

Having read most of the additional documentation submitted from Fairfax I believe that it changes nothing. I continue to object for all the reasons previously provided and in addition I have the following comments re. DM/23/2866:

1. The site is NOT sustainable.
  - a. There will be insufficient services on site to make the site self-sustaining and therefore there will be a significant level of off site journeys to where services are located.
  - b. The off site journeys will be made by car to a much greater extent than Fairfax would have you believe. This is because essential services (secondary school, shops, GP practice etc) will all be well beyond a 20 minute walk (and much greater than the 10 minute each way that is generally accepted as a viable limit), bus services are unlikely to be maintained beyond a subsidised period (there is no evidence provided to the contrary), cycle routes are not likely to be appealing (they are along fast moving busy routes used by HGVs and via lengthy indirect options). There is no evidence provided by Fairfax to justify the level of reduction they have shown in their transport reports making all their claims nothing more than wishful thinking that must be disregarded. My belief is that the traffic added to surrounding roads will be the straw that breaks the camel's back – the level of additional traffic in this location cannot be tolerated and must not be allowed.
  - c. It is questionable that some of the services promised by Fairfax will even be provided. Fairfax are not a developer and will not be held to account for what is or isn't provided. They still haven't substantiated any of their claims regarding things like provision of schools, sports facilities, GP services etc. The only information they have provided is generic and therefore meaningless.
2. The site is at odds with the District Plan, both from the perspective of it being excluded and from the perspective of the spatial strategy. The site is not in one of the three major urban areas within Mid Sussex nor does it provide a new settlement that is of sufficient size to deliver the required services for a sustainable site nor does it provide a link to other small towns/villages that could collectively deliver the required services for a sustainable site (Ansty is a category 4 settlement with no/limited services and limited capacity for any further development!).
3. From looking at the so-called cycle improvement plan, SK05.1 rev E, it looks like Fairfax are planning a certain amount of garden grab as well as narrowing of the A272 so that they can make a shared cycle/foot way. Fairfax have clearly never viewed this route at peak school times as they would recognise that shared routes would be simply putting school children in danger. This route would be nothing more than a white elephant, i.e. not used by cyclists, which would be at the expense of traffic forced to use a road made even narrower & more dangerous and I wonder who would be paying for the cost of the roadworks and land grab?!
4. I can see that Fairfax have reigned in their plans to convert all the on site public footpaths to bridleways but what is left is odd to say the least. They now seem to plan on turning just footpath 62CR into a bridleway which is meaningless as it doesn't provide any onward linkage of any merit.
5. I can see that Fairfax's representatives, Turley, have done their own assessment of the impact on heritage assets which downplays the impact on the heritage assets and is at odds with MSDC's own assessment and that of Louise Hooper Landscape Architect. In

particular, I noted that Turley refer to vegetation screening on the boundary protecting the heritage asset which completely ignores the fact that Fairfax plan to remove much of this screening to provide access to the site, visibility splays for the multiple new roundabouts and crossing points and a new cycle/foot way. They also refer to main roads being away from assets, Old Place & Mackerells, and the existing route being retained, yet they make no mention of this existing route being crisscrossed by new roads, footpaths and cycle routes running alongside it making the existing route completely different and impacting the assets (this aside from the damage that would be done by a housing estate).

6. The Long Section document seems to show that building heights will obscure the view from the church (2 of the 3 site lines run below the building height), this contradicts the claims being made by Fairfax. It is clear to anyone that stands on the ridge by Old Place that the open views across to Cuckfield will be obliterated by the proposed housing estate.
7. I note that there is still no quantification of the huge amount of trees and hedgerows that would need to be removed to accommodate visibility splays for the new roundabouts, access points and road crossings (both on and off site) let alone the huge loss of trees and hedgerows (which are known to contain dormice) to create a new cycle/foot way on the southern side of the A272 at the north of the site. This, amongst other impacts, will have a significant effect on any BNG calculations.
8. In the Transport Addendum several very telling comments are made, but one stood out to me which is “it may be that parcels of development are later sold off to housebuilders and these will wish to have the flexibility to change the housing mix/and or the layout”. This seems to suggest that claims about building heights, impact on heritage assets, woodland etc cannot be believed because as they themselves have said a developer may wish to change things!

With regards to DM/23/2867, again, the same as before applies but with the following additions:

1. Fairfax again offer confusing and contradictory information.
  - a. On the one hand this is meant to provide leisure facilities for local people and yet their own documentation shows the level of restriction of access makes this meaningless. Not only is most of the site out of bounds, but the so called new footpath will not be open for most of the year and even then only during the winter months. This tells me that Fairfax is not and never has been serious about this Parkland Reserve being anything other than a cynical attempt to offset the biodiversity impact of their proposed development.
  - b. In their Transport Statement they state that no use of the car park will be allowed and yet in their Stewardship Plan they suggest that the ongoing management costs could be offset by parking fees, a café or a van selling food! This clearly shows that Fairfax cannot be trusted.
2. They continue to refer to Knepp without referencing the letter from Sir Charles Burrell in which he explained that a site of this size is not suitable for re-wilding (and he has written again to emphasise this).
3. The latest set of plans show an even greater level of fencing which is something that should be avoided in an AONB/National Landscape. They are trying to change the history of this area of unspoilt landscape for no-one's benefit other than for their own financial gain.

I sincerely hope that MSDC continues to rule this site out on the basis that it is not capable of being made a sustainable site, it is simply the wrong type of development in the wrong location and would do nothing but create harm (to levels of traffic & pollution, to the landscape, to the wellbeing of existing residents, to local infrastructure that is already overloaded, to the wildlife, to the dark skies etc, etc).