

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 July 2025 13:30:00 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1218

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 05/07/2025 1:29 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To 19 Estcots Drive East Grinstead West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed erection of one pair of semi detached houses, with associated parking and new shared vehicular access.
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	r bourner 6 Estcots drive East Grinstead
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am grateful to the chartered civil engineer at Court Crescent for pointing out the many technical shortcomings of the application. Work has only recently recommenced on land adjacent to Mount Noddy cemetery following the recent "discovery" of an ancient pond; Southern Water have confirmed it was not shown on the plan.
-----------	---

Similarly, nobody can be unaware of the disruption caused by the Godstone sink hole where the area of potential problems is likely to extend as far as East Grinstead because of similar geology

Surely the Council is familiar with 2 previous sink holes in Estcots Drive and now another is forming. So here we have a pond AND a sink hole.

Assumptions have also been made about the responsibility for drainage, foul water removal and soakaways which indicates lack of care in the proposal.

As to design, it has always troubled me that a very large house was built at number 19 some years ago followed by a slightly smaller house crammed into the plot with privacy partly protected by extensive walls, measuring a max 2.8 metres high. As I understand it, properties in Estcots Drive are forbidden from having even a flower bed or low fence next to the pavement.

As there is little difference in the ridge heights, the pair of semi-detached houses has the overall appearance of another large house crammed onto a small plot. Unless the high wall at number 19 is removed, the proposed street scene as drawn is incorrect.

I also believe that the rules regarding parking spaces for a new-build 4 bedroom houses suggests a minimum greater than 2 spaces though it's possible the rules have been adapted to reflect the trend to open plan design which reduces the apparent number of rooms, combining as it does the kitchen, dining and living areas. I also doubt that, given that Councils are generally under-funded, I'm doubtful that bi-annual inspections of the permeable surface would be undertaken.

I understand that an application was rejected in 2004. That was the right decision then and remains so today.

Kind regards