

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 December 2025 17:44:45 UTC+00:00
To: "Tracie Axford" <tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2976

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/12/2025 5:44 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	50 Hurst Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9NL
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the erection of a new front boundary wall and entry gate (revised design to DM/25/2104).
Case Officer:	Tracie Axford

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	56 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to object to the new application for retrospective planning permission for the new wall at the front of 50 Hurst Road which was recently refused permission. The reason for refusal was "Due to its size, design and appearance, the wall constitutes an overbearing feature which is out of keeping with the character of the area and has a detrimental effect upon the street scene. While the applicant, develop Wooj Property Ltd have made an attempt to address the concern by reducing the height by 15cm and adding brick piers and capping, the height is still overbearing

and is still out of keeping with the rural character of Hurst Road.

Unfortunately, the developer/applicant, Wooj Property Ltd have once again submitted false information even though this was pointed out in my objection to their previous application, and noted in the Mid Sussex Council's Summary of Representations. The drawing titled 'As Existing' shows the previously existing wall as significantly higher than it actually was.

The height of the previous existing wall was only five courses high with brick piers of eleven courses high. Google Street View confirms this. The drawing titled "As Existing" however shows the wall to have been thirteen courses high with brick piers of fifteen courses. This grossly exaggerates the height of the previous wall and minimises the perceived additional impact of the new wall. This is misleading for the planners and the public assessing this application and is enough of a reason to refuse permission outright. Especially as it is the second time this has happened.

The wall which has now been built, is currently about twenty-three courses high and the proposal is to only reduce the height by 15cm. The height shown on the drawing is about 190cm plus new brick piers at about 220cm. The heights of the proposed wall and piers are very imposing over passing pedestrians.

The developer/applicant cites the front walls at 52 and 44 Hurst Road as examples of front walls in the vicinity. Both are over the permitted 1m height and neither have planning permission and therefore should not be taken as precedent. There are no other continuous brick walls over 1m height in the vicinity with the vast majority of frontages along the road comprised of hedges/planting.

The front wall at 52 Hurst Road should never have been permitted (in fact permission was never granted) but the height is more in keeping with the much larger scale of the property. The design and materials are in keeping with the Edwardian style of the building and built to a higher level of quality. The height of the front wall is an exception to the rule and should not be used as permission to allow others to break the rule.

44 Hurst Road is much lower in height at about 140cm high with piers approximately 160 cm high. Even though it does not have planning permission, it is much more in keeping with the style and height of the building with high quality materials and detailing. The proposed planting behind the wall will also hopefully enhance the street scene when the planting is established.

The proposed wall at 50 Hurst Road, however, is not in scale with the property, is out of keeping with the area, is too high and overbearing, and does not maintain or enhance the quality of the rural and landscape character of the district. In fact, it will have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

Since the proposed wall continues from the existing wall at 52 Hurst Rd, the overall effect is an extremely long stretch of very high wall along the front of both properties which have wide frontages. This is in stark contrast to the rest of Hurst Road which is mostly fronted by hedges and greenery. The new proposal contravenes policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

The developer/applicant cites the need for privacy in winter for the height of the wall. This is easily addressed by installing blinds or replacing the deciduous hedge with a dense evergreen hedge. There used to be a yew hedge along the front boundary which gave ample privacy and was visually attractive, but the previous owner replaced it with a deciduous hedge.

The developer/applicant states they did not know that they needed planning permission for the new wall/gates. Given they have instructed Town & Country Planning & Development consultants, they should have been made aware of this prior to their first planning application. This should not be used as mitigation during the assessment of the application.

It is the planning department's duty to make sure that applications conform to local policies and ensure the rural local character of the area is preserved. Allowing permission for this wall would set a precedent for more high walls to be built along the road, turning Hurst Road into an ugly urban environment. I strongly urge the planning department to refuse permission. To avoid setting a precedent, the maximum permissible height should be no more than 1m for the boundary wall but with brick piers protruding up to 30 cm higher along the front and higher for piers to which the gates are attached.

Kind regards