

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2026 20:06:18 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 04/09/2026 8:06 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:	2 Walnut Close Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am the owner/occupier of 2 Walnut Close and wish to object to application DM/26/1690. My objection relates primarily to the proposed access arrangements, the additional traffic and construction activity associated with a new four-bedroom dwelling, and concerns regarding the sustainability and drainage information submitted in support of the application. I am concerned about the potential effect of these matters on Walnut Close and the residents who rely upon it for access to their homes.

1. Access to the proposed dwelling

Walnut Close is a small private residential estate road serving the existing properties, including my home at 2 Walnut Close. The proposed development would introduce a further independent residential dwelling immediately adjacent to the rear of Walnut Close and therefore has implications for the use of the road by existing residents.

I am concerned that the application does not adequately demonstrate a safe, practical and deliverable means of access to the proposed dwelling, detached garage and parking.

There is an existing Deed of Easement dated 2025 between Walnut Close (Burgess Hill) Management Company Limited and Kevin Mansell, the owner of 77 Dunstall Avenue. The deed provides rights of access over the Estate Road to 77 Dunstall Avenue but also contains specific restrictions, including that the road is not to be used for purposes other than as an accessway to and from the Dominant Land and that vehicles must not be stopped or parked so as to obstruct the Estate Road. It also contains restrictions concerning access to properties which may now or in the future neighbour the Dominant Land.

I appreciate that the interpretation and enforcement of private legal rights is ultimately a matter for the parties and, if necessary, the civil courts rather than the Planning Authority. However, these existing arrangements appear relevant when considering whether the proposed development has a practical and deliverable access arrangement.

The proposal is not simply an alteration to the existing dwelling at 77 Dunstall Avenue. It would create an additional four-bedroom dwelling with its own garage and parking provision. The Council should therefore establish exactly how the new dwelling is intended to be accessed and whether the proposed arrangements are capable of safely supporting that additional residential use.

2. Additional traffic and construction activity

A further four-bedroom dwelling will inevitably generate additional vehicle movements. I ask the Council to consider whether the existing road and access arrangements are suitable for this additional traffic and whether the proposal could result in obstruction or conflict between vehicles using Walnut Close.

I am particularly concerned about the construction phase. The development involves demolition of existing outbuildings followed by construction of a substantial four-bedroom dwelling and detached two-bay garage. This is likely to involve repeated movements by construction vehicles, delivery vehicles, skips, plant and contractors.

Walnut Close is a relatively small private residential road and is not a construction compound or dedicated construction access road. Construction vehicles stopping, waiting, unloading or parking could interfere with residents entering and leaving their properties and could obstruct the road.

If permission is granted, I ask that a detailed Construction Management Plan is required, addressing the construction access route, vehicle sizes, deliveries, unloading and contractor parking,

the accommodation of skips and materials, protection of the privately maintained road from damage, and measures to ensure the road remains unobstructed and disruption to residents is minimised.

3. Residential amenity

The cumulative effect of construction activity and additional vehicle movements immediately adjacent to Walnut Close is also a concern. This includes construction noise, dust, delivery activity, vehicle movements, obstruction and general disturbance, potentially over a prolonged construction period.

These impacts should be assessed in the context of the established residential environment and the effect on existing residents, rather than considering the proposed dwelling in isolation.

4. Sustainability and solar-energy claims

The submitted Sustainability Assessment proposes an air-source heat pump, battery storage and 26 solar panels. It suggests that the development could generate surplus electricity and that much, if not all, of the energy required for electric-vehicle charging will be provided by the solar panels.

However, I cannot identify supporting calculations demonstrating the proposed solar capacity, predicted annual generation, panel orientation and performance, anticipated household consumption, heat-pump demand, battery capacity, or the annual and seasonal energy balance.

The amount of solar energy available for EV charging will also depend on factors including seasonal generation, household consumption, heat-pump demand, EV mileage, charging times and battery capacity. This is particularly relevant during winter, when heating demand is likely to be greatest but solar generation significantly lower.

I therefore ask that these sustainability claims are supported by appropriate technical calculations and a realistic annual and seasonal energy assessment if they are to be relied upon as benefits of the development.

5. Surface-water drainage and soakaway

I also have concerns regarding the proposed surface-water drainage arrangements. The Sustainability Assessment states that a below-ground rainwater storage tank will be positioned within the front garden with an overflow to a proposed soakaway. However, the approved drainage investigation undertaken for the immediately adjoining Walnut Close development identified that the site is underlain by London Clay and specifically concluded that infiltration drainage was not possible. The approved Walnut Close drainage strategy therefore relied upon attenuation and controlled discharge into the existing ditch and culvert.

I appreciate that ground conditions can vary over short distances. Nevertheless, given the findings on the immediately adjoining land, I ask that appropriate infiltration or percolation testing is provided to demonstrate that a soakaway is actually viable at this particular location.

6. Existing drainage system, watercourse and exceedance

The original Walnut Close drainage system was designed to serve the five-property development and includes an approximately 20m³ attenuation tank and Hydro-Brake arrangement, with peak discharge into the existing ditch restricted to 5 litres per second. The drainage network is privately maintained.

The current application indicates approximately 9m³ of storage and a maximum discharge of approximately 0.9 litres per second. If the proposed development ultimately discharges into the same ditch and downstream culvert, the capacity of the receiving system should be assessed cumulatively with the existing Walnut Close drainage system.

The Walnut Close Development Handbook also records an existing watercourse along the rear of Plots 2, 3 and 4 which must be maintained to ensure that it remains free from debris and continues to function. This watercourse leads into a culverted section.

The applicant should therefore clearly identify the final destination of the proposed surface-water discharge and demonstrate that the ditch and downstream culvert have sufficient capacity, that their condition has been considered, and that the additional discharge will not increase flood risk to Walnut Close or neighbouring properties.

The application should also demonstrate the proposed exceedance route in the event of extreme rainfall, blockage, failure of a flow-control device, failure of the soakaway or the attenuation/storage system reaching capacity.

Conclusion

My objection is not to the principle of solar panels, EV charging, air-source heat pumps, rainwater harvesting or SuDS. These can all be positive features when properly designed and supported by appropriate evidence.

My concern is that the application does not currently demonstrate that the proposed access and construction arrangements are practical and deliverable, nor that the sustainability and drainage claims are adequately supported by technical evidence.

I respectfully ask that the Council carefully assess the application in relation to access, highway and pedestrian safety, additional traffic, construction vehicles, obstruction and damage to the private road, noise and dust, residential amenity, sustainability claims, infiltration, drainage capacity, the receiving watercourse and exceedance arrangements.

I therefore object to the application in its current form and ask that permission is refused unless the Council is satisfied that these matters have been satisfactorily addressed.

Kind regards