

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 February 2026 15:27
To: planninginfo
Subject: DM/26/0131

Dear Planning Officer,

I note that this representation is submitted shortly after the consultation deadline of Friday 20th, with this submission being made on Sunday 22nd. This delay arose because I was not aware of the consultation period at the relevant time due to the inadequate publicity arrangements referred to in my earlier correspondence (Ref: JLEG001). I respectfully request that the Council accepts and takes these comments into account when determining the application, in the interests of fairness and meaningful public participation.

I am writing to formally object to the Reserved Matters application relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the proposed 550 residential units at land south and west of Upper Imberhorne School, Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead.

While the principle of development was established at outline stage, the submitted Reserved Matters details raise significant concerns regarding design quality, layout, residential amenity, infrastructure capacity and compliance with national and local planning policy.

Design, Layout and Spatial Integration

The proposed layout, density and urban form fail to respond appropriately to the established character and spatial structure of the surrounding area. The adjoining Imberhorne Estate is characterised by lower-density residential development, informal street patterns, generous spacing between dwellings and substantial off-street parking provision.

By contrast, the proposed scheme introduces a substantially higher density, more urbanised layout and built form which does not provide an appropriate transition in scale or character between the existing residential area and the new development. The absence of a coherent design response to local context conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement that development should be sympathetic to local character and establish a strong sense of place.

The proposal also disrupts the established spatial hierarchy of the area, where development typically transitions from higher density town centre environments to progressively lower density suburban character. The scheme instead introduces a higher density form adjacent to lower density residential areas, resulting in a discordant relationship with its surroundings.

Pedestrian Movement, Permeability and Residential Amenity

The proposed layout creates extensive pedestrian connections and walk-through routes linking the new development to surrounding areas, including routes through the existing Imberhorne Estate. The scheme therefore establishes the existing residential area as a primary movement corridor between different development zones.

This level of permeability is not consistent with the character or function of the surrounding low-density residential environment and is likely to generate significant increases in footfall, activity and associated noise within existing residential streets and pathways.

The introduction of substantial through-movement across a previously quiet residential environment raises material concerns regarding disturbance, loss of residential amenity, noise impacts and potential anti-social behaviour. The application does not demonstrate that these impacts have been adequately assessed or mitigated.

Parking Provision

The level of parking provision appears insufficient for a development of this scale and location, where car ownership levels are typically high. The proposal is therefore likely to result in overspill parking onto surrounding streets, increasing congestion and adversely affecting neighbouring residential areas. The application does not demonstrate that realistic parking demand has been adequately addressed.

Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

In addition, the application appears to rely on assumptions regarding future improvements to the A22 corridor (including the Godstone–East Grinstead section) to address traffic impacts. However, no confirmed or approved widening scheme for this section of the A22 has been published. Current proposals by Surrey and West Sussex County Councils remain at an early development and consultation stage, with no final design, secured funding, or delivery timetable in place. As such, any reliance on these potential improvements to mitigate the development's traffic impacts is uncertain and cannot be given significant weight. This further reinforces the concern that the cumulative impact of the development on highway capacity and safety has not been satisfactorily demonstrated.

Residential Amenity and Environmental Conditions

The site lies directly beneath the Gatwick Airport departure flight climb path, exposing future residents to significant and intrusive aircraft noise, particularly during peak operational periods and early morning hours. The site falls under the eastern departure route, which is frequently in use during spring and summer months due to prevailing wind conditions. Aircraft departing Gatwick regularly pass at relatively low altitude over this location after banking over Felbridge, including large long-haul aircraft such as Boeing 777s operating at high engine thrust during climb, as well as frequent early morning departures from approximately 5.30 to 6.00am onwards. These movements generate substantial and recurring noise levels that materially affect living conditions. As Gatwick Airport is designated as a 24-hour operational airport, the potential for aircraft movements and associated noise disturbance during night-time hours cannot be ruled out.

Given the intensity, frequency, and operational characteristics of aircraft movements over the site, this location does not represent a suitable environment for residential development. This concern is further heightened by proposals to bring Gatwick's existing standby runway into routine use, which would significantly increase aircraft movements and associated noise exposure over time. The application does not adequately demonstrate that mitigation measures would be capable of securing an acceptable standard of residential amenity, nor does it show how future occupants would be protected from existing and future increases in noise disturbance associated with airport operations.

This representation is made to ensure that the Council is fully aware of these constraints and the potential impacts on any future residents when determining the application. As such, the proposal fails to ensure a satisfactory living environment for future occupants.

Infrastructure Capacity and Utilities

The development would place further pressure on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare services and utilities, which are already operating under significant strain.

In particular, water infrastructure serving the Imberhorne Estate has experienced repeated failures, with ageing pipes already struggling to cope with demand and requiring repair following recent development in the area. Any additional demand arising from a development of this scale is likely to exacerbate these issues and would require substantial upgrades to existing infrastructure before further capacity can be accommodated. The application provides insufficient certainty regarding the delivery, funding and timing of the necessary infrastructure improvements.

Conclusion

Taken together, the proposed appearance, layout and scale do not demonstrate a development that integrates appropriately with its context, protects residential amenity, or delivers a high-quality and sustainable environment consistent with local and national planning policy. I therefore request that the Council carefully considers these matters when determining the application.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully,



55 Campbell Crescent
East Grinstead