

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 March 2026 19:05:31 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 17/03/2026 6:05 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:	7 Marwick Close Ansty
----------	-----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to formally object to the above planning application. I am a resident of Marwick Close, one of the existing residential streets through which this proposed development would be accessed. My family moved to the property in December 2024 shortly before the birth of our daughter. One of the main reasons we chose this location was the quiet and safe nature of the cul-de-sac environment, with very limited vehicle movements and a layout that prioritises pedestrians and residents.

The proposal to construct 34 dwellings accessed via Upton Drive and Marwick Close raises significant concerns regarding highway safety, the suitability of the existing road network, the impact on existing residents, and the effect on the rural character of Ansty.

Unsuitable use of shared surface residential roads

The proposed development relies on the existing residential roads of Upton Drive and Marwick Close as the primary means of access. These streets were originally designed to serve a small residential development of approximately 15 dwellings.

Both roads are shared surface streets with no pavements, meaning pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles occupy the same carriageway space. This arrangement currently functions safely because traffic levels are extremely low and drivers move cautiously within what is clearly a quiet residential environment.

The addition of 34 further dwellings would effectively triple the number of homes served by this shared surface network, meaning the road infrastructure could be serving close to fifty households once visitor, delivery and service traffic are considered.

Shared surface roads are generally intended for small residential clusters where vehicle movements remain minimal and pedestrian priority can realistically be maintained. Increasing the number of dwellings served by this road network to such an extent would fundamentally alter how the street operates and significantly increase the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.

The proposal would therefore undermine the pedestrian-priority nature of the existing shared surface environment and would increase the likelihood of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. This is contrary to the principles of national planning policy which seek to create streets that are safe and prioritise pedestrian movement.

Direct impact on existing residents and pedestrian safety

The increase in traffic would have a particularly serious impact on residents whose homes sit directly adjacent to the shared carriageway.

At my property, the distance from our front door to the edge of the carriageway is approximately 192 centimetres, and there is no pavement or pedestrian refuge space. When leaving the property we step directly onto the shared road surface.

At present this arrangement works because only a very small number of vehicles pass through the close each day. However, if

the development proceeds, traffic associated with dozens of additional households - including residents, visitors, deliveries and service vehicles - would regularly pass directly outside homes where there is effectively no separation between pedestrians and vehicles.

For families with young children this represents a very real safety concern. The increase in traffic would transform what is currently a quiet residential cul-de-sac into an access route serving a much larger development.

Intensification of vehicle movements

The proposed development would generate a significant number of additional vehicle trips. Even conservative estimates suggest hundreds of additional daily vehicle movements associated with commuting, school runs, deliveries and visitors.

All of these movements would pass through Upton Drive and Marwick Close before reaching Bolney Road.

The existing road layout was not intended to function as a distributor route for a larger housing development. The proposal therefore represents a significant intensification of use of infrastructure designed for a much smaller residential environment, which would inevitably increase the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the shared surface.

Safety concerns at the Upton Drive / Bolney Road junction

The development would also substantially increase the number of vehicles using the Upton Drive junction with Bolney Road, which already raises highway safety concerns.

Independent speed survey data indicates that actual vehicle speeds on Bolney Road exceed the posted 30mph limit, with westbound speeds recorded at over 38mph. At these speeds, highway design guidance requires larger visibility splays than those typically applied under Manual for Streets standards.

Evidence suggests that the geometry of the road and roadside vegetation restrict the available visibility splays, particularly for vehicles attempting to join Bolney Road. If the required visibility distances cannot be achieved based on the recorded speeds, the junction cannot be considered safe for the additional traffic generated by the development.

Given the number of dwellings proposed, the resulting increase in vehicle movements would represent a significant intensification of use of this junction, raising serious concerns regarding highway safety.

In the absence of clear evidence that appropriate visibility splays can be achieved based on recorded traffic speeds, it cannot be demonstrated that the development would provide a safe and suitable access for all users.

Poor pedestrian, cycling and public transport provision

The surrounding transport infrastructure also raises concerns regarding the sustainability of the location.

Sections of the footway along Bolney Road are understood to be approximately 1.2 metres wide, which is significantly below the recommended widths set out in national guidance. Such narrow footways cannot comfortably accommodate pushchairs, wheelchair users or two pedestrians walking side-by-side.

Traffic speeds and volumes on Bolney Road also make it unsuitable for most cyclists without dedicated infrastructure, which is not currently provided.

Public transport provision within the village is also extremely limited, with only a small number of bus services operating each day and little alignment with typical commuting patterns.

While the application documents highlight certain nearby services, this places undue weight on limited local facilities and public transport, while understating the reality that most residents rely heavily on private vehicles for daily travel. In practice, many journeys from the proposed development would almost certainly be undertaken by car, further increasing traffic on the surrounding road network.

Impact on the rural character of Ansty and loss of green space

The proposed development would also have a significant impact on the rural character of Ansty.

The application site comprises approximately 1.6 hectares of greenfield land, which currently forms part of the countryside setting of the village and contributes to its open and rural character. The land also supports local wildlife and forms part of the wider green landscape that surrounds the settlement.

The loss of this area of greenfield land would represent a substantial change to the character of the area and a significant loss of countryside within the village.

Ansty is a small rural settlement and its character is defined by relatively modest-scale development within a countryside setting. The introduction of 34 dwellings on a site of this scale would represent a large expansion which risks eroding that rural character and introducing a more urban form of development into

the village.

The scale and density of development proposed on this greenfield site would represent a significant and urbanising extension to the village that is not reflective of the existing pattern or character of development in Ansty.

Disproportionate scale of development

The scale of the proposal also appears disproportionate in the context of the village.

Ansty is a relatively small community with limited services and infrastructure, and the introduction of 34 additional dwellings represents a substantial increase relative to the size of the existing settlement.

When considered alongside other recent development within the village, the cumulative effect raises concerns that the overall scale of growth is not in keeping with the character or capacity of a small rural village.

Local infrastructure constraints

There are also wider concerns regarding the ability of local infrastructure to accommodate development of this scale.

Residents already experience limitations in local infrastructure, including very poor mobile phone signal coverage and occasional power interruptions within the village. While these issues are not directly controlled through the planning system, they nevertheless illustrate the limited infrastructure capacity that exists within a small rural settlement such as Ansty.

Taken together with the limited transport options and local services available, this raises further concerns about whether development of this scale is appropriate in this location.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

The proposed layout also raises concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy for existing residents.

Based on the draft site layout, it appears that four windows within our property would be directly overlooked by the proposed development, including two bedroom windows.

Given the relatively close relationship between the proposed dwellings and existing properties on Marwick Close, this arrangement would result in direct overlooking into habitable rooms, leading to a material loss of privacy for our household.

This is particularly concerning in relation to bedroom spaces, where a reasonable expectation of privacy is essential.

This relationship would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy, contrary to the principles of good design and the requirement to safeguard the amenity of existing residents.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety, the residential environment and the rural character of the village.

In summary:

The development relies on shared surface residential roads designed to serve a much smaller number of dwellings.

It would introduce significantly increased traffic onto streets with no pavements where pedestrians and vehicles share the same space.

In my case, our front door sits only 192cm from the carriageway and we step directly onto the shared road surface, meaning increased traffic would pass extremely close to our home.

There are serious safety concerns regarding the Upton Drive / Bolney Road junction, particularly given recorded vehicle speeds and restricted visibility.

Pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure in the surrounding area is limited and inadequate to support development of this scale.

The proposal would also result in the loss of approximately 1.6 hectares of greenfield land and harm the rural character of Ansty.

The layout would result in direct overlooking of four windows within our home, including two bedrooms, causing a material loss of privacy.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse planning permission for this application.

Kind regards