

I am writing to OBJECT to both planning applications DM/23/2866 and DM/23/2867.

(I would also like to highlight that all other objections received by MSDC in relation to DM/23/2866 should be applied to DM/23/2867 too as these applications should be one and the same, as per Fairfax's own statements despite their separately timed submissions. Further, the deadline date of 31 December 2023 has not been possible to meet as the system was unavailable to view documents for several days during this period, as it is I have only managed to view 75% of the documents in relation to DM/23/2866 due to the sheer volume of documentation submitted. I assume however that due to the Christmas/New Year break that this submission can still be taken into account.)

My reasons for objecting to this outline planning application are summarised in the points below:

1. This site is not allocated in the MSDC District Plan.
2. This site is in direct conflict with the local neighbourhood plans for both Ansty & Staplefield and Cuckfield parishes.
3. This site, if approved, would have a severe impact on traffic.
4. This site, if approved, is not sustainable, i.e. services and facilities will not be at a level required to reduce reliance on cars and encourage active travel.
5. This site, if approved, will destroy an area of countryside that has been recognised by MSDC as being of equivalent high standard to that of the adjacent AONB/National Landscape.
6. This site, if approved, will breach the prevention of coalescence policies.
7. This site, if approved, will breach the policies concerning the maintenance of local character.
8. This site, if approved, will result in higher levels of carbon emissions and the release of captured carbon.
9. This site, if approved, will cause significant harm to wildlife in the area.
10. This site, if approved, will cause significant harm to the health and wellbeing of existing residents of the area.
11. This site, if approved, will increase noise, air, and light pollution.
12. This site, if approved, will reduce agricultural land available for the provision of food security.
13. This site, if approved, will result in the further degradation of existing services (supply of water, sewage facilities, GP provision etc).
14. The site promoters have provided documentation that contains both contradictory and misleading statements which calls in to question their integrity.

Further details to support the above points are given below:

Point 1

- a) The current MSDC District Plan runs up to 2031 and does NOT include this Ansty Farm site.
- b) The current MSDC District Plan under DP6: Settlement Hierarchy recognises that "SettlementsAnsty....have already identified sufficient commitments/completions to meet their minimum housing requirement for the full plan period".
- c) The draft District Plan that will run up to 2039 does NOT include this Ansty Farm site.
- d) The NPPF requires that proposed developments are Plan Led and not just one-off speculative submissions.

Point 2

- a) The Ansty & Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan that runs up to 2031 states "POLICY AS1: NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT The Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan area is subject to significant environmental constraints and as a result new housing should be

focused within the Development Boundary of Ansty as identified in the proposal map. Other proposals for small scale housing development of up to 10 units, to meet identified local need will only be permitted subject to the criteria below and compliance with other policies within the plan.....". The proposal map referenced here is shown on page 18 and the Ansty Farm development far exceeds capacity for the small scale housing development that may be reasonably expected and it also sits outside of the identified area for development.

- b) The Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan that runs up to 2031 states that ".... in line with the assessment of need, commitments and capacity, the District Council expects Cuckfield to accommodate 130 dwellings as the contribution towards meeting the district-wide strategic housing need up to 2031". Again, the proposed Ansty Farm development far exceeds the capacity that is available within the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan.
- c) Both the Ansty & Staplefield and Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plans were produced through significant levels of consultation with local residents. Both parishes have supported the need for sustainable development, but the Ansty Farm site is completely contrary to what the parishes have defined as sustainable development and rides roughshod over the local plans.

Point 3

- a) Fairfax have attempted to suggest that the amendments they have made will mitigate the severe traffic impacts identified by WSCC and that these have been agreed with WSCC. From reading their documentation, this conclusion seems to be fundamentally flawed. See below for information taken from their documentation that appears to contradict this.
 - a. Fairfax have used car trip rate reductions of "15% reduction on residential unit car trip rates to account for home working, internalisation and future mode share assumptions. 80% reduction on primary school car trip rates to account for internalisation of trips" and "In addition to the above, as agreed with WSCC during pre-application discussions, a 25% trip rate reduction is to be applied to the proposed development to reflect the effects of the active and public transport strategies. This reduction consisted of a 20% reduction, to reflect the high proportion of employment types suited to working from home in Mid Sussex, as well as a further 5% for sites with local retail and community facilities" (source 6.32 and 6.34 from their Environmental Statement Traffic & Transport_Part 1). The email from WSCC does not give any agreement to the 25% reduction and even questions the use of the 15% reduction. It seems highly unlikely that WSCC would approve this version of modelling anyway as it appears to be double counting reductions, presumably this is the only way Fairfax can get their mitigations to 'add up'! The only references in the response from WSCC are in relation to the original proposal of Fairfax for a 50% reduction to which WSCC responded "a 50% reduction target at Ansty should not be justified against an Active Travel England target for proportion of walking and cycling trips within towns and cities. Ansty will remain a village after this development and separated from the town of Haywards Heath by distance, even when/if linked by new or upgraded walking and cycling infrastructure" and "this data is interesting but home working patterns may be continuing to evolve and this may not necessarily be a continuous trend to increase as people and employers have longer experience of both the upsides and downsides of continuous home working and continue to evolve their preferred hybrid working patterns. On this basis further adjustments for this trend should be on a sensitivity scenario basis rather than a part of core forecasting assumptions, to reflect the high level of uncertainty over future trends".

- b. "The principle of roundabouts as access points are fine but the form of roundabout is not what would be expected for well trafficked roads such as the A272" (source page 92 of the Environmental Statement Traffic & Transport_Part 7 email response from WSCC). "It's also recognised that a lower speed limit is being proposed in association with two of the roundabouts. The highway designs for these roundabouts are then based on the potential 40mph speed limit. It's generally not advised that the design is based on a potential speed limit given the proposed design speed cannot be secured by condition or legal obligation. At this time, no consideration appears to have been given as to whether the proposed speed limit complies with the current WSCC Speed Limit Policy and therefore has any potential to succeed" and "At present, the use of compact roundabouts has not been appropriately demonstrated" (source page 93 of the Environmental Statement Traffic & Transport_Part 7 email response from WSCC). Whilst these comments are based on versions of documents produced in May 2023, the updated versions still appear to show compact roundabouts and therefore these statements are far from an approval from WSCC.
- b) The additional traffic that would be generated by the sports facilities, retirement & care units, schools etc does not seem to have been factored into the Fairfax calculations. Examples of additional sources of traffic to the site, that will all add to the volume of traffic on surrounding roads, is given below:
 - a. The letter from the Lawn Tennis Association states that "We anticipate over 150,000 annual visits to the sport hub". (Source Sports Facilities Provision Statement page 45.) Assuming a similar number for the hockey facilities, this would generate over 300,000 annual visits (i.e. at least 822 per day).
 - b. The vast majority if not all of the pupils that attend SEND schools will be from outside the area as SEND schools cover wide catchment areas due to the requirement to meet the specific needs of children with SEN. These children often travel to school in individual taxis. Teachers are also extremely likely to be external to the site.
 - c. There is likely to be a surplus of spaces for the proposed primary school that will also generate incoming traffic.
 - d. The retirement units will generate visits from relatives as well as from healthcare providers that are unlikely to be possible to provision on site.
 - e. Any employment created on site is also likely to be resourced outside of the site itself generating further traffic to the site.
- c) The proposals for the existing roundabout at the B2036/A272 junction in Ansty (at the top of Bolney Road) appears to use a smaller HGV to show the swept path analysis which is presumably because showing the larger HGV size (which is common on this route) would highlight that the proposed changes to this roundabout would not work. Neither does it show 2 smaller HGVs alongside each other as again, this doesn't appear to be a feasible option. In fact, the diagrams used to show the swept path analysis seem to show the wheels of the smaller HGV touching the kerb! Perhaps more importantly, the sight line at this roundabout is set back such that a 2nd lane, even for just one car, will not provide visual sight of oncoming traffic from the Burgess Hill direction rendering the proposals here as ineffective and meaning that mitigation at this junction is not achievable via the proposals provided.
- d) The proposals for mitigation of impacts to other roundabouts assessed by WSCC as having severe impacts are questionable too in light of the inappropriate use of a car trip rate

reduction of 25% and the under estimation of traffic generated on surrounding roads as a result of the additional facilities referenced in point b) above.

Point 4

- a) Sustrans produced a very useful article in December 2020 in relation to 20 minute neighbourhoods, see link [What is a 20-minute neighbourhood? - Sustrans.org.uk](https://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-is-a-20-minute-neighbourhood/), which is all about reducing reliance on cars. There are a couple of key things to note from this article; “We think that the best way to do this is to ensure that it is easy for people to meet most of their everyday needs by a short, convenient and pleasant 20-minute return walk. 10 minutes there, and 10 minutes back” and that their suggested minimum features include “Food retailers and supermarkets, Education, including early years, primary school and nearby secondary schools, Health services, such as a pharmacy, GP and dentist, Financial services, such as post office or bank, Employment and jobs either within the neighbourhood or nearby, Public open space, such as parks and recreation grounds, Entertainment, such as leisure, culture and entertainment facilities”. The Ansty Farm site, despite Fairfax’s attempt to tick these boxes, will NOT meet these criteria, see below:
- a. There is no provision for a supermarket and retail provision is likely to be limited to one local shop, meaning that residents would need to travel to Haywards Heath or Burgess Hill, most likely by car, for their weekly food shopping (or have deliveries on site). The nearby Bolnore Village development has just one shop for what is a similarly sized development.
 - b. Secondary school education would NOT be on site and the nearest provision would be Warden Park which is over a 30 minute walk resulting in either transportation by car or by bus (assuming a service can be provided).
 - c. Health services are unlikely to be possible to provision on site due to a national shortage of resources. Under a Freedom of Information request, the NHS has confirmed that “GP numbers have fallen by about 5%....in England, there is a shortage of around 4,200 full time equivalent GPs” and “there are five practices in Mid Sussex operating under a ‘capped list’”. At the Fairfax consultation events they admitted that if GPs couldn’t be provisioned then dentists could use the space and if dentists couldn’t be provisioned then physiotherapists could use the space and if physiotherapists couldn’t be provisioned then the space would be kept available for some other healthcare service. To provide a GP service for the number of houses proposed would need a minimum of 2 GPs, plus the additional services that GP practices need to provide to meet the needs of their patients (such as a practice manager, a receptionist, nurses etc).
 - d. There are unlikely to be financial services or entertainment facilities and employment opportunities on site are likely to be very limited and the employees themselves will likely be from offsite locations.
- b) The Fairfax proposals to increase Active Travel (walking and cycling) and reduce the reliance on the car will be limited (certainly not the 25% referenced in point 3 above). Even the 10-minute there and 10-minute back walking option will be limited due to the undulating nature of the site and the outlier distances to where the facilities are located. For the facilities referenced in a) above that cannot be provided on site, walking will not be an option that will reduce reliance on the car as none of these facilities are located within a 20-minute walk of the centre of the site. The cycle way improvements that are suggested also only result in partial route improvements and often of very short distances resulting in cyclists still needing to travel on carriageways carrying 60mph traffic, some of which is on windy country lanes.

For example, there are no cycle way improvements to the south of the site to Burgess Hill and use of either the B2036 or the Cuckfield Road means cycling on 60mph country roads. The route to Cuckfield from the NE corner of the site would also be similar to this. Many of the routes proposed by Fairfax are unlit, muddy footpaths and not suitable for the purposes suggested. It is also questionable as to whether some of the suggested improvements can be made as some of the routes are privately maintained and the width of the pavement is less than 1 metre in places and not suitable as a shared footway/cycleway. It therefore seems highly unlikely that the so-called improvements will result in an increased level of walking or cycling.

- c) The Fairfax proposals to improve bus services are also vague and seem predicated on funding that is most likely to only be available in the short term. Compass Travel, who run the existing 89 service from Horsham to Haywards Heath (via Ansty), have confirmed that “for any new development there is normally a legal requirement to fund a bus service and very few rural bus services are viable without ongoing financial support. Our existing 89 bus operates under contract to WSCC. It is currently the only regular bus that serves Ansty but we would not want to divert it via the new estate as there is insufficient time and it would make through journeys unattractive to existing passengers”. Nearby Cuckfield that has a similar number of houses has limited bus services providing further evidence to suggest it will simply not be possible to run a regular enough service to reduce car usage.

Point 5

- a) In an earlier version of the District Plan, the following statement was made “2.31 The District Council is of the opinion that the landscape south and east of Cuckfield is of an equally high standard to that of the AONB. It comprises undulating countryside with small irregularly shaped fields divided by tree belts and areas of woodland. Small streams cut steeply into the sandstone creating narrow valleys or ghylls. The ridged landscape allows distant views to the South Downs and to landmarks such as Cuckfield Church spire. The view from Cuckfield Churchyard towards the Downs is well known as being one of the finest in the area. The area is also rich in historic features including sites of early iron works and associated hammer ponds...The District Council has proposed that this area be included within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as and when the boundary in this area is reviewed.” This statement refers to the Ansty Farm site and makes clear that this land is of the same value as the neighbouring AONB and should therefore be afforded the same level of protection.
- b) “An area in the centre of the Site (extending to 6.6 ha) is of Grade 2 “very good” quality, and two smaller patches of the Site (extending to 5 ha in total) is of Subgrade 3a “good” quality. There is a smaller area of 1.6 ha of Grade 1 “excellent” quality along the northern boundary of the Site” (source point 2.6.19 of Fairfax’s Environmental Statement Volume 2 Chapter 2). District Plan policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside states “where identified, Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land should be protected from development due to its economic importance and geological value”. The location of this high-grade land is shown in Fairfax’s Environmental Statement Volume 2 Chapter 10 point 10.5.13, cross referencing this with their Concept Masterplan shows that they plan to cover the grade 1 land with sports facilities which will either be buildings or artificial surfaces, the grade 2 land will be covered by housing and some of the grade 3a land will also be partly covered by housing. In other words, this in contravention of District Plan policy DP12.

Point 6

- a) The Ansty & Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan states “POLICY AS2: PREVENTING COALESCENCE Development proposals are expected to demonstrate that they would not result in the coalescence with any neighbouring settlement either individually or cumulatively or result in the perception of openness being unacceptably eroded between the following areas: Ansty and Cuckfield”. There are also two maps (on pages 37 and 38) in this neighbourhood plan that show with blue arrows where the local gaps are that should be maintained to prevent coalescence. This clearly shows that the Fairfax proposal will breach this policy by developing up to and beyond the Cuckfield Parish boundary.
- b) The District Plan, DP13: Preventing Coalescence, states the “Strategic Objective: 2) To promote well located and designed development that reflects the District’s distinctive towns and villages, retains their separate identity and character and prevents coalescence”. The very fact that the Ansty Farm site will merge both the Ansty & Staplefield parish boundary with the Cuckfield Parish boundary mean that the distinctive nature and separate identities of the Ansty and Cuckfield villages would be merged by the Ansty Farm site in clear contravention of DP13.

Point 7

- a) The Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan states “Cuckfield occupies an elevated position on the southern slopes of the Weald. The landscape setting of Cuckfield which is visible from public vantage points in the village and from the surrounding extensive footpath network is an important feature of the Plan area. One of the distinctive features of Cuckfield village is the visual connectivity with the surrounding countryside from public places. Map 5 shows the locations at the edge of the village where there is direct visual connectivity with the countryside (Cuckfield Views assessment is at www.cuckfield.gov.uk). These distinctive views combine shorter uncluttered views of the more immediate setting of the village with views across the Low Weald to the South Downs National Park to the south and across the Sussex Ouse valley towards the Balcombe Forest High Weald. The value and sensitivity of the landscape, the setting of the village and the distinctive views of the landscape from public vantage points are distinctive qualities of Cuckfield and they have been taken into account in assessing the suitability of development opportunities. Intrusive development (including buildings, highways and lighting) in areas of major or substantial landscape value or sensitivity or which would clutter distinctive views, would adversely affect the character of the village and this valued landscape.”
- b) Ansty is a category 4 small village within a rural setting containing a number of grade 2 listed properties. Although these listed properties are not within the boundary of the site itself, they would either be completely surrounded by the development or immediately adjacent to the development which would rob them of their historical landscape context rendering them no more than curious relics within an utterly changed landscape.
- c) At the time of the production of the neighbourhood plans, Cuckfield had 1439 houses and Ansty had around 70 (these figures have increased since then due to planned development). A development of 1450 house plus 90 retirement units would swamp both Cuckfield and Ansty, resulting in the urbanisation of Ansty in particular, and irrevocably change their characters in contravention of both DP6: Settlement Hierarchy and DP13: Preventing Coalescence.

Point 8

- a) The site itself, as stated in Fairfax's own documentation, will increase car usage and therefore carbon emissions. Even as car ownership slowly switches towards electric cars, this is not a carbon neutral option due to the carbon emitted during the production of the vehicles. Electric cars are also known to be heavier vehicles and therefore emitters of a higher level of particulate matter during the braking process, which would also increase with the introduction of additional roundabouts and signalised crossing points.
- b) Carbon that is also locked into the soil and trees that will also be destroyed during the construction process will also add to the sequestration of carbon. The trees/vegetation/hedgerows that will be removed has been understated by Fairfax as they seem to ignore the multiple areas of clearance that will be required to provide visual splays for the new roundabouts, signalised crossings and cycleways/footways outside of the site.

Point 9

- a) The objection letters provided by both the West Sussex Wildlife Trust and the Sussex Ornithological Society highlight the likely negative impact of the Ansty Farm development on wildlife and in particular to the rare species that are found in the area.
- b) Fairfax's own documentation (Environmental Statement Ecology & Diversity_Part 2) highlights "The site is used by a wide assemblage of bats and the trapping and radio-tracking surveys have confirmed the importance of the site at a regional level for the rare Bechstein's bats, barbastelle and Alcahoes bats....The proposed development therefore has the potential to impact the favourable conservation status of bats on site should these habitats be impacted". Whilst Fairfax might propose mitigation measures, it seems highly unlikely to be suitable given that their flight paths will be disrupted by buildings and the level of lighting will increase significantly. This could only be exacerbated by using bridges over two of the areas of woodland.
- c) Other protected and notable species identified in the Site include a dormouse population (the location of which would be destroyed to create visual splays on the A272 at the northern part of the site), badger setts, birds including firecrest, skylark, yellowhammer and bullfinch, great crested newts, common toad and grass snakes. No mention of deer that roam the site or kingfishers that have also been seen in recent years. Again, it seems inevitable that during the 8-year construction of a site that is in the countryside that significant harm to this wildlife would be the result, especially in the case of wildlife that would naturally roam beyond the boundaries of one area of woodland.
- d) Point 7.7.24 of Environmental Statement volume 1 lists several significant impacts but suggests that they would be temporary. This seems to be an extremely optimistic view given that the construction phase is proposed to take at least 8 years during which time it seems highly likely that wildlife lost during this time will not return and will therefore become permanent.

Point 10

- a) Existing residents of both Ansty and Cuckfield use the footpaths that cross the Ansty Farm site for walking, running and dog walking. Building on this site would render this area useless for these activities thus depriving existing residents of a key source for maintaining their mental health and physical wellbeing. Many of the existing residents would find the changes to the Parkland Reserve too restrictive to be a suitable replacement and would indeed prefer that site to remain as it is now in its intended form.

- b) The Statement of Community Involvement produced by Fairfax to tick a box cannot hide the fact that 96% of local residents are against this development, which is particularly notable when considered in the context of Neighbourhood Plans that show residents are not against development in the right place and scale. The overwhelming view of local residents is that the destruction of such a beautiful area of countryside that is enjoyed by so many currently would be heartbreaking and cause significant harm.

Point 11

- a) The Fairfax documentation that deals with Air and Noise pollution seems to ignore the impact to residents of the surrounding roads who would inevitably suffer the years of noise that construction traffic delivers, together with the air pollution that will be generated by traffic stopping & starting for 'temporary' traffic lights that would be used during the construction of the proposed roundabouts and signalised crossings. (Not conducive to the health and wellbeing of the impacted residents either!)
- b) The Lighting Impact Assessment provided by Fairfax does not cover the impact of the vehicles that will be travelling over the proposed bridges in the middle of the site; is this because to do so would be to highlight the impact on the dark sky area? Albeit they have stated that there will be a minor adverse effect overall, there seems to be an assumption that measures to reduce the level of lighting in a residential setting are the same as eliminating the impact of residential lighting in a dark sky area. The only way to eliminate the prospect of additional light pollution is to have no additional lighting!
- c) The impact of the proposed bridges for air and noise pollution also seems to have been overlooked. Presumably, exhaust fumes will permeate to the underlying trees and to the wildlife living there too, let alone the noise that will be generated!
- d) Pg 64 of Fairfax's Environmental Statement Air Quality_Part 1 suggests that Cuckfield's Wastewater Treatment Works data on odour measurements is being ignored due to "substantive variability exists between odour measurements which have historically been taken at WWTW" and therefore they've used Michael Bull and Associates Ltd instead. MBAL themselves suggest lots of reasons for subjectivity. The odour assessment produced highlights that housing needs to be more than 100 metres away from the sewage site but they have assessed that the sports facilities can be located right next to the sewage site. They conclude impacts are insignificant and no mitigation is required. This assessment is based on use of a medium sensitivity for the sports facilities. A medium sensitivity receptor should be used where "People wouldn't reasonably be expected to be present here continuously or regularly for extended periods as part of the normal pattern of use of the land". People that play tennis matches or hockey matches tend to do so regularly for hours at a time which seems to suggest that the 100-metre limit should be applied here too. It would be interesting to know if the Lawn Tennis Association are aware of the proposed location!

Point 12

- a) Fairfax suggest that the Ansty Farm site is of low value and can therefore be built upon. As outlined in point 5, the land has been assessed previously as of equal value to the AONB and the history of this site (and the neighbouring AONB) is aligned with farming. The removal of land available for agriculture does not come without its own issues. The main issue being that the more land that is lost to development, the less land there is available for farming and the provision of food security. Some of the site has been assessed of particular

importance for this purpose. District Plan policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside states “Where identified, Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land should be protected from development due to its economic importance and geological value. This is the land which is most flexible, productive and efficient and can best deliver future crops for food and non-food uses”.

Point 13

- a) Water supply has been an issue in the area, and not just during summer when hosepipes are banned. Ansty and Cuckfield have both suffered several water outages for days at a time. Houses that have been developed over recent years are also known to have an issue with water pressure resulting in showers not working. The Ansty Farm site doubling the population would not help.
- b) Southern Water have advised that they do not currently have the infrastructure to support the treatment of sewage for the Ansty Farm site. Whilst they are obliged to deliver this, and they have highlighted this could take more than 2 years and that they would not allow occupation of the site until this has been done, it is hard to see where this expansion would be made.
- c) GP services in the area are already under significant strain, as highlighted in point 4 above, dentists equally so and even the local pharmacy in Cuckfield was without a regular pharmacist for several months. It will not be possible to deliver all these services on site resulting in increasing pressure on already over stretched services and adding to traffic in the area.

Point 14

The following are examples of some of the statements that can be construed as misleading:

- The application form states Fairfax and the Norris's own all the land. The application is actually dependent on land that is owned by Highways to provide roundabout access and appropriate visual splays.
- Bus no.89 only runs Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and 3 times a day to Haywards Heath and once a day to Warden Park school for school children, NOT 1 per hour per day on weekdays as stated in their Travel Plan_Part 1. It only stops at the top of Bolney Rd and Cuckfield High St before going on to Haywards Heath, it does not stop at Highbridge Mill as shown in two the Fairfax diagrams.
- The removal of trees and vegetation stated in the Aboriculturalist Impact does not include the removal of at least 20 trees, one of which is categorised as A2 quality, and areas of trees/hedgerows that will be required to provide visual splays at the roundabouts and signalised crossings. This does not include the trees and vegetation that will need to be removed for the creation of a new cycle path at the north of the site on the southern side of the A272, this has not been referenced in the survey at all. This is also likely to impact on the accuracy of the biodiversity calculations.
- The green infrastructure parameter plan does not show the access roundabouts and therefore does not accurately show the buffer zones, also likely to be under stating the loss of vegetation at these sites.
- Environmental statement volume 1, point 5.3.3, suggests that the “Routes were positioned away from the Ancient Woodland and concentrated on the ecologically low value areas such as low value grassland and arable land”, yet the cycle path (that "will be formed using

a bound gravel or rolled hoggin surface") seems to run alongside Ancient Woodland and will result in the destruction of trees through the adjacent woodland.

- Environmental Statement volume 2 chapter 2 states "2.2.3 By foot, Cuckfield (located to the north of the Site) can be reached within 15 minutes and by cycle, Haywards Heath (situated to the east of the Site) and part of Burgess Hill (located to the south of the Site) can be reached within 15 minutes". Cuckfield is more than 20 minutes' walk from the centre of the site and there are no footpaths that go directly to Burgess Hill making this statement extremely misleading.
- Design & Access Statement_Part 1, page 10, suggests that the only developments there have been in Ansty are the Bolney Road and Crouchfields developments. In fact, there have also been 3 at Sunnyside, 1 on Deaks Lane, 8 in Deaks Paddocks plus multiple other adhoc planning applications granted permission. Given the size of Ansty, the last 10 years has seen a doubling of the size of the village. It is simply misleading to suggest that residents in Ansty might be Nimbys as the statistics prove that over the last 10 years more development than is expected of a village this size has been delivered.
- Page 63 of Design & Access Statement_Part 3 states "whilst also creating a pleasant and peaceful environment for students and staff" in relation to the SEND school. This school is situated right next to the road that is shown as a noise pollution area in other documents and most of the of the existing tree/hedgerow buffer will have to be removed for visual splays at the roundabout. Children at SEND schools tend to be very sensitive to noise and it is misleading to suggest a peaceful environment is being created!
- Travel Plan_Part 1 points 4.20 states "a shared 3m footway/cycleway will be provided on the north side of Tylers Green through to the B2272/Bolnore Road/Paddockhall Road Double Mini-Roundabout junction" which contradicts their own diagrams (SK05.1 B) that show the maximum in places is 2.5M. This existing footway only is utilised by school children and joggers on a regular basis and the addition of cyclists on such a narrow path is likely to be dangerous to existing users.
- Travel Plan_Part 1 diagrams SK03 D and SK04 C show proposed cycle route and footway enhancements along the full length of the B2036 to Cuckfield from the existing roundabout at the north east corner of the site. This proposal is not borne out by more detailed diagram SK05 B shown in Travel Plan_Part 2, this shows that the enhancement is limited to the southern end of the existing footway. The footway alongside the sports pavilion at this point is less than 1 metre wide and there is no capacity at this point to create a 3 metre wide shared footway/cycleway. It is therefore grossly misleading to suggest that enhancements run the full length of the road.
- Health Impact Assessment point 4.1.3 states "The site is well positioned in terms of transport links, with neighbouring areas easy to access. By foot, Cuckfield can be reached within 15 minutes; Haywards Heath and part of Burgess Hill can also be reached within 15 minutes by bicycle.....The nearest railway station is Haywards Heath which is approximately 2.7 km to the north-east of the Site." Cuckfield is NOT 15 minutes from the centre of the site. Cycling might be achievable within 15 minutes but the routes are not cyclist friendly, in particular the route to Burgess Hill which is not commonly used by cyclists due to its winding nature, narrow lanes and national speed limit application. They even contradict themselves on the distance to the station, as on page 27 of this document they state 4.5km, not 2.7km. There are multiple references in this document that are misleading in an attempt to reduce the reality that this site is simply not well positioned and will not meet the criteria required for this to be a sustainable development.