

Peter Davies

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 April 2026 07:49
To: planninginfo
Subject: Fw: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3108

[REDACTED]
we are resubmitting our concerns connected to next doors planning application for 5 pitched site, to reiterate our objections.

----- Forwarded message -----
From: "planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, 4 January 2026 at 22:09:57 GMT
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3108

Comments for Planning Application DM/25/3108

Dear Sir/Madam,

[REDACTED]
You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to Mid Sussex District Council using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 04/01/2026 10:09 PM [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Moonshine Meadows Land At Grid Reference 528715 121501 Cuckfield Road Ansty West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed 5 pitch site for settled gypsy accommodation including vehicular access, each containing mobile home, utility building and parking spaces.
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	Leigh Cottage Cuckfield Road Ansty RH17 5AL

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
-----------------	-----------------------------

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Planning DM/25/3108
Grid Reference 528715 121501

Dear Sirs

We are writing to object to the proposed, 5 sited mobile homes. To include each one a mobile home, utility building, and proposed car & caravan places.

As we live right next door to the development at Leigh Cottage, we are very concerned about the nature of this proposal.

We notice that a widening of the entrance has been placed on the application, does this constitute a reverse of what planning was originally given as the entrance to the site was given planning permission for Light Agricultural use only, (DM/20/1277) not for a busy transfer of up to ten or more vehicles going in & out on a regular basis daily, also concerns that the splays for the entrance cover the highways requirements for safety of cars turning in & out of the development.

We also have concerns that the splays for the entrance cover the Highways requirements.

I notice from the proposed plan that the existing plan has been revamped to an actual detailed plan, which still does not show where the wastewater septic tank is going to be situated or how big this tank needs to be for five residents' static caravans with five utility buildings.

I notice that a requirement that septic tanks need to be of at least 10 Meters away from any building or base unit.

I do not know how big this needs to be with our own tank being a large tank, which needs emptying on a regular basis, being used by a small number of people, this would have to be of a larger scale considering how many people are on the site.

In the report that was submitted to the council 3.12.25 it mentions the matrix treatment plant no measurements, but it also states it is down to the pitch holder to put in place for this item to be implemented, we would of thought that should have been shown on the plans.

Within this report it does not mention who stated this to be the requirement, how that accords with overall planning policy and the validity of this approach.

The report has no name on who wrote this for Mr. Deighton, so how can we trust that the report is a true supporting statement.

In the report page two clearly shows that the area includes some of Pondlyes land (bottom left hand side) yet on page six the red line shown shows the proper area of Moonshine Meadow why was this not shown on page two.

The report also states that the ditch on the eastern side is of the property is more than capable of carrying surface rainwater away, right into next door so increasing the threat of flooding Pondlye, Little Lower Ease, & the Barn as water will always find the lowest part for it to settle.

As our land borders the site on two sides, we are very worried as we are so close to the water table, which if overflows will flow on to our land, as the land falls away from the site on our side as our land is very suspect to flooding very badly on one side already, we don't want the top half going the same way.

We are particularly concerned that the proposed mobile homes would have a significant impact on our privacy and the quiet enjoyment of our property. The proximity of these units to our boundary would result in increased noise levels, light pollution, and a loss of outlook, all of which would be detrimental to our quality of life. Additionally, the cumulative effect of these changes would likely alter the character of the local area, making it less rural and peaceful than it is at present.

Now as already mentioned our next-door neighbour in Pondlye Cottage has already been flooded out on more than a couple of occasions, the land is made up from a clay bases so water will only penetrate the top layer rather than seeping away through the clay barrier.

We attended an appeal on this matter on the 18.6.25 with the outcome being rejected, number

APP/D3830/W/25/3362298.

The report gives concerns to the road, speed of vehicles, no streetlights, no pavements, we have seen many accidents in the road which includes some deaths.

Item 5 policy DP33 it states as follows The site is not an existing Gypsy and Traveller site and is NOT allocated by the district development plan.

It also raises the size of the area, whether this can sustain the number of units that have been placed on such a small area. (0.8 of an acre).

We have no public transport that services Cuckfield Road, the nearest bus stop is on the A2300, which means walking along a fast road with no lighting or pavements.

Item 7 in the report states that the area (policy DP33) requires that sites like these need to be nearer more accessible amenities. Schools for up to 18-year-olds, amenities such as shopping, activities, Doctors, Dentists, Pharmacies, Work places, & Community Centres. This site does not cover that criteria which was mentioned as a failure in the appeal notes.

The application refers to DM/22/2015 Slaugham in support, which was for a proposed encampment which was refused 13.10.22 so how can this be a supporting statement.

The plan for the utility's buildings does not give any real details, it does not look as professional as the plan for the caravans, and driveways, and is very unclear in terms of design, utilities etc..

Whilst we notice a report for the Great crested newts from NatureSpace, but no report for the bats that regular occupy the area along this road, which we understand the project on Streams Farm not 250 yards from this planning application had to go through a very tough assurance that bats were to be catered for, this was brought up in planning consultation with the MSDC.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge and confirm receipt of our objections, set out above.

Kind regards


Leigh Cottage
Cuckfield road
Ansty

Kind regards