

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 September 2026 12:50:07 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2178

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/09/2026 12:50 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between 149 And 161 College Lane Hurstpierpoint West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection 6no. dwellings with associated access, landscaping, parking and areas of open space.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	126 College Lane Hurstpierpoint
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	FORMAL OBJECTION - Planning Application: DM/26/2178 Proposal: Proposed 6 dwellings at Land Between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint I wish to formally object to planning application DM/26/2178 for six dwellings at land between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint.

- Firstly, I feel utterly betrayed by the council as, when permission was previously granted at the planning meeting on 10th October 2024 to build 7 seven houses on neighbouring land (DM/24/1139 - Land at 147-149 College Lane), planning officer Joanne Fisher stated: "The built-up area boundary would remain as it is drawn. Just because new development then becomes contiguous does not change the position of the development boundary. It would only change if a new district plan updated it." This is highly relevant to the present application DM/26/2178 - Land between 149 and 161 College Lane, as this statement now appears untrue, given that there has been no update to the district plan. We feel misled.

I therefore ask the Council to identify and explain when this boundary was changed and by whom. Please identify the relevant policy, evidence, and planning process responsible for this change.

- Next, if the proposal is being treated as "infill", the officer's report should clearly identify the policy definition being relied upon and demonstrate how this particular site and a development of six dwellings meet that definition, given that it is outside the built-up boundary, that there is no clearly defined existing building line, that the development will be largely perpendicular to the lane, and that the size of development exceeds the generally accepted limit of 1-2 houses for infill. The term "infill" surely cannot be applied in this situation.

- This application should not be considered in isolation from other recent proposals for development in this area, but instead alongside DM/24/1139 and other potential developments that will affect College Lane, including MM72.

- College Lane is a narrow country lane lined with many parked vehicles, having restricted width and limited continuous pedestrian provision. The addition of six dwellings would generate further traffic and create another access onto an already crowded and difficult road. Pedestrian safety, visibility, parking and emergency access and service vehicles must be considered. I have already witnessed on separate occasions an ambulance and a fire engine both unable to drive down College Lane due to a traffic jam and the lane being too narrow. Fortunately, nobody died on either occasion.

- DM/26/2178 currently is an area of undeveloped land along College Lane that contributes to the separation and special character of this part of Hurstpierpoint. The site is currently an undeveloped area used for livestock grazing that contributes to the semi-rural character and landscape as you approach the village. The possible continuing development of individual parcels along this part of College Lane is destroying the character and structure of Hurstpierpoint, along with the undeniable damage to nature and wildlife.

I formally object to planning application DM/26/2178 and request that this objection is considered at a public planning meeting so that all objections can be considered when the outcome of the application is determined.

Kind regards