

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 November 2025 05:03:22 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 22/11/2025 5:03 AM.

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:	Crossways Belmont Lane Hassocks
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	OBJECTION - Planning Application DM/25/2626 42 Hurst Road, Hassocks Dear Rachel Richardson I wish to register a formal objection to the above planning application. Having reviewed the submission, I consider the proposal to be wholly inappropriate for this location and in direct conflict with several adopted and emerging planning policies. My concerns relate to settlement separation, countryside protection,

harm to residential amenity, biodiversity, highway safety, and the unacceptable intensification of use arising from a back-garden dwelling.

1. Incompatible Encroachment into Countryside & Strategic Gaps

One of the most fundamental issues with this proposal is its intrusion into land that forms part of the countryside setting between Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint, and Burgess Hill.

The District Plan's Policy DP13 - Preventing Coalescence seeks to avoid exactly this type of creeping erosion of the narrow strategic gaps that maintain the separate identity of these settlements.

The introduction of a new dwelling deep in rear garden land would extend built form beyond the established building line, pushing development into an area that contributes to the open landscape. This is the opposite of what DP12 - Protecting the Countryside expects, which is that development outside defined built-up area boundaries must protect or enhance the landscape. There is no way to characterise this proposal as maintaining rural character.

2. Backland Development at Odds with Hurst Road's Established Form

Hurst Road displays a very clear and long-standing pattern of linear, frontage houses with long green rear plots. None of these gardens has been developed with a dwelling. Allowing one would alter the settlement form and set an unattractive precedent for successive garden plots to be infilled.

Policies requiring the safeguarding of character-DP26 and NPPF paragraphs 130 and 135-emphasise that new development must relate to the pattern and grain of the surrounding area. A four-bed dwelling hidden behind an existing house, reached by a hard access track pressed against garden boundaries, bears no relation to the locality's pattern of development.

3. Unacceptable Intensification of Use Compared With a Pool House

The applicant's suggestion that a pool house and a four-bed dwelling create similar impacts is misleading.

A pool house is used occasionally and quietly. A dwelling brings daily car movements, regular outdoor lighting, deliveries, refuse collection, increased parking demand, and continuous residential activity. The uplift in intensity is significant and materially affects neighbours.

DP26 (scale and intensity of development) and DP29 (light and noise pollution) both underscore that increased activity must not harm adjoining occupiers. This scheme does.

4. Residential Amenity: Light, Noise, Headlights, Privacy & Loss of Quiet Enjoyment

Running a driveway along existing garden boundaries is particularly harmful. Homes that currently enjoy peaceful, private gardens backing onto open countryside would instead border a busy access route.

Likely impacts include:

vehicle headlights shining directly into windows and gardens, noise from engines and doors at all times of day, increased overlooking and human activity where currently there is none, artificial lighting intruding into an area that is presently a dark wildlife corridor.

These conflicts with DP29 and NPPF para 185, which require the prevention of unacceptable noise and light impacts.

5. Precedent for Further Garden Erosion

Approving this dwelling would inevitably open the door for similar proposals along Hurst Road. It would transform a rural-edge neighbourhood into one where piecemeal, ad-hoc intensification becomes normalised.

The NPPF (para 11(d)(i)) confirms that even in periods of housing undersupply, permission should be refused where other planning harms outweigh benefits. Protecting character and amenity are specific examples.

In this case, the creation of a single dwelling cannot justify the long-term, cumulative harm.

6. Biodiversity Impacts & Loss of Dark Corridor

These connected gardens form a habitat network used by numerous wildlife species, including bats, owls, honey buzzards and other protected species. Increased lighting, new vehicular movements and construction activity will disturb nocturnal animals and reduce the ecological value of the area.

Policies engaged:

DP37 - protection of trees and green infrastructure

DP38 - conserving and enhancing biodiversity

NPPF para 180 - refusal required where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided

The ecological documentation submitted does not provide sufficient assessment of the effects on these species or on the established dark landscape.

7. Highway Concerns in a Sensitive Pedestrian Area

The site's access is situated on a busy stretch of Hurst Road regularly used by schoolchildren walking to and from two nearby schools. A second dwelling using the same narrow access point substantially increases vehicle activity at a location where visibility constraints already pose risk.

This directly conflicts with:

DP21 - Transport

NPPF para 111, which requires refusal where an unacceptable highway safety impact would result.

8. Sewage Treatment Plant Positioned Next to Neighbouring Gardens

The proposal places a sewage treatment system immediately adjacent to private garden spaces and near outdoor leisure areas, raising potential concerns about noise, odour, maintenance activities and overflow risks owing to site levels.

These impacts breach DP29 and NPPF para 185, which require protection against pollution affecting residential amenity.

9. Sustainability Claims are Unfounded

While the application references "Passivhaus principles," there is no commitment to meeting certified Passivhaus standards. Without certification by an accredited assessor and an enforceable condition, such statements have limited value and do not demonstrate compliance with the design and sustainability expectations under DP26.

10. Policy Summary and Overall Planning Harm

This proposal conflicts with a substantial suite of policies, including:

DP13 - Preventing Coalescence

DP12 - Protection of the Countryside

DP26 - Character & Design

DP29 - Noise, Air and Light Pollution

DP21 - Transport

DP37 & DP38 - Trees and Biodiversity

Relevant NPPF paragraphs: 11(d), 130, 135, 180 and 185

The proposal causes clear harm to character, amenity, settlement separation, habitat quality and highway safety, while offering minimal benefit.

Conclusion & Request for Refusal

The proposed intensification of the site through the creation of a four-bedroom dwelling in the rear garden is fundamentally at odds with planning policy and local character. It would disrupt the countryside edge, erode the strategic gap, cause unacceptable amenity and ecological impacts, and set a precedent for the gradual suburbanisation of an area that currently retains a rural feel.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuses planning application DM/25/2626.

Kind regards

