

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 September 2026 15:33:52 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 26/09/2026 3:33 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:	Goldings 1 College Place Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex
----------	--

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 the proposed six dwellings at Land Between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint.

My objection concerns the location and nature of the proposed development, its relationship with the existing built-up area, the cumulative effect of development in this part of Hurstpierpoint, highway and pedestrian-safety concerns, the impact on the established settlement pattern and surrounding countryside, landscape and biodiversity considerations, and the potential implications for the long-term character, identity and spatial structure of the village.

1. Cumulative Development and the Settlement Boundary

My concern is not simply with this application considered in isolation. There has been a progression of development and planning activity on adjoining or nearby parcels around Hurstpierpoint, and I consider it important that the cumulative effect is properly assessed.

I recognise that each planning application must be determined on its individual merits. However, this should not mean that relevant planning history, the cumulative effect of development, or the resulting impact on the settlement pattern can be disregarded.

I therefore respectfully ask Mid Sussex District Council to demonstrate that consideration of this application is being driven consistently by the adopted development plan, relevant neighbourhood plan policies and objective planning considerations, rather than resulting incrementally in a de facto extension of the village.

DM/24/1139 and the Built-Up Area Boundary

The planning history of DM/24/1139 - Land at 147-149 College Lane is particularly important to the consideration of the present application.

DM/24/1139 involved the development of seven dwellings on greenfield farming land at 147-149 College Lane. The proposal was strongly opposed locally, including concerns regarding the development of countryside, the loss of an important gap, coalescence, the settlement boundary and highway considerations.

The application was nevertheless approved by the Mid Sussex District Council Planning Committee on 10 October 2024.

The determination of DM/24/1139 is particularly relevant because the question of the existing built-up-area boundary, and whether development becoming contiguous with the settlement would alter that boundary, was expressly raised during the Committee's consideration.

During the meeting on 10 October 2024, in response to a question from Councillor Hitchcock concerning whether the boundary associated with DM/24/1139 would effectively become the new

boundary for decisions about further development in the surrounding fields, I understand that planning officer Joanne Fisher responded:

"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. So new development would have to be contiguous with the existing boundary."

This statement is of considerable significance to the present application.

If the built-up-area boundary remained fixed following the approval of DM/24/1139, the Council should explain precisely how the current application site relates to that existing adopted boundary, rather than simply relying upon its physical proximity or contiguity with development subsequently permitted outside that boundary.

I therefore ask the Council to address the following questions directly:

Does MSDC still consider the above statement to represent the correct interpretation of the adopted built-up-area boundary and relevant planning policies?

If so, precisely how does the DM/26/2178 application site satisfy the requirement to be contiguous with the existing adopted built-up-area boundary?

Is the Council relying upon physical contiguity with the original built-up-area boundary, or is it relying upon the development permitted under DM/24/1139 as the basis for considering the current site to be part of the built-up area?

If the latter, how is that consistent with the statement that the built-up-area boundary would remain as it was drawn and that subsequent development becoming contiguous would not itself change the boundary?

Has the adopted built-up-area boundary actually been altered since the determination of DM/24/1139?

If the boundary has not been altered, where precisely does it run in relation to the DM/26/2178 application site?

If the Council considers that the planning position has changed since the 10 October 2024 statement, what policy, plan-making process or other planning mechanism has produced that change?

What evidence demonstrates that DM/26/2178 is genuinely within the existing built-up area rather than representing a further

outward step from the established settlement?

These questions are particularly important because DM/24/1139 was itself a development of previously undeveloped greenfield farming land and was treated as a specific, self-contained proposal.

The approval of that application should not automatically establish a principle that further adjoining parcels are suitable for residential development. If the Council's position is now that the existence of DM/24/1139 means that further development can be treated as contiguous with the built-up area, I ask the Council to explain how that position is reconciled with the statement made during the determination of DM/24/1139.

The concern is not that DM/24/1139 should automatically determine the outcome of DM/26/2178. Rather, it is that the Council should demonstrate that the settlement-boundary principle is being applied consistently.

If a development outside the established boundary can subsequently be used as the basis for treating further land as part of the built-up area, this potentially creates a mechanism whereby successive developments can progressively move the effective edge of the settlement into surrounding countryside, even though the formal boundary itself has not been amended through the plan-making process.

That is precisely the cumulative planning issue which I ask the Council to consider in determining this application.

I request that the officer's report identifies the relevant adopted settlement-boundary map, shows the precise relationship of the application site to that boundary, and explains the policy basis upon which the site is considered to be within, or appropriately related to, the existing built-up area.

2. Cumulative Highway, Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Impacts
The proposed six dwellings should, in my view, be assessed in the context of existing and proposed development affecting College Lane.

The proposal would introduce a further estate access and a substantial number of additional vehicle movements and parking requirements onto an already constrained historic route.

Relevant development and planning activity includes:

DM/24/1139: the development of seven dwellings immediately adjacent at 147-149 College Lane, including a new estate junction and associated parking;

Land East of College Lane / Thakeham scheme: proposals for a substantially larger residential development in the wider area; and

DM/25/3199: the approved two-storey expansion of Hurstpierpoint College, with the associated potential for increased servicing, delivery and coach movements.

College Lane is a narrow historic route which contains parked vehicles and areas where traffic and pedestrians have limited space. Concerns have previously been raised regarding the lack of continuous pedestrian provision.

I therefore ask that the highway implications of DM/26/2178 are considered cumulatively rather than simply by assessing the six additional dwellings in isolation.

In particular, I request consideration of:

the interaction between the proposed access and the access created through DM/24/1139;

pedestrian visibility and safety;

the lack of continuous pedestrian provision;

vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-pedestrian conflict;

cumulative traffic generation;

parking and manoeuvring arrangements;

emergency and service-vehicle access; and

the cumulative effect of other committed or proposed development using College Lane.

The officer's report should clearly explain how the relevant highway and pedestrian-safety considerations have been assessed, including the combined effect of existing, permitted and proposed development.

3. Settlement Pattern, Countryside and Ribbon Development

The application site currently forms a noticeable break in the built form along College Lane. I am concerned that development of this parcel would reduce that separation and contribute to an incremental outward expansion of the settlement.

The planning history of the immediate area is therefore particularly relevant.

DM/24/1139 was permitted as a specific development of seven dwellings. It should not automatically establish a principle that

further adjoining parcels are suitable for development.

The present application should therefore be assessed on its own merits while also considering whether permitting another group of dwellings would materially alter the established settlement pattern.

I ask the Council to consider:

the precise position of the site in relation to the established built-up area;

the existing settlement boundary;

the character and function of the undeveloped land between existing development;

the visual and spatial relationship between the village and Hurstpierpoint College;

the cumulative effect of further development on the remaining gaps between developed areas; and

whether approval would make further incremental development of adjoining land more difficult to resist.

The green and open character of this part of the parish contributes to the spatial identity and landscape setting of Hurstpierpoint.

Once undeveloped land is built upon, the resulting change to the settlement pattern is difficult to reverse. The Council should therefore consider not only the immediate physical impact of the proposal but also the precedent and cumulative spatial implications of further incremental development.

4. Whether the Proposal Properly Constitutes Infill Development
I am concerned that the proposal may be characterised as "infill" development when the physical characteristics and scale of the site require more careful consideration.

The proposal is for six dwellings, together with associated access, parking and infrastructure. The site currently provides a distinct area of undeveloped land rather than simply representing a minor gap within an otherwise continuous built frontage.

I therefore request that the officer's report clearly explains:

which policy definition or criteria are being applied to the term "infill";

how the application site satisfies those criteria;

how the scale of six dwellings is consistent with the relevant infill

policy;

whether there is a continuous established building line on both sides of the site;

how the proposal relates physically to the existing built-up area; and

whether the site is functioning as a genuine gap within the settlement or instead represents an extension of development into currently undeveloped land.

This distinction is important because describing a proposal as infill should not, by itself, determine whether the site is appropriately located for residential development.

The Council should demonstrate the actual policy basis for treating this particular site as infill and distinguish between genuine infill within an established built form and incremental expansion into undeveloped land at the edge of the settlement.

5. Brownfield Land and the CPRE State of Brownfield 2026

I also ask the Council to consider the latest CPRE State of Brownfield 2026 evidence as part of the wider policy context concerning the use of previously developed land.

CPRE's 2026 assessment reports substantial identified brownfield capacity in England, including land with planning permission which has not yet been built out. The report therefore raises wider questions about the extent to which additional development needs can be accommodated through previously developed land.

I recognise that national brownfield capacity does not automatically remove the need to consider local housing requirements, site-specific circumstances, viability, deliverability or the development plan. Nevertheless, I consider the issue relevant to the question of whether development of this particular area of undeveloped countryside is necessary.

I 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 such alternatives have not been considered, why not;

where brownfield sites have been considered but rejected, what evidence demonstrates that they are unavailable, unsuitable or incapable of delivery; and

how the proposed development of previously undeveloped land has been justified in the context of the available brownfield capacity identified nationally.

I request that the officer's report specifically records how this wider policy context has been taken into account.

6. Housing Need and the Nature of the Proposed Development

I recognise the importance of housing delivery and the need for planning authorities to consider housing requirements when determining applications.

However, I ask that the contribution of this particular proposal to housing need is assessed in qualitative as well as numerical terms.

If the proposed dwellings are predominantly larger market homes, the Council should explain how the proposal contributes to identified local housing needs and how it relates to relevant affordable-housing and housing-mix policies.

The existence of a general housing requirement should not, in itself, resolve the separate questions of whether this particular site is appropriately located, whether the development complies with the settlement strategy, and what environmental and infrastructure effects would result.

The Council should therefore explain how the proposed mix, tenure and size of dwellings responds to identified local housing needs and whether the proposal makes an appropriate contribution to those needs in this particular location.

7. Landscape, Character and Biodiversity

The application site is currently an undeveloped parcel of land used for livestock grazing and contributes to the semi-rural character and landscape setting of this part of Hurstpierpoint.

Development would introduce:

six residential dwellings;

associated gardens and domestic paraphernalia;

a new access arrangement;

parking areas;

additional hardstanding; and

associated vehicle and pedestrian activity.

I ask the Council to assess the effect of these changes not only within the site itself but also from surrounding public viewpoints and in the context of the cumulative change occurring along College Lane.

The proposal should also be considered against relevant biodiversity and nature-recovery policies, including the objectives of the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan and applicable national planning policy.

The wider environmental consequences of replacing an undeveloped parcel with residential development should be fully assessed, including any effects on existing habitats, ecological connectivity, landscape character and biodiversity.

The Council should also consider whether the proposed development would alter the perception and character of the approach to Hurstpierpoint and whether the introduction of residential development would result in a material change to the existing semi-rural setting.

8. Nature Recovery and the 30-Year Nature Recovery Strategy

I ask the Council to give specific consideration to the 30-Year Nature Recovery Strategy and the importance of protecting, restoring and enhancing nature as part of its assessment of this application.

The application site is currently an undeveloped parcel of land used for livestock grazing and forms part of the wider green and semi-rural setting of this area of Hurstpierpoint.

Although the site may appear relatively modest in scale, its value should not be considered solely by reference to the number of dwellings proposed. Consideration should also be given to its role within the wider landscape, ecological network and potential for nature recovery.

The proposed development would result in the permanent conversion of currently undeveloped land to residential use, including six dwellings, gardens, access, parking, hardstanding, lighting and associated domestic activity. These changes have the potential to affect existing habitats, biodiversity, ecological connectivity and the ability of the land to contribute to longer-term nature-recovery objectives.

I therefore ask the Council to demonstrate how the proposal has been assessed against the relevant objectives of the 30-Year Nature Recovery Strategy, together with applicable national planning policy, local biodiversity policies and the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan.

In particular, I ask the Council to consider:

whether the existing land contributes to an existing or potential ecological corridor or area of habitat connectivity;

whether the development would result in the loss, fragmentation or degradation of existing habitat;

whether opportunities for habitat restoration and nature recovery would be reduced by the proposed residential use;

the cumulative effect of this proposal alongside other permitted and proposed development in the College Lane area;

whether the proposed landscaping and biodiversity measures provide genuine long-term ecological enhancement rather than simply mitigating the immediate effects of construction;

the effect of domestic gardens, fencing, lighting, access arrangements and other infrastructure on ecological connectivity;

whether the development would result in the loss of opportunities for future habitat enhancement or restoration; and

how the proposal contributes to, or is consistent with, wider objectives for nature recovery over the next 30 years.

I would ask that the officer's report clearly identifies the relevant nature-recovery and biodiversity policies and explains how they have been applied to this particular site.

The assessment should also consider the cumulative impact of incremental development. The loss of individual areas of undeveloped land can appear relatively limited when each application is considered separately, but the combined effect may be significantly greater in terms of habitat connectivity, landscape character and opportunities for nature recovery.

I therefore request that the Council does not consider biodiversity solely in terms of a site-specific calculation or mitigation package, but also considers the wider strategic importance of retaining connected areas of undeveloped land and their potential contribution to long-term nature recovery.

9. Cumulative Impact on Hurstpierpoint

Taken together, the developments and proposals affecting this part of Hurstpierpoint raise a broader planning issue.

My concern is that individually modest decisions can have a materially different cumulative effect when considered together. The relevant question is therefore not simply what impact six additional houses would have in isolation, but what effect this proposal would have when combined with other committed,

permitted and proposed development in the immediate area.

I ask the Council to consider the cumulative consequences for:

the settlement boundary;

the spatial identity of Hurstpierpoint;

countryside and landscape character;

the relationship between the village and Hurstpierpoint College;

highway capacity and pedestrian safety;

biodiversity, ecological connectivity and nature recovery;

infrastructure;

the remaining separation between developed areas; and

the long-term settlement pattern.

In particular, I ask the Council to consider whether the progressive development of individual parcels of land is resulting in a cumulative change to the character and function of the area which would not be apparent if each application were considered entirely in isolation.

10. Transparency and the Planning Decision

For transparency, I respectfully request that the officer's report for DM/26/2178 expressly addresses the following matters:

the cumulative effect of recent, approved and proposed development;

the precise relationship between the application site and the existing built-up area;

the relevant settlement-boundary and countryside policies;

the planning significance of the Council's interpretation of "contiguous" when determining DM/24/1139;

whether the built-up-area boundary has changed in any way since the determination of DM/24/1139;

how the statement made by Joanne Fisher on 10 October 2024 regarding the continuing status of the built-up-area boundary applies to DM/26/2178;

whether the current application relies upon DM/24/1139 as establishing physical contiguity with the built-up area;

the basis upon which the proposal is considered to constitute infill, if that is relied upon;

the cumulative impact on the character and spatial integrity of Hurstpierpoint;

highway and pedestrian-safety implications arising from development in the wider College Lane area;

the availability and relevance of brownfield alternatives;

the implications of the CPRE State of Brownfield 2026 evidence;

biodiversity, landscape, ecological and nature-recovery considerations;

the relevance of the 30-Year Nature Recovery Strategy;

whether the proposal would result in the loss or fragmentation of habitat or ecological connectivity;

the cumulative effect of development on opportunities for long-term nature recovery; and

the consistency of the proposal with the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan.

I consider these to be material planning matters which should be addressed transparently before a decision is made.

11. Request for Committee Consideration

Given the level of local concern and the wider cumulative planning issues raised by this application, I request that consideration be given to determining the application through the District Planning Committee, rather than solely through delegated officer powers, where the Council's procedures permit this.

This would provide an appropriate opportunity for the cumulative planning issues surrounding this part of Hurstpierpoint to be considered openly and transparently.

12. Resubmission and Update to Objection

Please note that I am resubmitting this objection with additional concerns and information, as I wish to update and supplement my original submission.

For reasons of transparency, I am notifying you of the following circumstances surrounding the resubmission.

Despite making numerous attempts, I was unable to log into your planning portal. As a result, I am now resubmitting my objection

using a new login under my maiden name, Golding.

I am extremely concerned about the reliability and stability of the portal. The difficulties experienced have the potential to place residents at a significant disadvantage by preventing them from submitting or updating objections within the permitted timeframe.

This is particularly concerning given the proximity to the submission deadline. A planning consultation process should provide residents with a reliable and accessible means of submitting representations within the specified period.

The apparent instability of the portal at such a critical stage raises serious concerns about whether all residents have been afforded a reasonable opportunity to participate in the consultation process.

I therefore ask that this updated objection is accepted and placed on the planning file, and that the difficulties experienced with the portal are taken into account when considering the consultation process and the deadline for representations.

Conclusion

I remain extremely concerned about the long-term consequences of incremental development around Hurstpierpoint.

My objection is not simply opposition to one individual development. It concerns whether the cumulative pattern of development remains consistent with the adopted development plan, settlement strategy, countryside policies, biodiversity and nature-recovery objectives, and the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan.

The planning history of DM/24/1139 makes the issue of the settlement boundary particularly important. The Council should explain clearly how the principle stated during the determination of that application - that the built-up-area boundary would remain where it was drawn and would only change through the plan-making process - is being applied to the present proposal.

If that principle remains applicable, the Council should demonstrate precisely how DM/26/2178 satisfies it. If the Council now considers that the position has changed, it should identify the relevant policy, evidence or planning mechanism which has produced that change.

The character, identity and spatial structure of Hurstpierpoint, together with its countryside, landscape, biodiversity and potential for long-term nature recovery, are important community and environmental assets.

Once open land is developed, the resulting change to the

settlement pattern, landscape and ecological connectivity can be difficult, and in some respects impossible, to reverse.

I therefore respectfully ask Mid Sussex District Council to ensure that the cumulative social, environmental, highway, landscape, biodiversity and spatial consequences of DM/26/2178 are fully understood and properly assessed before any decision is made.

I formally object to planning application DM/26/2178 and request that this objection is placed on the public planning file and fully taken into account when the application is determined.

Kind regards