

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 February 2026 14:15:13 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 05/02/2026 2:15 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: The Old Stables Coombe Hill Road East Grinstead

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to formally object to this application. The proposal represents an unsustainable and unsafe incursion into the countryside that fails to meet the "exceptional circumstances" test required for development of this scale. 1. Conflict with National and Local Policy The site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan. Critcially, it sits immediately adjacent to

the High Weald AONB. Under Paragraph 177 of the NPPF and the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (Paras 4.5 & 4.6), major developments in these sensitive areas should be refused unless they are in the public interest. The applicant has provided no evidence of such interest, nor have they demonstrated how the "great weight" given to conserving the AONB's natural beauty will be maintained.

2. Unacceptable Risk to Highway and Pedestrian Safety

The proposed access is near a blind bend where speeding is a documented issue.

Vulnerable Users: This is a primary walking route for families. Existing pavements are too narrow for pushchairs or wheelchairs, forcing pedestrians into the road.

Cumulative Impact: With the developer's own report confirming existing speed limit breaches, adding traffic from 44 homes-exacerbated by existing on-street parking congestion near the Recreation Ground-will create an unacceptable safety risk for children and residents.

3. Drainage, Flooding, and Infrastructure

The area suffers from frequent flooding and recent sewer bursts at the Recreation Ground. This development will significantly increase surface water runoff. Without a fully evidenced, site-specific groundwater solution, the proposal risks worsening flood conditions for existing residents. Furthermore, local GP and dental services are already at capacity; adding 44 homes places an unsustainable burden on local infrastructure.

4. Lack of Sustainability and Ecological Protection

The proposal is car-dependent. Inadequate public transport and steep gradients discourage walking, conflicting with national objectives on climate impact. Additionally, the lack of comprehensive ecological surveys is a major failing in a landscape known to support displaced wildlife.

Conclusion The proposal contradicts the Development Plan and poses a demonstrable threat to public safety. I urge the Council to refuse this application.

Kind regards