

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 December 2025 16:12:22 UTC+00:00
To: "Tracie Axford" <tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2976

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/12/2025 4:12 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	50 Hurst Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9NL
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the erection of a new front boundary wall and entry gate (revised design to DM/25/2104).
Case Officer:	Tracie Axford

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Crossways Hassocks
----------	--------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Current Planning Application - Altered 2m Brick Wall (Reduced by 15cm) I wish to object to the latest planning application to retain the brick wall on the front boundary, adjacent to the public highway, despite the minor proposed amendments. Although the applicant has proposed reducing the height by only 15cm and adding piers and capping stones, these changes do not address the fundamental issues identified by the Council in the

previous refusal. The wall remains visually dominant, disproportionate, and harmful to the character of the area.

1. The Height Reduction of Only 15cm Does Not Resolve the Overbearing Impact

A reduction of 15cm is negligible and does not materially alter the scale, massing, or presence of the wall.

At approximately 1.85 metres, the wall remains excessively tall for a roadside boundary in this location. It continues to appear: heavy and overbearing, visually intrusive, and highly disproportionate to the modest scale of the dwelling it fronts. Therefore, the wall still fails to comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which requires development to respect existing character and avoid visually harmful features.

2. The Wall Remains Incongruent and Out of Keeping With the Area

Even with added piers, the overall height and form of the wall remain wholly at odds with the surrounding streetscape, which is characterised by: open, lower, softer boundary treatments, visibility of front gardens, and a sense of openness along the highway.

The proposed alterations do not overcome the fundamentally incongruent, defensive and overly urban appearance of the structure.

This conflicts with:

DP12 - Protection of the Countryside,

DP26 - Character & Design, and

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, which emphasises appropriate boundary treatments that reinforce local character and avoid harsh, oppressive edges to the public realm.

3. Piers and Caps Do Not Make the Wall Acceptable in Context

While piers and capping stones may slightly improve the aesthetic detailing, they do not mitigate the primary issue: the overall mass and height are excessive.

The design enhancements simply decorate an otherwise inappropriate structure. They do not:

reduce the visual dominance,

soften the frontage, or

integrate the wall into the existing character of the area.

Thus the harm previously identified remains wholly unaddressed.

4. Continues to Harm the Distinctive Character of Hassocks (Policy 9)

Policy 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan requires development to respect and reinforce the distinctive character of the village.

This stretch of road is defined by openness, modest frontage treatments, and a welcoming suburban feel.

The amended wall still presents a harsh, closed-off and unneighbourly frontage completely out of keeping with local

character.

5. The Proposal Remains Contrary to the NPPF (Achieving Well-Designed Places)

The NPPF requires that development be:

visually attractive,
sympathetic to local character, and
contribute positively to the street scene.

The wall, even altered, continues to:

appear disproportionate,
dominate the public realm,
fail to reflect the surrounding context.

Therefore, the proposal remains inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 130.

6. Previously Stated Refusal Reasons Still Apply in Full

The Council previously refused permission because the wall was:
overbearing,

out of keeping,

detrimental to the street scene,

incongruent along the front boundary, and

harmful to the area's distinctive character.

The proposed amendments are superficial and do not address the core problems identified. The reasoning for refusal continues to apply.

Conclusion

The slight height reduction and addition of piers do not overcome the significant harm already recognised by the Council. The wall remains:

too tall,

too dominant,

out of proportion to the dwelling,

incongruous with the character of the area, and

harmful to the street scene.

For these reasons, the application remains in conflict with:

Mid Sussex District Plan Policies DP12 & DP26

Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9

Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD

NPPF Section 130

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse this application in full.

Kind regards