

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 July 2026 22:03:39 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 10:03 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 wish to submit a further representation regarding the above application. I understand that Permission in Principle has already been granted for residential redevelopment of the site for up to six

dwellings. As such, I am not seeking to re-open the principle of residential use. However, I do have serious concerns about the acceptability of the current detailed design and its impact on neighbouring residential amenity and the conservation area.

1. Overlooking, Privacy and Residential Amenity

My primary concern relates to the very close relationship between the proposed development and my property.

The proposed windows and private garden areas are positioned approximately 3 metres from my boundary and in some cases directly facing existing habitable room windows. This represents an unacceptably close interface between habitable spaces.

The result would be:

- * direct overlooking into my home, including an upstairs bedroom used by a child;
- * direct overlooking of my private rear garden;
- * a significant and permanent loss of privacy;
- * increased perception of enclosure due to proximity of built form and boundary activity.

These impacts are not minor or subjective; they represent a fundamental change in the residential amenity currently enjoyed and would be clearly noticeable on a daily basis.

The planning system places strong emphasis on safeguarding the living conditions of existing residents, including privacy and outlook. In this case, the proposed separation distances are significantly below what would normally be considered acceptable between habitable room windows and neighbouring properties.

2. Noise and Disturbance from Garden Use

The proposed six residential gardens run directly alongside my boundary.

This would result in:

- * continuous and close-range use of outdoor amenity space immediately adjacent to my property;
- * increased noise and activity from six separate households rather than one;
- * a significant reduction in the tranquillity currently enjoyed in my garden and rear rooms.

While residential development is expected to generate some level of activity, the intensity and proximity of six separate gardens immediately adjacent to an existing dwelling would create an unacceptable level of disturbance.

3. Conservation Area Impact

The site lies within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, where there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Whilst the reuse of the existing building is supported in principle, I am concerned that the level of subdivision and intensity of residential use, together with associated domestic paraphernalia (bins, cycles, parking, fencing and garden separation), risks eroding the character of the original building and its setting.

The introduction of a highly intensive residential arrangement within a sensitive historic building should be carefully assessed to ensure it does not result in an over-urbanised appearance that is out of keeping with the conservation area.

4. Inadequate Consideration of Residential Interface

The cumulative impact of:

- * close-proximity windows,
- * private gardens abutting boundaries,
- * and limited separation distances,

results in a poor residential relationship between the development and neighbouring property.

Even where internal conversion is acceptable in principle, the detailed layout must still ensure that neighbouring amenity is not materially harmed. In this case, the relationship appears overly constrained and results in an intrusive level of mutual overlooking.

Conclusion

While I do not object to the residential reuse of the building, I consider that the current detailed proposal fails to provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity for neighbouring occupiers and does not adequately respect the sensitive conservation area setting.

I respectfully request that the application be refused or, at minimum, significantly amended to address overlooking, separation distances, and the treatment of boundary-adjacent gardens.

Kind regards