

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 October 2026 19:45
To: planninginfo
Subject: Objections to Planning application DM/26/1926

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Planning application DM/26/1926 – Introduction of new perimeter security fencing, security gatehouse and cantilever gate at 3 Gothard Green Way, Goddards Green, Hassocks, BN6 9ZJ

I wish to object to this planning application and ask the Council to consider carefully whether the proposed development complies with the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031.

My objections relate to the visual impact of the proposed security arrangements, the treatment of the landscaped boundaries, the potential impact on biodiversity, and the lack of information about the operational requirements and intended use of the site.

1. Visual impact and character – Policy DP26

Policy DP26 (Character and Design) requires development to be of high-quality design, to respond appropriately to its surroundings, to include appropriate landscaping, and to protect trees and other features that contribute to the character of an area.

The application proposes 2.4-metre-high anti-climb weldmesh fencing incorporating flat razor wire, together with a security hut and a cantilever sliding gate. These are substantial security measures which could materially alter the appearance of the site.

I am concerned that the combination of high fencing, razor wire, a security gatehouse and a controlled entrance could create an unnecessarily harsh and industrialised appearance. The Council should assess the cumulative visual impact of these features, rather than considering each element in isolation.

The application statement asserts that the proposed works would be in keeping with other gates on the wider development. However, the existence of similar installations elsewhere does not, in itself, demonstrate that the proposed design is appropriate or that its visual impact has been adequately mitigated.

I ask the Council to require a proper assessment of the visual impact of the proposed fencing, razor wire, gatehouse and gate, including their appearance from the adjacent public footpath and the A2300 corridor.

2. Landscaping, trees and hedgerows – Policies DP26 and DP37

Policy DP37 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) requires development to incorporate and protect trees and hedgerows, prevent damage to root systems, provide appropriate protection during construction, and take opportunities to enhance green infrastructure.

The applicant's own tree statement acknowledges that the landscaping around the site is relatively new and that immature trees, whips and recently planted hedgerows occur along the boundaries, including beside the public footpath to the north.

Although the applicant suggests that the small dimensions of fence-post holes will minimise root damage, this does not fully address the potential effects of construction, access by machinery, excavation, soil compaction or damage to young planting.

The applicant's statement that the new fencing will, in places, replace existing fencing also does not establish that all proposed works can be undertaken without damaging the existing landscaping.

I ask the Council to ensure that the proposed development will not compromise the establishment and future growth of the landscaping, and to require appropriate protection measures and replacement planting where necessary.

The visual screening value of the new landscaping will increase as it matures. It should not be treated as unimportant simply because the planting is currently immature.

3. Biodiversity and ecological connectivity – Policy DP38

Policy DP38 (Biodiversity) recognises the importance of protecting and enhancing biodiversity and ecological networks.

The landscaped boundaries and hedgerows around the site may provide habitat and contribute to ecological connectivity. The Council should consider whether the proposed fencing, security installations and associated works could affect these functions, including through damage to vegetation or the introduction of additional security lighting.

I ask the Council to establish whether the ecological implications have been adequately assessed and whether any necessary mitigation should be secured through planning conditions.

4. Lighting and environmental effects – Policy DP29

Policy DP29 (Noise, Air and Light Pollution) requires development to minimise the effects of artificial lighting on local amenity, landscapes and nature conservation interests.

The application concerns a substantial security installation, but I have not identified sufficient information in the documents supplied to establish whether additional lighting is proposed or whether existing lighting arrangements will change.

I ask the Council to clarify whether additional security lighting, cameras or associated equipment are proposed as part of the development. If lighting is proposed, its intensity, direction, operating hours and potential effects on the adjoining public footpath, landscaping and wildlife should be assessed.

5. Insufficient information about the operational requirements

The planning statement says that the security works will allow a business to occupy the currently vacant unit and bring employment and spending to the local economy. However, the unit is described as vacant, and the documents do not adequately explain the specific operational requirements that make the proposed combination of fencing, razor wire, gatehouse and cantilever gate necessary.

I recognise that security requirements can be legitimate. Nevertheless, the Council should have sufficient information to assess whether the scale and design of the proposed installations are justified and

appropriate in this location, and whether a less visually intrusive arrangement could achieve the same purpose.

I also ask the Council to consider this application alongside the separate application DM/26/2085, which proposes substantial alterations to the same building and an increase in parking provision. The Council should establish whether these applications form part of a single development proposal and assess their combined implications.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I ask the Council to refuse planning permission unless and until it is satisfied that the proposal complies with Policies DP26, DP29, DP37 and DP38 of the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan.

At a minimum, I request that the Council obtain any further information necessary to assess the visual impact, protection of landscaping, ecological implications and lighting arrangements before determining the application.

Please confirm that this objection has been recorded against application DM/26/1926 and will be taken into account in determining the application.

Yours faithfully,

