

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 October 2026 12:18:49 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@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 12:18 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:	5 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 commenting to object to the proposed development of 6 houses. I believe that development should not be allowed at this site for many reasons including, but not limited to:
---------------	--

- The site is within the local gap identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The impact on traffic on College Lane and unsustainable transport plans.

- The cumulative impact of this site together with the local sites in the proposed modifications to the district plan.
- The problems with adequate water supply and drainage in the area
- And the impact of the development on the rural character of the area.

Coalescence between Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill.

The current district plan makes it clear under policy DP13: Preventing Coalescence that "The settlement pattern of Mid Sussex makes an important contribution to the distinctive character of Mid Sussex and therefore a strategic objective of the Plan is to promote well located and designed development that reflects the distinctive towns and villages, retains their separate identity and character and prevents coalescence." There is no proposed change to this policy in schedule of main modifications so it must still apply. It further makes it clear that "Local Gaps can be identified in Neighbourhood Plans [...] where there is robust evidence that development within the Gap would individually or cumulatively result in coalescence and the loss of the separate identity and amenity of nearby settlements." In this case there is an identified Local Gap which is in the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish 2031 Neighbourhood Plan (Policy C3). The development would sit outside the built up area boundary and within the identified Local Gap. Development of it would reduce the Local Gap and contribute to both coalescence and to a loss of the distinctiveness of Hurstpierpoint and Burgess Hill.

The impact on traffic on College Lane and beyond.

While, as part of the District Plan examination, there have been traffic studies that have looked at the potential impact of development on junctions, the District Council has not assessed the impact on College Lane, which is well known by local residents as a congestion hot spot. College Lane is a narrow rural lane with no footway at this point, and sections close to the proposed development are too narrow for two vehicles to pass which makes it incredibly unsafe for pedestrians - so much so that Hurstpierpoint College will not allow its pupils to walk to the school.

Despite this the developer is claiming in their Transport Statement that school aged children will be able to walk to the local bus stop when in reality the road is unlit at that point and they would need to walk in the road for 700m until they reach the footpath. The exact walk that Hurstpierpoint College deems unsafe for its pupils. Realistically there is inadequate pedestrian access to the primary school, healthcare and retail facilities in Hurstpierpoint, residents would need to drive to these as well as to the local railway station or secondary school which will involve them driving through both Hurstpierpoint High Street and the Stonepound Crossroad. The Stonepound junction has already been found to be 'Severely Impacted' and this development will add to this. Hurstpierpoint High Street is also a well known congestion hot spot which in places is only wide enough for a single vehicle and which is constrained by listed buildings and unsuitable for traffic lights. Congestion here is at least as bad as at the Stonepound Crossroad but this doesn't appear to have been assessed in the District Council's traffic studies and yet any residents from this development will need to use this road to access their local shops, primary school, health centre and library. The application should not

be approved until the impact of the proposed development on these local traffic pinch points has been looked at as part of the District Plan Examination. (As an aside it is interesting that the traffic assesment states the speed limit outside the site is 60mph when this hasn't been the case for 2 years and which suggests the authors haven't even visited the site but have instead relied on Google street view which still shows the old speed limit. They also quote a WSCC comment on another site suggesting there is street lighting by the proposed site, but there is no lighting on this section of College Lane.)

The cumulative impact of this development plus the other proposed allocations in and around Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common.

This site is being considered individually but at the same time the district plan is proposing to add around 5,936 additional dwellings across the parish of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common and neighbouring Albourne, with approximately 880 located on College + Malthouse Lane. While this proposal for 6 homes might seem insignificant compared to the scale of the other proposed developments it seems wrong to consider it in isolation rather than examining the cumulative impact of this scale of development on both the Lane and on the local area. I would ask that this development is considered as part of the total planned changes with modelling carried out to understand how it, alongside the other proposed developments, will impact traffic, road safety, the separate identity of settlements, the open countryside, local facilities and utilities.

The problems with adequate water supply and drainage in the area.

When it comes to drinking water, we have been living with restrictions ('hosepipe bans') for much of the last 5 years. Restrictions have been in place in 2022, 2023, 2025 and 2026 and have often lasted from July through to the following February. In the last year our local secondary school has twice been forced to close due to a lack of water meaning our children, who are currently doing their GCSEs, have had to miss these days of school. Houses in the area have gone without water for days at a time and, according to South East Water, "During the summer/autumn drought in 2025, water storage levels in Ardingly Reservoir in Sussex fell so low that we had less than 30 days' worth of supply left. We started planning for a Level 4 emergency situation in the county because of this." As I write in October South East water have just announced that the situation is getting worse this year with all hospice exemptions being cancelled and Ardingly reservoir only 22% full. And while water shortage are an issue in much of the south east, it is an issue that impacts Hurstpierpoint more than much of the local area. There are no hosepipe bans in place in Brighton, 4 miles to the south, in Crawley, 11 miles north or in Lewes 7 miles East. The Low Weald is especially badly impacted and yet is here that the majority of of new housing in the region is being planned. Then when it comes to sewage, the local sewers have repeatedly failed in the last 18 months with burst pipes pumping raw sewage into gardens, roads and allotments. As a result Malthouse/College lane has been closed at least 5 times for either sewer repairs or to allow emergency pumping of the pipes. This development, alongside the huge planned increase of the local population, will inevitably make things worse with no realistic prospect of increasing supply in the mid term and no guarantee of adequate sewers. How many more days of

missed school are acceptable? How many more houses without access to drinking water are ok? And how much more raw sewage and road closures should we be happy to put up with?

The impact of the development on the rural character of the area and on the South Downs National Park.

One of the joys of living in Hurstpierpoint is that we are surrounded by glorious countryside and this site is in that open countryside as well as being close to the listed buildings of the College.

This was given as a reason for rejecting development of a site just to the North West of this site in 2020:

"The proposed site is directly adjacent to the grounds of the College and would have a significant impact on the nature of its setting and outlook and on the approach to the College from the west. The existing rural setting is considered to make a positive contribution to the manner in which the special interest of the College is appreciated. Development on the site would be detrimental to this NPPF: LSH, MID/HIGH."

and

"This site has substantial landscape sensitivity and substantial landscape value. This site could be visible from the surrounding countryside and potentially from the South Downs National Park."

This site - especially when considered alongside the previous approval of DM/24/1139, and alongside the proposed sites in the District Plan will have a significant impact on the rural setting and the setting of the college when viewed from both College Lane and from the SDNP.

In conclusion:The proposed site sits in the Local Gap defined under policy C3 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish 2031 Neighbourhood Plan and so is in breach of policy DP13: Preventing Coalescence in the Mid Sussex District Plan.It's distance from facilities like a station and secondary school mean that it will be very reliant on car usage which will greatly add to local congestion hot spots.

And despite the application being concurrent with plans to add 880 homes to the Lane and almost 6,000 to the local area, there appears to have been little effort made to consider the cumulative impact with inadequate attempts at traffic monitoring (beyond local junctions) and no evidence that local heath centre and school capacity can absorb the potential growth; that the road network can cope or that there will be sufficient water supply and sewerage.The site is not a sound allocation and it is not consistent with national policy. Its allocation diminishes a protected local gap, relies on an inconsistent and non-transparent evidence base, and its cumulative road, sustainability and infrastructure effects have not been assessed. The application should therefore be refused.

Where did you hear	Not specified
--------------------	---------------

about this
applicatio
n?

Kind regards