

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 June 2025 21:21:12 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/1129

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/06/2025 9:21 PM.

### Application Summary

**Address:** Land At Foxhole Farm Foxhole Lane Bolney West Sussex

---

**Proposal:** Outline application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved), for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings, including affordable housing; a community building (use class F1) encompassing land for education provision, together with associated access, ancillary parking and landscaping; the creation of a vehicular access point from the A272 Cowfold Road, and pedestrian and cycle only access to The Street; and creation of a network of roads, footways, and cycleways through the site; together with the provision of countryside open space, children's play areas, community orchard, and allotments; sustainable drainage systems and landscape buffers.

---

**Case Officer:** Joanne Fisher

---

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

**Address:** Ryecroft House Ryecroft Road Bolney

---

### Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Neighbour or general public

---

**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

---

**Reasons for comment:**

Comments:

I am writing to object to the application for outline planning permission at Foxhole Farm, Bolney.

There are numerous reasons to object to this development. It is not within the current adopted plan. It was not included in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan having been considered a site not suitable for development. The mystery is why it was included in the current draft plan, which is currently stalled, despite significant opposition from the residents of Bolney and Bolney Parish Council (BPC) (over 200 objections). There had been no consultation with the village or BPC prior to its inclusion in the draft plan.

The site lies outside the built up area of the village and is therefore a greenfield development. The size of this development is out of proportion to the existing village, which has grown organically over several centuries, with the proposed 200 houses effectively doubling the size of Bolney village. It is in effect a separate satellite village to Bolney with little chance of cohesion and would forever alter the character of Bolney for the worse.

There are significant errors in the developer's supporting studies, particularly in the i-Transport Framework Travel Plan. The WSCC Highways Authority submission of 13 June compounds the errors, repeating inaccuracies of the i-Transport document. The stated aim of the Travel Plan is to "improve awareness of the opportunities to reduce car usage walking, cycling and use of public transport". This sentiment is facile because, in reality, the rural location of the site, lack of public transport options and safe cycleways means that residents will all be using their cars to get to work, take children to school, access doctors, dentists and shops as there is no realistic alternative to car use. There will be additional traffic from delivery services and the proposed community hub. It is therefore highly probable that the TRICS predicted two-way peak time vehicle trips of 124 AM peak and 126 PM peak is gross underestimate. More realistic sensitivity modelling of up to 400 AM and PM two way vehicle trips should be undertaken to stress test the assumptions. It is noted that with the increased traffic from Burgess Hill and Foxhole Farm, the proposed signalisation of the A272/London Road junction linked to the Burgess Hill Northern Arc development could exacerbate congestion along the A272 towards the Foxhole Farm site and at the A272/A23 southbound roundabout junction. This would add to increased pollution along the A272 in proximity to Bolney village. The i-Transport Framework Travel Plan states that the village is served by the nos. 2, 89 and 273 bus services. The no. 2 bus is the Handcross community bus, which runs once a week on a Thursday afternoon to Burgess Hill and only allows for a 90 minute visit before returning. It is a small, limited capacity bus of little use to residents who need to commute to Burgess Hill. The 89 has four service on three days and two on the other two weekdays and none at weekends. Two of these services are school bus runs to Haywards Heath and there is little or no space for commuting passengers. There is no service to the Horsham secondary schools. The 273 has four services on weekdays and Saturdays and none on Sundays and Bank Holidays. This service

---

has recently been reduced in frequency through Bolney. The timing of the buses does not coincide with any useful commuting to work, other than locally and certainly not to London. If bus frequency is to be increased the 89 service would potentially be of most value. It is rather disingenuous to suggest increasing the 273 service as that would simply be to restore what was taken away. The reason for the low uptake of bus services through Bolney is because they do not provide a service that is of practical value to residents. It is noted that the WSCC Highways Authority submission incorrectly states the nos. 2 and 89 buses are hourly services.

The Travel Plan Measures (Table 5.1) in the i-Transport Framework Travel Plan does not provide for any increase in access to transport services or offer to increase the availability of transport services. It simply offers to promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling, but as pointed out earlier given the rural location and lack of public transport infrastructure this is completely meaningless and of no substantive value. Table 3.7 suggests that the Cowfold surgery, primary school, barber shop and Co-op food shop are all within 5km of Bolney. This is incorrect as all Cowfold facilities are over 5 km from the entrance to the proposed site and given the traffic conditions along the A272, with no cycle path, it would be too dangerous to cycle to Cowfold. Walking and cycling to work are not feasible as there is little employment within a 2km and 5km radius. Commuting to work will inevitably be largely by car. By its own measures the "Travel Plan" fails on all counts before it even starts and "the proposed package of measures" will not deliver sustainable travel benefits and it is almost given that the Travel Plan targets will not be achieved. The entrance to the proposed site off the A272 opposite the petrol station is not suitable as the A272 at Bolney is a very dangerous and busy road. The suggested sight lines between the double bend to the east of Crosspost and the Bolney Chape Road junction to the west are at the very lower limit of what is considered acceptable. The presence of the petrol station, with its mini supermarket and the pelican crossing makes this a hazardous area for cars and pedestrians alike. There have been numerous accidents at Crossposts (the A272/Bolney Chapel Road/Foxhole Lane junction, outside the petrol station and at the A272/London Road junction. It is rare when a week goes by when there hasn't been a near miss or a collision along that stretch. These have been documented by residents, but for some reason the Highways Authority submission of 13 June states "there have not been any recorded road traffic collisions within the immediate vicinity of the proposed point of access". This statement is patently incorrect and should be fact checked to establish what type of collision gets recorded, as most may not, and what constitutes "immediate vicinity".

The proposed off site highway improvements to The Street in Bolney are neither wanted nor required. The road is narrow and has a 20mph speed limit. Cars can barely travel at the speed limit along The Street and the existing virtual walkways are suitable for

---

the village setting. To widen the road by cutting into the Bankside embankment and built out footways is likely to be counter productive and lead to increased vehicle speeds and lower awareness rather than the current slow speeds and heightened awareness.

The proposed Community Hub is anything but. The use by the Haywards Heath based Kangaroos charity will preclude its use by the Bolney community. It would be better if a permanent site was found for the charity in Haywards Heath where the majority of its users are resident rather than making them drive out Bolney causing increased traffic movements, pollution and congestion. Bolney has an existing community centre that can be booked by Kangaroos for activities if required. There has been no request for an allotment in Bolney in the past 17 years. The provision of allotments on the Foxhole site cannot therefore be warranted. The submitted documents admit that Bolney is at the end of the water supply line. This community of 269 houses regularly experiences low water pressure and water outages. An additional 200 houses will add substantial pressure to the water requirement for Bolney. Although it is the water company's responsibility to establish the infrastructure for future planned developments there is no guarantee that this capacity expansion will be achievable in the required timeframe. With respect to foul water, there appears to be some discrepancy between the possible peak flow discharge into the sewer along the A272 with 1.8l/s and 7l/s both mentioned. Southern Water indicates that the maximum available additional capacity in the sewer is 1.8l/s with no surface water flow allowed. It would appear that the potential foul water discharge from the proposed site is already at the limit of capacity of the sewer and if the suggested 7l/s originally requested by Ramboll on behalf of Wates is more likely the existing sewer infrastructure will be wholly inadequate. It is noted that for a development of 200 houses a 1.8l/s peak discharge flow equates to 9cm<sup>3</sup>/s (or about an egg-cup full) which could be seen as inadequate if all households flush their loos at the same time.

Surface run-off is likely to be an issue and although there are supposed to be settlement ponds around the site to capture pollutants these ponds will ultimately discharge into local ditches and streams and ultimately into the River Adur. Regular monitoring of the discharges from the site should be mandated to prevent heavy metals and other pollutants from entering the river system.

Commenting on the Draft Heads of Terms for Section 106 Agreement - April 2025 (Judith Ashton associates) - the provision of affordable housing (note that affordable in this case is c.80% of market rate rather than the c.30% under the old council house scheme - so not really affordable) will in the first instance be made to residents of Bolney parish. This was addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan and Magdalene Rise was built to fulfil that criteria. The issue of the community building to be set aside for Kangaroos exclusive use has been addressed above. It is not

---

inclusive as it does not serve the Bolney community and will lead to traffic problems which could prove divisive. The H4(2) buildings standards sounds as if the development is being designed for residents with special needs and it is questioned whether this is suitable given the rural nature of the proposed development. The pedestrian improvements are not required as they are currently deemed to be adequate for the village's needs. The potential bus improvements are either not required or cannot be delivered or financed for the long term. It is likely the 2 car club vehicles will never be used as all resident would have their own cars. Tater passes one per household - no point as the bus service is inadequate. The Travel Plan as pointed out above this is ludicrous. Allotments - no requirement. There is no secondary or 6th form educational facility within 5km. The primary school is close to capacity and cannot expand on its present site. There are no library facilities, community learning or Local Primary Care Trust within 5km. Contributions not spent within 5 years should be returned to Bolney Parish Council for community benefit and not returned to the developer. Some real intelligent thought needs to be put into these Section 106 promises before suggesting these ridiculous ideas. Post development changes mean that many of these promises go unfulfilled and are not worth the paper they are written on. If the development does go ahead then the Section 106 money should be a fixed non-returnable sum against properly defined projects that will materially benefit Bolney. NHS Sussex has stated that all NHS primary care GP practices are at capacity. Although it requests financial support through the s106 funding to expand capacity at the practices this was not included in the s106 heads, but it is also highly unlikely that NHTA Sussex will be able to deliver the capacity increase required given the lack of doctors within the NHS. Accordingly, the increase in housing in Mid-Sussex, exacerbated by the Foxhole Farm development could lead to negative health outcomes for new and existing residents.

It should also be noted that Bolney is attempting to be a 'dark skies' village and the two most recent developments Magdalene Rise and Davey Drive do not have street lighting. Consequently if the Foxhole Farm development were to go ahead there is a precedent against street lighting throughout the development. This would be to give access to the night sky and to protect nocturnal animals, bats, dormice, great crested newts, the presence of all of which have been documented on the proposed development site. Ultimately, Bolney is a small, peaceful rural settlement on the High Weald, surrounded by AONB wooded areas, listed buildings, banked tree-lined ancient lanes and wide vistas to the South Downs. Development of Foxhole Farm would create an unsustainable, parallel estate of disproportionate size entirely out of keeping with this characterful village.

---

Kind regards

