

Liz Everest

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 November 2025 09:44
To: Catherine Cardin
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Objection to Planning Application – Land North East of Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty, RH17 5AR

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]
Dear Ms Cardin,

Further to my earlier correspondence and objection regarding planning application DM/25/2591 (Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty), I am writing to seek clarification on a matter that has recently come to my attention.

I have been unable to locate the current version of the application online - possibly because the consultation deadline was 7 November 2025 - but my neighbour has informed me that a change has been made to the plans. I understand that the revised proposal now provides for a single entrance to Amberley Farm from Bishopstone Lane, replacing the existing access.

Could you please confirm whether this is correct ?

If so, I would like to record the following additional comments in supplement to my earlier submission:

1. I appreciate that an entrance to Amberley Farm is required, but a suitable and established access already exists.
2. It is unclear why this existing entrance should be replaced, particularly given that it is wider and offers a substantially larger turning circle than the new access apparently proposed off Bishopstone Lane.
3. The creation of a new entrance would necessitate drainage works to accommodate the existing roadside drainage channel and, more importantly, would require the removal of a well-established hedge. These interventions seem wholly unnecessary given that a perfectly adequate entrance is already in place.

I would also like to highlight a further concern regarding the Transport Dynamics report referenced in my earlier email. While Bishopstone Lane is technically a two-way road, it is in reality a single-carriage rural lane of limited width. The report therefore misrepresents the factual situation. The grass verges at and around the proposed access point are narrow and flanked on both sides by open drainage channels, meaning there is no usable verge width to accommodate passing vehicles safely. The movement of heavy farm or construction machinery at this point could easily damage or collapse the drainage channels, exacerbating flooding and surface water issues.

By contrast, the existing entrance does not present these problems: it is located where the turning circle is larger, the access is well-established, and the adjacent drainage is not at risk from vehicle

movements.

Taken together, these points further reinforce my concerns about highway safety, access suitability, and unnecessary environmental disruption.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email and whether my additional comments can still be taken into consideration in the determination of this application.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

....unfortunately, I can't recall the email below. Please note that I accept that Bishopstone Lane is a two way road I.e. it's not one way. That said, it is single track and not suitable for large vehicles. Additionally, it has very few passing places and these are mainly only possible to high axle vehicles.

[REDACTED]

O [REDACTED]

Subject: Addendum to Objection – DM/25/2591 (Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty)

Dear Ms Cardin,

Following my earlier objection submitted regarding planning application DM/25/2591 (Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty), I wish to provide this brief addendum after reviewing the Transport Dynamics report recently published in connection with the application.

Assuming this report was commissioned by or on behalf of the applicant (as no clarification has been provided by the Council), I must note that the document contains a significant factual inaccuracy in its Site Context and Existing Situation section. Specifically, at Point 5, the report states:

“Bishopstone Lane is a two-way public highway running from Job's Lane and the A2300 in the south to the A272 in the north, passing the application site. The A2300 provides access into Burgess Hill to the east and the A23 to the west. To the west the A272 also links to the A23.”

This description is incorrect and misleading. In reality, Bishopstone Lane is a single-track rural road, not a two-way highway. It has very limited passing places, only a few of which are wide enough for SUV-sized vehicles, and none of which provide adequate refuge for larger agricultural or construction vehicles.

The misrepresentation of the road's true character and capacity is material to the assessment of this planning application, particularly where highway safety, visibility, and suitability of access are concerned. The actual conditions on Bishopstone Lane are wholly inconsistent with the assumptions presented in the report.

Given this, I respectfully request that the Council treat the Transport Dynamics report with caution

and seek clarification or correction of its factual inaccuracies before giving it any weight in the determination of this application.

This further reinforces the concerns already raised in my original objection regarding highway safety, access suitability, and the incremental nature of development at Amberley Farm.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Cumberland Barne
Bishopstone Lane, Ansty
West Sussex RH17 5AR
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Dear Catherine,

Planning Application DM/25/2591

As required please attached find my **objection letter to Planning Application DM/25/2591**. Please also see below my objection to the first application for development on this site last year - in my opinion this is application by stealth and I request that you deny such activity when there is no case for development.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]
Cumberland Barn,
Bishopstone Lane
Ansty
W.Sussex
RH17 5AR

----- Forwarded message -----
[REDACTED]

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2025 at 07:55
Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Application – Land North East of Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty, RH17 5AR
To: <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>, Hamish Evans <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]

Ref: DM/25/0702

For: Variation of condition 3 of planning application DM/24/2120 - to allow for design changes.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Following on from emails around the proposed development to put footings into the above field I would like to emphasise that the updated application form still suggests that a building has already been constructed which is not true. No building has been built so the following conditions statement on Page 4 of the amended application form dated 21st March 2025 is

misleading - 'The building is not anchored to the ground and is proving to be vulnerable to high winds. It is therefore proposed to install concrete spurs, embedded in small concrete pad foundations in order to fix the building to the ground'. I have already commented on this both in emails to Hamish Evans (cc'd) and on the appeals website.

I am writing to formally object to the planning application submitted for development involving the installation of building footings on the field located North East of Amberley Farm, Bishopstone Lane, Ansty. This field is designated as agricultural land, and I have serious concerns about the implications of the proposed works.

I object on the following grounds:

1. Inappropriate Change of Use from Agricultural Land - the land in question is designated for agricultural purposes. The installation of building footings strongly suggests an intention to pursue non-agricultural development, which would be incompatible with its current designation. Such a change of use requires full justification and should not be permitted without rigorous scrutiny.

2. Harm to the Rural Landscape and Countryside Character - the proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the open and undeveloped nature of the surrounding countryside. The rural character of Bishopstone Lane and its environs would be undermined by the introduction of development infrastructure, setting an undesirable precedent for further encroachment into greenfield areas.

3. Precedent for Future Development - the placement of footings could be perceived as a preparatory step for more substantial construction, potentially paving the way for future residential or commercial development. This incremental approach to development is concerning and risks undermining the protections afforded to agricultural and rural land.

4. Lack of Agricultural Justification - if the application is being made under the guise of agricultural need, then a robust justification must be provided to demonstrate that the proposed structure is genuinely essential for agricultural operations. Without clear evidence of need, this could be seen as an attempt to bypass normal planning controls.

5. Potential Environmental and Ecological Impact - the field and its boundaries may provide habitat for protected and declining species, including great crested newts, bats, dormice, farmland birds (e.g. skylark and yellowhammer), and native reptiles such as slow-worms. The area includes hedgerows and potentially species-rich grassland, which are vital for biodiversity. Any development should be preceded by a full ecological survey. Groundworks could lead to irreversible habitat damage and would be in breach of UK wildlife protection laws if conducted without proper assessment and mitigation..

6. Highways and Access Concerns - Bishopstone Lane is a narrow rural road not suited to increased construction traffic. Furthermore, Bishopstone Lane is already in disrepair with multiple and increasing numbers of potholes along its 2 mile length. Even limited groundwork could result in mud on the highway, obstructions, or potential safety risks to other road users. Any increased use of this access point should be closely evaluated for its impact on local traffic and safety.

7. Conflict with Local and National Planning Policies - the proposal appears inconsistent with policies in the Mid Sussex District Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seek to protect the countryside, prevent urban sprawl, and ensure sustainable land use. Permitting this application would set a precedent at odds with those principles.

In conclusion, I urge the Council to refuse this application in order to preserve the character of the local area, uphold planning policy, and protect designated agricultural land from inappropriate development. I trust my comments will be taken into serious consideration during your deliberations.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

Cumberland Barn
Bishopstone Lane
Ansty
West Sussex
RH17 5AR

[Redacted text]

--

[Redacted text]

--

[Redacted text]

--

[Redacted text]