

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 September 2026 11:20:57 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2054

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/09/2026 11:20 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Prince Albert Copthorne Bank Copthorne Crawley West Sussex RH10 3QX
----------	--

Proposal:	Sever land and erect two detached dwellings with associated access and parking.
-----------	---

Case Officer:	Andrew Watt
---------------	-------------

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Ash grove House Brookhill Road Copthorne
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
-----------------	-----------------------------

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to object to the proposed construction of two houses within the garden of the village pub.
-----------	---

1. Loss of an important village community facility

The pub is an important community facility and a valued village family pub. Its garden is an integral part of its use and appeal, providing valuable outdoor space for families, children and other customers.

The construction of two houses within the garden would permanently reduce the outdoor facilities available to the pub and diminish its value and attractiveness as a village community facility.

The village should be protecting and retaining its existing community facilities rather than allowing them to be progressively reduced.

2. An inappropriate location for residential development

The proposed houses would be built within what is currently the pub garden, immediately alongside an active public house.

This raises questions about whether the proposed location would provide an appropriate and attractive residential environment for future occupants. Living within the garden of an operating village pub could expose residents to noise, activity, customers using the garden, deliveries, evening activity and other normal operations associated with a public house.

Equally, the introduction of private residential properties into the pub garden could create potential conflicts between the future residents and the continued operation of the pub.

It is difficult to see why this particular part of the site should be used for residential accommodation when it is currently providing valuable outdoor space for an established village community facility.

3. The proposed houses are out of keeping with the surrounding area

The proposed houses would be out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding properties.

The neighbouring properties are predominantly bungalows and chalet bungalows, which are generally lower in height and have a different scale and character to the proposed development.

The introduction of two houses of a greater scale and height would be visually intrusive and would not reflect the established pattern and character of development in this part of the village.

4. Overbearing and prominent position

The proposed houses would be located at the top of the hill, making them particularly prominent within the surrounding landscape and village.

Their position and scale would result in an overbearing

development and would have a significant visual impact.

The elevated location makes it especially important that any development is appropriately designed and carefully integrated with the existing low-rise properties. I do not believe these proposals achieve this.

5. Cumulative impact of development in the village

The village has already experienced considerable new housing development, and there are also potential sites identified that could provide hundreds of additional homes.

In these circumstances, the provision of two additional houses must be balanced against the permanent loss of part of an existing village community facility.

There is a clear difference between providing housing where it is appropriate and sacrificing part of an established pub garden to create two homes in a location that is poorly suited to residential development.

6. Previous application

A previous application involving development of the pub garden was refused.

The fact that the residential element has now been submitted as a separate application does not remove the concerns about the loss of the pub garden or its impact on the pub and the character of the village.

Kind regards