

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 March 2026 20:08:50 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2155

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 31/03/2026 8:08 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Nupur Indian Restaurant 122 High Street Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9PX
Proposal:	Proposed new 2no bedroom dwelling to the rear of 122 High Street. Revised plans and SUDS Drainage Report received 12.03.2025.
Case Officer:	Anna Tidey

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Highgate, South Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Dear Sir/Madam,

****Re: Objection to Planning Application DM/25/2155 - Proposed Two-Storey Dwelling on Private Access Road adjacent to Nupur, 122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint (Conservation Area)****

I write to formally object to the above planning application. I am a nearby resident and am directly affected by this proposal. I consider the development to be contrary to both local and national planning policies for the following reasons:

****1. Harm to the Character of the Conservation Area****

The site lies within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, which is characterised by its historic layout, open green spaces, and low-density village form. The introduction of a modern two-storey dwelling in this sensitive location would erode this character and diminish the openness currently experienced along the access road.

While there is a two-storey building in the wider vicinity, this is a historic structure that forms part of the established heritage character of the area. It cannot reasonably be used to justify the introduction of a new modern dwelling of similar height. The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy DP35 and Policy HurstC1.

****2. Inappropriate Scale, Design, and Inconsistency with Surroundings****

The buildings immediately adjacent to the proposed site-including those either side of the access-are all single-storey and were subject to strict planning controls regarding height and materials in order to maintain the character of the area.

The introduction of a two-storey modern structure would be wholly inconsistent with this established pattern of development and would undermine the integrity of those earlier planning decisions. It would also set a harmful precedent for further erosion of carefully maintained design standards.

This is contrary to Policy DP26 (Character and Design).

****3. Overbearing Impact and Loss of Outlook Due to Elevated Position****

A critical factor in this proposal is the site's elevated position relative to the High Street. Properties along the High Street sit at a lower level due to the natural rise of the land toward the recreation ground.

As a result, the proposed two-storey dwelling would appear significantly more dominant when viewed from neighbouring properties. This would lead to a serious loss of outlook, including from first-floor windows, and create an overbearing and enclosing effect.

****4. Unacceptable Proximity to Neighbouring Dwellings****

The proposed development would be located in extremely close proximity to existing residential properties-less than 5 metres from the rear door of neighbouring homes. This degree of proximity is

inappropriate for a development of this scale.

It would result in a harmful sense of enclosure, loss of privacy, and increased noise and disturbance, both during the construction phase and once occupied. The intensity of development within such a confined space fails to respect the amenity of neighbouring residents and is indicative of overdevelopment of the site.

****5. Access, Safety, and Proven Structural Risk on the Private Road****

The site is accessed via a narrow private road that is not suitable for increased traffic or large vehicles. There is already clear evidence of harm: a neighbouring residential property to the west has recently required structural rebuilding due to damage caused by oversized vehicles using the road as a turning point.

The proposed development would inevitably increase vehicle movements, exacerbating these risks and posing a danger to both property and pedestrian safety-particularly given the proximity to the recreation ground.

This is contrary to Policy DP21 (Transport and Access).

****6. Harm to the Setting of the Recreation Ground and Loss of Openness****

The development would visually encroach upon the adjacent recreation ground, diminishing its openness and the contribution it makes to the character of the Conservation Area.

This is contrary to Policy DP24 (Leisure and Open Space).

****7. Inappropriate Backland Development****

The proposal represents a form of backland or infill development within a constrained and sensitive site. This is not a natural continuation of the built frontage, but a secondary access serving existing dwellings and open space.

The development would result in a cramped and over-intensive form of development, out of keeping with the established spatial pattern, and would place undue pressure on substandard access arrangements.

****Conclusion****

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuses planning application DM/25/2155 on the following grounds:

- * Harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
 - * Inappropriate scale, design, and inconsistency with surrounding development
 - * Overbearing impact and loss of outlook due to elevated position
 - * Unacceptable proximity and loss of residential amenity
-

- * Unsafe and unsuitable access, with evidenced structural risk
- * Harm to the setting and openness of the recreation ground
- * Inappropriate and over-intensive backland development

The proposal is inconsistent with Policies DP21, DP24, DP26, and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, as well as Policy HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Kind regards