

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 March 2025 11:38:20 UTC+00:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application DM/25/0502

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 10/03/2025 11:38 AM from Adam Dracott on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/25/0502
Address:	Boars Mead Barn Bullfinch Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9ER
Proposal:	Change of Use of Agricultural Building to a Dwelling
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments:	The applicant has noted that a previous prior approval under DM/22/1777 provides a fall-back position for this site. Whilst I am aware that DM/22/1777 was permitted, I reiterate the comments made in relation to that prior approval as relevant to this new prior approval notification.
	This prior approval notification relates to a proposal to change the use of the barn from agricultural to residential. The constrained process for prior approvals means that full consideration of all the potential environmental impacts cannot be made. However, there are planning principles that I will outline which in my view have a bearing on the suitability of the proposal and that you may wish to consider when determining the application.
	Firstly, it is worth noting that the site is affected by road traffic noise from the A23 which is 140m west of the barn. This would ordinarily behave the applicant to provide an acoustic report on the likely

health impacts for future residents of the development. In such cases, if there are found to be adverse impacts on health or quality of life then the applicant should detail, and subsequently implement, mitigation measures to minimise the harm. In cases where such mitigation is not possible, then the development should be resisted. This assessment of harm and proposals to minimise the harm is not required in Class Q conversions.

Section 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework refers to the situation where new developments, particularly where sensitive receptors such as residential uses are involved, are introduced into areas where there are existing businesses and facilities. The intent is that existing businesses do not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. The agent of change principle is outlined in paragraph 200 and this places the onus on the applicant to provide mitigation measures where these are necessary to ensure the viability of existing businesses in the light of new sensitive uses being introduced as a consequence of a development proposal. This is pertinent in this case.

There is a commercial unit attached to the development site noted as a Class R building. This would allow storage and distribution activities in this adjacent and connected building. If the proposal proceeded and new occupants complained to the local authority about noise from these commercial activities, we have a duty to investigate and where statutory nuisance is established to serve an abatement notice on the commercial occupier. This would be an unreasonable restriction that paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should avoid.

I recommend you consider the above when determining whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise undesirable for this proposed change of use from agricultural to residential.

Kind regards