

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 19:25:42 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 7:25 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:	28 Sunnyside Close East Grinstead
----------	-----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I object to the above application. I recognise the need for new homes, including affordable housing, but this proposal is in the wrong location and has not demonstrated that it can be delivered without negative impacts. The development would create significant and enduring harm in relation to highway and pedestrian safety, flooding and drainage, landscape and biodiversity, and compliance with the development

plan.

1) Children's safety and pedestrian safety

West Hoathly Road/Dunnings Road is heavily used by children and families walking to school and nursery. The pedestrian environment is constrained: pavements are too narrow for pushchairs and wheelchairs in places, forcing pedestrians into the carriageway. This in itself is inherently unsafe, particularly for children - the addition of traffic from 44 new homes will materially increase risk to pedestrians and cyclists, and it will worsen an already hazardous walking environment.

2) Traffic impact and road safety at the access location

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. Introducing additional vehicle movements associated with 44 dwellings will materially increase conflict between vehicles and significantly increase danger for all road users.

The application should be refused unless the applicant demonstrates, with robust evidence, that the access arrangement and the wider highway network can operate safely with the additional traffic, and that effective mitigation is deliverable.

3) Pressure on essential services

Local essential services (GPs, dentists and childcare) are already at capacity. An additional 44 homes will increase demand further. The application does not demonstrate that the necessary supporting infrastructure is available or will be secured to accommodate this growth.

4) Flooding, drainage and sewerage capacity

The area suffers regular flooding, including near Dunnings Mill Pub, and there has been a recent sewer burst near the Recreation Ground. The site also has drainage constraints and restrictions on surface water discharge. This development will worsen flooding unless a fully evidenced surface water drainage strategy and groundwater solution is provided, with clear long-term maintenance arrangements and proof that discharge restrictions can be met.

In the absence of a complete, evidenced and deliverable drainage solution that prevents increased flood risk on- and off-site, planning permission should be refused.

5) Environmental impact and biodiversity

No comprehensive ecological and wildlife surveys have been submitted. The site is in a sensitive landscape with wildlife already displaced by nearby development. Without adequate baseline surveys, impact assessment, mitigation and measurable biodiversity outcomes, the proposal cannot be properly assessed and should not be approved.

6) High Weald AONB and landscape impact

The development affects the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting. The AONB boundary is immediately to the north, defined by the stream north of the Recreation Ground. National policy requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing natural beauty in AONBs. The proposal will harm landscape character and the setting of the AONB and does not provide the exceptional justification required for such harm.

7) Conflict with the development plan and neighbourhood plan

The site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan also sets a clear policy position that major development in designated areas should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it is demonstrated to be in the public interest. Those tests have not been met and have not been evidenced in this application.

8) Future expansion enabled by the proposed road

The proposal includes a road leading off the site. This creates a clear risk that the development enables future expansion, compounding the identified harms (traffic, flood risk, landscape and service pressures). The Council should not grant permission in a way that facilitates incremental growth beyond what is (not yet) properly assessed now.

Conclusion

The impacts set out above are severe, predictable and long-lasting. The proposal fails on highway safety, flood risk and landscape policy grounds. The only appropriate decision is refusal.

Kind regards