

OBJECTION LETTER – DM/26/0073

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

3 Streatfield Place East Grinstead RH19 4RQ

Dear Mr Joseph 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 **3 Streatfield Place** sits **directly 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 conflicts 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.

This is a Green field site

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.

Cont'd

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

- The site forms part of the **valley side 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 **asserted 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)**
- **MSDC DPC4**
- **NPPF para 14**
- **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan EG1 (High Weald AONB)**

NPPF JULY 2021 Paragraph 176 states that **AONBs along with National parks and the Broads have the highest status of protection**

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 **3 Streatfield Place**, directly opposite the site, I will experience:

- A complete loss of the current **undeveloped rural outlook**.
- Direct 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 3 Streatfield Place (DP26)

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

- **Overbearing massing** directly 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.

Cont'd

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.

Specifically as follows

A. Total Loss of amenity and privacy to rear garden

- The proposed development destroys the use of our **primary private outdoor amenity space in the rear garden** of our property.
- It creates **Intense invasive and continuous overlooking and allows uninterrupted views of** this complete area.
All of the garden but primarily the patio seated area immediately connected to the south rear of the house.
- This proposal makes our rear garden completely overlooked by totally obtrusive, invasive, overbearing structures
- This planning creates a **significant overbearing impact and means a total loss of the amenity of our rear garden outdoor space**

B. Total Loss of Living conditions to the Main house 3 Streatfield Place

The proposed development and specifically the disproportionally large scale buildings in the North West corner of the proposed development are **overbearing and Invasive in scale size position and dominance.**

This is exacerbated by a difference in a rising level of the proposed site.

The habitable rooms and windows where this proposed development allows views directly into the windows are listed below.

This causes **significant loss of living conditions** by this proposed development.

1. Ground Floor Main Living Room double Patio Doors on South Side of residence
2. Ground Floor Main living Room two side windows on East side of residence
3. Ground floor Main kitchen and dining room double patio doors on South side of residence
4. Ground floor Main kitchen window on south side of residence
5. First floor main bathroom window to East side of residence
6. First floor Main Bedroom window to South Side of residence
7. First floor third bedroom window to South side of residence
8. Second floor Second bedroom two windows to South side of residence
9. Second floor bathroom window to South side of residence

C. Loss of outlook

Nr3 Streatfield place is located directly opposite the North Western side of the proposed development overlooking West Hoathly Road, and would be directly impacted by the buildings in this corner of the proposed development.

The structures in this corner consist of multi storey buildings with main living areas on the upper floors.

The main objection is to the **size, scale, position and dominance of the buildings.** These structures are **oppressively dominant and looming.**

Due to the gradient of the green field hill side there **is a difference in site levels** between the two sites to the detriment of our existing property.

There is no significant natural hedge or tree cover, which could in any way reduce the impact of the proposed development. **Planning constraint mean I would not be able to mitigate the harmful impact.**

Conversely the buildings in proposed development in the North West corner create a loss of reasonable, open and immediate outlook from our property. It significantly impacts our amenity and living conditions

Cont'd

5. Housing Need Already Met Until 28/29

Recently The Mid Sussex District Plan DP26 and East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan confirm that **housing needs are met until 2028/29**.

There is no strategic justification for a speculative development on a **green field site outside the BUAB** in an AONB protected landscape.

Furthermore

A. Emerging planning policies in Mid Sussex. EXTRACT

- Refers to 2.32 of Strategic housing market assessment Final report. The Table below includes the “Updated Minimum Residual Housing Figure” for each Settlement Category alongside the expected yield from the housing supply set out in the Site Allocations DPD. 2021-2031

The position set out in the Table is accurate for 1st April 2020.

- This suggests there is **significant supply over capacity (100%)** new housing in the planning area for planning period to 2031
- Meaning that the proposed development in question is **not in the public interest and falls into the category of “Piecemeal**

Cont'd

development as defined in East Grinstead Neighbourhood plan

2.32 For context, the Table below includes the “Updated Minimum Residual Housing Figure” for each Settlement Category alongside the expected yield from the housing supply set out in the Site Allocations DPD. The position set out in the Table is accurate for 1st April 2020.

Table 2.2 Policy SA10 Settlement Hierarchy and Delivery (DPD 2021)

Category	Settlements	Min Requirement over Plan Period	Updated Min Residual Housing Figure	Site Allocations – Housing Supply	Difference between Residual and Supply
1: Town	Burgess Hill, East Grinstead, Haywards Heath	10,653	706	1,409	+703
2: Larger Village	Copthorne, Crawley Down, Cuckfield, Hassocks and Keymer, Hurstpierpoint, Lindfield	3,005	198	105	-93
3: Medium Village	Albourne, Ardingly, Ashurst Wood, Balcombe, Bolney, Handcross,, Horsted Keynes, Pease Pottage,	2,200	371	238	-133

9

6. Highways and Access Concerns

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

- The proposed entrance is directly opposite my property.
- 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 with access to Streatfield place blind

This conflicts with **NPPF Section 9** and **EG11 Mitigating highway impact**(safe and suitable access for all users).

Cont'd

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 plan-led 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, EG11)**
- **Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)**
- The statutory purpose of the **High Weald National Landscape**

The proposed site is an intrusion into the countryside.

It is a major development proposed for green field land. It's proposed position is outside of the "Built up Area Boundary" in a designated protected AONB on green field land

It presents Highway safety issues, increased noise light and traffic pollution for the immediate and extended area of Dunnings Road and beyond.

It presents a significant invasive continuous overbearing oppressively dominant loss of amenity and outlook to our property plus our immediate neighbours

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

Yours faithfully,



Streatfield Place East Grinstead

RH19 4RQ

