

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 November 2025 16:31:51 UTC+00:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2591

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/11/2025 4:31 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Amberley Farm Bishopstone Lane Ansty Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5AR
Proposal:	Proposed creation of agricultural access (revised plans received 07.11.2025)
Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Cumberland Barn Bishopstone Lane Ansty
----------	--

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing regarding planning application DM/25/2591. I note that Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council have recommended the proposal. However, I would like to draw attention to a significant inaccuracy in the submitted documentation that I would want to have confirmation that they are aware of. Under the "Trees and Hedges" section, the applicant has indicated "No" to both questions. This is factually incorrect. There
-----------	---

is an established hawthorn hedge running the entire length of the field boundary, standing approximately 2.5-3.0 metres high and around 2.0 metres wide. The proposed development would necessitate the removal or destruction of part of this hedge, with a resulting impact on local ecology and biodiversity.

Furthermore, I wish to dispute the characterisation of my previous representations, and those of my neighbours, as "pious and vexatious" as described by Transport Dynamics. Our comments were made in good faith, reflecting legitimate concerns about the environmental, visual, and safety implications of the proposal.

As previously stated, there are multiple valid reasons why this application should not be approved, not least the fact that there is already an existing entrance to the land, which makes the proposed new access unnecessary and environmentally damaging.

I would therefore ask that the inaccuracies in the documentation be corrected and that full consideration be given to the potential ecological harm before any decision is made.

Kind regards