

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 February 2026 10:53:16 UTC+00:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2626

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/02/2026 10:53 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	42 Hurst Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9NL
Proposal:	Subdivision of the existing residential plot to create 2no residential dwellings, alongside retention of existing dwelling. Amended drawings received on 26.01.2026.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	44 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>PLANNING OBJECTION - LIGHTING, HIGHWAY SAFETY & RESIDENTIAL AMENITY</p> <p>We wish to object to the application on the grounds that the proposals fail to adequately assess or mitigate significant impacts arising from lighting, vehicle movements, pedestrian safety, and the siting of the access road immediately adjacent to our property.</p> <p>1. Absence of a Lighting Impact Assessment</p> <p>No Lighting Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application, nor has any assessment been undertaken of the</p>

following critical matters:

1. Vehicle headlight glare associated with the access road, parking area and turning point
2. Whether the driveway, parking areas or car port will be artificially lit
3. Internal light spill through glazing from the proposed dwelling
4. Baseline lighting conditions (the site and neighbouring gardens are currently in complete darkness)
5. Impacts on residential amenity or wildlife

There is also nothing shown on the submitted or approved plans indicating any lighting strategy, controls, hours of operation, or mitigation measures.

2. Steep Gradient and Headlight Glare

Crucially, the proposed access road rises on a steep gradient towards our property, a material consideration that has not been acknowledged or assessed. This gradient will significantly increase the projection of modern LED headlights into our garden (which is currently in complete darkness), directly into our kitchen windows and across our outdoor kitchen and eating area.

Our principal garden, outdoor seating area and habitable rooms are less than 2 metres from the access road, yet no allowance has been made for hedging, screen planting, or any meaningful mitigation to address light, noise or disturbance arising from vehicle movements.

3. Lack of Passing Provision and Operational Impacts

The submitted plans make no provision for vehicles to pass along the access road. This omission is significant.

In practice, vehicles will be required to stop, wait, reverse or manoeuvre on the incline, resulting in:

- Prolonged headlight glare
- Increased noise
- Exhaust fumes

These impacts will occur immediately adjacent to our garden and habitable rooms, particularly during hours of darkness. These predictable operational impacts have not been assessed or mitigated and further compound the harm to residential amenity.

4. Pedestrian Safety, Access Design and Highway Impacts

The submitted plans also raise serious concerns regarding pedestrian safety, particularly in relation to the proposed infill dwelling.

As shown on the As Proposed Site and Ground Context Plan (Drawing No. 1684 3.002 Rev C), the infill house is positioned immediately to the west of the main dwelling, with its front door opening directly onto the shared access driveway. This driveway serves as the sole access and egress for a minimum of eight vehicles, together with service and delivery vehicles, via a single entry and exit point.

The driveway passes directly in front of the infill dwelling with no segregated pedestrian route, footway, or safety buffer shown on the plans. This creates an inherent conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

The risk is materially exacerbated by:

- The driveway approaching on a gradient, increasing vehicle speeds and reducing stopping distances
- Restricted visibility caused by retained trees and planting
- The absence of passing provision, meaning vehicles will stop, wait, reverse or manoeuvre directly in front of the dwelling entrance

In practice, occupants and visitors to the infill dwelling - including children - would be required to step directly onto a sloping vehicular access serving multiple dwellings, with compromised visibility. No swept-path analysis, pedestrian tracking, or highway safety assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that this arrangement would operate safely.

The conflict between vehicles and pedestrians is therefore not an unavoidable site constraint, but the direct consequence of the chosen layout and intensity of development. No alternative access alignments or layout options appear to have been explored to avoid placing a residential front entrance directly onto a shared vehicular access.

5. Inadequacy of Fence-Based Mitigation

A simple 2-metre close-boarded fence cannot mitigate headlight glare arising from vehicles manoeuvring on a steeply inclined access road. Modern LED headlights have a spread of up to approximately 60 metres, and fencing does not address the cumulative impacts of proximity, gradient, vehicle movements, stopping and reversing, nor the absence of passing provision. These are technical matters that require proper assessment, not assertion.

Given the complexity and sensitivity of the impacts - including steep gradients, headlight glare, pedestrian conflict, proximity to habitable rooms and ecological considerations - any Lighting Impact Assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified and reputable lighting specialist, with demonstrable experience in residential amenity and ecological assessments, and must be capable of withstanding independent technical scrutiny.

6. Driveway Siting and Over-Intensive Layout

Having reviewed the applicant's As Proposed Site and Ground Context Plan (Drawing No. 1684 3.002 Rev C) and sought further legal advice, we wish to clarify that the driveway and car port are positioned directly along our shared western boundary, immediately adjacent to our principal garden and living areas. This alignment appears to arise from the applicant's decision to accommodate multiple built elements on the plot, rather than from any inherent site constraint. The resulting impacts - including headlight glare, light spill, pedestrian conflict and disturbance from vehicle movements - are therefore layout-driven harms, not unavoidable site impacts.

The proposed fence appears to function as a compensatory measure for proximity rather than as mitigation arising from an evidence-led assessment. No alternative driveway alignments or layout options appear to have been explored, and no technical evidence has been provided to demonstrate that fencing alone would adequately address the impacts shown on the submitted

plans.

We respectfully request that the acceptability of the driveway siting be assessed on its own planning merits, including whether the overall scheme represents an over-intensive use of the plot that is driving harm to neighbouring amenity.

7. Arboricultural Concerns

We are also concerned by the Arboricultural Addendum submitted by Arborsense. The assessment of our Ash tree lacks detailed justification, particularly in relation to long-term impacts arising from vehicle movements, surfacing, and altered ground conditions adjacent to the access track. Given the reliance placed on this document, its adequacy should be carefully reviewed.

8. Policy Context

The proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular:

- Paragraph 110 - requiring developments to achieve safe and suitable access for all users
- Paragraph 111 - stating that development should only proceed where there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety
- Paragraph 127(b) and (c) - requiring development to ensure a high standard of amenity and to function well

It also conflicts with Local Plan policies that seek to ensure:

- Safe pedestrian and vehicular access
- Appropriate access design relative to the scale and intensity of development
- Avoidance of layouts that create conflict between vehicles and residential entrances

9. Conclusion

In the absence of:

- A Lighting Impact Assessment
- Any assessment of headlight glare, internal light spill or baseline darkness
- Consideration of driveway gradient, proximity, pedestrian safety or vehicle manoeuvring
- Passing provision or segregated pedestrian routes
- Evidence-led mitigation or alternative layout options

the application fails to properly assess or address its impacts on residential amenity, highway safety and the local environment.

We respectfully request that the application be refused

Amber & Tony Parr
44 Hurst Road

Kind regards