

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 August 2026 10:20:05 UTC+01:00
To: "Joseph Swift" <joseph.swift@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0073

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/08/2026 10:20 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Off West Hoathly Road East Grinstead West Sussex
Proposal:	The erection of 42 new homes with access from West Hoathly Road, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, drainage, and associated infrastructure and highway works (Amended plans received).
Case Officer:	Joseph Swift

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: LITTLE COOMBE COOMBE HILL ROAD East Grinstead

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing as a local resident residing approximately 1/2 of a mile from the application site on Coombe Hill Road to formally record my strong objection to planning application DM/26/0073. This proposal represents an unacceptable form of development that directly breaches national legislation, local planning policies, and the statutory protections of the High Weald National Landscape.

My objection is structured around the following critical policy breaches and material planning concerns:

1. Statutory Breach: High Weald National Landscape (AONB)
Policy Conflicts: Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; NPPF Paras 176-177; Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP16; East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan Policy EG1.

Statutory Duty: Under Section 85, the Council has a strict statutory duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Landscape.

Expert Findings: Place Services (the Council's commissioned landscape consultants) confirm that the scheme offers only "limited regard" to this duty and would introduce a pronounced urbanising effect onto a valleyside landscape, eroding the defining assorted medieval field pattern.

2. Breach of Spatial Strategy: Development Outside the BUAB
Policy Conflicts: Mid Sussex District Plan Policies DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside) and DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside).

Location Conflict: The application site lies entirely outside the defined Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of East Grinstead.

Unjustified Sprawl: Development in the countryside is strictly controlled. The applicant has demonstrated no exceptional circumstances to justify a 42-home estate on greenfield countryside.

3. Severe Landscape Character and Visual Harm
Policy Conflicts: Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP26; East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan Policy EG3.

Unacceptable Impact: Located in a highly sensitive area (Area 12: Sunnyside High Weald), the proposed density and tiered rooflines on a sloping site will permanently ruin the undeveloped rural outlook.

Flawed Assessment: Place Services noted that the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) underestimated the harm to local receptors (specifically West Hoathly Road), rating the true harm as substantial-moderate.

4. Severe Strain on Local Utility Infrastructure
Policy Conflicts: Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP37 (Infrastructure).

Water Supply Instability: East Grinstead has experienced severe, documented water supply failures and low-pressure outages. The

existing water network is operating beyond safe operational capacity.

Unsustainable Scale: Adding 42 high-demand residential dwellings to an unproven network risks further infrastructural failure to existing local residents.

5. Highway Safety and Access Hazards

Policy Conflicts: NPPF Section 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport / Safe Access); Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP21.

Egress Hazards: The proposed access onto West Hoathly Road forces vehicles onto a steep gradient with compromised visibility, adjacent to a busy bend and narrow pedestrian footways.

Traffic Infiltration: The introduction of 80-100 daily vehicle movements will degrade traffic conditions and safety across the surrounding rural lane network, including Coombe Hill Road.

6. Prematurity and Incremental Development Pressure

Policy Conflicts: Plan-led development principles under the NPPF.

Precedent Risk: Approval would represent unacceptable incremental encroachment ("development by stealth") on protected greenfield land, undermining the integrity of the adopted District Plan.

Conclusion

Application DM/26/0073 fails to meet basic statutory standards for landscape protection, violates adopted spatial policies (DP12, DP15, DP16, EG1), and threatens local infrastructure and highway safety.

I respectfully urge the Local Planning Authority to uphold its statutory duties and refuse planning permission.

Kind regards