

Andy Watt

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 December 2025 14:28
To: Andy Watt
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application DM/25/3108

Ref planning application No: DM/25/3108

Proposed 5 pitch site for settled gypsy accommodation including vehicular access, each containing mobile home, utility building and parking spaces
Re Land at Moonshine Meadow, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, West Sussex, grid reference 528715 121501

Dear Andy,

I own and live at the following property, immediately adjacent to the proposed development, with other members of my family:

Pondlye Barn, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, Haywards Heath, RH17 5AL

I wish to submit my objection to the planning for the reasons set out below.

Background/History

The land concerned was originally part of the property I own, which was separated from it by the previous owner Mr Jee in 2019, and then sold by way of a sealed bid auction in 2022. It is agricultural land, historically forming part of Leigh Farm, and is an open rural piece of land with stables in one corner immediately adjacent to the boundary line.

As you are aware a very similar planning application was denied on appeal (case ref APP/D3830/W/25/3362298)

Planning objections

Objections to the planning include specifically:

- DP6 – Settlement Hierarchy
- DP12 – Protection and enhancement of the countryside
- DP 15 - New Homes in the countryside
- DP26 - Character and design
- DP42 - Water Infrastructure and Water Environment

This development is not included in the District Plan either for housing or a gypsy settlement. It is noted that settled gypsy and traveller sites are included in the local housing plan, and existing local sites include:

Bedelands, Burgess hill, Fairplace Hill Caravan Site, Burgess Hill, Walstead Caravan Site Lindfield, Horsgate Caravan Site, Cuckfield.

Access and Highway safety

The plot of land originally had no independent access until retrospective planning was granted for a cross over for the purposes of light agricultural use only. As will be noted from the planning history there was extensive consultation in reaching approval for the existing access, which does not support access for residential purposes. Five mobile homes each with parking for 2 vehicles up to 3.5T (the size of a small horsebox) will result in up to 10 vehicles looking to leave and access the property daily – far in excess of the expectations of a cross over for “light agricultural

use". The land does not therefore have access to support a residential development. The Highways Agency considerations which permitted the crossover for light agricultural use was not for the purposes of a site with five mobile homes each with vehicles.

We note that a new crossover is included in the Planning Application which significantly alters the development of this land and creates the look of and access a small housing development - not access to an agricultural field. This is not in keeping with MSDC planning policy for rural areas. A single property on this land would not require such significant access construction.

Effect on the appearance of the area

This section of Cuckfield Road has approximately 16 individual detached properties, each set in a minimum of one acre of land and in most cases significantly greater amounts of land. They are all very individual in style and size. Across the road from the plot of land owned by Mr Dighton is a large area owned and maintained as a nature reserve, and next to that is Pond Lye, a fishing lake owned by the Sussex Piscatorial Society, which observes strict rules about usage in order to lessen impact on the local wildlife. The proposed development is not in keeping with the other properties on this road nor the density of dwellings, and a built up development of five mobile homes each with a touring caravan, utility building and parking on a plot which is less than an acre in size in total, is out of keeping and out of character. In addition mobile homes are not in keeping with the individual nature of all other properties on the road and there are two cases of mobile homes on other land in the road being the subject of enforcement notices.

The development will therefore have a fundamental impact on the rural character and appearance of the road as a whole, particularly with the new access.

There are no local facilities and occupants of the mobile homes would need to drive as there is no public transport or walking access to any facilities including shops, schools, doctors or local amenities. The previous planning application for three chalet bungalows was refused, and reasons included:

The proposal would represent new dwellings in the countryside, where occupants would be reliant on the use of a private car to gain access to local services. The site is not a sustainable location for new dwellings and the proposal fails to accord with Policy DP21 in the Mid Sussex District Plan and NPPF guidance. On appeal it was also refused and I maintain that these reasons apply to this planning application

Objections based on MSDC Planning guidelines

- The location is not suitable and does not meet the requirements of Policy DP21 or DP33 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2018 (this is a remote location with no street lighting, pavements or public transport and is a dangerous road which has sadly led to loss of life in the past 2 years). These accessibility issues were identified by Edward Dade on appeal, and have not changed.

- The plan fails to demonstrate adequately that it would not damage or lead to a loss of trees on the site

- The plan does not adequately meet the conditions set out in MSDC DP38 relating to sensitive habitats and species

Surface Water Drainage and Foul water waste, and flooding risk to neighbouring property

The planning application states that a septic tank will be used – the sketch of the site does not show where it is proposed to locate this and how this will meet the requirement to be 10m distant from any property.

There is no drainage on the site and there are no mains drains. The septic tank(s) would need to discharge water into the ditch on the roadside, such water then flowing through the ditches inside the boundaries of Pondlye Barn, Lower Ease Barn and Little Lower Ease. These ditches do not have a constant flow of water leading to stagnation particularly in the Summer.

Little Lower Ease / Lower Ease Barn has also suffered from stagnant foul smelling water historically, due to the lack of flow through the ditches (which was referred to the Environment Agency), and to alleviate this Pondlye Barn relocated the individual treatment plant and outflow to the land leading to the ditches at the rear of the property. The additional flow arising from surface water and treatment plants sufficient for 5 mobile homes with several occupants in each would therefore have a serious negative impact on the water ditches at Pondlye Barn, Lower Ease Barn and Little Lower Ease.

In addition, Pondlye Barn already suffers serious flooding at times of significant rainfall (which has been discussed already with the Environment Agency) and the additional water created by the proposed mobile homes will

exacerbate the problems, potentially affecting my 300 year old building itself, as well as the ability to live in and enjoy this as my home.

As noted above, my property suffers from stagnant water or flooding (according to the weather) and measures we have taken to try and manage this will not cope with water from the additional properties. I note that in planning application DM/21/0486 it is stated that land in this area has low infiltration and use of infiltration drainage may not be possible on the site. Other properties on the road have sufficient areas of land to manage this issue, but that will not be possible for the 5 mobile homes on 0.8 acre of flat land. Photographs submitted in support of my objections to the previous planning application are noted here.

Impact on neighbouring properties privacy and loss of amenity

As outlined above, the proposed development will have a significant impact on the adjacent properties, in particular Pondlye Barn and Leigh Cottage, and also Lower Ease Barn and Little Lower Ease.

Five mobile homes will result in significant additional noise in what is a quiet residential and country road, with a nature reserve directly opposite the proposed development and large pond nearby. Peaceful enjoyment of our homes will be affected by both noise from people living in 5 mobile homes, and the noise of several vehicles on the site.

I am also concerned that there will be light pollution which will negatively impact the bat population – we have observed large numbers of bats in that area and have put up bat boxes on our property and planted seeds to grow plants which encourage insect populations the bats feed on (obtained from the RSBP website). This bat activity is most active in the area adjacent to the boundary with the land proposed for development, and will be negatively affected by noise and light.

Impact on the environment and biodiversity

In addition to the impact on bats noted above, there is a rich selection of wildlife in this area which would be affected by the development. This includes newts, foxes, badgers, various birds and water fowl which visit the Pond Lye lake and nature reserve on the land opposite. I maintain that the proposed remedial measures for the development do not adequately protect the wildlife on the site and nearby.

I should be grateful if you would confirm receipt and the planning officer would take my objections set out above into consideration when considering the planning application.

Kind regards