

Ref: DM/23/2867

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).

Dear Sir,

In my representation dated 09.01.2024 as shown on the planning portal I objected to the following:

The effect of this proposed development on the appearance of the area.

Intrusion on the countryside to both animals and local people.

The flawed quality and design.

Significantly increased noise and disturbance.

The non-existent ecological benefits to the proposal.

Highway safety issues.

The application's lack of compliance to and consideration of inclusivity.

Degradation of the countryside.

These points are still relevant, and I do not wish to withdraw them. However, I would like to reiterate that the proposal to cull fallow deer and build a fenced cycle route creating corridors that dissect ancient woodland, suggests that the planners foresee them as potential obstacles and risks to cyclists, which is ironic given that this is their natural habitat. These proposals do not add any ecological enhancement or benefit as proffered, quite the reverse.

I would like to now also object to the *Additional Information* received on 8th November 2024 and in particular the *Latest Plan - Access and Framework Plan* (map) as shown on the planning portal dated 08.11.2024.

I believe the map to be incorrect and lacking in important detail for the following reasons:

- Pont 'C' on the map is referred to in the key as '*Bridleway gate*' but does not indicate whether the gate is to be erected between the proposed cycle path and bridleway 59CR, or if it is to traverse bridleway 59CR. If the former, then it is unclear as to why it is necessary, If the latter, then the bridleway gate is proposed to be erected across bridleway 59CR, which has shared access along a privately owned driveway.
- A section of '*Deaks Lane*', which is an adopted road, has been depicted as a bridleway. For identification purposes this area is coloured as a green dotted

line and referred to in the key as '*Bridleway*'. However, bridleway 22CR stops where it intercepts with Deaks Lane and the map is, therefore, incorrect.

- The cycle path is marked as going through ancient woodland, which is not shown on this map. The area in question is named on the map as '*Potential area for informal access*'. The only map within this entire application to show this area as ancient woodland can be found on page 58 of *the Environmental Statement (Volume 4: Appendix G: Ecology & Biodiversity Part 8)*, where the area is shaded in dark green and called 'ancient woodland' in the key. The supplied map in this recent application is therefore misleading.

In addition, on this same map, where the cycle path is marked as going through the area called '*Potential area for informal access*', the following points haven't been recognised:

- No information has been submitted as to how the river is to be bridged to accommodate the cycle path.
- Consideration has not been given to the fact that the whole area floods. See attached photos 1&2 (taken looking to the south) showing the extent of the flooded area.
- There has been no proposal as to how safety precautions will be implemented where the cycle path crosses over bridleway 59CR or what surface has been agreed by the WSCC PRoW team.
- In the *Supporting statement - Latest Plan - Cycle route woodland 08.11.24*, it stops short of photographing the area called '*Potential area for informal access*'. This is where the cycle path is proposed to traverse through before crossing the river and photographs would show how unsuitable the area is for this purpose. This should be considered as it is withholding important information.

To conclude, the lack of incorrect and incomplete supplied information is misleading and at worst deceptive.

Furthermore, there is still a 'Lack of compliance to and consideration of inclusivity', as nothing has changed to accommodate equestrian use. As a new development it has not complied to the Government's initiative that 'all new developments should be **accessible to all**'.

The proposed cycle path does not connect to the proposed development east of the A272 (application ref: DM/23/2866) in a safe way for cyclists and equestrians. In particular, there is no connectivity to any bridleway specific to equestrians within the proposed development, therefore '**accessibility for all**' has still not been addressed. The proposal still does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, the West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the Ansty, Staplefield & Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours faithfully,



Pondtail,
Deaks Lane,
Cuckfield.