

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 March 2026 22:44:41 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0454

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 25/03/2026 9:44 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Parcel At Bolney Road Ansty West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed erection of 34 new homes with access from Marwick Close, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, drainage, and associated infrastructure and highway works.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Sherwood Bolney Road ANSTY
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Planning Application Ref: DM/26/0454 Location: Land Parcel at Bolney Road, Ansty, West Sussex I write to object to the above planning application on the following planning grounds: Consultation and Notification I note that, despite residing in close proximity to the site, I did not

receive direct notification of this application. I would ask the Council to confirm that all statutory consultation requirements have been met, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, to ensure that affected residents have had a fair opportunity to participate.

Settlement Hierarchy and Sustainability

The Council's development strategy, as set out in Policy DP4 (Housing) and Policy DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy), identifies Ansty as a Category 4 settlement. Such settlements are defined as having limited services and facilities and are therefore considered less suitable for significant development.

In this context, the scale of the proposal appears inconsistent with the spatial strategy, which seeks to direct development to more sustainable locations. The proposal risks undermining the plan-led approach by introducing development in a location that lacks the infrastructure and services to support it.

Sustainable Development and Transport

Under Policy DP1 (Sustainable Development in Mid Sussex) and Policy DP21 (Transport), development should minimise the need to travel and prioritise sustainable modes of transport.

The application site has:

- Limited and infrequent public transport provision
- No meaningful cycling infrastructure
- Poor pedestrian connectivity

Future occupiers would therefore be highly dependent on private vehicles, which conflicts with the Council's sustainability objectives and the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Highway Safety

Policy DP21 (Transport) also requires that development ensures safe and suitable access for all users.

The A272 in this location is characterised by relatively high traffic speeds despite posted limits. The addition of further vehicle movements is likely to:

- Increase congestion
- Exacerbate existing highway safety concerns
- Create additional risk at site access points

A robust and evidence-based transport assessment should be required to demonstrate that the development would not have an

unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Pedestrian Infrastructure and Safety

There is a lack of safe, continuous pedestrian infrastructure, particularly along the route between Ansty and Cuckfield. This raises concerns under:

Policy DP21 (Transport)

Policy DP26 (Character and Design) (which includes safe and accessible movement)

The current footway provision is limited and, in places, poorly maintained. The development would increase pedestrian demand without delivering adequate improvements, to the detriment of safety, particularly for school children and other vulnerable users.

Public Rights of Way

The submitted plans indicate that the development may affect or adjoin a public footpath to the south of the site. Under Policy DP21 and Policy DP26, development should protect and enhance public rights of way.

Clarification is required as to:

Whether any diversion or stopping-up is proposed

What safeguards will be implemented to ensure continued public access

This is particularly important given the importance of maintaining connectivity and public amenity value.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Policy DP38 (Biodiversity) requires that development:

Protects existing habitats and species

Provides net gains in biodiversity

The site and surrounding area support a range of wildlife, including bats and bird species. There is concern regarding cumulative habitat loss from recent development in the area, including the removal of mature trees.

In the absence of clear and robust ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, the proposal risks conflicting with Policy DP38 and national policy requirements for biodiversity net gain.

Character and Local Context

Under Policy DP26 (Character and Design), development should

respect the character and distinctiveness of the local area.

Given the rural nature of Ansty and its limited infrastructure, there is concern that the proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site that is not in keeping with the surrounding context.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal appears to conflict with key policies of the Mid Sussex District Plan, particularly DP1, DP4, DP6, DP21, DP26, and DP38, as well as the overarching principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.

I respectfully request that the application be refused.

Kind regards