

Steve Ashdown

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 15 December 2024 16:18
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 15/12/2024 4:17 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 received on 8th November 2024).
Case Officer:	Stephen Ashdown

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Meadow View Cuckfield Road Ansty
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Application DM/23/2867 I wish to object to the above application. This application has no benefit to anyone other than the developer, as we already have beautiful countryside around us for people to enjoy and access, but that is to be destroyed together with trees, hedges and wildlife if application DM/23/2867 is approved. It seems this application is being used for the sole purpose of the developer trying to deliver a biodiversity net gain to offset the destruction of biodiversity at the Ansty Farm site. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the following:

25. Planning policies and decisions should:

- a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains - such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;
- b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production

25(b) notes that land can perform many functions which this site already does and therefore should not be developed just for the purpose of biodiversity net gain.

In the current district plan (2014-2031) which was adopted in 2018, policy DP16 states that "Development will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty". This application serves neither purpose and is therefore contrary to this policy. The purpose of the "Parkland Reserve" or "Country Park" is confused and contradictory. On the one hand it claims to provide a recreational resource to local people whilst at the same time limiting access to enhance biodiversity. It cannot achieve both aims in such a small area because they are mutually incompatible.

National Planning guidelines state that Biodiversity net gain should be achieved ideally at the development site itself rather than on an alternative one. Although the landowners are the same for this site and application DM/23/2868 the two sites are quite separate and the activity in one cannot compensate logically for destructive activity in the other.

This application gives local people nothing that they do not already have in terms of access to the countryside, its enjoyment and benefits to wellbeing and health.

Kind regards