

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 October 2026 22:07:10 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <susan.dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
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 10:07 PM.

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:	110 College Lane Hurstpierpoint
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Comment er Type:	Neighbour or general public
---------------------	-----------------------------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
---------	--

Reasons
for
comment:

Comment s:	I am writing to formally register my strong objection to the proposed residential development of 6 properties on land situated between 149 and 161 College Lane. The site is fundamentally unsuitable for this level of intensification, and the scheme should be refused on the following grounds: 1. Highway Safety, Access, and Transport Dependence Inadequate Road Network: College Lane is a narrow, single-track rural lane that
---------------	--

already suffers from severe daily congestion, frequent gridlock, and obstruction to emergency service vehicles. Adding further vehicle movements will exacerbate an already dangerous bottleneck.

Lack of Pedestrian Safety: There is no continuous footway along the lane, forcing pedestrians to walk directly in the carriageway alongside heavy traffic.

Isolation and Car Reliance: The site is poorly connected to local services. The walk to the village centre takes approximately 25 minutes via unlit rural paths and fields, which is impractical for daily commutes or utility journeys. The absence of nearby, frequent public transport options means future occupiers will be entirely dependent on private motor vehicles, directly opposing sustainable transport policies.

Request for Morning Site Inspection: To properly evaluate the daily impact on the road network, I urge the planning officer to conduct a site visit at approximately 8:15 AM on a weekday during school term time to observe the existing severe congestion and safety hazards firsthand.

2. Encroachment into the Countryside and Landscape Impact

Outside Built-Up Area Boundary: The application site lies outside the defined settlement boundary within open countryside and the Strategic Gap.

Precedent and Settlement Edges: The case officer for adjacent application DM/24/11390 explicitly confirmed on the record at Planning Committee that approving those 7 units would not alter the built-up area boundary. Consequently, this proposal cannot be considered contiguous with the existing settlement and represents uncoordinated urban sprawl.

Loss of Visual Amenity: The development will obstruct key public views across the countryside. The limited scope of visual impact identified in the applicant's supporting documentation fails to capture the true loss of rural landscape character and local wildlife habitat.

3. Drainage, Flooding, and Climate Resilience

Foul Drainage Deficiencies: The local infrastructure is already overburdened, with documented issues of foul discharge running into adjacent farmland.

Surface Water & Flood Risk: This specific section of College Lane is prone to severe surface water flooding, frequently rendering the road impassable.

Replacing an absorbent greenfield site with hardstanding will significantly increase run-off, worsening flood risks that are already escalating due to climate change.

4. Cumulative Impact and Local Context

Existing Construction Disruption: Local residents are currently enduring significant noise, dust, and heavy vehicle disruption from the neighboring site (DM/24/11390).

Wider District Plan Allocation: This application cannot be evaluated in a vacuum. The cumulative effect of this site, the adjacent development, and other proposed allocations across Hurstpierpoint will overwhelm local infrastructure, harm village identity, and create unmanageable highway congestion, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) principles regarding cumulative transport impacts.

5. Brownfield-First Principle

Adequate brownfield capacity exists nationally to meet housing delivery targets without sacrificing unallocated countryside and greenfield sites. Rural spaces like this field should be preserved.

For the reasons outlined above—specifically highway safety, landscape protection, poor connectivity, and flood risk—I urge the Authority to refuse this application.

Where
did you
hear
about this
applicatio
n?

Not specified

Kind regards