

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 June 2025 16:06
To: planninginfo
Subject: Re planning applications DM/23/2866 and DM/23/2867

Dear Sir/Madam

re: panning applications **DM/23/2866 and DM/23/2867**

As residents of Cuckfield, we would like to object most strongly to the above applications. These are just the same, ongoing applications that have rightly been rejected before, with a few cosmetic and largely unattainable additions.

The site is patently not sustainable. Fairfax make the age-old empty promises about Schools, GP Provision, Public Transport etc, but how - in the real world - are these to be achieved? In practice, we all know that they never are. It is a byword in the area that it is impossible to recruit doctors to the surgeries we have at present...just you try to get a GP appointment around here!...so how on earth Fairfax are going to wave a magic wand and alter this situation it is impossible to imagine. Exactly similar with teachers in the local schools. This is a national problem and Fairfax are certainly not going to be able to solve it by building a further 1,450 houses! They can cover it up with a fancy name such as a "Garden Community" if they like, but it amounts to the same case of over-development whatever made-up name you give to it.

We particularly take exception to the emphasis on older-persons' housing and the emotional tug this is meant to place on anyone viewing the applications. A more unsuitable site for older-persons' housing could not be imagined. Isolated in a community where the promised shops will never get built and they are living in a permanent traffic jam would be a travesty of provision for the elderly and we are heartily opposed to this age group being used as a marketing tool. It is an insult to a much-valued generation.

And, while we're talking about traffic jams, let us refer to Fairfax's claims about public transport. You actually **have to live in the area** to know what the addition of 1,450...1,450!...dwellings would mean to the road in question. There would be tailbacks a mile long or more. Just go to the road at certain hours of the day and see for yourself. Talk about unsustainable!

The evidence by Fairfax that the roads can be engineered to ensure that the traffic flows freely has been laughed out of court by West Susses Highways own modelling and is patently ridiculous. As is their alternative suggestion of "active travel" by foot or bicycle. Try telling that to an elderly person or the mother of a child on its way to school. It would be just plain dangerous and seems insulting to our intelligence. We personally wouldn't want to have the accident that is waiting to happen here on our conscience.

And the proposals for a Country Park or Parkland simply do not make sense or reflect any kind of current thinking by renowned experts. International wilding expert Sir Charles Burrell himself says that Fairfax's plans in this are are not feasible. Indeed, their 'wilding' proposals run completely contrary to their parallel claim that the land will be used as a "recreational facility" for people of the new development. It is either going to be wilded or used as a recreational facility - you can't have

both! This hasn't even been thought-through so again it seems insulting to put it forward as a proposal in any way. It is to be hoped that people are not fooled that easily.

The proposed applications would simply make Cuckfield and Ansty one conjoined, semi-urban sprawl and destroy the separate identities of both communities for all time. Despite the fact that the development is related to neither the category 4 settlement of Ansty nor the category 2 settlement of Cuckfield, it nonetheless effectively coalesces the two. You couldn't imagine a worse situation for the people of both communities or, indeed, the proposed occupants of the proposed development.

One simple question: would the permanent damage caused by these applications be outweighed by any possible benefits? The answer is patently "no" because there is clearly no benefit to existing residents **only to the developers**. Fairfax claims that in the provision of affordable homes they are providing for "desperate local need", but the reality as shown by independent evidence is that they are doing the bare minimum allowed and nothing more. This is also against a backdrop of MSDC having met their housing target in previous years.

It has become clear by now that this is a speculative, dangerous development which would cause considerable damage to the local area and create a semi-urban sprawl of "Cuckstye".

With thanks,

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

20 Ockenden Lane, Cuckfield.