

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 April 2025 10:20:49 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Clarke" <andrew.clarke@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0886

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/04/2025 10:20 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	South Meadow Cottage Brantridge Lane Staplefield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 6EW
Proposal:	Retrospective planning application for the partial change of use of land to residential paddock area.
Case Officer:	Andrew Clarke

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Tyes Place Brantridge Lane Staplefield
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We object to this planning application. The agricultural land sits within the HWAONB and outside the curtilage of South Meadow Cottage and any change would go against multiple District Plan policies including DP12 which states that the countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty as well as policy DP16 which seeks to protect the character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB. Policy DP34 aims to protect the setting of listed buildings and any change to this land use would alter the setting

of Tyes Place which is situated directly next to the field. The field, which is being used as garden, is visible from the wider area and noisy activities associated with such garden use can be heard from the footpath and the road as well as from Tyes Place.

It is our view that this application, which seems scant on detail, uses muddled and inaccurate language. From research there appears to be no such thing, in planning terms, as 'residential paddock'. To use the land as paddock would not require planning permission and it could already be used for grazing non domestic animals without change. To use it as a 'residential garden' does require specific planning permission and it is something that is generally strictly controlled in the National Landscape.

For a number of reasons, as near neighbours, we are left with nothing but uncertainty and suspicion of the applicant's long term intentions for this agricultural land particularly bearing in mind there is another undetermined retrospective planning application (DM/22/3875) on the same piece of land for a domestic garden room which was erected back in September 2022. In our opinion this is a contrived way of seeking to circumvent the planning process by trying to obtain permission for another use which would then allow the building to be retained.

This protracted nature of multiple breaches of planning control is concerning and unsettling and we feel the garden room building, which isn't marked on the latest application, should have been determined years ago.

Kind regards