

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 February 2026 17:24:04 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 09/02/2026 5:24 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:	12 Stockwell Road East Grinstead
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	This proposed development is within the High Weald AONB and it does not conform to any overriding criteria within MSDC's current District Plan relevant adopted planning policies or those within the National Planning Policy Framework and so should not be given approval. The field concerned is currently separated from the housing on the Southern edge of East Grinstead by a well-patronised and popular recreation ground, with a separate play area for young

children. This very effectively provides a gradual and pleasant transition between town and countryside, which would be lost should development be sanctioned beyond. Such development would in turn severely compromise the amenity of the recreation ground.

Surface water drainage is an issue in the area, and the nearby recently completed Sunnyside Close development has experienced difficulties, possibly relating to its attenuation system. The firm clay soils in this area do not allow for infiltration to any significant degree. An application for housing to the West of the nearby Toybox Nursey was refused a couple of years ago with inadequate surface water drainage dispersal issues being cited on the refusal document. The introduction of such a large extent of new hard surfacing, leading to rapid influx into drainage systems discharging ultimately into the Dunnings Brook as opposed to more gradual percolation currently occurring, will obviously have a detrimental effect on flooding risk, in this area and further downstream. Attenuation, as allowed for in the scheme, will not totally alleviate this risk - such installations depend to a great degree on regular maintenance. It is also noted that foul water is to be stored on-site and pumped to foul water drains when on-site capacity is reached. Again such installations depend to a great degree on regular maintenance and the likelihood of off-site drainage capacity being overcome at times of discharge cannot be discounted. The FW sewer by the recreation ground, to which foul water from the proposed scheme would ultimately be taken, recently burst due to inadequate capacity.

West Hoathly Road and Dunnings Road are both unmarked minor roads of limited width, limited visibility and are poorly lit. They are patently unsuitable for the increased traffic that would result from this development. A little to the South of the site West Hoathly Road passes through a narrow section where two cars cannot easily pass and minor collisions here are commonplace. Pedestrian access to the site is also unsatisfactory - the only footpath is on the opposite side of the road and it is very narrow.

It is noted that the Transport Statement asserts that that no incidents have occurred along West Hoathly Road within the vicinity of the site in the latest 5-year period. This is incorrect, several have occurred - only a couple of months ago a car crash resulted in significant damage to a nearby property - this was only the latest of several incidents unfortunately.

It will be noted that the current Mid Sussex District Council Landscape Capacity Study identifies the Southern and South Eastern edges of East Grinstead, where the site is located, as the most sensitive to development - further reason to resist any development in this location.

In view of this it is surprising that no Environmental Impact Assessment has been required by the council in order that this

application be correctly registered. It is also noted that the New Application Pre-Screening Checklist for environmental impact is incomplete, unsigned and undated...

East Grinstead does not have a service infrastructure that can provide for further housing, GP Surgeries, Dental Surgeries, Schools and childcare facilities will be unable to cope. In this respect is also noted that the construction of 550 new homes to the West of Imberhorne Lane has recently been given Planning Approval, which will already further over-stretch the current service infrastructure.

Public Transport nearby the site is limited to only 6 services each weekday between East Grinstead and Crawley (5 on Saturdays and none on Sundays). The Journey to Crawley from the site takes nearly an hour... This should not be seen as a sustainable transport provision, adequate for planning permission.

Observations on submitted Planning Statement:

1:9 Planning History states incorrectly that the site has a 'very limited planning history'. In fact there have been several recent applications in connection with a new access road between Boyles Farm, on Harwoods Lane to the East, and West Hoathly Road, all of which have been refused. In this respect it is noted that the site boundary projects through the ancient woodland to the South East of the site, the consequential loss of and disturbance to was pertinent the refusal of the these applications. It is noted that the 'Biodiversity Net Gain' Report erroneously states that no 'Lowland mixed deciduous woodland' units will be lost. This site projection would indicate that this is not the case... This and other previous preclusions to development must therefore be taken into account with this application. This aspect of the site plan would also indicate that the applicant is considering a future application for further adjacent development.

4:14 Asserts that the site is 'contiguous with an existing built-up area...' in attempting to show compliance with Policy DP6. This is substantially incorrect. It will be seen that, apart from a very short boundary with the adjacent property to the North, No 145, it is very obviously separated from the built-up area by Sunnyside Recreation Ground and so is not 'contiguous'. The boundary of the built-up area (and hence the adopted boundary for planning purposes), is the other side of the recreation ground to the North East of Dunnings Brook, around 75 to 80m from the application site boundary. To further amplify this point it will be seen as salient that the list of 'Neighbours Notified' by the Council for this application do not include any addresses in Stockwell Road or Lister Avenue, the nearest roads within the built up area - proof that the site is certainly not considered by MSDC to be contiguous with the built up area... It is also noted that the Council has previously refused applications with lack of contiguity being cited within the reasons for refusal.

4.3 Reference to Draft Policy DPA4 in the Emerging District Plan

Review, which identifies the site as a 'possible' development, should not be given any credence in respect to this application as this document is still at consultation stage, the inspector concerned has just changed and no dates for the hearing are currently confirmed. There is therefore no certainty of it being adopted in its present form and consequently it should not be invoked in this instance.

Kind regards