

DOCUMENT A – PUBLIC PLANNING OBJECTION

PLANNING OBJECTION – RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

Application Ref: DM/25/2945

Site: 14 Culpepper, Burgess Hill

Proposal: Retrospective planning permission for shed erected forward of the principal elevation

Objection submitted by an affected neighbouring household (details to be withheld for safety reasons)

1. Unauthorised development in the front garden

The shed has been erected forward of the principal elevation within the front garden, without planning permission. Outbuildings in this location are **not permitted development** and require express consent.

Granting retrospective permission would undermine the integrity of the planning system by regularising unauthorised development.

2. Claimed storage need does not justify front-garden development

In correspondence dated **15 November** to Planning Services, the applicant states that the shed was installed to provide storage for bicycles, tools and household items.

However:

- The applicant's property has **converted its garage and extended internal living space**, removing existing storage capacity.
- This was a **self-created need**, not a constraint imposed by the site.
- The property benefits from a **large rear garden** capable of easily accommodating a shed without harm.

The decision to locate the shed in the front garden represents a **choice of convenience**, not necessity, and does not outweigh the harm caused.

3. Harm to visual amenity and character

The shed is visually intrusive when viewed from the public realm, out of keeping with surrounding properties, and **contrary to the prevailing pattern of development** where ancillary buildings are located to the rear rather than the front of dwellings.

4. Displacement of parking, boundary encroachment and obstruction of a shared driveway

The applicant's property shares a **private driveway** with the objecting property.

Prior to the erection of the shed, the area now occupied by the structure was predominantly used for **vehicle parking**.

Since the shed was erected:

- Vehicles are now parked **on the shared driveway**
- Vehicles are positioned **over the boundary**, reducing usable width
- Access to the adjoining property has been **directly obstructed**
- Safe manoeuvring has been compromised

This is a **direct and foreseeable consequence** of the development and constitutes **material planning harm**, not a private civil matter.

5. Impact on a Blue Badge holder – Equality Act consideration

Policy references: Equality Act 2010

The adjoining household includes a **Blue Badge holder**, for whom safe, unobstructed access and adequate turning space are essential.

The parking displacement caused by the shed has had a **disproportionate impact** and must be considered in line with the Council's **Public Sector Equality Duty**.

6. Accuracy of information submitted with the application

The Householder Application form (available on planning portal) contains **inaccurate or misleading responses** that are relevant to the assessment:

a) Trees and hedges

The application states that no trees or hedges are within falling distance of the shed.

This is incorrect: there is a tree approximately 3 feet from the structure (reference photographs submitted by applicant, available on the planning portal).

b) Parking impact

The application states that parking has been reduced by approximately **0.5 metres**.

Photographic evidence shows that prior to the shed, vehicles regularly parked **1–1.5 metres beyond the current shed line**. Refer to Images 1 & 2 at end of this document.

The actual loss of functional parking space is therefore **significantly greater**, directly causing boundary encroachment and access obstruction.

c) Visibility from public areas

The application states the shed cannot be seen from a public road or footpath.

This is incorrect: the shed **is visible from the edge of Culpepper**. Image1 (refer to end of this document) is a screenshot taken from Google Maps (camera car) on a public road.

The application contains inaccuracies regarding proximity of trees, degree of parking loss, and visibility from the public realm, which materially affect assessment.

7. Parish consultee recommendation – lack of site-specific impact consideration

The planning portal includes a consultee response from **Burgess Hill Town Council (Parish Consultation)**, submitted on **12 December 2025**, stating that the Committee of 8 December **recommends approval**.

This recommendation appears to have been made **without due consideration of the specific and material impact on the adjoining household**, which is the **only property directly affected** by the shared driveway, parking displacement and access issues arising from the shed.

There is no evidence that the Parish Committee made contact with the adjoining occupiers or was aware of the **reduced access and Blue Badge implications**. As such, the recommendation should be given **limited weight**, as it does not appear to be informed by the site-specific impacts that are central to this application.

7. Evidence of former parking use removed prior to inspection

Hardstanding slabs previously laid parallel to the shed directly in front of the driveway was visible and further reduced parking area. These were removed prior to inspection/ retrospective application and should be considered when establishing baseline conditions as these could easily be returned to their original position at any later date.

8. Escalation of conflict linked to the development

Since the erection of the shed and resulting parking displacement, there has been a significant escalation of neighbour conflict by applicant and their visitors by regularly and inconsiderately parking over their boundary. There is also an **open police case relating to xenophobic behaviour** from applicant.

While planning decisions must focus on land-use impacts, this escalation highlights the seriousness of the access harm arising from the development.

9. Response to Applicant's Claim of "Good Faith"

This relates to the applicant's letter dated 15 November to the Planning Services Division (letter available on the planning portal).

We respectfully request that this claim is treated with caution for the following reasons:

1. The structure was installed by a **professional builder**, who would reasonably be expected to understand that a front-garden outbuilding requires planning permission or to advise the applicant accordingly.
2. The shed has been erected **forward of the principal elevation**, which is a well-established planning constraint and not permitted development.
3. The property has **converted its garage and extended internal living space**, creating a self-generated storage shortfall. This does not amount to a planning justification for front-garden development.

4. A **large rear garden** exists which could easily accommodate a shed without harm, yet this option was not pursued.
5. The development was carried out **without prior consultation** with the only neighbouring property materially affected, despite foreseeable access and parking impacts.

Taken together, these factors cast doubt on the assertion that the development was undertaken in genuine ignorance of planning requirements. In any event, the applicant's intentions cannot override the **material planning harm** arising from the development.

This application must be assessed on its planning merits and impacts, rather than on claims of "good faith".

10. Precedent, alternatives and cumulative impact

Reasonable alternatives exist to erect the shed in the rear garden.
Cumulatively, the development causes:

- Obstruction of shared access **for Blue Badge holder**
- Loss of parking
- Boundary encroachment

Conclusion

The application causes demonstrable material planning harm and conflicts with the Mid Sussex District Plan. It should therefore be **refused**, and enforcement action taken.

Confidentiality / Anonymity Request

Due to concerns about retaliation, the objector requests that all identifying details are withheld from public view.

Image 1 No shed in driveway. Red circle — silver car is parked well forward and is significantly closer to tree on its right-hand side.



Image 2: New shed submitted by 14 Culpepper, available on planning portal. Position of tree is adjacent to far side of shed. Referencing Image 1, prior to the shed, applicant's cars regularly parked significantly closer to this tree, minimising parking problems.

