recent decision history. For the adjoining seven-dwelling scheme DM/23/1139, Southern Water did provide a specific consultation response stating that its investigations indicated it could facilitate foul and surface-water sewerage disposal for that development. The committee report also recorded public representations raising drainage-capacity concerns and asking Southern Water for reassurance. That earlier response is material, but it related to that separate seven-dwelling proposal and does not automatically establish the hydraulic capacity or wet-weather performance of the network after adding the present six dwellings as well.

Residents and the farmer at Clayton Wickham Farm report that after periods of heavy winter rainfall foul sewage has escaped onto the field, with visible foul material. This is expressly presented as local observational evidence, not as a verified technical finding by Southern Water. Because the phenomenon is rainfall-related and seasonal, the absence of visible evidence in summer does not resolve it. In light of those reports and the cumulative loading from the adjoining committed development, the proportionate response is to obtain an up-to-date, site-specific Southern Water assessment for DM/26/2178 addressing downstream hydraulic capacity and known wet-weather performance. The applicant's South East Water note addresses potable water supply only and is not evidence of foul-sewer capacity.

The report's discussion of the statutory right to connect does not answer the planning question of whether the receiving network is already constrained or whether reinforcement is required. The Council should obtain a site-specific response from Southern Water addressing the receiving network and committed development. The applicant's separate Water Capacity Note is from the potable-water supplier and should not be treated as evidence of foul-sewer capacity.

3.8 The wider College Lane - Malthouse Lane - Chalkers Lane network is intrinsically constrained

The application should not be assessed on the assumption that College Lane is an unconstrained distributor road with spare practical capacity. It is a rural/local lane serving residential properties, Hurstpierpoint College and onward connections to Malthouse Lane and Chalkers Lane. Its effective width is repeatedly reduced by parked vehicles; there are bends and sections with restricted forward visibility; pedestrians have no continuous footway near the site; and vehicles already have to yield at narrow points. The submitted photographs illustrate these operational constraints.

Malthouse Lane adds a further vulnerable-user dimension because it serves established equestrian premises and is used by horse riders. Chalkers Lane has also been the subject of recent public safety complaints and a petition citing repeated near misses involving pedestrians and cyclists. Those reports are not a substitute for police collision data, but they are relevant to understanding the lived operation of the network and justify a site-specific assessment rather than reliance on theoretical capacity alone.

3.9 Recorded collision and near-miss evidence

Published STATS19 road-safety data captures personal-injury collisions reported to the police; it does not record most near misses or damage-only incidents. A published emergency-services archive records a serious head-on collision on Malthouse Lane in 2013 in which a 76-year-old driver suffered life-threatening injuries. Separately, a recent Chalkers Lane safety petition reports multiple near misses involving

pedestrians, children and cyclists, vehicles leaving the carriageway, and two children having been struck by cars. Those petition statements are community reports rather than verified police statistics and should be described as such. They nevertheless reinforce the case for the Highway Authority to review the local network as a whole and, if necessary, obtain current STATS19 collision data for College Lane, Malthouse Lane and Chalkers Lane before determination.

3.10 Landscape and settlement form must be assessed cumulatively

The correct visual baseline now includes the seven dwellings permitted immediately south of the application site. The Council should assess the combined effect of those dwellings and the proposed six houses, including not only buildings but access roads, parked cars, domestic gardens, boundary treatments, lighting, refuse storage and the normal paraphernalia of residential occupation.

The issue is not confined to landscape views. It is the morphology of the settlement. Hurst Wickham has historically been read as a linear/semi-rural settlement associated with College Lane. The present proposal extends built form materially behind the frontage and further east into land presently forming part of the countryside edge. The aerial plan demonstrates why this is not adequately described as the benign filling of a neat gap. It creates a deeper, more suburban/backland pattern and further fragments the remaining open land.

The Council should therefore assess whether the proposal maintains a coherent and defensible settlement edge, rather than merely asking whether six houses can be screened by landscaping. Landscaping may soften views; it cannot undo the permanent change from open land to residential built form and domestic curtilage.

The aerial plan demonstrates why the effect is not adequately described simply as six houses filling a neat frontage gap. The proposal materially changes the shape of development east of College Lane and the relationship of the remaining open land to the settlement.

3.11 Emerging College Lane allocations reinforce the need for coordination

The emerging District Plan/Main Modifications process now identifies substantial additional development around College Lane, including sites east of College Lane and south of Hurst Wickham Barn. The current Main Modifications material includes allocations of 75 dwellings east of College Lane, 9 dwellings south of Hurst Wickham Barn and a further 35-dwelling College Lane allocation. These emerging allocations do not themselves determine DM/26/2178 and should be given only the weight appropriate to their plan-making status.

They are nevertheless highly relevant to the need for coherent infrastructure planning. The emerging policy requirements for College Lane development include new footway/shared-use provision, sustainable-transport measures, protection of heritage setting and prioritised pedestrian/cycle connections between sites. That is important context: the strategic planning process itself recognises that additional development in this corridor requires coordinated transport and connectivity measures.

The Council should therefore be particularly cautious about allowing small standalone permissions to consume or fragment land, fix access arrangements or extend residential form in ways that pre-empt the coherent pedestrian, cycle, landscape, heritage and drainage framework being developed for the wider area.

The appropriate question is not whether this application should be refused merely because other development may occur. It is whether the current scheme is compatible with a coordinated long-term planning solution for a corridor already under significant development pressure.

4. Matters the Council should resolve before determination

- Which limb of NPPF Policy S5 is the Council applying to this site, and why does the full layout constitute limited infilling rather than countryside expansion?

- Has the transport assessment explicitly included the seven dwellings permitted under DM/23/1139 as committed development?
- Has the Council examined the raw ATC data at the actual school arrival/departure periods and reconciled it with the submitted photographs showing queuing, opposing flows and constrained carriageway width?
- Does the Highway Authority consider walking within the College Lane carriageway for approximately 640 metres to the formal footway to be safe and suitable for all likely users, given the need for pedestrians to step onto verges, restricted visibility on bends, on-street parking and equestrian use of the connected lanes?
- How are the submitted photographs of peak-period congestion reconciled with the description of College Lane as lightly trafficked?
- Has Southern Water provided a site-specific capacity response for the foul sewer and downstream network, taking account of committed development?
- Has the landscape assessment considered the combined effect of the seven committed dwellings and the six proposed dwellings?
- Would the layout safeguard future pedestrian/cycle connectivity and strategic infrastructure associated with wider College Lane planning?
- Has the Council considered whether the proposal would create an incremental development pattern that progressively fragments the countryside edge?

5. Request for Planning Committee determination

Given the planning history of this site and adjoining land, the previous appeal findings, the relationship of this proposal to the recently permitted development at 147-149 College Lane, and the significant issues raised concerning settlement form, countryside encroachment, highway safety and cumulative traffic impact, drainage and foul sewer capacity, landscape character and the cumulative effect of development along this sensitive edge of Hurstpierpoint, I respectfully request that this application is determined by the Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers.

I also request that the Ward Members consider formally requesting committee determination in accordance with the Council's Constitution and Scheme of Delegation.

This is particularly appropriate because the application proposes six dwellings and raises planning issues extending beyond the effect of the development viewed in isolation. The relationship between this proposal, the adjoining permitted seven-dwelling development and the wider emerging development proposals affecting College Lane requires transparent consideration of the cumulative consequences for this part of Hurstpierpoint.

These are matters which, in my view, warrant consideration and debate by elected Members in public, with the benefit of the complete consultation responses and technical evidence before them.

6. Conclusion

The application should be determined on its own merits, but on the basis of the real and current baseline. That baseline includes the seven dwellings already permitted immediately to the south, the acknowledged absence of a nearby footway, existing on-street parking and recurrent width constraints, school-related peaks, equestrian use of the connected rural lanes, reported sewage problems and the site's location outside the defined built-up area.

The applicant relies heavily on the adjoining permission to support the principle of development. The same permission must therefore be given full and consistent weight when cumulative impacts are assessed.

On the evidence presently submitted, the proposal raises a coherent group of mutually reinforcing planning concerns rather than a series of isolated objections: a countryside site outside the built-up area; a disputed 'infill' characterisation; a pattern of development extending behind the College Lane frontage; cumulative urbanisation with the seven immediately adjoining dwellings; a lane with no nearby footway and acknowledged width/visibility constraints; peak-period congestion not represented by a simple 24-hour average; established equestrian use of the connected lane network; and foul-sewer capacity which is assumed rather than demonstrated.

The relevant planning history reinforces the need for careful scrutiny. Previous decision-makers have repeatedly identified openness, settlement edge, rural character, accessibility and uncharacteristic backland development as substantive issues in the College Lane/Hurst Wickham context. Those decisions do not

create an automatic precedent for refusal, but neither should they be disregarded simply because the current proposal contains only six dwellings.

For those reasons I request that planning permission be refused. If officers are nevertheless minded to recommend approval, the matters set out above should be addressed expressly and transparently in the officer report, with the cumulative baseline and relevant decision history clearly identified.

7. Evidence from the applicant's documents

Source	Relevant point
Transport Statement, 2 September 2026, §§3.8-3.12	No dedicated footways in the vicinity; ATCs 10-17 March 2025; AAWT 1,214; applicant says residents can walk in carriageway; formal footway approx. 640 m south.
Transport Statement, §3.16	Nearest bus stops approx. 1.2 km south, described as an 18-minute walk.
Planning and Heritage Statement, §7.2	Acknowledges site is countryside/outside built-up area; relies on adjoining seven-dwelling permission and NPPF S5 limited-infill case.
Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, §§2.6-2.12	Weald Clay; slowly permeable seasonally wet soils; no infiltration testing; infiltration not pursued.
Flood Risk Assessment, §§4.21-4.24 / 13.5	Records 12 sewer-flooding incidents in BN6 9 over ten years, while concluding site risk is low because postcode area is broad.
Flood Risk Assessment, §§12.1-12.6	Existing 300 mm foul sewer; 0.05 l/s estimated foul flow; capacity is 'anticipated'; relies on statutory connection framework.
Water Capacity Note	Potable water-supply capacity evidence; not a Southern Water foul-sewer capacity confirmation.
Same-site planning history: 14/03359/FUL / AP/15/0002	Applicant's Planning and Heritage Statement records refusal of three dwellings in November 2014 and dismissal of the appeal in May 2015; main issues included character/appearance and accessibility.
Secretary of State decision APP/D3830/V/14/2211499 (4 September 2014)	81 dwellings off College Lane refused; Local Gap held to perform an important planning function and additional built development found to diminish openness.
Appeals APP/D3830/W/17/3191742 and APP/D3830/W/18/3194173 (Hurst Wickham Barn, 2018)	Appeals for 10 and 6 dwellings dismissed; Inspector identified intrusion into open land, erosion of the clear Hurst Wickham edge and uncharacteristic backland/suburban form.
Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (made 19 March 2015)	Policy framework addresses cumulative coalescence/settlement identity; supporting text warns that incremental development can urbanise settlement character; country lanes recognised for walking, cycling and horse riding.
Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council highways records	College Lane/Hurst Wickham identified for traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and parking; College Lane/Malthouse Lane described as a country lane with hazards and sections where less than 30 mph may be safer.
Hurstpierpoint College visitor guidance	Visitors are advised not to use College Lane because it is narrow - independent evidence of the

	physical constraint from a major local traffic generator.
Mid Sussex District Plan Main Modifications 2026 - College Lane allocations	Emerging College Lane sites carry requirements for footway/shared-use links, sustainable transport and coordinated pedestrian/cycle connections, demonstrating the importance of strategic infrastructure planning.

Appendix A - Aerial context plan

The aerial image below illustrates the relationship between the seven-dwelling development already permitted/under construction (blue), the current application site (red), and the remaining undeveloped land. It is submitted to illustrate cumulative settlement form and fragmentation; it is not relied upon as evidence that any future application will necessarily be made.



Figure 1. Aerial context: blue = permitted seven-house development; red = DM/26/2178 application area.

Appendix B - Photographic evidence of College Lane traffic conditions

The following photographs are submitted as direct visual evidence of College Lane operating under congested conditions. They show queuing, opposing vehicle movements and the limited residual carriageway available when traffic meets. They are directly relevant to the Transport Statement's reliance on an average of approximately 50 vehicle movements per hour and its proposal that future residents should walk within the carriageway. They do not suggest College Lane is congested continuously; they demonstrate that peak-period conditions can be materially more constrained than a 24-hour average suggests.



Figure 2. College Lane during a recent congested period. The image shows opposing traffic, vehicle queuing and constrained carriageway space. In the context of the application, it illustrates the conditions pedestrians may encounter on a section of road where there is no dedicated footway.



Figure 3. College Lane during the same recent period, showing a queue extending along the carriageway. This illustrates why peak-period conditions should be assessed directly rather than inferred solely from the applicant's average traffic-flow calculation.

Note: the exact date and approximate time should be added to the captions before submission if available, as this will strengthen the evidential value of the photographs.

Appendix C - Policy and contextual sources

Key external decision/policy sources checked September 2026:

National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 17 August 2026.

Mid Sussex District Council: Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (made 19 March 2015).

Secretary of State: Land off College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, APP/D3830/V/14/2211499, decision 4 September 2014.

Planning Inspectorate: Hurst Wickham Barn appeals APP/D3830/W/17/3191742 and APP/D3830/W/18/3194173, dismissed 2018.

Mid Sussex Planning Committee: DM/23/1139, Land at 147-149 College Lane, committee report and consultation material.

Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council: Highways & Cycleways Working Group records concerning College Lane/Malthouse Lane.

Hurstpierpoint College: Visitor Guide - route guidance advising visitors not to use College Lane because it is narrow.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2040 Main Modifications / Site Allocations Evidence Library, current September 2026.

- National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 17 August 2026.
- Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (made 19 March 2015), including the identified concern regarding traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and parking in College Lane, Hurst Wickham.
- Planning Practice Guidance: Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements - cumulative impacts of committed development.
- Mid Sussex District Plan / policy maps and emerging District Plan evidence library, including MM72 Land east of College Lane and MM73 South of Hurst Wickham Barn.
- Applicant documents submitted with DM/26/2178, including Transport Statement, Planning and Heritage Statement, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Design and Access Statement and supporting plans.