

From: Steven King
Sent: 26 May 2026 18:30:48 UTC+01:00
To: "'Prideaux Planning'" <prideauxplanning@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: DM/26/0432 – Whittaker House

Dear Rebecca

To clarify, the Council considers that the development is not acceptable for the reasons that are set out in the delegated report, which form the basis for the four reasons for refusal.

Reasons 1 and 2 could be addressed by the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the required infrastructure payments and the required mitigation in relation to the Ashdown Forest. That would leave reasons for refusal, numbers 3 and 4 which the Council will defend at appeal. If a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed, then the Council will defend all four reasons for refusal.

If I had thought that the proposal could be made acceptable by minor changes then I would have looked to achieve this, however this was not the case.

I trust this clarifies the Councils position.

Regards

Steven King, BSc (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI
Team Leader, Major Development
Mid Sussex District Council
01444 477556

Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk



Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Prideaux Planning <prideauxplanning@gmail.com>
Sent: 26 May 2026 17:12
To: Steven King <Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/0432 – Whittaker House

Dear Steven,

The Appellant notes and welcomes the Council's confirmation that refusal reasons 1 and 2 are capable of resolution through the completion of an appropriate legal agreement.

As you are aware, the Appellant has consistently maintained throughout the application process that all matters raised by the Council are capable of satisfactory mitigation and resolution.

In particular:

- the planning obligation matters can be addressed through the appeal process and completion of the relevant agreement;
- the refuse arrangements are operationally functioning in practice, with no collection issues identified by the Council's Waste Officer;
- additional land within the wider site is available to accommodate revised refuse and cycle storage provision if required;
- and the proposal does not result in any significant departure from the approved built form previously granted planning permission.

The Appellant has now also obtained Counsel's advice in relation to the refusal and appeal position. Counsel's view is that, once refusal reasons 1 and 2 fall away through the completion of the legal agreement, the remaining refusal reasons are not realistically defensible at appeal given that the remaining matters are capable of straightforward mitigation, as acknowledged within the consultee responses themselves.

In particular, the Local Highway Authority expressly invited consideration of alternative cycle provision elsewhere within the site and the Appellant immediately confirmed that such land was available. Equally, the Council's Waste Officer confirmed there are no operational collection issues arising at the site.

The Appellant therefore remains willing to work proactively and constructively with the Council in an effort to resolve matters without the need for a contested appeal process.

However, before further time and expense is incurred progressing amended details and legal agreements, the Appellant would require clarity as to whether the Council is genuinely prepared to reconsider and withdraw the refusal decision in full should suitable amended cycle/refuse arrangements and the relevant planning obligations be secured.

As matters presently stand, the appeal will continue.

Kind regards,

Rebecca Ali
Prideaux Planning

Mobile: 07922 536003

Email: Prideauxplanning@gmail.com