

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 November 2025 16:12:57 UTC+00:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2626

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/11/2025 4:12 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	42 Hurst Road Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9NL
Proposal:	Subdivision of the existing residential plot to create 2no residential dwellings, alongside retention of existing dwelling.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	46 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I am writing to object to planning application DM/25/2626 at 42 Hurst Road, Hassocks for the change of use of an existing garden outbuilding/pool house into a four-bedroom dwelling, together with a new access driveway running along the shared boundary. The proposal represents inappropriate garden development, intensification of residential use, and harmful impact on residential amenity and local character. The application conflicts with several adopted and emerging planning policies, outlined below.

2. Conflict with Ribbon Development Character (Garden Development Not Supported)

Hurst Road is characterised by long plots with undeveloped garden land extending to the rear - a classic example of ribbon development. No other dwelling along this stretch has been built in its back garden.

Relevant Policies:

- MSDC District Plan Policy DP26 - Character & Design: development must respect the existing character and pattern of development. Back garden dwellings in a ribbon development setting fail this requirement.

- MSDC District Plan Policy DP12 - Protecting the Countryside: development must not lead to inappropriate encroachment into private gardens that form part of the wider green landscape.

- NPPF Para 130 / 135: developments must be sympathetic to local character and avoid over development of plots.

The proposal introduces a form of backland / garden development that is out of keeping with the linear, frontage based character of Hurst Road.

3. Precedent & Cumulative Impact

Approving this dwelling would:

- Set a dangerous precedent for other long garden plots to follow.
- Result in piecemeal, unplanned intensification across Hurst Road.

- Undermine the strategic objective of protecting existing character areas.

Relevant Policies:

- NPPF para 11(d)(i): even where housing targets are not met, permission should be refused if "protecting areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal". This includes local character and residential amenity.

- DP26 & DP29 remain key policies that continue to carry weight, even in the absence of a full supply.

The Council is still required to balance harms, and the harms caused by this scheme significantly outweigh any minor contribution of one dwelling toward housing numbers.

4. Residential Amenity: Noise, Light, Headlights & Loss of Tranquility

The proposed dwelling introduces a new access road directly along residential garden boundaries, where there has always been quiet, private, undeveloped land.

Impacts:

- Vehicle headlights shining into neighbouring kitchens, bedrooms, and garden spaces.
- Noise from vehicles entering and exiting the long driveway.
- Loss of privacy due to increased human activity.
- Disturbance to peaceful gardens backing onto open fields.

Relevant Policies:

- DP29 - Noise, Air & Light Pollution: developments must prevent

unacceptable light spillage, glare and loss of amenity.

- NPPF para 185: requires planning decisions to avoid noise/light that results in significant adverse impacts on quality of life.
- Emerging District Plan DP2 (2024 draft): strengthens protection against light pollution, requiring minimisation of "sky glow, glare and light spillage".

Given the site's gradient and elevated position, the impact of lights and vehicle movements will be significantly magnified.

5. Ecology & Trees: Harm to Wildlife and Green Corridors

These gardens form a dark, wildlife rich corridor backing onto open countryside, with established trees, bats, owls, honey buzzards and other protected species.

The proposed development, including lighting, increased human activity and construction, risks:

- Habitat fragmentation
- Loss of foraging areas
- Disturbance to protected species

Relevant Policies:

- DP37 - Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows: requires protection of established trees.
- DP38 - Biodiversity: states that development must conserve and enhance biodiversity.
- NPPF para 180: development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity should be refused.

No ecological report has adequately addressed the impact on these species or the dark landscape nature of the gardens.

6. Highways Safety - Intensification of Traffic at a Busy Section of Hurst Road

The application increases the access demands on an already busy section of Hurst Road, used daily by children walking to two nearby schools.

Further concerns:

- Shared access between the existing approved infill house and the proposed new dwelling.
- Increased vehicle movements, reversing manoeuvres and turning.
- Poor visibility due to the gradient and fencing.

Relevant Policies:

- DP21 - Transport: requires safe and suitable access for all.
- NPPF para 111: development should be refused if it would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

7. Sewage Plant Location - Unacceptable Proximity to Residential Gardens

The proposal includes a sewage treatment plant directly next to neighbouring gardens and outdoor pool areas.

This raises:

- Odour concerns
- Noise from pumps/aeration
- Maintenance disruption

- Risk of overflow on a sloping site

Relevant Policies:

- DP29 - Noise, Air & Light Pollution: prevents developments causing unacceptable impacts on adjoining properties.
- NPPF para 185: requires planning decisions to protect residents from pollution.

A sewage system of this scale immediately adjacent to long established gardens is inappropriate and harmful to amenity.

8. Change from Pool House to Dwelling - Misleading Comparison

The developer asserts that "there is no difference between a pool house and a dwelling". This is factually and materially incorrect.

Key differences:

- A pool house generates minimal traffic, no regular parking, and almost no lighting.
- A four bed dwelling introduces daily trips, multiple cars, waste collection, deliveries, sewage, lighting, noise and permanent habitation.

Relevant Policies:

- DP26: requires assessment of scale and intensity of use.
- DP29: requires evaluation of light and noise impacts.

The change of use represents a major increase in intensity, not a like for like situation.

9. Summary of Key Policy Conflicts

The application conflicts with the following:

- DP26 - Character & Design
- DP29 - Noise, Air & Light Pollution
- **DP21 - Transport
- DP12 - Countryside Protection**
- DP37 / DP38 - Trees & Biodiversity
- NPPF para 11(d), 130, 135, 180, 185

Even with the five year housing supply deficit, the harm clearly outweighs the benefit of a single dwelling.

10. Request for Refusal

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuses planning application DM/25/2626, as the proposed development is inappropriate, harmful to neighbouring amenity, damaging to local character, and contrary to established planning policy.

Kind regards