

Susan Dubberley

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 September 2026 13:00
To: Susan Dubberley
Subject: Objection to Planning Application DM/26/2178 WITH ATTACHMENT
Attachments: Objection to Planning Application DM262178 6 houses.docx

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: Planning Application DM/26/2178 Proposed 6 Dwellings at Land Between 149 And 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint

Dear Susan

Here is my objection to Planning Application DM/26/2178 (also attached). I have emailed this due to the portal sometimes not working and there being not trust in its functionality. Please could you confirm receipt of this email. Thank you.

I am writing to object to Planning Application DM/26/2178 — Proposed 6 Dwellings at Land Between 149 And 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint.

Firstly, I would like to request that this application is called in as would be expected for any application over 5 houses.

Before I go into specific issues here is my personal experience

All that I write in this objection needs to be taken in the context of the large amount of development in this immediate area in the District Plan and also threatened in the many Main Modifications proposed for this area which could add a further 5900 houses in Hurstpierpoint, Albourne and Sayers Common.

College Lane is a small, narrow, rural lane which is already facing considerable development and cannot absorb any further new houses. We already have more and more traffic using the lane and at certain times of day, it can be impassable. And it only takes one lorry getting stuck in the narrow part of the lane (Wickham Conservation area) or a often occurring chaotic school run for Hurst College and it is blocked and the road gridlocked.

This development would cause a further strain on our local infrastructure. Some of the existing infrastructure is broken and cannot cope with current demand. Details to follow.

In addition to my personal experience there are concrete planning considerations to be taken into account.

Previous refusal

This application has been refused before because it is located within the countryside area of development restraint and of a semi-rural character providing the transition between the built-up part of the village and countryside beyond. Also, the proposal harms the character and appearance of the locality. It is also deemed to be in an unsustainable location where occupants would be reliant of the use of a private car to gain access to local services. The development conflicting with paragraphs 7, 14, 17 and 55 of the NPPF, policies C1, H11 and T4 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan and policies C1, C3 and H1 of the emerging Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan.

These factors have not changed.

The local gap and incorrect characterisation as an infill development

The need to protect the local gap

This plot is outside the village building boundary therefore still in an area of development restraint.

DM/24/1139 was built on greenfield farming land, was strongly opposed, and granted as a single, self contained entity. In relation to 1139 is very important to note that on 10th Oct 2024 when answering Councillor Hitchcock's question (36 mins into the meeting) about whether the boundary to DM/24/1139 would become the new boundary for decisions about further developments in the surrounding fields the planning officer, Joanne Fisher, responded:

"The built up area boundary would remain as it is drawn. Just because new development then becomes contiguous does not change the position of the development boundary. It would only change if a new district plan updated it. So new development would have to be contiguous with the existing boundary."

Was this in fact not true?

Instead does MSDC consider that allowing individual developments on adjoining parcels over and over again, effectively extending **the village boundary each time**, rather than through well thought through planning policy and resultant decisions? Or is there a policy on definition of a boundary which allows for this? Such incremental development sets a dangerous planning precedent and a free for all for developers.

Local gaps need to be protected from development. This allocation will create an adverse impact on the local gap contrary to current policy DP13 (Preventing Coalescence) of the District Plan and Policy Countryside Hurst C3 of the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan which protects the separation of settlements. Development here reduces openness and moves the two settlements towards coalescence.

Current Policy DP13 states:

"The individual towns and villages in the District each have their own unique characteristics. It is important that their separate identity is maintained. When travelling between settlements people should have a sense that they have left one before arriving at the next." The policy goes on to state that proposed development should not *"result in the coalescence of settlements which harms the separate identity and amenity of settlements and would not have an unacceptably urbanising effect on the area between settlements."*

Not infill

The proposal states that this will be an infill development. However, infill development relates to the filling of a small gap in an otherwise fully built-up frontage rather than 6 homes forming a self-contained estate on a greenfield site with no established building line on both sides of the site.

Sustainability of the site

In addition to the impact on the highways (see below), the site is not sustainable because it will:

- increase the burden on the provision of water – water resources are operating under severe pressure – on College Lane water provision already operates at a low pressure. This summer has seen a number of days where there have been water outages in certain areas, including Downlands secondary school being closed as a result. In August our MP directly challenged SE Water about the mismatch between housing delivery timescale and the much longer timeframe to address the much recognised need to improve water infrastructure
- place further pressure on the drainage and sewage systems which are already struggling. No building should take place until the sewerage company confirms capacity (including the condition of the pipes not just the facility at Goddards Green). The sewerage pipe work is old and not fit for purpose in this area. Two examples being 1) the farmland behind this proposed new development joins onto the main foul water drain on the lane and has raw sewage coming up after every heavy rainfall. This then runs into the ditch and into the water course. The owner of this land has provided photographs and a video of this and reported it to the relevant authority on numerous occasions, but no action has been taken. And 2) the north end of Malthouse Lane (which College Lane runs in to) is often closed (for weeks at a time) due to sewerage spills from broken pipes including into ancient chalk streams. Further development would exacerbate this problem, which negatively impacts the residents, the countryside and wildlife.

- place further demand on local GP services - the NHS says that the local GP practice is full
- schools are already full

Highway impact and Pedestrian Safety

Highway impact

This development was refused in 2014 partly due to it being an unsustainable location where occupants would be reliant of the use of a private car to gain access to local services. This remains the case.

- since 2014 traffic on College Lane has increased greatly. College Lane and Malthouse lane have over 200 properties. Parents at Hurstpierpoint College (there are 844 day pupils) use their cars daily in term time to take their children to and from school in the morning and afternoon also adds a very high volume of cars. (And other proposed allocations will add many more cars using the lane including DPSC1, numerous potential Main Modifications and campus extensions to Hurst College). The narrow part of College Lane (Wickham Conservation area) cannot be widened and is virtually a single lane which is already highly congested at certain times of the day. Expecting all this traffic to go through this sub-standard highway infrastructure completely fails the safety and capacity tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- please note that on 28/05/2024, in response to a query from the planning officer regarding another development on College Lane, the district councillors:
“both cited the issues with the narrow section of College Lane to the south of the application, and the traffic issues extra housing would represent.”

Recently a car has been written off on College Lane.

Pedestrian Safety

College Lane is not a safe road for pedestrians; there are long stretches without pavements and there is no safe access to the south end of the lane to get to public transport. In the last few weeks, a pedestrian was almost hit by a car and this was reported to the police

During the hearings about DM/24/1139 (in the immediate area), serious concerns were raised regarding the dangerous lack of a continuous pedestrian footpath on College Lane.

The loss of greenfield sites

As stated in the previous refusal of this proposal this development is proposed to be built in an area of semi-rural character.

The loss of greenfield this site will impact wildlife and landscape and this can never be regained. It will destroy a natural habitat for various species of plants, birds and mammals. The land is of value to local wildlife, for example, I live at 141 College Lane can confirm that there are many bats in the area. This proposal is not in-line with the conservation element of the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan

The CPRE states that in 2025 there was enough brownfield land to accommodate a minimum of 1.54 million homes across England exceeding the government's national housing delivery pledge of 1.5 Mio. They state that each year this number increases. So why build on this greenfield site? (CPRE, *State of brownfield 2026*).

It also needs to be taken in to account that the UK is legally committed to the global 30by30 nature recovery initiative, a target aimed at protecting and managing 30% of our land and sea for biodiversity by 2030. This development is not in-line with this requirement, it is a sheep farming field.

Lines of site to open countryside

The committee has previously refused planning permission due to the need to preserve lines of sight to open countryside. This has not changed and therefore is another reason to prevent development on this site.

Summary

For all these reasons, I suggest that **Planning Application DM/26/2178 is refused**. It is a development that has already been refused, it erodes a protected gap (which was said to be protected in the district plan by the planning office in 2024) and is not infill, it will seriously impact local highways (pedestrian safety cannot be

guaranteed) infrastructure and sustainability. It is also a greenfield site that needs to be protected for the reasons stated and also protect lines of sight to open countryside.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this objection.

All the best