

Caroline Grist

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 23 June 2026 12:26
To: Caroline Grist
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/26/1259

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/06/2026 12:25 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Hillsborough House 118 High Street Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9PX
Proposal:	Proposed change of use from 6 self-contained flats to a single dwellinghouse.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	118 High Street Hillsborough House, Flat 5 Hurstpierpoint
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Planning Officer, I am writing to object to planning application DM/26/1259 for the proposed change of use of Hillsborough House, 118 High Street, Hurstpierpoint from six self-contained flats to a single dwellinghouse. My principal objection is that the proposal would result in the loss of six existing homes and replace them with one. This would represent a significant reduction in housing stock and would further narrow the range of housing available in the village. Smaller self-contained flats play an important role in providing homes for single people, younger working adults, couples and others who do not require or cannot afford larger family housing. In a settlement such as Hurstpierpoint, retaining a mix of housing types is important to maintaining a balanced and sustainable community.

The supporting statement places considerable weight on the building being more suitable for a single family home. However, the fact that a property may be convenient for one household type does not justify the loss of six existing homes from the local housing supply. Planning decisions should take account of the wider need for housing choice, including smaller homes that serve a broad section of the community.

The application also relies on earlier permissions, including DM/15/0334 and DM/19/1118, to show that residential use at the site has previously been accepted. While those permissions confirm the principle of residential use, they do not outweigh the current harm caused by the loss of six flats. Each application must be considered on its own merits, and the present proposal would materially reduce the number of homes on the site.

I also consider that the proposal would have a negative effect on the vitality of the village. Six occupied flats are likely to support more day-to-day use of local shops, services and facilities than one dwellinghouse. Reducing the number of households at this location would therefore be less supportive of the local economy and the life of the village centre.

As the site lies within a Conservation Area, the council should also give careful consideration to the effect of the proposal on the character of the area, including the cumulative impact of reducing residential density and housing diversity in this historic village setting.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Kind regards