

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 12:22:18 UTC+00:00
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 28/01/2026 12:22 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Off West Hoathly Road East Grinstead West Sussex
Proposal:	The erection of 44 new homes with access from West Hoathly Road, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, drainage, and associated infrastructure and highway works.
Case Officer:	Joseph Swift

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	16 Lister Avenue East Grinstead
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	1. Children and pedestrian safety. The road is heavily used by children and families walking to school and nursery. Pavements are too narrow for pushchairs or wheelchairs, forcing pedestrians into the road. The developer's own transport report confirms vehicle speeds already exceed the limit and there have been numerous near misses. Traffic from 44 new homes would significantly increase risk to all pedestrians, particularly children. 2. Traffic and road safety. The proposed access is close to a blind

bend on a narrow road where speeding is common. On-street parking near the Recreation Ground and Dunnings Pub already forces vehicles onto the wrong side of the road. Additional traffic from the development would materially increase danger for all road users.

3. Pressure on essential services. GPs, dentists and childcare are already at capacity.

An additional 44 homes would place unsustainable pressure.

4. Flooding, drainage and sewerage. The area already suffers from regular flooding, particularly near Dunnings Mill Pub, and a sewer burst recently at the Recreation Ground. With known drainage constraints and restrictions on surface water discharge, the development risks worsening flooding unless a fully evidenced drainage and groundwater solution is provided.

5. Environmental impact. No comprehensive ecological or wildlife surveys have been submitted. The site lies within a sensitive landscape where wildlife has already been displaced by nearby development. It also lies within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The AONB boundary is defined by the stream north of the Recreation Ground, which lies immediately north of the proposed site. Great weight must therefore be given to the conserving and enhancing natural beauty.

6. Sustainability and public transport. Public transport is extremely limited and poorly served. The bus stop lacks shelter and floods, while steep gradients and poor pedestrian infrastructure discourage walking. The proposal conflicts with national planning policy objectives on sustainable transport, road safety and climate impact.

7. Other policy conflicts. The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan Para 4.5 & 4.6 says

"National Planning Policy goes on to state at Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework...

*Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest."
- This has not been evidenced.

This site also lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031.

8. Future expansion. The plan includes a road leading off the site, raising concerns that this development could enable future expansion, compounding the existing and identified harms.

Kind regards

