

OBJECTION LETTER – DM/26/0073

Land Off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead 44 dwellings with access, parking, landscaping and associated works

From: 1 Streatfield Place East Grinstead RH19 4RQ

Dear Mr Swift,

I am writing to object to planning application **DM/26/0073** for the erection of 44 dwellings on land off West Hoathly Road. My property at **1 Streatfield Place** sits **opposite the proposed site**, and the development would have a severe and unacceptable impact on both the local landscape and my residential amenity.

My objection is based on clear conflict with the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, the **Mid Sussex District Plan**, the **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan**, and the statutory protections afforded to the **High Weald National Landscape**.

1. The Site Lies Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

The application site is **outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB)** of East Grinstead as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan. Development in this location is therefore classified as **countryside**, where policies **DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside)** and **DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside)** strictly limit new housing unless exceptional circumstances apply. None apply here.

The proposal is therefore **fundamentally contrary** to the adopted spatial strategy.

2. High Weald National Landscape (AONB) – Statutory Duty to Protect

The site lies **within the High Weald National Landscape** (formerly AONB). Under **Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000**, the Council must “*have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty*” of the area.

The Place Services consultation (05/02/2026), commissioned by the Council, confirms:

- The site forms part of the **valleyside landscape** and acts as a **gateway into the High Weald National Landscape**.
- The development would introduce **multiple layers of rooflines** on a sloping landform, creating a pronounced **urbanising effect**.
- The scheme offers only “**limited regard**” to the statutory duty to conserve and enhance natural beauty.
- The LVIA **underestimates** the level of harm to several receptors, including Dunnings Road and West Hoathly Road.

- The proposal would erode the **assorted medieval field pattern**, a defining characteristic of the High Weald.

This is a direct conflict with:

- **NPPF paras. 176–177**
- **Mid Sussex District Plan DP16 (High Weald AONB)**
- **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan EG1 (High Weald AONB)**

The proposal does not conserve or enhance natural beauty — it demonstrably harms it.

3. Landscape and Visual Harm – Supported by Place Services

Place Services identify multiple areas of unacceptable harm:

3.1 Landscape Character

- The site sits within a **highly sensitive landscape** (Area 12 Sunnyside High Weald).
- Development would have **moderate–substantial adverse effects** at Year 1.
- The density and layout are **inconsistent with the rural edge** of East Grinstead.

3.2 Visual Impact

As a resident at **1 Streatfield Place**, opposite the site, I will experience:

- A complete loss of the current **undeveloped rural outlook**.
- Views of **urbanising rooflines** rising up the slope.
- Increased light pollution from street lighting and dwellings.
- A permanent change to the character of the entrance to the National Landscape.

Place Services confirm that:

- The LVIA **underestimates** the harm to West Hoathly Road.
- The impact should be judged **substantial–moderate**, not moderate.
- The development interrupts the **countryside edge** and the **gateway into the High Weald**.

These findings directly support refusal under **DP12, DP16, DP26, DP37, DP38**.

4. Severe Loss of Amenity to 1 Streatfield Place (DP26)

The proposal would cause a **significant and irreversible loss of amenity** to my property, including:

- **Overbearing massing** opposite my home.
- **Loss of privacy** from dwellings positioned on rising ground.
- **Loss of rural outlook**, replaced by a dense urban frontage.

- **Increased noise and disturbance** from traffic entering the new estate.
- **Headlight glare** from vehicles exiting the site at night.
- **Light pollution** from street lighting and housing.

Planning regulations prevent me from increasing boundary heights, meaning I have **no lawful means of mitigating** these impacts. This materially increases the weight of the harm.

5. Housing Need Already Met Until 2028/29

The Mid Sussex District Plan and East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan confirm that **housing needs are met until 2028/29**. There is no strategic justification for speculative development **outside the BUAB** in a protected landscape.

6. Highways and Access Concerns

Although general traffic volume may not be determinative, the **specific access arrangement** is unsafe:

- Vehicles will exit onto a **steep gradient** with limited visibility.
- The junction is already hazardous, particularly at peak times.
- Pedestrian safety is compromised due to narrow footways and proximity to a busy bend.

This conflicts with **NPPF Section 9** (safe and suitable access for all users).

7. Incremental Development Pressure

There is a clear pattern of **incremental development attempts** on this landholding. This proposal represents another attempt to secure development **by stealth**, contrary to the planned system and the protections afforded to the National Landscape.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above — and supported by the findings of the Council's own landscape consultants — the proposal is in clear conflict with:

- **NPPF (paras 11, 130, 174–177)**
- **Mid Sussex District Plan (DP12, DP15, DP16, DP26, DP37, DP38)**
- **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (EG1, EG3, EG5)**
- **Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)**
- The statutory purpose of the **High Weald National Landscape**

I therefore respectfully request that the application be **refused**.

Yours faithfully,

 1 Streatfield Place East Grinstead RH19 4RQ