

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 September 2025 11:13:45 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1921

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/09/2025 11:13 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Site Of Former East Lodge Farm Malthouse Lane Hurstpierpoint West Sussex BN6 9LA
Proposal:	Proposal for 7 new build houses (Corrected address)
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	East Lodge Malthouse Lane Hurstpierpoint
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>The applicant has previously applied and secured planning permission (DM/24/2932) which resulted in increased traffic on Malthouse Lane and the wider area in general. As part of this application the applicant recognised the dangers of increasing traffic flow on this unsuitable country lane and argued that this was an application that increased traffic by a small level.</p> <p>The aforementioned planning application's committee report document referred to the Noise Management Plan which was used as a supporting document in the application suggesting the</p>
-----------	---

volume of traffic would be minimal and restricted to '1 HGV Delivery per week. Usually, this delivery will take place during the daytime but in certain circumstances it could happen at night. Outside of normal hours of operation, deliveries or traffic to be limited to no more than 5 small cars or vans per night. It should be noted that the likelihood is that it will only be the occasional car or van visiting the site during out of hours'. Again, identifying that the site is unsuitable for traffic movements and increasing the volume of traffic would have a detrimental effect on neighbours, safety and the environment.

The BN6 9LA postcode area has a high number of vehicles per household (ONS 2121 census) with over 36% of households having 3 or more vehicles. The proposed development is for 3 & 4 bedroomed executive properties, and the area is not served by public transport it is foreseeable residents living in such properties will be dependent on personal vehicles and vehicle ownership will be higher than the average. It is probable that the development will result in at least 21 extra vehicles being parked and added to the already congested Malthouse Lane and the surrounding area. The average number of trips per year, per vehicle owner is 337 (DFT Nation Travel Survey).

As a minimum this development would add 7077 vehicle movements in the area and specifically on Malthouse Lane per year. However, due to the location, lack of public transport and demographics of home ownership in BN6 9LA it is highly likely such vehicle owners will be above average users of vehicle which is noted as 644 trips per vehicle. It is foreseeable allowing this development to proceed will add in excess of 13,000 vehicle movements yearly on Malthouse Lane, plus the extra day to day delivery, postal, tradespeople, utility and local service vehicles which will be attending these dwellings.

This will increase the risks to current residents, horses and their riders, walkers and their dogs as well as other road users to a level that is unacceptably high. If this application is allowed, it is accepting of the fact serious injury or worst will no doubt occur. It is well known that Malthouse Lane has more traffic using it than it was designed for with numerous incidents happening on a daily basis which, thankfully do not always result in injury, damage or loss but plenty do, including at least one fatal RTC occurring in recent times. The structure of Malthouse Lane is in a poor condition, vehicles damaged by contacting potholes and other irregularities in the road surface are commonplace. As this is a minor road the local authority rarely undertakes any maintenance and if they do it is reactive due to damaged vehicles and injuries. Consciously increasing the traffic flow on this road cannot be justified.

This previous planning application noted that the 'The nearest

residential property to the site appears to be Eastlands Farmhouse set on the east side of Malthouse Lane and also set back from the roadside behind trees and shrubs. (see photo)'. Implying that the commercial activity of the owner's other business assets were of a suitable distance not to inconvenience the nearby residents by the 24/365 commercial vehicle activities proposed. It is absurd that now, an application is submitted to build houses next to the very commercial activity that the applicant has acknowledged is not suitable to be within close proximity to domestic dwellings.

The Fire and Rescue Service quite correctly have raised numerous concerns about the validity of this application. In particular the risk of having domestic premises next to a large battery energy storage system (BESS), whilst they mention the 25m exclusion zone, this is a suggested minimum, and the domestic curtilage of the proposed properties are well within this 'danger zone'. When a BESS develops a fault that results in thermal runaway or creation of excess gas the result is the release of toxic explosive gases, a fire that cannot be controlled and as the gas ignites the explosive reaction causes shrapnel to be ejected at high velocity. All these reactions have the ability to kill and/or seriously injure persons within the surrounding area. There are many examples of this technology failing and creating loss in the UK and worldwide, recently events have occurred in Merseyside and Scotland as well as deaths of firefighters in other countries.

The original planning consent for the BESS is DM/17/0572, the associated Planning Statement that supported the application stated that the closest residential property was some 130m away as a positive reason for granting planning and suggesting that this was part of the safety considerations within the application. Yet this current application is saying it is positive to have domestic dwellings only 25m away. The risks were the same then as they are now and this previous application implied that 130m was a positive safety feature. Also, within the same application the large distance to the nearest domestic dwelling was used to mitigate the noise pollution that emanates from such electrical infrastructure. The Noise Impact Assessment of this planning application also used the 130m distance to the nearest domestic dwelling to justify that the noise generated would not be a nuisance. This impact assessment states that the noise level at 130m from the BESS is 60% of the noise that the World Health Organisation deems acceptable for 'good sleeping'. Now allowing the nearest residential dwelling to be only 25m away from the BESS will have unacceptable noise levels which will be harmful for any prospective residents.

This current application makes a mockery of the planning system, where various criteria including safety has been used to achieve planning for one thing and such criteria is disregarded for the next application. This site is unsuitable for domestic dwellings.

The application site is also within a Strategic Gap, Policy C2 of the MSLP, DP11 of the District Plan and HurstC3 of the Neighbourhood Plan all seek to prevent coalescence between settlements unless: "(a) it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, or some other use which has to be located in the countryside; (b) it makes a valuable contribution to the landscape and amenity of the gap and enhances its value as open countryside; and (c) it would not compromise individually or cumulatively the objectives and fundamental integrity of the gap."

This current application meets none of the aforementioned requirements!

The site is a commercial site, the proposals 'contaminated land' report suggests the contamination on the land is beyond the limits that should be allowed for domestic premises to be built on the site. In recent years there have been over 20 planning applications for this site. Every single one of them have extolled the fact that this is a commercial site and the lack of residential dwellings within close proximity has been used as a reason to gain planning permission. What has changed? It is unsuitable for domestic premises; it is a commercial site not a domestic site.

The average selling price of houses in the BN6 area is £637,374.00, for detached properties this figure is in excess of £900,000.00.

There are currently at least 147 detached houses for sale in this area (Rightmove), there is not a shortage of this type of house in the area, they are not the type of houses that figure in any government house building targets or are needed to help people find a home, there is no requirement for these houses in this area.

I am surprised that development of this site has already commenced before planning permission has even been decided. The land has already been cleared and hedgerows ripped out. With no enforcement action being taken by the local authority could well be reflective of some expectation. I would expect such a transgression to be required to be rectified prior to any planning application being considered.

This application should be refused.

Kind regards