

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 February 2026 09:41:20 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 21/02/2026 9:41 AM.

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:	1 Streatfield Place East Grinstead
----------	------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing in response to the Highways Authority's consultation comments dated 9 February 2026 regarding this application. While I appreciate the assessment undertaken, I wish to raise several significant concerns that I do not believe have been fully addressed, and which, in my view, warrant further scrutiny before a "No Objection" position can reasonably be maintained.

1. Visibility Splays - Below Standard and Based on Outdated Data

The consultation response states that visibility splays of 2.4m x 55m and 49m are achievable and acceptable. However:

- For a 30mph road, Manual for Streets normally requires 2.4m x 59m.

- The splays fall below this standard, particularly on the southern approach.

- The speed survey relied upon was undertaken in June 2025, now almost a year old, and may not reflect current traffic conditions or seasonal variations.

- West Hoathly Road is known locally for excessive vehicle speeds, even if not captured in collision data.

Given these factors, the splays should be reassessed using current speed data and measured against full MfS guidance, not minimum tolerances.

2. Accident Data Review Too Narrow

The response notes no recorded collisions "within the immediate vicinity". This phrasing is ambiguous and does not confirm the length of road assessed.

Local residents report:

- Multiple near misses,
- Poor forward visibility,
- Challenging gradients and bends, and
- Regular speeding.

These are material considerations even in the absence of recorded collisions. A more comprehensive safety review is required.

3. Pedestrian Access - Safety Concerns Not Addressed

The proposed pedestrian access relies on an uncontrolled crossing point to the north east of the site. Concerns include:

- Crossing located on a curved section of West Hoathly Road.
- Footways in this area are narrow, uneven, and not suitable for increased pedestrian use.
- No assessment of children walking to school, pushchairs, or mobility impaired users.

Given the scale of the development, a more robust pedestrian safety solution is required.

4. Parking Provision Below Standard

The Highways response acknowledges that parking provision is "slightly under the requirement" but does not quantify the shortfall.

This is concerning because:

- The surrounding area already experiences significant on street parking pressure.
- Any overflow parking onto West Hoathly Road will reduce visibility, particularly near the new access.
- Under provision is inconsistent with the stated aim of reducing highway risk.

A full parking impact assessment is required.

5. Internal Layout Issues Remain Unresolved

The Highways response lists several design matters that "should be considered", including:

- Raised tables,
- Internal visibility splays,
- Tactile paving, and
- Speed control measures.

These are not minor details; they are fundamental safety elements. It is unclear why a "No Objection" has been issued while key internal layout matters remain outstanding.

6. Capacity Assessment Does Not Reflect Local Conditions

The TRICS based assessment does not account for:

- Existing congestion on West Hoathly Road,
- School traffic peaks,
- The lack of alternative access routes, and
- The cumulative impact of other developments in East Grinstead.

A theoretical TRICS output cannot replace a localised capacity assessment, particularly on a constrained road network.

7. Sustainable Transport Assumptions Are Overstated

The response suggests the site is "reasonably located" for sustainable travel. However:

- Bus route 84 is infrequent and does not support commuter patterns.
- The High Street is a 20 minute walk, which is unrealistic for many residents.
- Cycling to the station involves steep gradients and unsafe road sections.
- No improvements to footways, lighting, or cycle infrastructure are proposed.

The assumptions made do not reflect the actual transport realities of the area.

8. Section 106 Mitigation Is Vague and Non Specific

The reference to a Total Access Demand (TAD) contribution towards A22 corridor improvements lacks:

- A defined amount,
 - A clear mitigation strategy, and
 - Any guarantee that funds will address impacts on West Hoathly Road, where the development's effects will be felt most acutely.
- Mitigation must be site specific and proportionate to the development's impact.

Conclusion

Given the concerns outlined above, I respectfully request that the Highways Authority reconsider its "No Objection" position and require the applicant to provide:

1. Updated speed surveys and revised visibility splay analysis.
2. A full pedestrian safety assessment.
3. A quantified parking assessment.
4. Revised internal layout drawings addressing all outstanding safety issues.
5. A localised capacity assessment reflecting real world traffic conditions.
6. A realistic sustainable transport appraisal.
7. Clear, site specific S106 mitigation proposals.

Until these matters are resolved, it is my view that the

development poses unacceptable risks to highway safety and network capacity, contrary to Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

Kind regards