

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 June 2025 19:00:53 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 12/06/2025 7:00 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:	Sherlocks Cross Colwood Lane Bolney
----------	-------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to planning application DM/25/1129 for the proposed development of approximately 200 homes at Foxhole Farm, Bolney for the following reasons.

1. Conflict with the Adopted District Plan and Policies. The Foxhole Farm proposal is contrary to Policy DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy BOLBB1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan.

Bolney is designated a Category 3 settlement, where only limited development is supported to meet local needs. The Foxhole Farm site lies outside the defined built-up area boundary and is a clear encroachment into open countryside. For good reason this site not included in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. Although the emerging District Plan proposes this site for future development (as DPA14), this Plan is not yet adopted, and may never be, and therefore should carry no weight in the planning decision.

2. Contrary to Countryside Protection Policies. This proposal is in conflict with Policy DP12 and Policy BOLE2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. DP12 states that development in the countryside should only be permitted where it maintains or enhances landscape quality and where it is necessary. No necessity exists for this application. The proposal erodes the rural landscape, extend the urban footprint of the village into open fields, and degrade the character and setting of Bolney inconsistent with local and district policy objectives.

Bolney has conservation areas at both the north end and south end of the village, and the proposal would undermine rather than conserve its special quality and historic feel. Building on a green field site will inevitably lead to a loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity.

2. Fails the Village Character and Scale Policy DP26. This policy requires new development to reflect the distinctive character and identity of the districts towns and villages. The proposal would change both. Bolney currently comprises circa 259 households with a population of under 650 (2021 Census). The proposal would effectively double the population, and undermining Bolney's rural character and community. The proposal would be a dramatic transformation of the village's identity and form, notably contradicting the aims of Policy BOLD1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3. Fails the Transport Policy DP21. This policy aims to create sustainable communities which include sustainable transport network and ease of access to local services and facilities. The application's Transport Assessment does not achieve this- it would not create a sustainable community. The proposal has very limited access to essential services, including shops, healthcare, and employment, resulting in dependence on private vehicles. Car

travel is necessary to access essential local services including supermarkets, transport hubs, non-primary education, and health facilities. This is particularly true of secondary and sixth form education. There is currently no public transport enabling teenagers to access sixth form colleges in Haywards Heath, Horsham, or Brighton. There is no viable bus service connecting residents with local towns - and bus services have decreased over recent years. The current bus service (273) is intermitted and limited and cannot be used for regular journeys. The proposed enhancements totally inadequate. The suggestion that residents could safely cycle to Cuckfield or Cowfold is completely misguided- there are no dedicated cycle paths, only narrow rural roads.

Increased traffic volumes from this proposal on already constrained roads will result in serious highways safety issues. The proposed junction with the A272 is at a dangerous position. Traffic congestion would be significantly worsened resulting in environmental impact. The already high accident rate on that specific stretch of the A272 would be significantly worsened by the increased number of car journeys. The A272 is not able to cope with extra traffic, and the knock-on effect for road users during commuting hours would be significant.

4. No clear benefit from the proposed Community Hub and Infrastructure Contributions. It is unclear whether the proposed "community hub" is intended for the existing residents of Bolney or primarily for the new development. If for existing residents then it is something which the village neither wants nor needs, showing that the developer has not researched or understood the needs of the village. The village already has a village hall and introducing a second similar village facility risks undermining its viability. The community will not be able to sustain and manage two community centres.

If the community hub is intended for the residents of the new development, this will increase traffic strain and parking pressures, and does nothing to mitigate the development's wider impact.

The draft Heads of Terms for the proposed Section 106 agreement offers insufficient detail on the scope and scale of infrastructure contributions. The impact on local school capacity, medical services, and recreational spaces remains uncertain. Given the scale of the proposal, this lack of certainty and vagueness is a genuine concern. There is already huge pressure on GP services and NHS dentists in the area.

As for utilities infrastructure, Bolney often has inadequate water pressure and is very vulnerable to water stress. There have been frequent periods in the last few years when Bolney has been without water. I understand that Bolney is at the end of the supply

line so severely affected by mains issues. Bolney also experiences power cuts, because of overhead power lines. There is also no mains gas. All these issues would be exacerbated by the proposal.

There is also the real risk of flooding- During periods of bad weather, there are drainage issues in the area around Foxhole Farm. The public footpath at the top of the site is frequently flooded. Water accumulates in the fields. The proposal could increase the flood risk to properties on The Street and A272 at the south end of the village.

For all these reasons, planning application DM/25/1129 should be refused.

Kind regards