

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 02 October 2026 10:22
To: planninginfo
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 02/10/2026 10:21 AM.

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:	106 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	To Mid Sussex District Council Re planning application DM/26/2178 Representation letter 1st October 2026 Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the Council, We are writing to object to the above quoted planning application for 6 houses to be built at a site between 149 and 161 College Lane. We are house owners living at 106 College Lane. College Lane is currently being subjected to planned overdevelopment by builders, which it cannot sustain. College Lane is an overly narrow roadway that is frequently blocked by traffic, due to the

continued expansion of the College and other building works, as well as repairs, due to river over flows and poor road surface and under-maintained utilities.

As the rivers and sewers which flow down the lane, or under it, and across it, are never properly managed, we often find that the lane is closed for repairs. More house-building will lead to increased pressure and therefore, increased repairs (unless the proper infrastructure is built - e.g. new sewers down the road and new sewers in Burgess Hill, and solutions to the flooding in Malthouse Lane, which leads to it being closed frequently).

When sewers from Burgess Hill discharged last year into the (highly important chalk streams) in Malthouse Lane, both northward heading roads (Cuckfield Road and Malthouse Lane) were blocked by tankers pumping waters out of the rivers for a considerable time meaning we could not leave the village in those directions. This is a minor inconvenience when compared to the true tragedy, which is the massive environmental damage those incidents bring about, and which councils do not seem to care about or act upon.

Outside our house at 106 and our neighbour's at 108 the sewer has collapsed which for years meant a huge dip in the road. Letters to the council about this problem received no response or action. However, recently, the road was completely resurfaced meaning that all these 'problems' were simply tarmacked over - we assume pushing the sewerage out into the environment beneath the road and houses. This careless approach will poison the very land we sit on and, as more houses are planned for, no proper infrastructure is being added or developed.

These new houses are also being planned for greenfield sites outside the village boundary. They are encroaching on the chalk streams, which, once sufficiently polluted, will no longer support the delicate ecosystems that survive there. These are documented ancient streams, which have survived from the last ice age and are a unique feature of this part of Sussex.

At this time of climate change we should be supporting the environment and building on brownfield sites only. A great section of Burgess Hill town centre sits empty and undeveloped

This brown field site is on our doorstep and nothing is being done about redeveloping it - so 'housing need' is actually not being addressed by this new proposed development

The houses planned for are not even eco homes. Why are new houses that are not even eco homes being planned for and built at this time? It should be enshrined in house-building policy that all new homes MUST be eco homes with as little as possible impact on the environment. New houses should be recycling and reusing their grey water and being powered independently from the grid at the very least. If central government has not insisted on it, which is a failure at this time, councils, who are stewards of the environment, must step up to the plate instead to secure our futures, through sustainability.

Therefore:

- 1 As not eco homes, these proposed houses are not a benefit to the environment, and are not sustainable,
2. They promote damage to the chalk streams, the wildlife and the environment.
3. They take up countryside on ancient and beautiful farmland obstructing fine views over the countryside.
4. They are not being built as affordable homes to benefit the community.
5. They are proposed to be built outside the village boundary in contravention of the council's own rules and regulations.
6. They are an increased burden on the all ready overstretched infrastructure. This includes the already busy railways as well as roads and sewers.

7. These houses are being built to provide monetary return to the landowner and the developer. That is the only reason for their construction. As this is the only reason for development, it is utterly wrong that they should go ahead. Our countryside is being developed for profit and future generations are being denied the benefit of the countryside.

[Redacted signature block]

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted name]

Where did you hear about this application?	Not specified
--	---------------

Kind regards