

OBJECTION TO RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION DM/26/0131

Land South and West of Upper Imberhorne School, Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead, West Sussex

55 Campbell Crescent,
East Grinstead,
RH19 1JT

Date: 22/06/2026

To: Planning Department, Mid Sussex District Council

By email: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: DM/26/0131 - Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DM/23/2699

I object to application DM/26/0131 and ask that it is refused. If the Council is not minded to refuse the application now, I ask that it is deferred for further information, statutory consultee responses, proper re-consultation on the final amended plans, and determination by Planning Committee rather than delegated officer approval.

I understand that outline planning permission has already been granted under DM/23/2699. This objection is therefore directed to the matters now before the Council: appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, together with compliance with the outline permission, approved parameter plans, planning conditions, S106/phasing obligations, highway safety, playing-field protection, drainage, ecology, listed-building setting, and residential amenity.

The scale of this reserved-matters submission by Vistry Homes Limited and David Wilson Homes Southern is very substantial. It concerns 550 dwellings and will permanently affect the existing Imberhorne estate, Imberhorne Upper School, Imberhorne Lane, the Worth Way/Bluebell Railway corridor, local highway conditions, drainage, landscape character, residential amenity and the setting of heritage assets.

Although the principle of development was considered at outline stage, the Council is now being asked to approve the detailed appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of a major residential development. Vistry Homes Limited and David Wilson Homes Southern should not be permitted to proceed unless the final reserved-matters plans are demonstrably compliant with the outline permission, technically complete, properly phased, and acceptable in planning terms.

The application should therefore be refused or deferred unless the Council is satisfied that the amended plans fully address parameter-plan compliance, residential amenity, school playing-field protection, education capacity, drainage, parking, highway safety, construction impacts, aircraft noise, landscape mitigation, ecology, heritage setting and infrastructure phasing.

1. Reserved matters must comply with outline condition 19 and the approved parameter plans

The Council should require the applicant to provide a clear condition-by-condition and parameter-plan compliance table before determination. Outline condition 19 requires reserved matters to be in general conformity with the approved Land Use and Access Parameter Plan, Scale Parameter Plan, Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan and Green Infrastructure Strategy.

The officer report should expressly assess whether the amended layout, building heights, street pattern, housing parcels, parking courts, pedestrian/cycle links, drainage basins, open spaces, landscape buffers

and green infrastructure remain in general conformity with those approved documents. If any part of the submitted reserved matters materially departs from the approved parameter plans, the application should be refused or deferred rather than approved through reserved matters.

2. The May 2026 amended plans require proper re-consultation and a clear superseded-drawing schedule

The description of the application records amended plans and information received between 20 and 27 May, covering revisions to design, landscaping, highways, housing and sustainability measures. These are not minor peripheral matters; they go to the heart of the reserved matters now being determined.

The Council should publish a full list of superseded and current drawings, identify the final drawing pack, and give residents and statutory consultees a fair opportunity to comment on the final scheme. The application should not be determined until WSCC Highways, the Lead Local Flood Authority, Sport England, Sussex Police Designing Out Crime, the Conservation Officer, the Council's drainage/ecology/landscape officers, and affected local residents have had a proper opportunity to review the final amended plans.

Previous objections should not simply be noted and put aside. The officer report should explain how material concerns have been addressed, including layout, scale, parking, pedestrian/cycle routes, school playing-field phasing, drainage, lighting, noise, privacy, highway safety, ecology and infrastructure phasing.

3. Layout and scale: unacceptable edge relationship with the existing estate

The submitted reserved matters do not adequately demonstrate that the proposed high-density development will sit acceptably next to the established lower-density residential estate. The issue is not a private loss of view; it is the planning impact of scale, massing, outlook, privacy, overbearing development, levels, lighting, noise, public routes and weak boundary treatment.

The Council should require detailed existing and proposed site levels, finished floor levels, ridge heights, boundary sections, window-to-window distances, street scenes and verified visualisations from the existing estate. A plan view alone is not sufficient for a development of this size and sensitivity.

The concern across the Imberhorne Estate is that the proposed development would materially alter the residential environment that gives the estate its character, amenity and liveability. The combined effects of high-density development, three-storey buildings, flats, parking courts, public routes, school-run displacement, local noise, lighting, overlooking and weak boundary treatment would reduce the quality of living conditions for existing residents. Those are material planning matters which must be assessed before the reserved matters are approved.

4. Landscaping must be structural mitigation, not cosmetic planting

The landscaping proposals should not be treated as decorative detail. They are essential mitigation for the impact of 550 dwellings on the countryside edge, existing residents, public routes, ecological corridors and heritage setting.

The Council should require a landscape plan that clearly identifies retained hedgerows and trees, structural buffer widths, native species, tree sizes at planting, boundary fencing/walls, acoustic or privacy treatment where required, replacement planting, long-term maintenance responsibilities, and management arrangements for public and private open space.

Thin planting strips that may take many years to mature are not adequate mitigation for immediate impacts on outlook, privacy, noise, lighting and local character. Where the layout relies on landscaping to make the development acceptable, that landscaping must be substantial, deliverable, enforceable and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

5. Parking, refuse access, emergency access and highway safety are not adequately demonstrated

Inadequate or poorly located parking will cause overspill parking, obstruction of refuse and emergency vehicles, pavement parking, pedestrian/vehicle conflict, street clutter and harm to visual amenity. These are material planning issues directly linked to layout and design.

The Council should require a plot-by-plot parking schedule, visitor-parking schedule, disabled-parking details, cycle-parking details, EV-charging layout, garage dimensions, refuse-collection plan, swept-path analysis for refuse vehicles and fire appliances, and parking-management arrangements for parking courts and visitor spaces.

Garages, tandem spaces and remote visitor spaces should only be counted where they are realistically usable. The layout should not depend on optimistic assumptions about car ownership, particularly when the scheme is on the edge of town and the full mixed-use/local-centre infrastructure is not being brought forward as part of this reserved-matters application.

6. Roundabout, Imberhorne Lane, Worth Way/Bluebell Railway bridge area and PRow 44b/EG/1

The final highway design should be re-tested against the amended reserved-matters layout. The outline report identified the proposed vehicular access as a new roundabout on Imberhorne Lane south of Bluebell Close, with the spine road crossing PRow 44b/EG/1. The outline highway assessment also recorded departures from standards in relation to the roundabout design, including circulatory carriageway width and forward visibility.

The Council should not treat the roundabout and related highway works as a settled detail unless the final general arrangement drawings, visibility splays, pedestrian/cycle crossings, Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, designer's response and WSCC Highways comments are available and have been assessed against the final May 2026 amended layout.

Particular scrutiny is needed because of the Worth Way/Bluebell Railway bridge corridor, approach speeds, school traffic, construction traffic, HGV movements, emergency access, pedestrian and cycle safety, and the interaction with PRow 44b/EG/1. The layout should not be approved if the development relies on a compromised or unsafe highway arrangement.

7. Imberhorne Upper School playing fields: no works should affect existing fields before replacement facilities are complete and available

This is a critical point. The existing Imberhorne Upper School playing fields are used for football, rugby, athletics, PE and school/community sport. Current pupils should not suffer any temporary or permanent loss of sports provision while this development is built.

No works, fencing, contractor access, haul route, site compound, pedestrian/cycle link, road, service route, drainage works or other development affecting the existing school playing fields should be permitted until the replacement playing fields and sports facilities are fully completed, certified fit for purpose, available for school use, and accepted by WSCC, the school and Sport England.

A "build first, replace later" or "temporary gap" approach would be unacceptable. National planning policy protects existing open space and playing fields unless they are surplus, replaced by equivalent or better provision in a suitable location, or otherwise justified by alternative sports provision whose benefits clearly outweigh the loss. The same principle should apply to phasing: pupils must not be disadvantaged during implementation.

The Council should also confirm that no vehicular road access is proposed across existing school playing-field land. The WSCC land-exchange material describes transfer for a pedestrian and cycleway access with associated landscaping, and refers to protections to ensure that the disposal land is not used as a road access. If any vehicular road, construction road or haul route across existing school playing-field land

is now proposed, that would require fresh scrutiny, Sport England consultation, DfE/WSCC confirmation and full public consultation.

Condition 21 only prevents occupation of more than 150 dwellings before the replacement playing fields and sports facilities are completed and available. That is not enough to protect current pupils if works on the existing fields could occur earlier. The Council should secure a stronger phasing requirement preventing any disturbance or loss of existing school playing-field use before replacement provision is complete and available.

8. Phasing and infrastructure: 550 dwellings should not come forward in isolation

The reserved-matters submission by Vistry Homes Limited and David Wilson Homes Southern appears to relate to the 550 Class C3 dwellings, while other important elements of the wider outline scheme, including the care village, school land and mixed-use/community infrastructure, are to be brought forward separately.

This creates a serious and unacceptable risk that a large residential estate could be approved and occupied before the infrastructure and public benefits relied upon at outline stage are delivered. The Council should not permit the residential phase to come forward in isolation from the local centre, school land, community/health provision, care provision, public transport mitigation, SANG, sports facilities, pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, drainage works and highway improvements.

The Council should publish and assess the relevant S106 obligations, occupation triggers and whole-site phasing plan before determining this reserved-matters application. The residential layout should be tied to enforceable phasing so that the development does not become a car-dependent dormitory estate before the facilities and infrastructure that justified the outline permission are in place.

The Council should also confirm whether any occupation restrictions apply to the 550 dwellings before delivery of the primary school land, replacement school playing-field provision, local/community facilities, public transport measures, safe pedestrian/cycle routes and required highway works. If such triggers are absent or inadequate, the reserved-matters application should be deferred until enforceable phasing has been secured.

9. Drainage, flood risk, SuDS, levels and Felbridge Water

The drainage addendum should be fully reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority before any decision is made. The reserved-matters layout cannot be separated from drainage because roads, housing plots, open spaces, levels, SuDS basins, swales, exceedance routes and landscape areas all need to work together.

Outline condition 32 requires existing and proposed site levels. Outline condition 33 requires foul and surface-water drainage details, a timetable, and lifetime management/maintenance arrangements. Outline condition 41 requires details demonstrating that all built development is in Flood Zone 1 and at least 5 metres from Flood Zone 2, or otherwise a detailed model review of Felbridge Water and the site is required.

The Council should not approve the reserved matters until the LLFA has confirmed that the drainage addendum, final layout, proposed levels, exceedance routing, infiltration/groundwater assumptions, climate-change allowance, maintenance/adoption arrangements and phasing are acceptable. Particular attention should be given to whether the proposed layout would increase flood risk to existing homes or downstream land.

10. Noise, aircraft noise, ventilation and overheating

Outline Condition 23 requires any residential reserved-matters application to submit a scheme addressing the combined issues of acoustics, ventilation and overheating. These matters must not be assessed in isolation. Condition 23 requires good acoustic design to be integrated into the scheme, including separation from noise sources, layout, orientation of buildings, façade design, screening and only then use of the building envelope. It also requires the applicant to identify the noise exposure for each property.

The site lies directly beneath Gatwick take off easterly flightpaths, with aircraft passing over or near the application site at relatively low altitude in some operating conditions. This is not a minor background issue and should not be treated as a generalised “airport noise” point. It is a specific residential-amenity issue affecting the suitability of this layout for future occupiers.

Recent flight-tracking evidence demonstrates the issue clearly. Examples observed directly over the site include British Airways flight BA2065 at approximately 3,300 ft displayed altitude and Air Peace flight APO7579 at approximately 3,850 ft displayed altitude. These examples show that future residents would not merely experience distant background aircraft noise, but identifiable low-altitude overflights by large long-haul aircraft.

The concern is not limited to altitude alone. The application site appears to be affected after the right-hand banking/climb manoeuvre from Gatwick, where departing aircraft may still be using, maintaining or adjusting significant climb thrust. Aircraft noise at this point can be materially more intrusive than a simple altitude figure suggests, because noise impact is affected by aircraft type, engine power, climb profile, banking/turning movement, wind direction, temperature and time of day. The applicant’s acoustic assessment should therefore consider the actual flight profile over or near the site, including banked departures, thrust/climb conditions and single-event maximum noise levels, rather than relying only on generic average noise contours.

Large wide-body aircraft, including Boeing 777-series aircraft such as Boeing 777-300 / 777-300ER aircraft, generate materially different and more intrusive single-event noise impacts than smaller short-haul aircraft. These events can be sudden, distinct and disruptive, particularly during early morning, evening, night-time and warmer spring/summer periods when residents would normally wish to open windows, use gardens, and sleep with adequate ventilation.

This issue is made worse by changing wind and runway conditions. Gatwick runway use changes according to wind direction, meaning that overflight can become materially worse when prevailing conditions change and the airport operates in a mode that routes aircraft over the proposed site. This is typically over the spring, summer months. These conditions may continue for prolonged periods, especially during seasonal weather patterns. The assessment must therefore consider seasonal and wind-dependent aircraft operations, not merely annual average noise contours.

Gatwick's night-time operation must be treated as a material residential-amenity issue. Government night-flight restrictions apply to Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted during the 23:30 to 06:00 night quota period, but the permitted seasonal movement limits are materially different. For the October 2025–2028 regime, Gatwick is permitted 11,200 night-quota-period movements in summer, compared with 3,250 at Heathrow. Gatwick is also permitted 3,250 winter movements, compared with 2,550 at Heathrow. The Government also confirms that the summer season runs from the last Sunday in March to the last Sunday in October, which covers the warmer spring/summer period when residents are most likely to sleep with windows open and use gardens.

This is directly relevant to Condition 23, which requires proper assessment of acoustics, ventilation and overheating. The Council should not treat Gatwick night aircraft noise as a remote or theoretical issue. Gatwick has a substantial permitted night-flight allowance, particularly in summer, and this must be reflected in the applicant's acoustic assessment, including night-time, early-morning and late-evening aircraft events, single-event maximum noise levels, aircraft type, runway mode, seasonal variation and the effect on bedrooms, openable windows, gardens and overheating risk.

As a comparison, Heathrow's own published information states that it currently has no scheduled departures between 22:40 and 06:00 and no scheduled arrivals between 22:55 and 05:05. The practical comparison is therefore important: Gatwick's permitted and operational night-flight regime is materially different and, in summer, allows far more night-quota-period movements than Heathrow.

Future occupiers of the proposed dwellings should not be exposed to this aircraft-noise environment unless the applicant has first demonstrated, with robust evidence, that acceptable living conditions can be achieved. Condition 23 requires a scheme addressing acoustics, ventilation and overheating for residential reserved matters. That assessment must not be limited to road traffic or internal estate noise. It should consider all relevant existing and reasonably foreseeable noise sources, including aircraft noise associated with Gatwick flightpaths, large wide-body aircraft movements, night-time and early-morning aircraft events, road traffic, school/sports activity, parking courts, play areas, public open space, pedestrian/cycle routes, servicing/refuse areas and evening/night-time estate movement.

The Council should not rely only on annual average aircraft-noise contours. Average contours can mask the actual lived experience of repeated intrusive aircraft events. The applicant should be required to assess single-event aircraft noise, including LAmax / maximum noise events, frequency of overflights, aircraft type, altitude, runway mode, time of day, and seasonal variations. The assessment should specifically address observed examples such as BA2065 at approximately 3,300 ft and APO7579 at approximately 3,850 ft over or near the site.

The assessment should also address the impact on bedrooms, gardens, balconies, private amenity spaces and openable-window conditions. This is especially important during spring and summer, when residents are most likely to use outdoor amenity space and when overheating risk is greatest if windows must remain closed because of aircraft noise and it also coincides with when the route is most affected by the prevailing wind.

The layout should apply good acoustic design first: separation, orientation, building layout, acoustic screening, landscape/acoustic buffers and the careful positioning of bedrooms, gardens and other sensitive spaces. The development should not rely prematurely on sealed windows, mechanical ventilation or later technical fixes. Where windows would need to remain closed to achieve acceptable internal noise levels, the applicant must demonstrate that ventilation and overheating can still be properly managed without creating poor, oppressive or unhealthy living conditions for future occupiers.

Gatwick Airport is an established airport operation. If new residential development is introduced into an existing aircraft-noise environment, the burden should be on the applicant to prove that the homes will provide acceptable living conditions and that the airport's existing lawful operations will not be placed under pressure from avoidable future complaints. The Council should require suitable mitigation before the development is approved or occupied.

The Council should not approve the reserved matters unless it is satisfied that future residents will be properly protected from aircraft noise during day, evening and night-time conditions, including seasonal wind/runway changes and low-altitude wide-body aircraft overflights. It would be unacceptable for future occupiers to discover only after occupation that the site is directly affected by frequent intrusive aircraft noise from large long-haul aircraft using Gatwick flightpaths.

The Council should also confirm whether Gatwick safeguarding consultation is required, including in relation to building heights, lighting, cranes during construction, solar glare and wildlife hazard management.

Condition 23 expressly requires the applicant to show how living rooms and bedrooms will meet relevant internal noise standards with windows open for normal ventilation, where possible. It also requires bedrooms, with windows open, not normally to exceed 42 dB(A) LAFmax between 23:00 and 07:00. Only where those standards cannot be achieved after applying good acoustic design may the applicant rely on windows being closed, and even then the applicant must prove that adequate ventilation and cooling will still be provided.

This creates a serious acoustics / ventilation / overheating conflict. If aircraft noise from Gatwick's flightpaths, including low-altitude wide-body aircraft and night-time or early-morning movements, means that residents would need to keep windows closed to achieve acceptable internal noise levels, the applicant must demonstrate how these homes will avoid unacceptable overheating and poor ventilation during warmer spring and summer conditions.

The Council should not accept sealed windows or mechanical ventilation as a simple technical fix. Condition 23 requires an overheating assessment where windows must remain closed, and it applies a cooling hierarchy: first minimising heat generation, then reducing heat entering the building, then enabling passive ventilation, then mechanical ventilation, and only lastly active cooling. Mechanical ventilation is expressly a later-stage measure and must still comply with internal noise limits while providing sufficient ventilation.

The applicant should therefore be required to demonstrate, plot by plot, that future residents will have acceptable living conditions in bedrooms, living rooms, gardens, balconies and private amenity spaces during day, evening and night-time conditions. The assessment should include Gatwick aircraft noise, night-quota-period movements, low-altitude overflights, single-event maximum noise levels, aircraft type, runway mode, seasonal wind/runway changes and spring/summer overheating risk.

If the applicant has not robustly demonstrated how Condition 23 will be satisfied in this aircraft-noise environment, the reserved matters should be refused or deferred. Approving the detailed layout before the Condition 23 acoustics, ventilation and overheating conflict is resolved risks creating oppressive and unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers.

11. Lighting, crime prevention, pedestrian/cycle routes and residential amenity

The pedestrian and cycle network must be safe, direct, legible, well overlooked and accessible. However, it must not funnel large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists through the quiet existing residential/private estate roads of the Imberhorne Estate in a way that creates unacceptable noise, disturbance, privacy impacts, lighting impacts or anti-social behaviour risk. This includes the houses that run behind the Worth Way.

The Council should require a route-safety and amenity audit covering route width, gradients, lighting lux levels, natural surveillance, boundary treatment, privacy, management, maintenance, desire lines, anti-social behaviour risk, school-safeguarding issues and interaction with existing residents. Sussex Police Designing Out Crime should be asked to comment on the final amended plans.

Lighting must balance safety with residential amenity and biodiversity. The applicant should provide lux-level plans and Isolux contours showing impacts on existing homes, proposed routes, public open spaces, ecological corridors and bat-sensitive areas. Glare and light spill into existing homes should not be accepted.

12. Ecology, farmland birds, biodiversity net gain and lighting for bats

The site has ecological constraints and the outline permission includes conditions for ecological mitigation, farmland bird compensation, biodiversity-sensitive lighting and survey review if development does not commence within one year of the permission. The Council should confirm whether that one-year trigger has been or will be engaged.

The farmland bird compensation strategy should be published and secured before any works that would displace farmland birds. It should identify the purpose, methodology, mapped locations, persons responsible, duration and enforceability of compensation measures, including skylark plots. The Council should also require clarity on biodiversity net gain delivery, landscape/ecological management, hedgehog highways, bird and bat boxes, native planting, ponds and long-term maintenance.

The reserved-matters layout should be checked against ecological corridors and lighting requirements. Streets, parking courts, pedestrian/cycle links and public open space should not be lit in a way that fragments or degrades bat foraging/commuting routes or other biodiversity features.

13. Heritage setting and visual impact

The public notice for DM/26/0131 identifies the application as affecting the setting of a listed building. Although the outline balance has already been considered, the reserved matters now determine the actual scale, roofscape, materials, elevations, lighting, landscaping and views.

The Council should require the Conservation Officer to review the final amended plans, and should require heritage-specific visualisations and views where necessary. The detailed design should minimise harm to heritage significance through reduced scale where needed, appropriate materials, roof forms, boundary treatments, landscape buffers and careful lighting design.

14. Construction impacts, school operation and protection of existing residents

Given the scale of the proposal, the Construction Management Plan must be robust, enforceable and available for public comment before works begin. It should identify construction routes, HGV numbers, delivery hours, school peak (start and finish) restrictions, wheel-washing, dust control, noise limits, lighting, surface-water control, compound locations, contractor parking and a named complaints contact.

Local residents are aware from other large-scale local works, including developments in the Felbridge area and works affecting the Turners Hill Road / West Hill roundabout area, that construction-management commitments can fail in practice if they are not precise, monitored and enforced. This must not happen again at Imberhorne. The Council should not accept vague or generic construction-management wording. The CMP must contain clear route restrictions, working-hour limits, monitoring arrangements, breach procedures and named enforcement responsibilities.

Construction traffic should not be routed through existing residential or private estate roads. It should not obstruct Imberhorne Upper School access, Bluebell Close, Imberhorne Lane, existing residential access points, public rights of way, pedestrian/cycle routes or the Worth Way/Bluebell Railway corridor. HGV routing must be controlled from the outset and should be supported by signage, contractor induction, GPS route instructions and enforceable penalties for non-compliance.

Under no circumstances should contractors use, park on, compound upon, or route haul roads across existing school playing fields unless the replacement school playing-field provision has first been completed, certified fit for purpose, accepted by WSCC/the school/Sport England as appropriate, and made available for school use. Current pupils must not lose access to football, rugby, athletics, PE curriculum space or after-school/community sport because of construction phasing.

The Council should require strict delivery-hour restrictions avoiding school start and finish times, zero-tolerance wheel-washing and mud-on-road controls, dust suppression, noise and vibration limits, lighting controls, surface-water protection, contractor parking controls and a direct complaints/escalation procedure. The CMP should be secured before commencement and should be actively monitored throughout the construction period.

15. Education capacity, pupil displacement, school transport and phasing

The reserved-matters application should not be approved unless WSCC Education has provided an updated assessment of pupil-place demand arising from the final housing mix now proposed. The outline-stage education contribution formula depends on the number, size and type of dwellings approved at reserved-matters stage. The Council should therefore require WSCC Education to confirm, using the current reserved-matters housing schedule, the expected child yield for early years, primary, SEN, secondary and sixth-form provision.

This issue has repeatedly been raised by local residents and should be addressed directly in the officer report. There is a particular concern that pupils from surrounding villages, including Crawley Down, Copthorne, Turners Hill and West Hoathly, from which many current pupils travel to attend Imberhorne School, could be displaced or forced into longer and less sustainable journeys if education capacity, catchment effects and admissions impacts are not properly assessed before approval. This is not an abstract concern: it goes directly to school capacity, school transport, highway impacts, sustainable travel, and whether the education infrastructure relied upon at outline stage will be delivered early enough.

The outline scheme relied on education infrastructure as part of the public benefit of the development, including land for a 2-form-entry primary school, early-years provision and special needs education provision. The reserved-matters approval for 550 dwellings should therefore be tied to enforceable education phasing. The Council should confirm when the primary school land, early-years provision, SEN provision, secondary-school contributions and any sixth-form mitigation will be delivered, and whether occupation of dwellings will be restricted until sufficient education capacity is available.

The Council should require an updated WSCC Education consultation response before determination, addressing:

- current capacity in relevant early-years, primary, SEN, secondary and sixth-form provision;
- the child yield from the final reserved-matters housing mix;
- likely pressure on schools serving East Grinstead and surrounding villages;
- whether pupils from existing communities could be displaced;
- whether temporary bulge classes or temporary accommodation would be required;
- school-transport implications;
- safe walking and cycling routes to schools;
- the timing of the new primary/SEN/early-years provision;
- the occupation triggers for education infrastructure and financial contributions.

Without this information, the Council cannot safely conclude that the residential reserved matters will be supported by adequate education infrastructure or that surrounding communities will not suffer avoidable displacement and school-run impacts.

Conclusion and requested action

For the reasons above, I ask the Council to refuse DM/26/0131. In the alternative, the application should be deferred until the applicant has provided all missing information, statutory consultees have responded to the final amended plans, residents have been re-consulted on the final drawing pack, and the application has been referred to Planning Committee.

At minimum, the Council should require the following before determination:

- A Condition 19 parameter-plan compliance table and condition-by-condition compliance schedule.
- A complete superseded/current drawing schedule and proper re-consultation on the final amended plans.
- Existing/proposed levels, sections, ridge heights, separation distances, boundary treatments and verified visualisations from the existing estate and relevant heritage viewpoints.
- A plot-by-plot parking, visitor parking, disabled parking, cycle parking, EV charging, refuse and emergency-access schedule with swept-path analysis.
- Final roundabout/highway drawings, visibility splays, pedestrian/cycle crossing details, Stage 2 Road Safety Audit and WSCC Highways confirmation.
- A displacement and school-run impact assessment, including existing and proposed school pick-up/drop-off arrangements, displaced parent and visitor parking, on-street parking stress, pedestrian desire lines, pupil safety at school start and finish times, and mitigation to prevent overspill parking, congestion and unsafe manoeuvres on surrounding residential roads.
- A legally enforceable school playing-field phasing plan preventing any loss or disturbance of existing playing-field use until replacement facilities are complete, fit for purpose and available for school use.
- Sport England, DfE/WSCC and school confirmation regarding any works affecting school playing fields.
- LLFA confirmation on the drainage addendum, SuDS, levels, exceedance routes, maintenance/adoption and Flood Zone 1 / 5-metre Flood Zone 2 requirement.
- A full Condition 23 acoustics, ventilation and overheating assessment, undertaken plot by plot, which considers aircraft noise from Gatwick flightpaths, road noise, school/sports noise, public-route noise, parking courts, play areas, openable-window conditions and overheating risk.
- A specific Gatwick aircraft-noise assessment addressing low-altitude overflights, single-event maximum noise levels / LAmax, night-time and early-morning movements, aircraft type, runway mode, seasonal wind/runway variation, impacts on bedrooms, gardens and balconies, and whether acceptable living conditions can be achieved without relying on sealed windows or unacceptable overheating.
- A lighting strategy covering residential amenity, route safety, glare, biodiversity and bat-sensitive corridors.
- Updated ecology/farmland bird/BNG information where required, including mapped skylark compensation and long-term management.
- A whole-site phasing plan and S106 trigger schedule securing local infrastructure before occupation thresholds are reached.
- Conservation Officer review and heritage visualisations on the final amended plans.

- A robust Construction Management Plan protecting existing residents, school operation, public rights of way, current pupils, school-run access and surrounding residential roads from construction traffic, displaced parking and unsafe vehicle movements.

I reserve the right to submit further comments if further amended plans, consultee responses, condition-discharge material or committee papers are published.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the person writing the letter.