

From: Lyn Williams (Cllr) <Lyn.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 October 2026 11:02:25 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application number DM/26/2178: Land between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint

Dear Susan

I am writing to express my concerns about this planning application for 6 houses between 149 and 161 College Lane.

There are several references in the submitted documents that indicate a lack of understanding of this site, which lies to the north of the Hurst Wickham Conservation Area.

The Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area Appraisal correctly describes Hurst Wickham and emphasises the importance of the open countryside to the setting of the Conservation Area:

"Despite the spread of development from Hurstpierpoint to the south west, Hurst Wickham remains largely surrounded by open fields. This open, rural setting is very important to the character of the area as a small hamlet."

Yet the Traffic Statement for Remmus Designer Homes, dated August 2026, states:

"The site is located approximately 800 metres north of Hurst Wickham village centre."

This implies a more sustainable location than actually exists and with no public transport along College Lane, any future occupiers of these houses would be reliant on cars to reach the local facilities. Although there are public footpaths across the fields to the west of the site leading to the school and other facilities in Hurstpierpoint, they can become muddy and being unlit, are not realistically suitable to use in the dark winter months. Thus the site is not sustainably located as highlighted in the appeal decision APP/D3830/W/14/3001881 (May 2015).

The Design and Access Statement describes the site as being "*vacant land*" rather than farmland creating a gap which appears to be in the countryside outside the developed area, also highlighted in the appeal decision above.

This land is outside the settlement and does not meet the requirements of the NPPF (August 2026) section S5, despite the claim that it is limited infilling. It would also not follow the existing settlement pattern, which is largely linear along College Lane, and would remove the open rural setting of this area.

The applicants are relying on the precedent set in application DM24/113 9 and the lack of a 5 year housing land supply but the recent changes to the NPPF have changed the requirements since that decision was made in March 2025. Additionally, the reasons for

the appeal decision above still apply and the adverse impacts of the proposed development would still significantly outweigh the benefits.

For these reasons, the application should be refused.

Kind regards
Lyn Williams

--