

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 November 2025 17:05:42 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 5:05 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:	8 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	-----------------------

### Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I object to this planning application. The back-garden development of additional dwellings is completely inappropriate:  - It is contrary to District Plan policy DP13 (Preventing Coalescence) because it encroaches dwellings into the strategic gaps (a) between Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks and (b) between Hassocks and Burgess Hill causing increased coalescence;  - It is contrary to policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside). That policy says "The countryside will be protected
-----------	--

in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty." It adds "Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District" but this application does not achieve maintenance or enhancement of the rural landscape;

- It is contrary to policy DP26 (Character and Design), because it:

- (a) fails to protect open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;
- (b) fails to protect valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;
- (c) would cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, by reason of the impact on privacy, outlook, noise, and light pollution (see Policy DP29);
- (d) does not positively address sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design: it makes vague statements about building to 'Passivhaus principles' but that does not equate to a commitment to construct a dwelling that is certified as achieving Passivhaus certification by an accredited Passivhaus assessor (the application could easily address this point by accepting a condition that any dwellings constructed as a result of this application would do so before occupancy);
- (e) It is further contrary to policy DP26 because the proposed pool house conversion is partially underground on a steeply north facing slope that does not receive sunlight for 2 to 3 months of the year: imagine living underground in a house that receives no sunlight whatsoever for that period, except via a bunker entrance faced south (but which also is unlikely to get direct sunlight); to my mind it would be deeply unpleasant.

---

Kind regards