

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 September 2026 11:55:46 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <susan.dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/2178

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/09/2026 11:55 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between 149 And 161 College Lane Hurstpierpoint West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection 6no. dwellings with associated access, landscaping, parking and areas of open space.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 9 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Application DM/26/2178 - Land Between 149 and 161 College Lane I am writing to object to planning application DM/26/2178, for the erection of six new dwellings on land between 149 and 161 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint. This is not the first time development has been proposed on this exact site. In November 2014, the Council refused an application

on this same plot (ref. 14/03359/FUL, for three houses) on the grounds that it lies within "the countryside area of development restraint" and provides "the transition between the built up part of the village and countryside beyond." The decision notice specifically found that this point of College Lane "allows wider views to the countryside" and that development would therefore "harm the character and appearance of the locality." It also found the site to be "in an unsustainable location, where occupants would be reliant on the use of a private car to gain access to local services," concluding that these adverse impacts "significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits." Nothing about the site's location or character has changed since that decision, and if anything the case against building here is now stronger, not weaker, given the cumulative pressure of development already proposed elsewhere on College Lane. I do not see how six houses on the same plot avoids the same harm that three houses were found to cause in 2014.

I am also concerned about pedestrian safety. There is no contiguous footway along College Lane, and on this stretch in particular residents of any new development, along with existing residents, would have no safe route on foot to reach public transport at the top of the lane. Adding more households without addressing this basic safety gap is not acceptable.

On housing need, Hurstpierpoint requires affordable homes, not a further six expensive detached houses that do nothing to address the type of housing the village actually needs.

Finally, this application cannot be considered in isolation. College Lane is already the subject of three separate proposed allocations under the District Plan Main Modifications, sites MM72, MM73 and MM75, which between them would add 119 further dwellings to this same stretch of road. I have seen no assessment anywhere of the combined impact of these overlapping proposals, plus this new application, on traffic, drainage, or local infrastructure, and each is being considered as though the others do not exist.

For these reasons, I object to application DM/26/2178 and ask that it be refused, consistent with the Council's own decision on this site in 2014.

Kind regards