

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 July 2026 17:09:30 UTC+01:00
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 27/07/2026 5:09 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Off West Hoathly Road East Grinstead West Sussex
Proposal:	The erection of 42 new homes with access from West Hoathly Road, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, drainage, and associated infrastructure and highway works (Amended plans received).
Case Officer:	Joseph Swift

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	12 Morton Road East Grinstead
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam, I wish to formally object to the amended plans for the proposed development dwellings on land off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead. All my points are still valid and have not been addressed. In addition to my original statement there have been two further serious car accidents on the road which only raises my concern about safety. One of which was an overturned van before

the blind bend where the proposed pedestrian crossing is. My objection is still on the grounds of highway and pedestrian safety, impact on residential amenity, drainage and water infrastructure constraints, landscape harm, and conflict with the Mid Sussex District Plan, the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, and national planning policy, including protections afforded to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

1. Highway Safety and Pedestrian Access

The proposed pedestrian crossing linking the development to the existing public footpath is located on a blind bend on West Hoathly Road, where visibility is poor and vehicle speeds are frequently high. This presents a big risk to pedestrian safety. From personal experience using the pathway to Toybox Nursery everyday, this road and narrow path is not built to be a high traffic area. The existing footpath is extremely narrow, often requiring pedestrians with prams to walk in the road if someone's coming the other way, cars often speed round the bend making this very risky. The addition of 42 dwellings will inevitably increase both vehicular movements and pedestrians at this location, exacerbating an already dangerous situation. This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 111, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. It also conflicts with Mid Sussex District Plan Policy T2 (Transport Infrastructure), which requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users, including pedestrians. Please note this is not a main road so the number of road collisions this year alone (2 of which ploughed into houses) is alarming.

2. Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal would result in a significant and harmful impact on my residential amenity. I currently can see the application site from our top floor bedroom. With the recent development at no 9 our outlook would then be altered both to the front and rear of my property. This represents a substantial loss of outlook and openness, causing harm to living conditions and wellbeing. The proposal conflicts with Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP26 (Character and Design), which seeks to protect the amenity of existing residents. The small development at 9 Morton Road has had a significant negative impact on surrounding residents and their well being so far, and it isn't even complete yet, with road damage, loss of parking, loss of trees, loss of wildlife, increase in litter from builders, illegal blocking of known badger setts and flooding to name a few. so I can only imagine the impact on this larger scale development.

3. Drainage and Water Infrastructure

There are serious concerns regarding surface water drainage and

the capacity of existing water infrastructure to accommodate this development. The local area already experiences drainage constraints, and insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that surface water can be managed without increasing flood risk on-site or elsewhere. The road runs downhill from the site which I foresee being an issue. Dunning's Mill area has had reoccurring problems recently. There is actually a leak on Stockwell Rd as I write this going onto the main road and into Sunnyside stream. What will you do to fix this? In addition, water supply in the area is under pressure, the local water shortage and house pipe bans recently only proves this. The proposal does not adequately demonstrate that sufficient water resources are available to support 42 additional dwellings without negatively impacting existing residents. All of this is contrary to Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP41 (Flood Risk and Drainage), which requires development to manage water sustainably and avoid increasing flood risk, as well as NPPF paragraph 174, which seeks to prevent development from contributing to unacceptable environmental impacts. Again I'd also like to point to the development at 9 Morton Road which has flooded adjacent gardens during rain fall (which previously did not flood) and has had streams of water flowing down the site and running down the road contributing to an already blocked/over capacity drain.

4. Conflict with the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and AONB Setting

The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan emphasises that development should respect the town's character, protect important views and landscapes, and be supported by appropriate infrastructure. The scale and location of this proposal, combined with its impacts on safety, amenity, and infrastructure, are inconsistent with these objectives, particularly policies relating to landscape character and sustainable growth. Furthermore, the site lies within the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. NPPF paragraph 180 requires that great weight be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, including their setting. The proposed development would urbanise an open and sensitive landscape, causing harm to the rural character and wider setting of the AONB, which has not been adequately justified.

5. Evergreen Farm toxic waste

Should this application be considered in the context of the nearby Evergreen Farm (former Standen Landfill) restoration site, where historic land contamination, including methane and other contaminants, has already required significant remediation and oversight by the relevant authorities. Planning reports for Evergreen Farm acknowledge risks to controlled waters and the need for extensive environmental controls. Given the cumulative

environmental sensitivities in this locality, I believe a precautionary approach should be taken, with full consideration of any potential impacts on groundwater, drainage, local infrastructure and the wider environment before further development is approved.

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to this application and respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards