

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2026 13:59:33 UTC+01:00
To: "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1961

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/09/2026 1:59 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Foxhole Farm Foxhole Lane Bolney West Sussex
Proposal:	Approval of reserved matters (appearance landscaping layout and scale) following outline approval of DM/25/1129 for the erection of 198 dwellings (including 60 affordable) with associated landscaping, community orchard, public open space and infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Westway, The Street Bolney
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Although a full consultation is not required for reserved matters, the change of developer since outline planning permission was granted made effective engagement particularly important. The document issued to some Bolney residents was plainly inadequate: its questions were too narrow and prescriptive to constitute genuine community engagement, and residents had no meaningful opportunity to challenge the proposals, raise

concerns, or suggest workable alternatives. For a development of nearly 200 homes, this falls well below the standard the community should expect. CALA must hold a face-to-face public meeting or presentation and show that it is prepared to listen to residents' views and act on them. Local people must have a real say in the design and delivery of a development that will permanently alter Bolney's character and affect existing residents' daily lives. An open, transparent conversation is not optional; it is the minimum CALA must provide.

The RMA states that CALA will provide a buffer zone along the full site boundary behind The Street to reduce the impact on existing residents. In practice, the proposed layout fails to deliver that commitment. The buffer is substantially narrowed behind several homes by the road alignment linking the southern and northern parts of the development, while the main Foxhole Farm house receives a disproportionately large buffer. This is inequitable and undermines the buffer's stated purpose. The buffer around Foxhole Farm should be reduced, the road rerouted, and a consistent, effective buffer provided along the whole eastern boundary.

The RMA makes clear that the final road alignment is to be agreed through the Reserved Matters process. CALA therefore has both the opportunity and the responsibility to choose a less harmful layout. There is no sound planning reason to place the road immediately behind the rear gardens of existing homes on The Street, where it would cause a direct and lasting loss of residential amenity and harm the village's character. The road should be moved away from the eastern boundary and towards the centre of the site. This would be a practical and fairer solution, reducing intrusion, protecting residents' privacy, and limiting avoidable noise, light, and environmental pollution. Alternatively, much stronger mitigation must be put in place to protect residents from the impact of the proposed location.

If the community hub is to be used as a dedicated home for the Kangaroos charity, as previously proposed, its location must still be reconsidered. It should not be placed on the highest part of the site. Moving it to the southern parcel near the A272 would reduce traffic through the development, place the hub closer to the children's play area, and create a more logical focal point for that part of the site. Its current position would obscure views of the Grade I listed church from the public footpath between The Street and Foxhole Lane. Relocating the hub is therefore necessary to improve both the layout and the visual impact of the scheme. Safeguarding and safety considerations for the SEND facility also require serious attention to its day-to-day transport needs, including access for bus drop-offs and pick-ups for day pupils and outward-bound trips.

CALA is a mainstream housebuilder and may seek efficiencies through standardised house designs. That is not acceptable for a development of 198 homes on such a prominent site. The scheme must respond to Bolney's character, scale, materials, and architectural identity, rather than rely on generic off-the-shelf templates. The current proposals are uninspiring and risk creating a development that feels detached from the village it will permanently affect. CALA should be required to redesign the homes so they properly reflect Bolney's local character. I understand this concern is shared by Anna Kramarczyk-Dillon, Architect and Urban Designer at MSDC.

Kind regards