

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 November 2025 22:09:41 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 10:09 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:	31 Hurst Road HASSOCKS WEST SUSSEX
----------	------------------------------------

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 DM/25/2626. The addition of additional dwellings in the back garden is completely inappropriate for this area: - 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; - 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).

In addition, this is already a very busy road and the addition of more properties will put further strain on infrastructure in the area.

Regards
Alison Dobbin

Kind regards