

Steve Ashdown

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 28 June 2025 21:36
To: Steve Ashdown
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/23/2867

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/06/2025 9:36 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land East Of Ansty Way Cuckfield Bypass Cuckfield West Sussex
Proposal:	Change of use of farmland and woodland to parkland reserve to include public access and instigation of long-term management and rewilding regime, including establishment of pedestrian and cycle tracks, with new pedestrian and cycle access points off Cuckfield Road to the south and Staplefield Road to the north. Proposals to include the addition of two wooden viewing platforms and two hides. Sports pitches at Beech Farm Field to remain in sports use. (Additional information and amended plans received 27th May 2025).
Case Officer:	Stephen Ashdown

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Oaks corner rose cottage lane staplefield
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Planning Applications DM/23/2866 DM/23/2867 I continue to oppose the Planning Application by Fairfax Properties to build 1450 houses on rural agricultural land. I repeat my reasons from my previous letters to the Council. I do not believe there is anything further in the new documentation which changes the position: 1 An essential feature of Mid-Sussex is its separate villages with much of the surrounding countryside given AONB status. In order to retain this unique character which is clearly enjoyed by its residents it is necessary to retain the separation of individual villages from neighbouring ones. This proposal which is hideous in its size imposing 1450 houses on two small villages (Ansty and Cuckfield) will destroy that separation, will cause unnecessary

coalescence between the two villages and will damage the character of Mid-Sussex which should be preserved.

2 I understand that the Planning Inspector has rejected the current draft of the District Plan prepared by MSDC essentially on grounds that there has not been enough communication with neighbouring Councils such as Crawley to consider how to deal with the unmet housing need of those Councils. However this does not give a green light to disregarding the sensible principles put forward by MSDC in the draft district plan such as DP6 which makes clear that development which fails to retain the separate identity and character of our villages and fails to prevent coalescence (see DP13) will not be permitted.

The proposal would be in clear breach of DP12 which seeks to ensure the protection and enhancement of the countryside."The primary objective of the District Plan with respect to the countryside is to secure its protection by minimising the amount of land taken for development and preventing development that does not need to be there." This proposed development does not need to be there. This principle is very important to me and I believe to many others in Mid-Sussex who I have talked to and who wholly oppose this proposed development

The proposal would be in breach of DP16. Although the site itself is not in the AONB it abuts it and has views into it. "Development on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular should not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location or design." A huge development of 1450 houses will be highly damaging to the adjoining AONB and will detract from it.

A development of 1450 houses between Cuckfield and Ansty will cause a huge increase in traffic generated by the development which in turn will cause substantial noise and air pollution and the lights generated from the houses and street lighting will cause light pollution and damage yet further the rural character and dark sky quality of the site in its present form.

3 The proposed development is not sustainable. 1450 houses which could mean in the region of 6000 additional residents and in excess of 3000 motor vehicles on already seriously overcrowded roads will have a very damaging effect on the existing area. The new residents will place yet further strain on the transport infrastructure both on the roads and on the trains commuting to London , on schools, Gp surgeries and other local amenities. The water shortages which are now an annual event in Mid-Sussex and the pollution caused by the water companies disposing of sewage will be much worse when 6000 additional residents are placing yet more pressure on an already over-stretched system.

4 The proposed development will have a serious adverse impact on traffic. The A272 between Ansty and Cuckfield is already hugely busy and produces pollution from vehicles detrimental to existing residents. 6000 further residents many of whom will drive cars as their first choice of transport will only make matters far worse. The rural location of the site exacerbates this problem.

5 I do not believe the development would increase biodiversity. on the contrary, the destruction of around 100 hectares of rural land will of course destroy natural habitats and decrease bio-diversity.

It is clear to me from local meetings that the vast majority of local people who choose to live in small villages in the area are wholly opposed to this proposal and the Council should reject it. It will provide no benefit to existing residents but would be a disaster for them urbanising a beautiful rural area and destroying Cuckfield and Ansty as separate villages.

Yours faithfully


Oaks Corner
Rose Cottage Lane
Staplefield
RH17 6 EP

Kind regards