

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 May 2026 13:39:19 UTC+01:00
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 19/05/2026 1:39 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. Amended drawings received on 28.04.2026
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	44 Hurst Road Hassocks
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I note the reduction in the size and massing of the entrance/car port building following your discussions with the applicant. While this amendment is acknowledged, it does not address the principal concerns previously raised. 1. Access Road Position and Site Layout The proposed access road continues to run directly along the boundary. This does not appear to represent the most logical or well-considered arrangement for the site. Given the presence of the approved (but not yet built) infill

dwelling to the left of the main house, there is a clear opportunity to position the access between the two dwellings, creating a more coherent and contained access corridor.

Instead, the current layout places the access along the outer edge of the site, resulting in unnecessary and avoidable impacts on neighbouring amenity, including noise, disturbance and vehicle movement immediately adjacent to the boundary - particularly given the gradient of the land.

Importantly, this harm appears to be entirely avoidable through a more appropriate layout.

While I appreciate that the infill dwelling benefits from an existing consent, this does not remove the requirement for the current proposal to demonstrate an acceptable layout in its own right. The presence of a previous permission should not be relied upon to justify a layout which gives rise to avoidable harm, particularly where a clear and viable alternative exists.

2. Insufficient Landscape Buffer / Mitigation

While landscaping is indicated alongside a boundary fence, the space allowed appears to be approximately 0.5 metres in width. In practical terms, this is insufficient to provide meaningful mitigation. It would not support hedge planting or create an effective visual or acoustic buffer, and therefore does little to reduce the impacts of vehicle movements, including noise, headlights and general disturbance. There also appears to be no buffer provision adjacent to our kitchen and living areas.

In comparable situations, a minimum of approximately 2 metres would typically be required to provide an effective landscaped buffer.

As proposed, the relationship between the access road and the boundary remains harsh and immediate, resulting in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

3. Unclear / Unreferenced Plan Changes

On the amended Proposed Site Plan (Drawing 1684_3.002 Rev C), there appears to be a change to the driveway entrance serving the infill dwelling.

This change does not appear to be referenced or explained in the accompanying correspondence. I would be grateful if this could be clarified, including whether it forms part of the current application or relates to the previously approved scheme. The relationship between the relocated access point, the infill dwelling and the proposed garden house suggests potential conflict between vehicles entering/exiting and those accessing parking areas. This indicates a constrained and poorly resolved layout and further gives rise to the moving of the location of the proposed road.

4. Overall Planning Balance

Taken together, these points indicate that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, where the layout is being forced rather than achieving a high-quality and functional design.

The amendment to the car port does not address these

fundamental issues.

I have taken independent advice on the scheme, and where a viable alternative layout exists which would materially reduce the identified harm, this should be properly considered as part of the planning balance. In this case, repositioning the access between the two dwellings represents a clear and deliverable alternative. I would be grateful if you could confirm how this option has been assessed as part of the decision-making process.

Kind regards