

Steve Ashdown

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 19 June 2025 09:47
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 19/06/2025 9:46 AM.

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:	5 Mantell Drive Cuckfield
----------	---------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS DM/23/2866 AND DM/23/2867 I strongly object to the planning applications DM/23/2866 and DM/23/2867, submitted by Fairfax for the Ansty Farm site. This is a speculative and poorly conceived proposal that brings no meaningful benefit to the local area. It fails on fundamental planning grounds and should be refused outright. Isolated, Unsustainable and Unfit for Purpose This site is not an extension of a village or town. It is a housing estate in the middle of nowhere. It is physically detached from both Cuckfield and Ansty and offers no logical

connection to either. There are no local shops, no local jobs, no nearby schools or doctors, and no public transport to speak of. The idea that people will live here and somehow not rely on their cars for every daily need is simply nonsense. Fairfax may talk of future facilities, but they can't deliver them. They rely entirely on third parties who haven't committed to anything. No plans, no funding, no timetable. Empty promises don't make a development sustainable.

Traffic Chaos Is Inevitable

This location guarantees more congestion, more car journeys and more risk on already overloaded roads. Local routes are narrow, dangerous and already at capacity. The only realistic option for most residents will be to drive - to schools, shops, workplaces, everything. Cycling and walking are not viable options here. The claims by Fairfax that the local road network can somehow absorb the extra traffic are not only unconvincing, they have been actively disputed by experts, including West Sussex County Council. To suggest otherwise is to ignore both reality and evidence.

Severe Environmental and Heritage Damage

This is not just any piece of land. It includes ancient woodland, working farmland, wildlife corridors and historic landscapes. The surrounding area includes listed buildings that rely on the rural context for their character. The development would destroy that. Views from the High Weald and South Downs would be permanently harmed. Any attempt to widen roads or create new junctions would involve bulldozing habitat-rich verges and mature hedgerows. This isn't light-touch development - it's environmental vandalism dressed up in soft landscaping language.

A Hollow 'Green' Offer That Doesn't Stack Up

The so-called parkland reserve is neither wilding nor public amenity space. Fairfax cannot have it both ways. You cannot rewild a landscape and invite hundreds of people to tramp through it. The claim that this mirrors Knepp is misleading and has been publicly dismissed by Sir Charles Burrell himself. There is no business plan for long-term funding or management. No governance structure. No clear purpose. It is little more than a marketing device with no substance behind it.

Unwanted Merging of Villages

This development drags Ansty and Cuckfield closer together without respecting the identity of either. It is not welcomed by residents in either community. It introduces a new, characterless estate that does not fit with the existing settlement pattern. Once this happens, further development becomes harder to resist and the distinctiveness of both villages is lost. It's creeping coalescence, plain and simple.

Minimal Benefit, Maximum Harm

Let's be clear. This is a speculative proposal designed to serve the developer's financial interests, not the needs of the community. The affordable housing offer is the bare minimum, dressed up as benevolence. Mid Sussex has already met its housing numbers. There is no need for this scheme and no strategic justification. Any small gain is dwarfed by the damage this would cause.

Conclusion

This is not a sustainable, desirable or deliverable development. It puts pressure on infrastructure, destroys valuable countryside and offers very little in return. The local community is not being listened to and deserves better than this. I urge the Planning Committee to reject these applications without hesitation.



Kind regards