

Susan Dubberley

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 September 2026 12:41
To: Susan Dubberley
Cc: Judy Holmes; Kathryn Hall; Julie Galvin; Eric Owens; Hurst Sayers Common Parish Clerk
Subject: Objection to application DM/26/2178 - New Matters Arising Since My Email of 14 September 2026

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Susan Dubberley

Further Representation — New Matters Arising Since My Email of 14 September 2026

This email is submitted further to my previous objection and representation dated 14 September 2026. I ask that it be treated as a **further formal representation in relation to application DM/26/2178** and placed on the public planning file alongside my earlier correspondence. The matters below are **additional to** and should be considered alongside my previous representations.

Cumulative Development and MSDC's Decision-Making

I recognise that each planning application must be determined on its individual merits. However, this cannot reasonably mean that the surrounding planning history and cumulative effect of successive developments can be disregarded. Given the progression of development onto adjoining parcels around Hurstpierpoint, I respectfully question MSDC's motives and decision-making approach. I therefore ask the Council to demonstrate that these decisions are being driven consistently by the adopted development plan and objective planning considerations, rather than contributing incrementally to a de facto extension of the village boundary.

In particular, I ask the Council to explain:

1. The policy basis for permitting development on land outside or immediately adjacent to the established village boundary;
2. What evidence demonstrates that each site is genuinely within the existing built-up area;
3. Whether an access, driveway or narrow connection to the built-up area is being relied upon to establish contiguity;
4. How the cumulative impact on the settlement boundary, countryside, landscape and coalescence is being assessed;
5. How successive permissions have been reconciled with the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan;
6. Whether the cumulative pattern of development is effectively creating a settlement extension which should properly be considered through the plan-making process.

I request that the officer's report for DM/26/2178 expressly addresses these matters and identifies the relevant policies, evidence and settlement-boundary maps relied upon.

Brownfield Land — CPRE State of Brownfield 2026

I also ask the Council to consider the latest CPRE **State of Brownfield 2026** evidence. CPRE reports that in 2025 England had sufficient identified brownfield land to accommodate a minimum of **1.54 million homes, exceeding the Government's 1.5 million national housing delivery pledge**. Around **846,000 potential homes were already on brownfield sites with planning permission but had not been built**. CPRE also

identifies a continuing increase between 2022 and 2025 in brownfield sites, area and minimum net dwelling capacity.

This raises a fundamental question:

If brownfield capacity is continuing to increase, including land which already has planning permission, what evidence demonstrates that developing this particular parcel of undeveloped countryside is necessary?

Of course I recognise that national brownfield capacity does not automatically replace the need to assess local housing requirements or individual site deliverability. However, it is relevant to the wider policy context and the Government's stated brownfield-first approach, is it not?

Therefore ask MSDC to explain:

- What assessment has been made of available brownfield land relevant to the housing requirement;
- Whether suitable and deliverable brownfield alternatives have been considered;
- If not, why they have not been considered;
- If they have been rejected, what evidence demonstrates that they are unavailable, unsuitable or incapable of delivery; and
- Why further undeveloped countryside is considered necessary despite the substantial brownfield capacity identified by CPRE.

Request for Transparency

My concern is not simply opposition to individual developments. It is whether the cumulative pattern of decisions around Hurstpierpoint remains consistent with the development plan, settlement strategy and neighbourhood plan. I therefore respectfully question MSDC's approach and ask the Council to demonstrate transparently that successive permissions are not, in effect, **creating a de facto extension of Hurstpierpoint** through individual planning decisions.

I specifically request that the officer's report addresses:

- The cumulative effect of recent and proposed development;
- The precise relationship between the application site and the existing built-up area;
- The relevant settlement-boundary and countryside policies;
- The cumulative impact on the character and spatial integrity of Hurstpierpoint;
- The availability of brownfield alternatives; and
- The implications of CPRE's **State of Brownfield 2026** findings.

I consider these to be material matters which should be addressed transparently before a decision is made on DM/26/2178.

I would also like to place on record how extremely concerned I am about the long-term and potentially irreversible consequences of the decisions being made by MSDC in relation to the ongoing development around Hurstpierpoint. These decisions will have a lasting impact not only on the character, identity and cohesion of the local community, but also on the countryside, landscape, biodiversity and wider environment. **Once open land is developed, the loss can never be reversed.** I urge the Council to exercise particular care and ensure that the cumulative social, environmental and spatial consequences of these decisions are fully understood and properly considered before further development is permitted.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

1 College Place
BN6 9AF