

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 September 2026 15:59:40 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1690

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/09/2026 3:59 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	77 Dunstall Avenue Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 8PJ
Proposal:	Proposed demolition of various outbuildings and erection of a 4 x bedroom part two storey detached house with a detached 2 bay garage and two parking spaces
Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 Walnut Close Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I have the following comments to make on planning application number DM/26/1690 which form the basis of my objection to the application as it is currently submitted. 1. Environmental Increased numbers of bats have been seen flying around the neighbourhood within the past few years. Should a survey be carried out to ensure non-disturbance of existing bat habitat which

may be within the outbuildings or close by?

2. Tree protection orders

In addition to the protected tree (TP25) mentioned in the application (on the land of the applicant) there is an additional mature protected oak tree (TP22) which is located on the land adjacent to and intended to be used for access. TP22 has two monitors. The roots of this tree are directly beneath the access surface and the canopy above may be damaged by construction traffic. How would this be dealt with as I can see no mention of this in the application?

3. Access to the site

Access to the proposed development will be via a private road, Walnut Close and is only possible as a result of a grant of easement signed in 2025. This is not a matter for the Planning Authority but the terms of the easement raise the following potential issues:

- Maximum weight of 3,000 kg (or less unladen) for vehicles to stop or park on the Estate Road. How will large construction and or contractors vehicles cope with this weight restriction?

- Electric vehicle (EV) charging is showing in the application. Many EV cars are heavy and could well exceed this weight. Whilst the applicant remains the owner of the existing property this will not be a problem as there is a shared access driveway on the other side of his property to facilitate exit. Should that separate dwelling ever be sold the scope for future EVs or any other heavy vehicles to enter/exit would be severely curtailed and I respectfully submit that the application should be updated to show what plan the applicant has to mitigate that. No assumption of any retrospective amendment to the easement can or should be made.

- There is no mention of where construction/contractors will be able to park during the project. Dunstall Avenue is already a densely populated road with limited availability of additional parking spaces during working hours. A detailed plan of how to manage this additional traffic should be provided. Residents of Nos 2,3 & 4 have open parking spaces at the front of their properties and access should not be or blocked at any time.

4. Flood risk

The applicant should clearly identify the impact of any additional water discharge into the existing culvert at the rear of properties 2,3 & 4 from the proposed development. This ditch falls within the boundaries of these properties and runs from right to left when facing from Dunstall Avenue into Walnut Close.

5. The Walnut Close development was set up as a 5 property one.

There may have been initial discussions with the developers for the purchase of additional land to accommodate an additional property but agreement was not reached between the parties at that time and the subsequent development was progressed, marketed and sold to the owners as a 5 property development. This has been formally confirmed by the developer in writing.

So, all reference to a "missing 6th property" in the letter accompanying the application should be removed or, I request, ignored by the Planning Authority in their deliberations. The infrastructure of that development was not designed or planned to include further housing at a later date

Kind regards