

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 July 2026 21:38:41 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0624

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/07/2026 9:38 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Hurstpierpoint Methodist Church Hall 42 Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9SA
Proposal:	Technical Details Consent pursuant to permission in principle reference DM/25/0958/PIP (which granted planning permission in principle for the development of up to six residential dwellings (maximum floorspace of 1,000 sqm))
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	40 Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write to object to the above planning application in its current form. At the outset, I wish to make clear that I do not object in principle to the site being used for residential purposes, nor do I object to the principle of development on this land. I recognise the need for additional housing and appreciate the importance of making effective use of available sites. My objection relates specifically to

the scale and intensity of the proposed development and the resulting impact on neighbouring amenity and local infrastructure. In my view, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, with six dwellings being an excessive number for a plot of this size. This gives rise to a number of significant planning concerns.

1. Inadequate Parking Provision and Highway Impact

The proposed provision of four parking spaces for six dwellings is, in my opinion, insufficient and does not reflect realistic levels of vehicle ownership likely to arise from six separate households. The inevitable consequence is likely to be overspill parking onto the adjoining highway. The surrounding road network already has limited capacity for additional on-street parking and there is inadequate space on the main road to accommodate the likely number of additional vehicles generated by the development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users and states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Whilst I recognise that local parking standards vary between authorities, I do not believe that the proposed level of parking provision adequately serves six dwellings or reflects the practical realities of car ownership in the area.

2. Inadequate Bin and Cycle Storage Provision

The plans do not appear to provide adequate or practical space for the storage of refuse and recycling bins associated with six separate dwellings.

Similarly, there appears to be insufficient provision for secure and convenient bicycle storage. These are important considerations in assessing whether a development provides a satisfactory standard of accommodation and whether it can function effectively without creating additional visual clutter or inconvenience for neighbouring residents.

The lack of appropriate storage provision further supports the conclusion that the proposal seeks to accommodate too many units within the constraints of the site.

3. Loss of Privacy and Harm to Residential Amenity

My principal concern relates to the proposed gardens located to the southern side of the development which run directly alongside my property boundary.

The introduction of residential gardens in such close proximity to my boundary would significantly impact the privacy and enjoyment of both my house and garden. The increased activity associated with multiple households using these outdoor spaces would inevitably result in increased noise and disturbance immediately adjacent to my home.

The proximity of these garden areas to my doors and windows is of particular concern and would materially reduce the level of privacy currently enjoyed by my family.

In practical terms, I would likely be forced to substantially increase the height of my boundary treatment in an attempt to mitigate

overlooking and loss of privacy. Such measures would themselves result in a reduction in natural light reaching parts of my property and garden.

The planning system places considerable weight on protecting the living conditions and residential amenity of existing occupiers, and I believe this proposal would fail to achieve an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties.

4. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy from Windows

I am also concerned by the relationship between the proposed windows and those of my property.

The proposal would result in direct overlooking between first-floor windows and my upstairs bedroom windows, including a child's bedroom. This level of mutual overlooking would be intrusive and would materially reduce privacy for both existing and future occupants.

In addition, several proposed windows appear to have direct views into my rear garden, further reducing the privacy and enjoyment of what is currently a private residential space.

The impact of overlooking and perceived loss of privacy are well-established material planning considerations and should be carefully assessed against the local authority's adopted design and residential amenity policies.

5. Character of the Area and Overdevelopment

Whilst I support appropriate development, I do not consider that six dwellings on this site represent appropriate development.

The density and intensity of occupation proposed are not in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development along the road and would result in a form of development that appears cramped and over-intensive relative to neighbouring properties.

Taken together, the issues of inadequate parking, insufficient servicing and storage arrangements, overlooking, noise, and loss of privacy indicate that the proposal seeks to accommodate too many people on a plot that is simply not capable of supporting this level of development without causing harm to neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the local planning authority refuse the application in its current form.

My objection is not to residential development on the site itself, but rather to the excessive scale of the proposal and the resulting adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity, privacy, parking provision and the character of the area.

I ask that the authority gives careful consideration to these concerns when determining the application.

Kind regards