

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 February 2026 09:36:52 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 07/02/2026 9:36 AM.

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: Flat 4, Tobias Place Coombe Hill Road East Grinstead

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Planning Application Objection - Reference DM/26/0073 I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 44 new homes on land off West Hoathly Road / Dunnings Road, East Grinstead. After reviewing the available information, I believe the application raises several significant planning concerns that should be carefully considered before any approval is granted. 1. Children and Pedestrian Safety

The surrounding road network is heavily used by children and families travelling to school and nursery. Pavements in the area are already too narrow to safely accommodate pushchairs and wheelchairs, often forcing pedestrians into the road. The developer's own transport report confirms that vehicle speeds already exceed the limit and that there have been numerous near misses. Introducing traffic from an additional 44 homes would materially increase the risk to pedestrians, particularly children.

2. Traffic and Road Safety

The proposed access is located close to a blind bend on a narrow road where speeding is common. Existing on-street parking near the Recreation Ground and Dunnings Mill Pub already pushes vehicles onto the wrong side of the road, creating hazardous conditions. Additional traffic generated by the development would significantly increase danger for all road users.

3. Pressure on Essential Services

Local GP surgeries, dental practices, and childcare facilities are already operating at or near capacity. The addition of 44 homes would place unsustainable pressure on these essential services without clear evidence that adequate infrastructure improvements are planned.

4. Flooding, Drainage and Sewerage

The area is known to suffer from regular flooding, particularly near Dunnings Mill Pub, and there has recently been a sewer burst at the Recreation Ground. Given the existing drainage constraints and restrictions on surface water discharge, the development risks exacerbating flooding unless a fully evidenced and robust drainage and groundwater strategy is provided.

5. Environmental Impact

No comprehensive ecological or wildlife surveys appear to have been submitted. The site lies within a sensitive landscape where wildlife has already been displaced by nearby development and is close to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Great weight should therefore be given to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, in line with planning policy.

6. Sustainability and Public Transport

Public transport in the area is extremely limited. The nearest bus stop lacks shelter and is prone to flooding, while steep gradients and poor pedestrian infrastructure discourage walking. As a result, the proposal conflicts with national planning policy objectives relating to sustainable transport, road safety, and climate impact.

7. Conflict with Planning Policy

The site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. National Planning Policy indicates that permission for major developments in designated areas should only be granted in exceptional circumstances and

where it is demonstrably in the public interest. Based on the current submission, this has not been evidenced.

8. Risk of Future Expansion

The inclusion of a road leading off the site raises legitimate concerns that this proposal could facilitate further development, compounding the existing harms and placing even greater strain on local infrastructure and the environment.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above - including significant highway safety risks, infrastructure pressures, flood concerns, environmental harm, and clear policy conflicts - I respectfully request that the Council refuse this planning application.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these objections.

Kind regards