

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 September 2026 08:03:25 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2178 - Duplicated Comments

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/09/2026 8:03 AM.

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:	120 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Formal Planning Objection - DM/26/2178
-----------	--

Application Reference: DM/26/2178
Site: Land between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint
Proposal: Erection of 6 dwellings with associated access, landscaping, parking and open space

Dear Case Officer,

I write to formally object to the above application and respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Whilst I recognise the need for additional housing within the District, this proposal represents an inappropriate form of development in the countryside and fails to demonstrate compliance with several key policies of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. My principal objections are summarised below.

1. Development Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary

The site lies outside the defined Built-Up Area Boundary and is therefore within the countryside. The Council's own pre-application advice concluded that residential development on this site would not satisfy the relevant countryside policies and would therefore be contrary to policy. Furthermore, a Planning Inspector dismissed an appeal on this same site in 2015, concluding that development would result in harmful urbanisation of the countryside and that refusal was justified even at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a five-year housing supply.

2. Harm to Rural Character and Landscape

The application has not been supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or any equivalent landscape appraisal. As a result, there is no robust evidence demonstrating compliance with countryside protection policies.

Previous assessments of this land by both the Council and the Planning Inspectorate have consistently identified the site as an important transition between the built settlement and the open countryside beyond. The appeal decision found that development would erode the attractive rural character of the area and create an undesirable urbanising effect. This proposal would result in the loss of openness and rural character that currently defines this section of College Lane.

3. Excessive Scale and an Overly Urban Form of Development

The Council's own pre-application officer concluded that the proposed six-dwelling scheme remained "too urban" for an edge-of-settlement rural location and requested a meaningful reduction in scale. Despite that advice, the submitted scheme remains substantially unchanged.

The proposal introduces a suburban-style arrangement of large detached dwellings positioned around an internal access road, together with extensive garage and parking provision. This pattern bears little resemblance to the established linear form of development along College Lane and would introduce an intrusive

urban character into a presently rural location.

4. Unsustainable Location

The site is not a sustainable location for residential development.

The applicant's own Transport Statement confirms that:

No footway exists immediately outside the site.

The nearest continuous footway is approximately 640 metres away.

The nearest bus stops are approximately 1.2 kilometres from the site.

Future residents would therefore be heavily reliant on private vehicles for access to services, employment, education and public transport. This directly conflicts with the objectives of sustainable development and relevant transport policies designed to reduce private car dependency.

5. Conflict with the Village Design Statement

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Hurst H5 requires development to follow the Village Design Statement. However, the application contains no meaningful assessment against that document.

The proposal conflicts with the established rural settlement pattern of College Lane, fails to reflect the traditional form of frontage development in the area and introduces materials and design approaches that are not clearly supported by the Village Design Statement. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate compliance with local design policy.

6. Drainage Concerns

The proposed drainage strategy depends upon upgrading an existing highway drainage pipe outside the application site from 225mm to 300mm.

These works are:

Outside the red-line application boundary.

Not included within the planning application.

Not secured through any legal agreement.

Not confirmed by the Highway Authority.

Accordingly, the applicant has not demonstrated that a deliverable and implementable drainage solution exists. In addition, infiltration testing has not been undertaken to justify discounting higher-order sustainable drainage options.

7. Inadequate Supporting Information

The application is also deficient in a number of important technical areas, including:

Affordable Housing

No clear gross internal floor area calculation has been provided to demonstrate whether the scheme exceeds the thresholds requiring affordable housing provision. The proposal comprises six large market houses with no affordable housing contribution.

Transport

The Neighbourhood Plan requires an up-to-date Transport Assessment, Travel Plan and consideration of cumulative traffic impacts. These have not been submitted.

Ecology and Biodiversity

The Biodiversity Net Gain calculations rely on a very small margin, while Great Crested Newt surveys were not completed despite one tested pond returning a positive result.

Heritage

The submitted Heritage Statement does not properly assess the significance of nearby heritage assets or the contribution their setting makes to significance. Nor does it address potential archaeological impacts.

Water Infrastructure

There is insufficient evidence demonstrating water supply capacity or compliance with required water-efficiency standards.

8. Cumulative Impact

This proposal cannot be considered in isolation. Seven dwellings have already been approved immediately adjacent to the site, and the applicant relies heavily on that approval to justify the current proposal.

The cumulative effect of incremental residential encroachment into the countryside along College Lane is a material planning consideration. The Planning Inspector previously warned that allowing development on this land could make it difficult to resist further piecemeal development, leading to progressive erosion of the rural character of the area. That concern is now becoming reality.

9. Coalescence and Local Gap Policies

The site lies within land identified as contributing to the separation of settlements and the prevention of coalescence. Despite this, the application contains no meaningful assessment of Local Gap policies or the cumulative impact of development along College Lane on settlement identity and openness.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, this application:

Represents unjustified residential development in the countryside.
Would harm the rural character and landscape setting of College Lane.

Is of an excessive scale and urban form for this location.

Occupies an unsustainable location reliant on private car travel.

Conflicts with local design policies and the Village Design Statement.

Has unresolved drainage and infrastructure issues.

Lacks key technical evidence necessary for proper determination.

Creates harmful cumulative impacts when considered alongside recent and proposed development in the area.

I therefore respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse planning permission for application DM/26/2178.

Yours faithfully,

Kind regards