

Joseph Swift

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 February 2026 22:44
To: Joseph Swift
Subject: Objection letter to the decor land off West Hoathly Road East Grinstead

[REDACTED]
Dear Mr Swift

OBJECTION LETTER – DM/26/0073

Land Off West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead 44 dwellings with access, parking, landscaping and associated works

My objection is based on clear conflict with the **Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, the **Mid District Plan**, the **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan**, and the statutory protections afforded to the **High Weald National Landscape**.

1. The Site Lies Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

The application site is **outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB)** of East Grinstead as defined in the Mid District Plan. Development in this location is therefore classified as **countryside**, where policies **DP12 (Development in the Countryside)** and **DI1 (Development in the Countryside)** strictly limit new development unless exceptional circumstances apply. None apply here. The proposal is therefore **fundamentally contrary** to the adopted spatial strategy.

2. High Weald National Landscape (AONB) – Duty to Protect

The site lies **within the High Weald National Landscape** (formerly AONB). Under **Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000**, the Council must “*have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area*”.

The Place Services consultation (05/02/2026), conducted by the Council, confirms:

- The site forms part of the **valleyside landscape**, which is a **gateway into the High Weald National Landscape**.

- The LVIA **underestimates** the level of harm to receptors, including Dunnings Road and West Road.
- The proposal would erode the **assorted medieval pattern**, a defining characteristic of the High

This is a direct conflict with:

- **NPPF paras. 176–177**
- **Mid Sussex District Plan DP16 (High Weald**
- **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan EG1 (H AONB)**

The proposal does not conserve or enhance natural it demonstrably harms it.

3. Landscape and Visual Harm – Supported by Services

Place Services identify multiple areas of unaccepta

3.1 Landscape Character

- The site sits within a **highly sensitive landscap** (Sunnyside High Weald).
- Development would have **moderate–substanti effects** at Year 1.
- The density and layout are **inconsistent with th edge** of East Grinstead.

3.2 Visual Impact

~~As a resident at Streamside, I will experience:~~

- A complete loss of the current **undeveloped ru**

5. Housing Need Already Met Until 2028/29

The Mid Sussex District Plan and East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan confirm that **housing needs until 2028/29**. There is no strategic justification for speculative development **outside the BUAB** in a j landscape.

6. Highways and Access Concerns

Although general traffic volume may not be deter the **specific access arrangement** is unsafe:

- The proposed entrance is directly opposite my
- Vehicles will exit onto a **steep gradient** with l visibility.
- The junction is already hazardous, particularly times.
- Pedestrian safety is compromised due to narro and proximity to a busy bend.

This conflicts with **NPPF Section 9** (safe and suit for all users).

7. Incremental Development Pressure

There is a clear pattern of **incremental developm attempts** on this landholding. This proposal repre another attempt to secure development **by stealth**

the plan-led system and the protections afforded to National Landscape.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above — and supported by of the Council's own landscape consultants — the in clear conflict with:

- **NPPF (paras 11, 130, 174–177)**
- **Mid Sussex District Plan (DP12, DP15, DP1 DP37, DP38)**
- **East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (EG1,**
- **Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of (2000)**
- **The statutory purpose of the High Weald National Landscape**

I therefore respectfully request that the application

Yours faithfully


4 Austen Close
East Grinstead
RH19 1RZ