

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 June 2026 15:30:37 UTC+01:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <rachel.richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0412

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 23/06/2026 3:30 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Barrington House Portsmouth Wood Drive Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2DW
Proposal:	Proposed ground mounted PV solar panels. Additional Information received on 21.05.2026.
Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	7 Barrington Wood Lindfield
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	7 Barrington Wood Lindfield RH16 2DJ 22nd June 2026 Dear Madam, Re: Objection to Planning Application DM/26/0412

I write to formally object to the above planning application on several grounds.

Firstly, the proposed development would result in a harmful and intrusive visual impact on the surrounding area. Due to its elevated position and scale, the installation would dominate the outlook from neighbouring properties and the street scene below. It would appear starkly out of keeping with the established character of the area, which is defined by mature planting, landscaped gardens and a coherent architectural style. Rather than blending into its surroundings, the proposal would introduce a conspicuous and incongruous feature.

The description of the site as a minor or unused section of rear garden is misleading. In reality, the location is highly prominent, occupying the front-facing aspect of the property and being clearly visible from multiple viewpoints within the street. Its position on sloping land above a substantial boundary structure further amplifies its prominence, making it a defining feature within the landscape rather than a discreet addition. Any suggestion that screening could adequately mitigate this impact is unrealistic. Given the gradient of the land and the proposed mounting of the panels, the overall height and visibility of the structure would remain significant. Consequently, it would continue to present an overbearing and visually dominant presence regardless of any limited planting or boundary treatment.

The proposal also fails to respect the character and significance of the host property and its surroundings. While reference has been made to alterations carried out elsewhere within Barrington Wood, these developments were subject to detailed consideration by Mid Sussex District Council and assessed against the historical significance of the area, including evidence relating to the original layout and development of the site. The existence of those approved developments should not be taken as justification for a proposal that would cause demonstrable harm to the character and setting of this particular location.

The site forms part of the original grounds of a historically important dwelling that has subsequently been subdivided, and its setting contributes to the heritage value and historic integrity of the wider group. Development of this nature would erode that context and diminish the relationship between the original house and its grounds.

It is also important to note that alternative locations appear to exist within the applicant's garden where a solar installation could be accommodated with substantially less visual impact on neighbouring residents and the wider street scene. As illustrated in Photograph 1, there is a south-facing area within the property, highlighted in yellow, which appears suitable for solar panels and benefits from unobstructed solar access. By contrast, the

proposed location, highlighted in red, is the area that would have the greatest impact on neighbouring properties and the public realm. It is understood that these alternative locations were not pursued because they would be more visible from within the applicant's own property. If correct, this raises concerns that private convenience has been prioritised over wider planning and amenity considerations.

In addition, there are significant concerns regarding surface water management and drainage. Barrington Wood is situated on a steep hillside and is already susceptible to substantial surface water runoff during periods of heavy rainfall. Water regularly flows down the road and surrounding slopes in considerable volumes. The existing trees, shrubs and vegetation currently play an important role in intercepting rainfall, absorbing water and stabilising the bank. However, a number of trees and shrubs have already been removed from the site. I believe that one of the removed trees may have been a Beech tree subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The accompanying photographs demonstrate the extent of vegetation previously present and the progressive clearance of the site. Photographs 1 and 2 were taken in 2011, Photograph 3 was taken on 2 February 2026 prior to the completion of the tree survey while vegetation removal was ongoing, and Photograph 4 shows the site in its current condition following the removal of substantial shrubbery.

Despite the vegetation already removed, the submitted plans indicate that further clearance may be necessary to ensure the effective operation of the proposed solar array. This would result in additional loss of vegetation, further diminishing the visual character of the site and potentially increasing the drainage and erosion concerns outlined above.

The loss of vegetation, combined with the introduction of solar panels and their supporting structures, is likely to exacerbate existing drainage issues. Rainwater would be able to run more freely across and around the panels and supporting framework, increasing both the volume and velocity of surface water flowing downhill. This raises a clear risk of accelerated erosion of the bank, together with increased water discharge onto the road and shared parking areas below, potentially leading to localised flooding and associated hazards. Recent storms have already demonstrated how reduced vegetation cover can contribute to increased runoff and erosion on the slope.

While I fully support environmentally responsible and sustainable energy initiatives, it is important that such measures are appropriate to their setting and do not cause undue harm to neighbouring amenity, landscape character or heritage assets. There appear to be alternative low-carbon technologies available, such as air source or ground source heat pump systems, which could deliver environmental benefits in a far less visually intrusive manner. Greater consideration should be given to solutions that

achieve a better balance between sustainability objectives and the protection of local character.

Furthermore, the application lacks sufficient clarity and consistency in its supporting information. Although a line drawing has been submitted covering the whole site, it does not adequately illustrate the three-dimensional elevation, massing or visual appearance of the proposed panels. The absence of accurate visual representations, photomontages or street-level perspectives further compounds this issue, as there is no reliable means of understanding how the development would appear within the existing streetscape.

The proposal would replace a predominantly green and landscaped area with a substantial expanse of dark photovoltaic panels and supporting structures. Given the prominence of the site, this would create a stark visual contrast with the existing character of the area and would be particularly noticeable when viewed from surrounding properties and the public realm.

In addition, no information has been provided regarding any potential implications for safety or maintenance arising from the installation, despite the scale and prominence of the proposed development. The suggested panels location mentioned on the data sheet are apparently good for 'Flat roofs, landfills, open spaces, green areas (excluding hydrogen sulphide exposure)' which doesn't seem to mention the area that is suggested.

Finally, insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate that the scale of the proposed installation is proportionate or necessary for the stated purpose. In the absence of supporting technical evidence regarding energy requirements, generation capacity and alternative siting options, it is not possible to conclude that the extent of the development is appropriate or justified.

In summary, this proposal represents an unsuitable and harmful form of development in a sensitive and highly prominent location. Its adverse visual impact, harm to the historic setting, potential drainage implications, loss of vegetation, lack of clear supporting information and questionable siting all weigh strongly against approval.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Nikola Tucker

No 1 Alternative south-facing locations highlighted in yellow and proposed location highlighted in red.

No 2 Site in 2011.

No3 February 2026 Site during vegetation removal (2 February 2026)

No4 March 2026 condition
(photos sent via email)

Kind regards