

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3176	Case Officer:	Anna Tidey
Application Type:	Technical Details Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed dwelling, detached three bedroom chalet bungalow.		
Site:	Land Adj To The Meadows, Little Park Farm, Marchants Close, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9UZ,		
Validation Date	22 Dec 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	31 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	10 Apr 2026
Target Date:	26 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Anna Tidey

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	10 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3176

Land Adj To The Meadows, Little Park Farm, Marchants Close, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9UZ

Proposed dwelling, detached three bedroom chalet bungalow.

Emma Poland

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Two representations received which contain the following points:

- Proposed dwelling in the countryside, contrary to plan-led strategy to focus new housing within settlement boundaries.
- Does not meet the limited circumstances to allow development of new houses in the countryside, eg. essential rural worker housing, re use of existing buildings or truly exceptional quality design.
- Contrary to Council's countryside protection policies and National Framework re isolated homes in the countryside.
- Conflicts with the original consent.
- Seeks second dwelling on land outside approved curtilage and on approved paddock area.
- Permitted Development rights were removed to prevent incremental domestication and over development on edge of settlement site.
- Sets a harmful precedent for further such development.
- Concern that development, foundations, services will harm trees and their root protection areas.
- Contrary to original tree protection condition, Council's tree and biodiversity policies and national policy.
- Harm to green edge of the village, eroding landscape character, creating suburban appearance.
- Overdevelopment, over intensifying the use of the plot, loss of spacious setting of house.
- Mutual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance, impact upon neighbouring amenities.
- Incompatible with PiP approval as it fails to comply with the development plan, intentions for the site, adopted countryside , design, tree and landscape policies.
- Removal of pd rights clearly indicates an established planning intention to restrict further residential development on this land.
- The proposal is an afterthought rather than part of a coherent or well-considered development strategy.
- The proposal would require the subdivision of the garden of The Meadows into two separate plots.
- the removal of the existing hedgerow, an important and established boundary feature, is harmful to the rural character of the area, and detrimental to local biodiversity.
- the land on which this dwelling is proposed should remain as a paddock serving The Meadows. It was never intended to function as a separate residential plot. The character and function of this land are being fundamentally altered in a way that is wholly inappropriate for its setting.
- There should also be a planted orchard within this plot, consistent with its historic and rural use, rather than the introduction of additional housing.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Tree Officer: The Arboricultural Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Survey and Tree Protection Plan have been reviewed. No objection, subject to a planning condition to require adherence to this report for tree protection.

SE Water: No response received.

Historic England: No response received.

Conservation Officer: The proposal is for a fairly substantial detached three bedroom chalet bungalow on the part of the former paddock which was intended to be retained as a buffer as part of the 2022 approvals for redevelopment of the former farm buildings and mobile home. This would in my opinion erode the surviving rural/agricultural character of this part of the wider setting of Little Park, resulting in harm through impact on setting to its special interest. It should be noted that this is a more substantial structure than was envisaged in the 2025 appeal relating to extension of Little Meadows, but its relationship in terms of its position between Little Park house and the countryside beyond the site is similar- it too would sit within the views with which the Inspector was concerned, but will be significantly more prominent within them. I would also add that the new dwelling would be prominent in the above mentioned vistas from the eastern side of the Little Park grounds which place the listed building within its historic rural/agricultural context. In views looking eastwards from the house itself it will sit alongside the existing development at The Meadows as a further discordant suburbanising element, severing the listed building from the surrounding countryside.

The appearance of the building, and the associated domesticating impact on the paddock area which would arise from its use as a residential garden, as well as the regrading of the site with the addition of brick retaining walls would all exacerbate the adverse impact of the proposal.

For these reasons in my opinion the proposal will result in harm, through impact on setting, to the special interest of Little Park and how this is appreciated. This is contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal will result in less than substantial harm, at the low-mid point of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. In carrying out that balancing exercise, the Council must be mindful of the great weight that must be given under paragraph 212 of the Framework to the conservation of the heritage asset, and that this should be given even greater emphasis due to the II* listing of Little Park. Furthermore, this harm would under paragraph 213 require clear and convincing justification.

Flood Risk & Drainage Team: The proposal is for a single dwelling (more vulnerable development). The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not identified as being at fluvial flood risk. Based on available mapping and records, there are no known historic flood incidents at the site.

The proposed Surface Water Drainage Strategy is considered acceptable in principle, subject to appropriate detailed design. The proposed Foul Water Drainage is reasonable in principle, subject to appropriate detailed design. Recommend a drainage condition.

Ecologist: No ecological objection subject to recommended conditions to require mitigation in accordance with the details contained in the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, the provision of a Biodiversity Enhancement Layout prior to works above slab level, and the provision prior to occupation of a lighting design strategy for biodiversity and the BNG condition.

Environmental Protection: Given the proximity of nearby existing residents to the application site, there is a concern with regards to the impact of the demolition and construction work which will produce a certain level of noise and dust. Conditions are therefore recommended in order to minimise any adverse impact. Recommends conditions as for DM/22/0204 re: construction activities.

Contaminated Land Officer: Recommends a discovery strategy condition.

Naturespace: I can confirm that the submission of the NatureSpace District Licence documents adequately mitigate for any impact this development may have on great crested newts. Recommends a planning condition and Informatives.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council: The committee recommend MSDC should refuse the application for the following reasons:

- o Policy DP34: The proposed dwelling would be detrimental to the rural setting of the Grade II* listed Little Park Farm. The introduction of an additional dwelling would erode the historic farmyard context.

- o Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside): The proposal does not align with the objectives of this policy. The development would result in further urbanisation of a rural site and would fail to protect or enhance the countryside character of the area.
- o Overdevelopment of the Site: The original planning permission was granted for the previous properties, on the clear understanding that the site would retain its original rural farmyard character. The addition of a further dwelling represents overdevelopment, would overwhelm the site, and would significantly detract from its intended form and appearance.
- o Scale, Massing and Visual Impact: The proposed dwelling is very large for the size of the plot, with a high roof profile that would be visually intrusive. The height and bulk of the building would be visible across Hurst Meadows, Hurstpierpoint countryside open space, causing harm to long-distance views and the rural landscape character.
- o Impact on Amenity and Public Views: The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of the countryside by users of Hurst Meadows, whose open views across the rural landscape would be adversely affected.
- o Biodiversity Impact: The development would have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity and rural character of the site, further eroding its function as part of the countryside setting.
- o Impact on Trees / Inadequate Arboricultural Assessment: The proposed dwelling is located too close to mature trees and would result in the plot falling within the construction exclusion zone set out in Condition 16 of the original planning permission. Furthermore, the arboricultural tree survey was undertaken for the original scheme of properties only and did not assess the impact of this additional dwelling, rendering it inadequate.
- o Removal of Permitted Development Rights: It is also noted that permitted development rights were removed from the original plots in order to protect the character of the site. In this context, it is inappropriate and unreasonable for a new additional dwelling to now be considered.

INTRODUCTION

This is an application for Technical Details Consent in relation to the Permission in Principle (PiP) approved under reference DM/25/1549 by the MSDC Planning Committee, dated 13th October 2025, for a single proposed dwelling at land adjacent to The Meadows, Little Park Farm, Marchants Close, Hurstpierpoint.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The following applications have been made on land forming the wider site at the former farmstead and also on the property at The Meadows.

DM/25/1549. PIP - Single proposed dwelling. Approved October 2025.

DM/25/0785. Proposed two storey extension on southern side elevation with gabled roof including two gabled dormers, a rooflight and a Juliette balcony. Addition of new gabled dormer on existing east facing roof slope to replace two rooflights, to serve an existing first floor bedroom. Refused June 2025. Appeal Dismissed November 2025.

DM/25/0784. Proposed fencing. Approved July 2025.

DM/24/1406. Proposed two storey side extensions with Juliette balcony to first floor also new and relocated dormers. Proposed two storey part single storey rear extension with Juliette balcony to first floor. Refused August 2024.

DM/23/2001. Removal of Condition No. 14 of planning permission DM/22/0204. Refused October 2023. Appeal Dismissed under reference AP/24/0002 in April 2024.

DM/23/0891. Single-storey porch extension. Refused May 2023.

DM/22/3843. Proposed single storey porch extension. Refused February 2023. Appeal Allowed under reference AP/23/0037 in July 2023.

DM/22/2131. Variation of Condition 2 in relation to DM/22/0204. Approved August 2022.

DM/22/0204. Removal of former dairy, mobile home and other outbuildings and construction of 2 dwellings (revisions to approved scheme DM/21/2367) now including garages and alterations to eastern unit to accommodate rooms within the roof space. Approved April 2022.

DM/21/2367. Removal of an existing barn, mobile home and other outbuildings. Construction of 3 dwellings. Approved September 2021.

DM/20/1533. Removal of an existing barn, mobile home and other outbuildings. Construction of 3 dwellings. Amended Plans received 16.06.2020. Refused October 2020. Appeal Dismissed May 2021.

DM/19/4153. Removal of an existing barn, mobile home and other outbuildings. Construction of three dwelling, 1x5 bedroom with detached garage, 1 x3 bedroom and 1 x2 bed bedroom. Refused January 2020. Appeal Dismissed May 2021.

DM/19/2344. Application for determination as to whether prior approval is required for the change of use of an agricultural building to 4 dwellinghouses and for associated operational development. Prior approval granted August 2019.

DM/19/0824. Remove existing barn, mobile home and other outbuildings for the construction of 4 dwellings with car ports. Refused May 2019.

14/00745/LDE. Application to site a caravan for domestic use. This is an application to establish whether the development is lawful: this will be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed use cannot be taken into account. Approved April 2014.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site for the proposed dwelling is a triangular area of land with an area of 0.2 hectares. The land is grassed and is in use as part of the domestic curtilage associated with the dwelling at 'The Meadows'. The red site outline includes the vehicular access from the turning head at the northern end of Marchants Close.

The current property at The Meadows is a modern, detached 5 bed dwelling, which is located on a site formerly known as Little Park Farm (formerly referred to as Unit C in the recent residential development of the site). The property has been the subject of a series of applications to extend the building to add additional ground and first floor living space.

The property at 'The Meadows' and the adjacent dwelling at The Old Dairy (formerly referred to as Unit B) are located off a narrow-shared access track. This access track is shared with another residential property at North End House, which is located to the northeast of the site. The track also serves as a pedestrian route for occupiers of the houses at Idenhurst and allows public access to the public open space at Hurst Meadows to the east of the site.

A Dutch barn remains undeveloped on the former farmstead site, to the west of 'The Meadows', occupying the position of a further approved dwelling, known as Unit A. A vehicular access gate located in the site boundary, to the south of the Dutch barn, allows access into an extended garden area serving the adjacent Grade II* property known as Little Park. Beyond this there is a large private pond which is in the grounds of that property.

An extensive area of land to the east of the site adjacent to the access track is in use as Hurst Meadows Public Open Space. This land is allocated for use as public open space for informal recreation, referred

to as Hurst Meadows in the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan (Policy Amenities HurstA1: Hurst Meadows).

The application under DM/22/0204, for the residential development of the site, included a Landscape Plan (Drawing ref. 1166-21-02d). This showed the curtilage of the dwelling at The Meadows marked by a 1.2m high timber post and rail fence with indigenous hedge planting. This was shown to be erected between a designated garden space and a grassed paddock and orchard extending to the south and east of the property. To date this fence has not been erected and no delineation has occurred. The manicured garden space in use at The Meadows has extended over the area originally shown to be designated as a paddock and an orchard.

The eastern boundary of the land is enclosed with chain link fencing, running along the line of the boundary trees, which are growing along the boundary with the adjacent public open space. There are open public views into the site, and the land associated with The Meadows, from Hurst Meadows and from adjacent public footpath (HSC/63HU/2), the route of which follows the eastern boundary line.

The application site is situated within the countryside as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans, outside the designated built-up area of Hurstpierpoint. The site is not contiguous to the Built-up Area boundary of the village.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application is for the technical details following the approval of a permission in principle (PiP) on the site under DM/25/1549.

The proposal is for the erection of one dwelling of a chalet bungalow design, with ground and first floor accommodation, sited on an L shaped footprint, to the east of the existing extended chalet bungalow at 'The Meadows'.

The proposed new dwelling would share the access drive that serves The Meadows and would be positioned off a new access point and forecourt to the east.

Plans show that the dwelling is to measure some 19.2 metres wide, and a maximum of 11.6 metres in depth, with an eaves height of 3 metres and an overall ridge height of 6.5 metres (approx). The side elevation closest to The Meadows has a depth of 11 metres (approx.). The end gables of the building are 6.6 metres in width.

The proposed dwelling is to be constructed in materials to match those of The Meadows: black painted horizontal timber weatherboarding, plain clay tiles, with black aluminium windows. On the front (north facing) elevation the plans show a 1.5m deep by 3.6m wide open canopy porch supported by oak posts.

The dwelling would comprise of an open plan kitchen / dining room, utility, toilet, study and lounge off an entrance hall at ground floor level. At first floor level there would be three bedrooms, one with an ensuite and dressing room, a separate shared bathroom and open landing, with a first floor void to create a two storey hallway.

Pathways are shown around the perimeter of the dwelling linked to the driveway / parking area to the north and north west of the dwelling.

The application has been supported by a Street Scene Drawings to illustrate the front and rear elevation of the proposed dwelling next to the outlined form of the adjacent dwelling at The Meadows. The plans indicate that the existing ground levels will be lowered to allow the construction of the proposed dwelling. The finished floor level of the proposed dwelling relative to the existing dwelling are shown to differ by 1m, with the immediate curtilage of the new dwelling being on a lowered ground position up to a retaining structure built on the boundary between the two dwellings. The spot height details of the existing land levels detailed on the survey drawing (Appendix 3 -Tree Constraints Plan) submitted in the Arboricultural Report also correspond to these details.

During the course of determining the application additional supporting information and documents have been provided, which include: Tree Reports - Tree Constraints, Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Outline Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan (TPP), and Topographic Survey, Drainage information, a Drainage Strategy, Surface Water Calculations, a Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment and Metric and a Naturespace Partnership Certificate. These documents have been the subject to various Consultations and are saved on the planning file.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and Site Allocations DPD.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP12 Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DP17 Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC
DP21 Transport
DP26 Character and Design
DP27 Dwelling Space Standards
DP29 Noise, Air and Light Pollution
DP34 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
DP37 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DP38 Biodiversity
DP39 Sustainable Design and Construction
DP41 Flood Risk and Drainage

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no policies deemed relevant to this application.

Neighbourhood Plan

Neighbourhood Plan - Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, made March 2018.

Policy HurstC1: Conserving and enhancing character of countryside
Policy HurstC3: Local Gaps and Preventing Coalescence

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 - 2039 - Submission Draft (Regulation 19)

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections

to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS1- Climate Change
DPS2- Sustainable Design and Construction
DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage
DPN4- Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DPN7- Noise Impacts
DPC1- Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPC3- New Homes in the Countryside
DPC6- Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC
DPB1- Character and Design
DPT4- Parking and EV Charging Infrastructure
DPH1- Housing
DPH2- Sustainable Development - Outside the BUA
DPH11- Dwelling Space Standards

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

ASSESSMENT

Issued in support of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle)(Amendment) Order 2017, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Guidance on Permission in Principle (published 28 July 2017 updated March 2019) sets out matters within the scope of a decision in relation to a permission in principle, which are limited to: 'location, land use and amount of development', it continues to state that other matters should be considered at the technical details consent stage (NPPG Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 58-012-20180615).

The NPPG sets out that '*Following a grant of permission in principle, the site must receive a grant of technical details consent before development can proceed. The granting of technical details consent has the effect of granting planning permission for the development. Other statutory requirements may apply at this stage such as those relating to protected species or listed buildings. Technical details consent can be obtained following submission of a valid application to the local planning authority. An application for technical details consent must be in accordance with the permission in principle that is specified by the applicant.*' (NPPG Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 58-003-20190615).

The principle of the development has already been accepted through the approval of the PiP application under reference DM/25/1549. In making the decision to approve the PiP application the Planning Committee Members were mindful of the policies contained within the NPPF, and in particular Paragraph 11 of the NPPF which sets out that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is also relevant that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, and that the relevant policies for the supply of housing from the

development plan are out-of-date (footnote 8 of paragraph 11 NPPF). As such, while the proposal for a new dwelling on this site conflicts with some policies in the development plan, it is not considered that it would lead to any adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that while this proposal is for only one new dwelling, it would still contribute to the Council's much needed housing supply and make effective use of the land.

This application considers the technical details of the development and these include: the design, scale, accessibility, impact on neighbouring occupiers and impact on trees.

Design and impact on the character of the area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Countryside HurstC1 allows for development in the countryside where it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the Parish area.

Also relevant in the determination of the application is the design guidance contained in the Mid Sussex Design Guide. The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The proposal has been designed with careful consideration to the rural setting of the existing dwelling at The Meadows. The low level eaves and subordinate form on a reduced land level next to the host dwelling will give the new building a subordinate presence to the existing dwelling.

The proposed dwelling has been designed to include sympathetic rural materials, with dark stained timber cladding, plain clay roof tiles and recessive grey coloured windows to blend in with the rural landscape and the backdrop of the other neighbouring houses at The Meadows and The Old Dairy.

Given the siting of the dwelling and the colour palette of the chosen construction materials it is considered that the new house will not visually harm public views from the nearest public vantage points or from the public right of way along the eastern site boundary. The retention of the boundary trees around the new dwelling will ensure that it blends into the established garden setting.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling would be seen in the context of the residential development of the site, with the backdrop of the other two residential dwellings on the site when viewed from the adjacent open space. The proposal would be inkeeping with the semi rural appearance of the area, would not negatively impact upon the rural environment and would maintain the character of this edge of village location.

It is considered that the proposal would comply with the design aims of District Plan Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy Countryside HurstC1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Dwelling Space Standards

The Government's Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards document was published in March 2015. It sets out space standards for all new residential dwellings, including minimum floor areas and room widths for bedrooms and minimum floor areas for storage, to secure a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future residents. Policy DP27 - Dwelling Space Standards of the District Plan, which refers to open market dwellings, affordable housing, the full range of dwelling types as well as dwellings created through conversion, supports this.

The proposal is for a 3 bed dwelling. For a 2 storey, 3 bed property the standards require a minimum gross internal floor area of some 84-108 sqm. The proposed new dwelling will provide approx. 305 square metres of floor space, approx., which is considerably larger than the minimum requirements for a 3 bed property.

The proposed bedrooms in the new house will accord with the required size standards for a single bedroom size of 6.5 sq m and for a double bedroom size of 10 sq m minimum, the smallest bedroom measuring a minimum of 15 sq m approx.

As the new dwelling will exceed the National Dwelling Space Standards the proposed development would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The dwelling would also provide appropriate means of escape, heating and ventilation, with natural lighting available to the kitchen, bedrooms and living room spaces.

The proposal complies with the requirement of Policy DP27 of the District Plan for new dwellings, and will meet the national housing standards.

Impact on residential amenities

Policy DP26 of the District Plan requires developments to demonstrate that it does not cause significant harm to amenities of existing nearby residents (or future occupiers), taking into account matters such as impact on light, privacy and outlook.

In addition Principle DG45 in the Design Guide refers to the need to consider privacy of existing and future residents and it is noted that privacy may be affected by the relationship of buildings to each other.

The nearest properties to the proposed dwelling (other than The Meadows itself) are located at some distance from the development site, with The Old Dairy some 40m to the west, and North End House over 80 m to the northwest.

The presence of The Meadows between these neighbours, and the retention of natural tree screening around the site boundaries will ensure any impact from the development and future visual impact to the occupiers of those properties from the completed development will be very limited.

The proposed dwelling will share the access with these other properties. It is considered that the additional vehicle movements that the proposed dwelling will create can be accommodated and will not adversely impact upon the neighbouring residential properties.

It is considered that there will be no adverse overlooking or overbearing impact as a result of the proposed siting of the proposed dwelling on this site. Accordingly, the scheme would comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Design Guide Principles with regards to the amenities of adjoining properties.

Impact upon Listed Building

Consideration was given to the impact of the development of a single dwelling upon the Grade II* Listed Building at Little Park, sited to the west of the site, in the determination of DM/25/1549.

The site for the proposed dwelling lies some 109 metres away from the listed property at Little Park, and within the grounds and the garden of The Meadows, to the eastern side of the site. The Grade II* listed building status of the ex-farm house building at Little Park gives that property a high degree of significance, being one category lower than a Grade I Listed building. Taken together Grade I and Grade II* Listed buildings account for just 8% of all listed buildings, with Grade II Listed Buildings accounting for 92% of all listed buildings.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the

desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

In addition, in enacting section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act, the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should be given 'considerable importance and weight' when the decision taker carries out the balancing exercise, thus properly reflecting the statutory presumption that preservation is desirable.

Given the proximity of the development site to Little Park District Plan Policy DP34 is relevant in the determination of this application. This requires development to protect listed buildings and their settings.

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paragraphs 212 - 215 of the NPPF provide advice to Local Planning Authorities regarding development proposals that affect heritage assets. They state:

'212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional⁷⁵.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the proposal and raises concern in respect of the urbanising effect of the proposal. She considers that the proposed dwelling would have a negative impact upon rural character of the site and the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building at Little Park and that the proposal would result in harmful further domestication of the open former farmstead and land around The Meadows. She believes that this would be harmful to the setting of the Listed Building and would be detrimental to its special interest, as set out in the summary of her comments at the start of this report. The Conservation Officer states:

'This would in my opinion erode the surviving rural/agricultural character of this part of the wider setting of Little Park, resulting in harm through impact on setting to its special interest.the new dwelling would be prominent in the above mentioned vistas from the eastern side of the Little Park grounds which place the listed building within its historic rural/agricultural context. In views looking eastwards from the house itself it will sit alongside the existing development at The Meadows as a further discordant suburbanising element, severing the listed building from the surrounding countryside.'

Notwithstanding these comments and concerns, it is considered that due to the separation of the site from the site of the listed building, with the intervening gardens and the site being shielded by the other dwellings and buildings at the site, the position and form of the proposed dwelling would not detrimentally harm the setting of this listed building. The assessment is made with consideration of the intervening position of the property at The Meadows, and the proposed reduced ground level siting of the proposed new dwelling, making it subordinate to the existing property in the existing landscaped garden.

In the consideration of the appeal under AP/23/0037, which followed the refusal of application DM/22/3843 for a residential porch addition at The Meadows, the Inspector considered 'the significant distance between The Meadows and Little Park; the lower site level of the former, and the presence of substantial mature screening between the two buildings' was an important consideration. He concluded that in the case of the Appeal *'The combination of these factors means that there is effectively no meaningful visual relationship between the buildings that could be reasonably said to result in this limited extension of The Meadows having a harmful effect on the setting of the Grade II* listed 'Little Park'.*

The proposed site for the proposed dwelling is part of the wider land ownership of The Meadows. The proposed plans indicate the ground level for the new dwelling will be reduced to set the building down from the host dwelling. The site is lower and physically separated from the boundary of curtilage belonging to Little Park. Given the presence of the other recently constructed dwellings, and the now disused, former agricultural, Dutch barn building that lies between the site and Little Park, it is considered that the proposed site does not significantly contribute to the significance of the Listed Building setting. Therefore, it is considered that the distance, intervening natural screening and the presence of the surrounding buildings the impact of the proposed new dwelling will not harm the setting of Little Park. The neutral impact of the proposed new dwelling upon the setting of the listed building complies with the aims of Policy DP34 of the District Plan.

Highways

The proposed dwelling will share the existing access used by The Meadows, The Old Dairy and North End House. This arrangement was reviewed by WSCC Highways Authority at the PiP application stages and they raised no object to the principle of a single dwelling on this site.

The relevant District Plan Policy is DP21, which states:

'Development will be required to support the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026, which are:

- o A high quality transport network that promotes a competitive and prosperous economy;*
- o A resilient transport network that complements the built and natural environment whilst reducing carbon emissions over time;*
- o Access to services, employment and housing; and*
- o A transport network that feels, and is, safer and healthier to use.*

To meet these objectives, decisions on development proposals will take account of whether:

- o The scheme is sustainably located to minimise the need for travel noting there might be circumstances where development needs to be located in the countryside, such as rural economic uses (see policy DP14: Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy);*
- o Appropriate opportunities to facilitate and promote the increased use of alternative means of transport to the private car, such as the provision of, and access to, safe and convenient routes for walking, cycling and public transport, including suitable facilities for secure and safe cycle parking, have been fully explored and taken up;*
- o The scheme is designed to adoptable standards, or other standards as agreed by the Local Planning Authority, including road widths and size of garages*
- o The scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable;*

- o Development which generates significant amounts of movement is supported by a Transport Assessment/ Statement and a Travel Plan that is effective and demonstrably deliverable including setting out how schemes will be funded;*
- o The scheme provides appropriate mitigation to support new development on the local and strategic road network, including the transport network outside of the district, secured where necessary through appropriate legal agreements;*
- o The scheme avoids severe additional traffic congestion, individually or cumulatively, taking account of any proposed mitigation;*
- o The scheme protects the safety of road users and pedestrians; and*
- o The scheme does not harm the special qualities of the South Downs National Park or the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty through its transport impacts.*

Where practical and viable, developments should be located and designed to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. Neighbourhood Plans can set local standards for car parking provision provided that it is based upon evidence that provides clear and compelling justification for doing so'.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF is relevant in respect of transport matters. It states:

' In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- (a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
- (b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- (c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 48 ; and*
- (d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.'*

The site is located within easy walking access to the village centre, the Primary school, services in the village centre and to public transport opportunities. This provides sustainable travel options for the occupiers of the new dwelling.

The proposed site plan demonstrates that there is adequate space on the site for vehicle parking and turning to serve the proposed dwelling. The applicant has accepted drafted planning conditions to require the provision of the vehicle turning space and electric charging spaces for the new dwelling ahead of its occupation.

West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments requires a 3 bed dwellinghouse in this part of Mid Sussex to have provision for 2.1 off road parking spaces. The available space for parking for the new dwelling will accord with the WSCC Car Parking Standards for a 3 bed house.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this case to accord with the aims of District Plan Policy DP21.

Sustainability

District Plan Policy DP39 is relevant in the determination of this application. This states:

'All development proposals must seek to improve the sustainability of development and should where appropriate and feasible according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures:

- o Minimise energy use through the design and layout of the scheme including through the use of natural lighting and ventilation;*

o Explore opportunities for efficient energy supply through the use of communal heating networks where viable and feasible;
o Use renewable sources of energy;
o Maximise efficient use of resources, including minimising waste and maximising recycling/ re-use of materials through both construction and occupation;
o Limit water use to 110 litres/person/day in accordance with Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment;
o Demonstrate how the risks associated with future climate change have been planned for as part of the layout of the scheme and design of its buildings to ensure its longer term resilience.'

Paragraph 164 of the NPPF states:

'New development should be planned for in ways that:

a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through incorporating green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems; and

b) help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings in plans should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.'

This application is for a new build dwelling on the site. The application was submitted with an accompanying Sustainability Statement to support that the new dwelling will be energy efficient. This contains details of the sustainable measures that will be included in the new dwelling. In summary these include:

- low water consumption solutions
- WCs with a dual flush cistern with a low flush capacity
- Kitchen taps, basin taps and showers with a restricted flow
- waste management procedures from construction will be segregated
- local suppliers and local contractors will be used, where possible
- the building will be highly insulated and double glazed to minimise heat demand and loss

There is sufficient evidence to support the proposed new build dwelling as a sustainable development on this site.

Therefore the new property will accord with the requirements of District Plan Policy DP39 and the aims of the NPPF in terms of sustainability.

Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan relates to flood risk and drainage seeks to ensure development is safe across its lifetime and will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

The proposed dwelling is located on land within Flood Zone 1, and is not identified as being at fluvial flood risk. Based on available mapping and records, there are no known historic flood incidents at the site.

The Council's Flood and Drainage Team have commented upon the drainage submissions and requested the submission of further information. They have found the amended Drainage Strategy and the proposed Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage acceptable in principle, subject to a detailed design.

A pre-commencement condition has been recommended for the foul and surface water drainage design. With such a pre commencement condition in place the proposal will accord with the aims of Policy DP41 of the District Plan.

Ecology

The site falls within the Amber and Red Impact Risk Zones for Great Crested Newts. The Naturespace Newt Officer has been consulted for her views on the application, and has required the submission of additional supporting information during the course of determining the application.

The relevant District Plan Policy for biodiversity and its protection is DP38. This states:

'Biodiversity will be protected and enhanced by ensuring development:

o Contributes and takes opportunities to improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity and green infrastructure, so that there is a net gain in biodiversity, including through creating new designated sites and locally relevant habitats, and incorporating biodiversity features within developments; and
o Protects existing biodiversity, so that there is no net loss of biodiversity. Appropriate measures should be taken to avoid and reduce disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Unavoidable damage to biodiversity must be offset through ecological enhancements and mitigation measures (or compensation measures in exceptional circumstances); and
o Minimises habitat and species fragmentation and maximises opportunities to enhance and restore ecological corridors to connect natural habitats and increase coherence and resilience; and
o Promotes the restoration, management and expansion of priority habitats in the District; and
o Avoids damage to, protects and enhances the special characteristics of internationally designated Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation; nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and locally designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserves and Ancient Woodland or to other areas identified as being of nature conservation or geological interest, including wildlife corridors, aged or veteran trees, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, and Nature Improvement Areas.

Designated sites will be given protection and appropriate weight according to their importance and the contribution they make to wider ecological networks.

Valued soils will be protected and enhanced, including the best and most versatile agricultural land, and development should not contribute to unacceptable levels of soil pollution.

Geodiversity will be protected by ensuring development prevents harm to geological conservation interests, and where possible, enhances such interests. Geological conservation interests include Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites.'

As advised by the Newt Officer a planning condition and an Informative is recommended to ensure that the appropriate District Licence is obtained to ensure that the development can proceed without adverse harm to any Great Crested Newts at the site and to accord with the aims of District Plan Policy DP38.

Ashdown Forest

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations'), the competent authority - in this case, Mid Sussex District Council - has a duty to ensure that any plans or projects that they regulate (including plan making and determining planning applications) will have no adverse effect on the integrity of a European site of nature conservation importance. The European site of focus is the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The potential effects of development on Ashdown Forest were assessed during the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. This process identified likely significant effects on the Ashdown Forest SPA from recreational disturbance and on the Ashdown Forest SAC from atmospheric pollution.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed development.

Recreational disturbance

Increased recreational activity arising from new residential development and related population growth is likely to disturb the protected near-ground and ground nesting birds on Ashdown Forest.

In accordance with advice from Natural England, the HRA for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, and as detailed in District Plan Policy DP17, mitigation measures are necessary to counteract the effects of a potential increase in recreational pressure and are required for developments resulting in a net increase in dwellings within a 7km zone of influence around the Ashdown Forest SPA. A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation approach has been developed. This mitigation approach has been agreed with Natural England.

The proposed development is outside the 7km zone of influence and as such, mitigation is not required.

Atmospheric pollution

Increased traffic emissions as a consequence of new development may result in atmospheric pollution on Ashdown Forest. The main pollutant effects of interest are acid deposition and eutrophication by nitrogen deposition. High levels of nitrogen may detrimentally affect the composition of an ecosystem and lead to loss of species.

The proposed development was modelled in the Mid Sussex Transport Study as a windfall development such that its potential effects are incorporated into the overall results of the transport model, which indicates there would not be an overall impact on Ashdown Forest. This means that there is not considered to be a significant in combination effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC by this development proposal.

Conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment

The Habitats Regulations Assessment concludes that there would be no likely significant effects, alone or in combination, on the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC from the proposed development.

No mitigation is required in relation to the Ashdown Forest SPA or SAC.

A full HRA (that is, the appropriate assessment stage that ascertains the effect on integrity of the European site) of the proposed development is not required.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The Local Planning Authority has statutory biodiversity duties under s40 NERC Act 2006 (as amended) for the delivery of mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain.

The application has been supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment by Ecology Partnership, dated March 2026 and a Statutory Biodiversity Metric, dated March 2026. The submitted calculations indicate there will be a loss of onsite habitat units as a result of the development. The Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment recommends the purchase of offsite biodiversity units from a habitat bank registered on the Biodiversity Gain Site Register to achieve a net gain of at least 10% and to satisfy trading rules

The Ecological Adviser has reviewed the submitted BNG information and has advised that the biodiversity gain condition is attached to the Decision as an informative, using draft text provided by the Secretary of State. The applicant has been made aware of this requirement and this is agreed, along with the other Draft planning conditions.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

This application is for Technical Details following the approval by the MSDC Planning Committee to a PiP application under DM/25/1549 in October 2025.

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the application to be

assessed against the policies in the development plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.

As the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, it follows that the relevant policies for the supply of housing from the development plan are out-of-date (footnote 8 of paragraph 11 NPPF). As such, reduced weight should be given to these policies.

In these circumstances paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides for a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole (having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination), or specific policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development.

When undertaking the balancing exercise, the following benefits, harms and neutral impacts are as follows:

In terms of the scheme's benefits, the proposal would form one dwelling. Socially, the provision of the new dwelling will bring about positive impacts to the local community. The provision of a net increase of one dwelling on the site would make a minor contribution to the district's housing supply, which is a positive impact. The proposal would also result in construction jobs over the life of the build and an increased population likely to spend in the community. Environmentally, the proposed development is sustainably located within close proximity to facilities, services and public transport options available in Hurstpierpoint village centre. These are positive considerations in the planning balance.

While the proposal conflicts with some policies in the development plan, it is not considered that it would lead to any adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that, while this is only one new dwelling, it would still contribute to the Council's much needed housing supply and make effective use of the land.

The neutral impacts relate to the impact on Ashdown Forest, and to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building at Little Park.

In weighing up these issues, when taken together, it is your Planning Officer's view that having regard to paragraph 11d of the NPPF, that the adverse impacts of granting consent would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of this development.

In these circumstances the NPPF states that permission should be granted, and this is a material consideration of sufficient weight to overcome the proposal's conflict with the development plan.

There are no other material considerations that would alter the above planning balance. It is considered that the planning balance falls significantly in favour of granting planning permission

Overall, it is considered that the principle of a new dwelling represents a sustainable development and is acceptable on this site, subject to appropriate planning conditions, listed below.

The proposal would comply with the aims of Policies DP12, DP17, DP21, DP26, DP27, DP34, DP37, DP38, DP39 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies Policy HurstC1 and Policy HurstC3 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such, it is recommended that planning permission should be granted for the proposed new dwelling.

Consequently this application is recommended for approval, with agreed planning conditions and informatives.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Anna Tidey