

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 January 2026 14:08
To: planninginfo
Subject: RE: Planning Application DM/25/3108 - Objection

Dear Sirs

[REDACTED]

We are writing to object to the planning application DM/25/3108, Proposed 5 pitch site for settled gypsy accommodation including vehicular access, each containing mobile home, utility building and parking spaces

We live at Legh Manor Farmhouse, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, RH17 5AJ approximately 0.4miles from the proposed development.

This planning application follows the recent planning application and subsequent Appeal, references DM/20/2175 and APP/D3830/W/25/3362298 respectively which was refused.

We believe that the Cuckfield Road is an entirely unsuitable location, the applicant is incorrect to suggest there are local amenities close by. Access to local amenities would require travel by car.

1. The appeal at clause 12 stated "...In the absence of travel choice, the site would not be reasonably accessible to the range of services identified by Policy DP33, and therefore the proposal would conflict with the policy." A few examples follow.
 - a. There is a bus stop on the A2300, about a ten minute walk away, except that no busses are timetabled to stop.
 - b. The nearest village of Ansty is a thirty minute walk away, along an unlit road with no pavement and the national speed limit of sixty miles per hour.
 - c. The village of Ansty contains just a petrol station and small convenience store, no other retail shops.
 - d. The nearest railway station is Wivelsfield Station, which is a one hour walk away.
2. The appeal at clause 13 stated "The proposed development would not be located to minimise the need for travel or to promote the increased use of alternative means of transport. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DP21."
3. The appeal at clause 14 stated "There are no policies in the development plan which favour a development of this type in this location. Therefore, having regard to the local development strategy, the proposed development would not be in a suitable location."

The proposed development will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The local area is rural with well spaced out houses along the west side of Cuckfield Road and a pond on the east side (Pond Lye). A development of five dwellings on this small plot is utterly different to the current character of the area.

The site is susceptible to surface water flooding as evidenced by the photographs submitted by the neighbours for the previous planning application and also shown here below. Note that in planning application DM/21/0486, it is stated that land in this area has low infiltration and use of infiltration drainage may not be possible on the site. We suggest that statement reflects the situation for the site here and as evidenced by the photographs below. The site is flat as identified at clause 6.2 of the Tree Survey: "There are no significant inclines in any direction that would affect the recommendations in this report." The Appeal at clause 55 recognised the concerns of local residents to the risk of flooding, but mitigated the risk by stating "...discharge surface water off-site, would have a permeable access road ..." We suggest that because of the flat terrain and the likely low infiltration, the proposed surface water details in the application are insufficient. There

needs to be certainty that the site is able to discharge surface water safely within the boundary of the site and without making the flooding situation any worse for the neighbours.





The foul water drainage solution proposed is to utilise a package sewage treatment plant. It is not clear how many sewage plants are proposed, whether it is one per caravan or one for the whole site. At times of high rainfall the water table will be at or close to the surface as described above. The sewage plant needs to be designed such that it is able to function with this high water table. Note that if the proposal was to discharge the sewage unit into the Cuckfield Road ditch, this ditch does not run continuously and as such would not meet the environment agency requirement for treated foul effluent to discharge to a watercourse

with a constant flow of water. There has already been an Environment Agency referral because of smells arising from sewage unit discharges into this ditch, (the objection from Catherine Jones gives more detail).

Regards

