

Steve Ashdown

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 30 November 2024 19:02
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 30/11/2024 7:01 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:	White Cottage Cuckfield Park Cuckfield
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	This is a cynical ploy to mitigate for the development of 1450 homes (application DM/23/2866) on land to the east of the section of the A272 between Cuckfield and Ansty, land which bears all the hallmarks of an AONB, with ancient woodland and historical views across to Cuckfield church. Mitigation should be undertaken within the site to be developed and not on this separate site DM/23/2867. I understood this is an established principle.

The assumption that the formation of a parkland reserve will not attract additional traffic and therefore no additional parking is required is ridiculous. Country parks become destinations and attract visitors which generates additional traffic and a requirement for additional parking.

If it were true that there were to be no additional traffic from this application where is the money coming from to maintain it as the application suggests parking fees would contribute to its maintenance.

The creation of cycle paths will destroy habitats.

The habitat is established, diverse and historic. Please note the objections raised by Walstead Forge which I echo but won't repeat.

It is hard to see the value in the cycle path as it joins a busy road at one end and doesn't link into any cycle routes.

The cycle tracks and information boards detract from the rural character and ultimately change the character of the landscape.

There is no indication how the park and its fencing and paths is to be effectively maintained and who will guarantee its future maintenance once any development is secured.

It certainly won't be self-funding from some proposed parking fees which are unlikely to pay much more in reality than the cost of collecting them. This will become a burden on the local council and with the proposed easy access is likely to fall into disrepair and would the run the risk of waste being illegally disposed of on the land and potentially illegal occupation of the land.

The built heritage statement seems to be suggesting that there is no "interconnectivity" between the listed buildings within the boundaries of DM/23/2866 & DM/23/2867 and the surrounding countryside but they give no justification for this claim. I disagree with the claim and believe there is a deep historical relationship between these buildings and their surroundings. The historical presence of these old building outside of the village of Cuckfield but within its visible presence, will be fundamentally changed by these linked applications.

The creation of a path through the wood to the west of Cuckfield Park lakes amounts to a change in the relationship between the landscape and the historic site and will lead to loss of privacy and security for both Cuckfield Park Manor House and The White Cottage.

Kind regards