

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 September 2026 12:05:25 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 12:05 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:	139 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to object to the planning application DM/26/2178 This site was subject to a planning application for just three dwellings back in 2014 and was refused, since then nothing has changed. The site was deemed unsuitable as it would mean residents would be reliant on cars to access all local services, this remains the case today. The site is nearly 2 miles to the train station, nearly a mile to nearest bus stop and 1 1/2 miles to the centre of the

village. To walk to all these places residents would need to walk along a road without a pavement. The traffic survey in the application states there is an average of 50 vehicle movements on the lane per hour. This might be the average but gives a very skewed view, traffic at peak times is incredibly heavy often causing jams and queues to pass through the narrow part of the lane, which in turn leads to angry and aggressive driving from people that have been held up.

Since living in the lane I have had cars brush against me, a cyclist almost collide with me, another cyclist verbally abuse me after a near miss shouting and swearing that "I should not be walking in the road". This week I have had to step right into a hedgerow to avoid a speeding oncoming car and became entangled in brambles. These incidents have all occurred in the daytime and I always wear bright hi visibility clothing for my own safety.

The transport also cites that the development is close to a footpath making that a safe option for accessing the village, however, this is often very muddy/ flooded so only suitable for dog walking etc, not so much for accessing schools etc unless you can change children once they arrive which is not practical.

The traffic survey says that there have been no accidents in the area so the road is safe, however, since the survey a parked car has been written off in a hit and run and all residents will tell you of near misses that they have been involved in.

As regards the parking allocation on the site this again is wholly inadequate. The 2 bedroom properties in the application have upstairs studies which are technically bedrooms as does the three bedroom detached property. Therefore, the car parking allocation calculation is based on the wrong figures. Furthermore, given the inaccessibility of the site and lack of safe walking and close by public transport there will be an over reliance on cars and so properties are likely to have a higher number of vehicles than the calculation suggests. Also allowing just 2 visitor spaces for the development is ridiculous. This inadequate parking will lead to dangerous parking within the development blocking safe passage of refuse and emergency vehicles or will lead to more cars parked on College lane which in turn will make the road more dangerous than it already is, particularly as the site is close to two sharp blind bends.

The developers have called this an infill development. However, after the granting of the application 7 houses above this site the planning officer said that this would not change the boundary of the built up area and would not be justification for further development. Infill is normally limited to one or two properties and should continue an existing building line that exists on both sides of the site. This is far from the case here, there is not an existing building line and these houses are not in a line, it is an estate.

Furthermore infill developments should not be in open countryside, should not be different to the scale and character of existing properties, the nearest properties are a Victorian working terrace, and should not be allowed if the gap provides a visual break or view.

This road already has issues during the winter with drainage and flooding, rivers run down the road during heavy rain and often the flood water at the far end if college lane makes it impassable. Furthermore development will lead to a loss of open land and increase in impermeable surfaces leading to further pressure on the already inadequate drainage infrastructure. This problem is only going to escalate with climate change.

The only financial gain for this development is the pockets of the developers. It will not benefit the village, the house are not in the affordable bracket, the village services are already overstretched and the High Street is struggling and shops shutting as the traffic in the village centre and inadequate parking mean people avoid going into the village.

Instead this and other developments just lead to an increased cost to existing residents. Even less available appointments at the doctors, more difficulty getting children into local schools, less parking at the station. Increased traffic in the lane will mean that gradually local residents will just find it too difficult and dangerous to walk into the village and will be forced for their own safety to drive putting more strain on the roads and further polluting the environment.

There is of course a huge cost to local wildlife from the loss of open land and harm to the rural nature of this part of the village. This is currently grazing land and at a time when as a county we import 40% of our food and there is increasing environmental and geopolitical instability we should not be losing any farming land. The campaign for rural England surveys show that the country has enough brownfield sites to accommodate the building of 1.54 million homes, above that of housing target, there is no need to destroy the countryside.

This might only be an application for 6 homes which may not seem many but it is the cumulative effect. Hurstpierpoint is a village bursting at the seams it does not have the infrastructure to just keep slowly tacking on more and more homes. The roads in and out of the village are all struggling as they are narrow and there is no easy way to remedy this. The local services are all full, the schools, gps, station car park are all full. The roads around the school at pick up and drop off are nothing short of carnage with the car park full, cars are parked up to and on bends, on double yellow's, blocking drives and mounting pavements and grass verges. A child has recently been hit by a vehicle outside the school. The area is already extremely dangerous it cannot take anymore.

Given the size of this development it needs to be called in and not rubber stamped by a single planning officer.

Kind regards