

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 February 2026 21:11:00 UTC+00:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3176

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/02/2026 9:10 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj To The Meadows Little Park Farm Marchants Close Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9UZ
Proposal:	Proposed dwelling, detached three bedroom chalet bungalow. Supporting Arboricultural Report, Arboricultural Assessment and Outline Method Statement and Tree Layout Plan received on 20.01.2026.
Case Officer:	Anna Tidey

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Marchants close North End house Hurstpierpoint
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to proposed new dwelling at the Meadows DM/25/3176 I wish to object in the strongest terms to the above application and ask that the Council refuses planning permission for the following reasons. 1. Unjustified new dwelling in the countryside

The site lies beyond the defined built-up area boundary of the village and is therefore in the countryside in planning policy terms. The proposal would introduce an additional market dwelling on paddock land that forms part of the rural setting of the settlement, contrary to the plan-led strategy which seeks to focus new housing within settlement boundaries and to strictly control sporadic development in the countryside.

National policy only supports new homes in the countryside in limited circumstances (for example essential rural worker housing, re-use of existing buildings or truly exceptional quality design). This proposal does not meet any such exception and would amount to unjustified encroachment of built form into open countryside. It would therefore conflict with the Council's countryside protection policies and the relevant paragraphs of the national planning framework on isolated homes in the countryside.

2. Conflict with original consent, curtilage definition and removal of permitted development rights

The original permission for the existing dwelling on this plot deliberately:

- Defined a residential curtilage separate from the wider paddock land; and
- Removed permitted development rights to prevent incremental domestication and overdevelopment of this sensitive edge-of-settlement site.

The current application seeks a full second dwelling outside the approved curtilage and on land specifically identified as paddock rather than domestic garden. This is fundamentally at odds with the clear intent of the original permission, which was to maintain the open, rural character of the paddock and exercise tight control over additional built form. Allowing a substantial new dwelling would undermine that earlier decision, effectively circumvent the removal of permitted development rights, and set a harmful precedent for further "backland" or paddock-based development on similar edge-of-village plots.

3. Harm to trees and breach of tree protection zone

The proposed dwelling, along with its access, parking, drainage and service runs, is located within a designated tree protection zone that was secured by condition on the original consent. That condition recognised the importance of the trees and their root protection areas to the character and ecology of the site and wider area.

The construction and occupation of a dwelling within this zone is likely to result in:

- Direct root damage from foundations and services.
- Compaction and change in ground levels from vehicles and hard surfacing.
- Pressure for future pruning or removal of trees due to proximity to habitable rooms and garden use.

This would cause unacceptable harm to protected trees and their long-term health, contrary to the original tree protection condition, the Council's tree and biodiversity policies, and national policy which resists the loss or deterioration of important trees and habitats without overriding justification. The application fails to demonstrate that the development can be delivered without such harm.

4. Harm to rural character, landscape and settlement edge

The paddock forms part of the soft, green edge to the village and contributes positively to the rural character and appearance of the area. Introducing a second dwelling, with its associated domestic paraphernalia, parking, lighting and activity, would:

- Erode the open, pastoral character of the paddock.
- Push the perceived built-up edge of the settlement further into the countryside.
- Create a more suburban appearance that is out of keeping with the surrounding rural landscape.

This represents a clear urbanising intrusion into the countryside and would conflict with local plan policies requiring development at settlement edges to protect and enhance landscape character and the setting of villages.

5. Overdevelopment and poor site layout

The original permission envisaged one dwelling with a generous rural setting. Inserting a second dwelling into the remaining land would over-intensify the use of the plot and result in a cramped and contrived layout. Consequences include:

- Loss of the spacious setting of the existing house, contrary to the character of the area.
- Mutual overlooking, loss of privacy and reduced garden quality for both properties.
- Increased noise and disturbance from additional comings and goings in what is currently a quiet paddock.

Taken together, these effects amount to overdevelopment and conflict with design and amenity policies that require high-quality layouts, protection of neighbour amenity and development that responds positively to its context.

6. Incompatibility with the Permission in Principle

While a Permission in Principle has been granted, that does not guarantee approval of the technical details. The Council must still refuse permission where the detailed scheme fails to demonstrate compliance with the development plan and other material considerations. In this case, the chosen siting within the tree protection zone, outside the approved curtilage and on sensitive paddock land means that the technical details are fundamentally incompatible with the earlier intentions for the site and with adopted countryside, design, tree and landscape policies.

For all of the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Council refuses this application. The proposal would cause clear and demonstrable harm to the countryside, trees, landscape character and amenity, and it conflicts with both local and national planning policy.

Kind regards