

Weald Chase
The Street
Bolney
West Sussex
RH17 5PF

8 April 2026

Planning Services Division
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath RH16 1SS
Email: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk

FORMAL OBJECTION – Planning Application Ref: DM/26/0764

Proposed single dwelling (self/custom build) at Land at Franc Jean Farm, The Street, Bolney, West Sussex RH17 5PJ

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write as a neighbouring resident – having lived close to this site for nearly 25 years – to formally object to the above planning application for the erection of a three-bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling on land at Franc Jean Farm, The Street, Bolney. The deadline for representations is 27 April 2026.

I request that the Council refuse this application for the substantial reasons set out below. It is noted at the outset that the Planning Notice has been displayed on the basis that this application constitutes a departure from the Development Plan, a fact that is itself a powerful reason why permission should not be granted. I also draw the Council's attention to a number of material inaccuracies in the application documents that, in my view, go to the heart of whether this application has been validly submitted and should properly proceed to determination.

The most recent planning application on this site – BK/05/98, which sought outline consent for a semi-retirement bungalow – was refused by the Council in December 1998. The fundamental policy obstacles that led to that refusal have not materially changed.

1. Application Validity – Validation Concerns

The application form records the applicant's address as Franc Jean Farm, The Street, Bolney, RH17 5PJ – the same address as the application site. However, the Self-Build and Custom Build Statement, dated 26 March 2026, records the applicant's address as Harlyns Farm, London Road, Bolney. The applicant does not reside at the application site. This is a material discrepancy that should have been identified at the validation stage and may render the application incorrectly submitted.

It is further believed that the boundaries shown on the application plans do not correspond to the boundaries reflecting the legal ownership of the land in question.

Under section 65(6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, an applicant is required to complete the correct ownership certificate and to notify all owners of the application site who are not the applicant. If the red line boundary does not accurately reflect the extent of land in the applicant's ownership, there is a reasonable doubt that the correct ownership certificate has been completed and that all relevant landowners have been properly notified of this application. This would constitute a further procedural defect that should be investigated before the application proceeds to determination.

The Council is respectfully invited to reassess whether this application has been validly verified in respect of both the applicant's stated address and the accuracy of the ownership certificate, and whether it should properly proceed to determination in its current form.

2. The Application Is a Departure from the Development Plan

The Planning Notice states expressly that this application has been advertised as 'a departure from the Development Plan for the area in which the land is situated.' Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the starting point for determination must be compliance with the development plan. The departure status of this application is a fundamental material consideration weighing against permission. No sufficient material considerations have been advanced to displace the presumption against the grant of permission that this departure status requires.

3. Principle of Development in the Countryside – Policies DP12, DP15 and DP6

The site lies outside the defined built-up area boundary of Bolney and is accordingly designated as countryside under the Mid Sussex District Plan (2018). Three interlocking policies are directly in play.

Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside) permits development in the countryside only where it maintains or, where possible, enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the district, and is either necessary for agriculture, or supported by a specific policy reference in the Plan, a DPD, or a relevant Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development does not meet any of these criteria. Crucially, rather than enhancing rural character, the proposal would negatively impact existing rural businesses operating at the adjacent stable block and in the outbuildings situated behind Franc Jean Farm, which currently rely on access routes across the site and contribute to the active rural character of this part of The Street.

Policy DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside) permits new dwellings in the countryside only where 'special justification' exists. The specified categories of special justification are: essential agricultural or forestry workers' accommodation; isolated homes of exceptional design quality; rural exception sites; or where the requirements of Policy DP6 are met. No credible special justification is advanced here. The proposal is not for essential agricultural or forestry workers' accommodation. It does not come close to meeting the 'exceptional design quality' threshold for isolated dwellings. It is not a rural exception site. The only remaining limb relied upon – Policy DP6 – is addressed below.

Policy DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy) states that outside defined built-up areas, the expansion of settlements will be supported where the proposed development is for fewer than ten dwellings, the site is contiguous with the existing built-up area of the

settlement, and the development is demonstrated to be sustainable. The applicant asserts that all three criteria are met. In my view this is incorrect. The claim of contiguity is a strained and artificial interpretation plainly contrary to the spirit and intent of the policy, which was designed to facilitate genuine infill and extension of settlements, not to permit development on countryside land at its periphery. As to sustainability, the claimed sustainability of the site is disputed in detail below. The proposal also cannot satisfy Policy DP6 because it negatively impacts existing rural businesses rather than meeting identified housing, employment or community needs.

It is noted that the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan was made in September 2016, is now more than five years old, and that the Council does not currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. However, NPPF paragraph 11(d)(i) expressly provides that the tilted balance does not apply where policies protecting areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development. The countryside protection policies, the proximity to the High Weald National Landscape, the impacts on rural businesses, and the highway safety concerns set out below collectively constitute such strong reasons.

4. Bolney Neighbourhood Plan – Policies BOLE2, BOLD1 and BOLT3

The Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (made September 2016) forms part of the Development Plan. Policy BOLE2 (Protect and Enhance the Countryside) requires development outside the built-up area boundary to demonstrate that it does not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. Policy BOLD1 requires new development to be of high quality, reflecting Bolney's rural nature and responding to its heritage and distinctive character by way of height, scale, and design.

The proposed dwelling as shown on Drawing 302A makes extensive use of white UPVC windows throughout all elevations, white UPVC rear sliding doors, and a black UPVC front door. These materials are wholly inconsistent with the traditional vernacular of a High Weald village and are contrary to the requirements of Policy BOLD1. The planning statement acknowledges that the design uses 'tile hanging, stock brick and a pitched roof in plain tiles' but omits to mention the predominant use of UPVC fenestration, which fundamentally undermines the claimed compliance with local character policies.

The applicant also claims compliance with Policy BOLT3 (Transport) on the basis that the proposed access provides improved visibility and a safer connection to The Street. As set out in Grounds 7 and 8 below, this claim is incorrect. The proposed access is situated on a 90-degree bend where visibility is severely constrained. Compliance with BOLT3 and Policy DP21 has not been demonstrated.

5. Setting of Grade II Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Character

The application site impacts the setting of Grade II listed properties on The Street, including Yew Tree Cottage and The Thatched House. The significance of these designated heritage assets extends to their immediate setting and the character of the rural lane in which they sit. A two-storey residential dwelling with an 8.5-metre ridge, semi-circular forecourt driveway, and UPVC fenestration would be an incongruous addition to a setting characterised by historic farm buildings and traditional rural properties, causing harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings in conflict with Section

66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, NPPF Chapter 16, and Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

MSDC's own conservation officer, when consulted re. DM/24/2215, emphasised that the surviving rural setting makes a strong positive contribution to the special interest of nearby listed properties, and in terms of the northern conservation area said that the surviving rural setting of the northern part of the Area will be considered to make a strong positive contribution to its special character. The Council should seek the formal views of its Conservation Officer on this application.

6. High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty / National Landscape Setting

The boundary of the High Weald National Landscape lies immediately to the north of the application site. Policy DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan requires that development on land contributing to the setting of the AONB does not detract from its visual qualities and essential characteristics. NPPF paragraph 189 requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes and their settings.

No Visual Impact Assessment or Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with this application to assess the impact of the proposed development on views from within the AONB. The applicant asserts without supporting evidence that the development will not be visually intrusive from any viewpoint within the AONB. This is wholly inadequate and the Council should require a proper assessment before determining this application.

7. Highway Safety – Road Character and Legal Status

The proposed in/out driveway would emerge directly onto The Street, a narrow, unlit carriageway of constrained width with zero passing opportunities for most of its length, with a loose, rough surface that is prone to icing and surface water flooding. The Street at this point has not been adopted as highway maintainable at public expense under the Highways Act 1980, and no Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has been made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose a speed limit. The road is nevertheless publicly accessible, and accordingly the national speed limit applies — 60 mph for cars and motorcycles, with lower limits applying to certain heavier vehicle classes. The geometry of The Street at this location is severely constrained, with a junction situated on a 90-degree bend immediately adjacent to the proposed access point. This combination of an unlit, unmade carriageway, an unrestricted speed limit, and constrained geometry creates a hazardous context into which the proposed access would introduce additional conflict. There are no known proposals to adopt the road, surface it, light it, or impose any speed restriction by TRO.

The planning statement (paragraph 6.40) asserts that the proposed access 'provides improved visibility and a safer, more straightforward connection to The Street, in line with Bolney Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLT3 and Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP21.' This claim is incorrect. The proposed access point is located immediately adjacent to the 90-degree bend, where sight lines in both directions are severely constrained. Introducing an in/out driveway at this location does not improve visibility – it places a new residential access at the worst possible point on the road alignment.

The claims of compliance with BOLT3 and Policy DP21 on this basis are therefore also incorrect.

As someone who has lived adjacent to The Street for nearly 25 years, I can confirm that the description of the access on the southern boundary as 'currently in use' is inaccurate. I do not recall the gated access on the southern boundary being used during all those years. Vehicular access to the site during these years has been via informal entrances on the eastern boundary. The application's description of the southern access as the 'existing site access' is therefore misleading.



Figure 1: The claimed 'existing access' on the southern boundary. The undisturbed, unbroken grass in front of the gate clearly demonstrates no recent vehicular access through this gate.

The severity of the access difficulties at this point on The Street is independently evidenced by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council itself withdrew its green waste collection service from this part of The Street because access was too difficult for the standard collection vehicle. For general landfill and recycling collections, the Council explicitly deploys a smaller vehicle than is used elsewhere in the village, again because of the constrained geometry of The Street at this location. These operational decisions by the Council's own waste service directly contradict the applicant's assertion that the proposed access is safe and acceptable.

8. Highway Safety – Visibility Splays and National Design Standards

The Manual for Streets (MfS) and Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2) set out the visibility splay requirements applicable to new accesses onto residential and lightly trafficked streets. Even applying the most favourable scenario — a 20 mph speed limit, for which there are no current proposals — MfS requires a minimum X-distance of 2.4 m and a Y-distance of 25 m in both directions. Due to the 90-degree bend immediately adjacent to the proposed access, neither the required X-distance nor the Y-distance can be

achieved in either direction. As MfS makes clear, visibility splays must be measured to the point at which drivers have an unobstructed view of oncoming vehicles; where road alignment prevents this, the access is considered unsafe. Where the national speed limit applies, the required Y-distance would be substantially greater still, further compounding the failure.

No visibility splay drawing or Transport Statement has been submitted with this application, leaving the splay deficiency entirely unaddressed. The presence of pedestrians and other vulnerable road users — including dog walkers and children — typical of The Street reinforces the severity of this hazard. The proposed access therefore fails to meet national design standards as set out in MfS, MfS2, and West Sussex County Council Highways Development Management guidance, conflicts with Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and paragraph 116 of the NPPF (December 2024), and on these grounds should be refused.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes native hedgerow planting along the eastern boundary of the site, as well as planting on the southern boundary, as part of the landscaping scheme. Rather than mitigating the access safety concern, this planting will further reduce the already severely limited visibility splay at the access point by obscuring drivers' views, regardless of direction of approach. Pedestrians, including children, heading south from, or north towards, the public footpath will be at particular risk.



Figure 6: The Street name plate, confirming that this section of road is part of The Street and forms part of the public highway – not a private access road as characterised in the WSCC Highways consultation response.

West Sussex County Council's Highways Authority, in its consultation response dated 20 April 2026, has recorded a recommendation of No Objection. However, the response explicitly records that no site visit was undertaken ('Date of Site Visit: n/a'). The highways officer's assessment was conducted entirely on a desktop basis, without any physical inspection of the access point, the road geometry, or the visibility conditions on the ground. For an application proposing a new residential access on a 90-degree bend on a national speed limit road, a desktop-only assessment is wholly inadequate. The response also contains a material factual error: it describes the proposed vehicle access as egressing 'onto a private access road which connects to the end of The Street which is part of the public highway.' In fact, the proposed access egresses directly onto The Street itself – at the 90-degree bend, which is part of the public highway at that very point. This fundamental mischaracterisation of the site layout is unsurprising given that no site visit was undertaken. The response makes no reference to the absence of any visibility splay drawing or Transport Statement, and contains no assessment whatsoever of sight lines or compliance with MfS or MfS2 standards. Minimal, if any, weight should be attached to this No Objection response, and the Council is respectfully invited to seek a further assessment from WSCC Highways following an actual site visit.

9. Flood Risk and Surface Water Disposal – Application Inaccuracies

The application form answers 'No' to whether the site is within an area at risk of flooding. While the application site may not sit within a designated Flood Zone, this does not mean there is no flooding risk. In practice, surface water run-off across and from this plot is significant. This surface water is largely the source of water in wildlife ponds located on properties to the south of The Street. Any development that alters the site's drainage characteristics risks diverting that run-off to the detriment of neighbouring properties and ecology. If permission is granted, surface water drainage from the site should be directed under The Street toward those ponds and should not be connected to any sewer.

Video evidence of this surface water behaviour is available at: [Surface Water Runoff video \(Dropbox\)](#). The footage shows surface water run-off from the application site being directed via a channel to run across the unmade section of The Street, causing flooding of the carriageway and simultaneously feeding into nearby wildlife ponds.

The application form states that surface water will be disposed of via the 'main sewer.' This is likely to be inaccurate or inappropriate. I am not aware of a rainwater sewer in The Street at this location to which a new surface water connection could readily be made. Surface water should not be connected to a combined or foul sewer. The Council and Southern Water should verify whether appropriate sewer capacity and connection points are available, and whether an alternative drainage approach – such as a soakaway or sustainable drainage system (SuDS) – would be more appropriate given the site's drainage characteristics and the potential impact on neighbouring properties.

Policy DP41 ('Flood Risk and Drainage') of the Mid Sussex District Plan sets out the preferred hierarchy for managing surface water drainage from any development: (1) Infiltration Measures; (2) Attenuation and discharge to watercourses; and only if these cannot be met, (3) Discharge to surface water only sewers. The proposed development plans to discharge surface water to a sewer believed to be a combined sewer – not a surface water only sewer – which does not comply with any stage of the

DP41 hierarchy. MSDC's own Flood Risk and Drainage Team, in their consultation response dated 7 April 2026, notes that the BGS infiltration potential map shows the site to be in an area with high infiltration potential, but that soakaways are therefore unlikely to be feasible on site. Even if this rules out option (1), the applicant has made no attempt to explore option (2) – attenuation and discharge to a watercourse – before proposing to proceed directly to sewer discharge. This leap directly to option (3) without evidencing that option (2) cannot be met is a further clear failure to comply with the DP41 hierarchy. Moreover, diverting this surface water away from its natural drainage pattern would deprive the wildlife ponds in the vicinity – including those at Scarps Side and The Thatched House – of their principal water source, with potentially serious ecological consequences.

MSDC's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has confirmed in the same consultation response that 'it has not been demonstrated that surface water can be managed safely on site without increasing flood risk.' The Team has required a substantial body of outstanding information before the drainage strategy can be accepted in principle, including: drainage calculations for the 1-in-100-year rainfall event plus a climate change allowance; BRE365-compliant infiltration testing and groundwater level evidence; evidence of an alternative surface water drainage strategy in accordance with the drainage hierarchy; a measured plan demonstrating soakaway offsets; outfall agreement from the sewer authority; and a management and maintenance plan. None of this information has been provided. The Team explicitly reserves the right to object to the development and to recommend drainage conditions. This application should not be determined until all of this outstanding information has been submitted and assessed.

The Flood Risk and Drainage Team further notes that the foul water drainage strategy has also not been demonstrated in principle. As a new sewer connection is proposed, evidence of communication with the Water Authority regarding connection and capacity is required but has not been provided. The Council should not grant permission until both the surface water and foul water drainage strategies have been properly evidenced and accepted by its own drainage team.

Southern Water, in its formal consultation response to this application dated 15 April 2026 (ref DSA000052941), has confirmed that it will refuse any request to discharge surface water into its foul-only sewer network and will resist discharge to the combined sewer network. Critically, Southern Water states that this refusal applies even where the surface water hierarchy has been followed and all alternative options have been exhausted. This position is reinforced by paragraph 1.10 of the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, which states that 'surface water runoff from the development shall not discharge to a foul drainage system.' The applicant's proposed drainage solution – discharge to the main sewer – is therefore not only contrary to Policy DP41 but will be actively refused by Southern Water as the statutory sewerage undertaker. The drainage strategy as currently proposed is undeliverable.

Of further concern, Southern Water has noted that the applicant's Drainage Plan shows a sewer crossing the application site that does not appear in Southern Water's GIS records. Southern Water requires an assessment of this sewer to determine its ownership and the impact it could have on the proposed site layout, noting that it is possible the sewer is now deemed to be public. If a public sewer does cross the application site, this would have significant implications for both the site layout and any drainage strategy. This matter has not been addressed in the application documents.

Whilst Southern Water has confirmed, on the basis of a desktop study, that foul sewer capacity is available in principle to serve the development, a formal Section 106 connection application must be submitted to and approved by Southern Water before any connection can be made. No such application has been made. Southern Water has also flagged restrictions on the proposed tree planting and landscaping in proximity to its sewers, rising mains, and water mains – an additional unresolved constraint given the extensive boundary planting proposed.

10. Disputed Sustainability Claims

Walking and cycling routes

The planning statement asserts (at paragraph 2.8) that village facilities are accessible via existing pedestrian routes and that the site is ‘sustainably located.’ This characterisation is misleading. The pedestrian routes in question include an unlit, unmade track of constrained width with zero passing opportunities for most of its length, with a rough, loose surface notorious for potholes, prone to surface water flooding and icing, and impractical for cyclists and wheelers. The photograph below illustrates the typical condition of this track immediately west of the site (the track is typically in similar disrepair between the site and Top Street).



Figure 3: Typical condition of the track (used by pedestrians and vehicles) — extensively flooded, severely potholed, and strewn with loose material. This track does not provide the ‘safe continuous pedestrian access’ described by the applicant.

The applicant has recently smoothed portions of the track surface, but this is a temporary amelioration of a structural problem on an unadopted, unmaintained route. The track reverts to its hazardous condition repeatedly after wet weather.

Cycle provision and accessibility for those with mobility impairments (including those using wheelers) have not been considered, despite both being required elements of a comprehensive sustainable transport assessment.

No mention is made in the application of access to medical facilities or other similar, essential services. The claim in paragraph 2.10 that the PRowS provide 'safe continuous pedestrian access to shops and services' is incorrect.

Public transport

The planning statement (at paragraph 2.9) cites bus stops within 400 metres providing links to Haywards Heath, Wivelsfield and Balcombe railway stations as evidence of sustainable accessibility. In practice, the frequency and timetabling of bus services is wholly inadequate to support routine journeys to employment, healthcare, further education, or higher-order retail facilities. Bus services from any part of Bolney are extremely limited. Future residents would be almost entirely reliant on private motor vehicles for everyday travel. The sustainability credentials of this site are accordingly overstated to a degree that should attract significant scepticism when assessing Policy DP6 Criterion 3.

The proposed development is located within the countryside and occupies a location which is distant from readily accessible local services. As such, future occupiers will be heavily reliant on the private car to meet their daily needs. The development thereby conflicts with Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031, and paragraphs 8, 11 and 109–111 of the NPPF.

11. Contamination – Application Inaccuracy and Consultee Response

The application form answers 'No' to the question of whether land contamination is suspected for all or part of the site. This answer is, in my view, incorrect. The site has historically been used as a working farm and farmyard, with activities including vehicle maintenance, fuelling, coal storage, and tool maintenance over decades. Storage of pesticides, herbicides, and other agricultural chemicals is probable given the farming history of the site.

Importantly, MSDC's own Contaminated Land Officer (Oliver Benson, comments dated 30 March 2026) has already submitted a formal consultee response on this application, noting that agricultural sites 'often present potential contamination risks because of past activities,' specifically including pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers, fuel and oil spills, and hazardous building materials. The Officer recommends a series of conditions requiring a phased approach: a preliminary risk assessment and site walkover, intrusive investigation if risks are identified, a remediation strategy and validation report, and a discovery strategy. The fact that the applicant answered 'No' on the application form to the contamination question, while the Council's own Contaminated Land Officer has independently concluded that contamination risks are likely, underscores the inadequacy of the information submitted with this application.

12. Outstanding Ecological Survey Requirements and Pre-Application Tree Clearance

The Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) submitted with the application recommends that additional species surveys be undertaken to determine the presence or likely absence of Great Crested Newts, a European Protected Species. No such

surveys have been submitted. The application form answers ‘No’ to the biodiversity questions, including whether protected species are present on the site or adjacent land, yet the applicant’s own ecologist has recommended protective surveys be undertaken. The Council cannot lawfully determine the impact on protected species without this information.

Of additional concern, the photograph below shows that trees on the application site were being cleared prior to the submission of this planning application.



Figure 5: Trees on the application site being cleared prior to submission of the planning application. This work may have disturbed or removed habitat relevant to the species assessments required by the PEA.

13. Self-Build Credentials and Biodiversity Net Gain Exemption

The application claims exemption from the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement on the basis that it is a self-build or custom build development. However, the Self-Build and Custom Build Statement justifies the self-build credentials in a single sentence: ‘The proposal is that it will be built by the applicant for his own use.’ This falls entirely short of demonstrating the primary input into design and layout required by the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended). The application form ticks ‘Self-build and Custom Build’ as the housing category, whilst the planning statement variously describes the proposal as ‘custom build.’ These are legally distinct categories. The BNG exemption justification provided is ‘as above’ – a wholly inadequate response. On such threadbare evidence, the Council cannot be satisfied that the BNG exemption is validly claimed.

14. Impact on Existing Rural Businesses and Access Routes

The application documents make no mention of the fact that the site currently provides access routes to outbuildings behind Franc Jean Farm that are used for rural business activities. The photograph below, taken recently, shows the eastern boundary access in active use, with a tractor and gas delivery cylinders visible confirming ongoing rural activity at these outbuildings.



Figure 2: The eastern boundary access in active use, showing a tractor (left background) and gas delivery cylinders for outbuildings behind Franc Jean Farm. This — not the southern boundary gate — is the established means of vehicular access to the site. The proposed development would block this existing route to outbuildings.

The proposed development would physically block these access routes. The likely consequence is that vehicles serving those outbuildings would be diverted to an alternative route: the single-lane track passing residential properties, turning north to the west of Malt House, to reach the outbuildings. This diversion would increase vehicular movements on a narrow residential lane not designed for regular commercial traffic, creating unacceptable risks to pedestrians, including children and dog walkers who regularly use this route. It would also increase vehicle conflict on a track where passing is extremely difficult, and worsen conditions for those who park at the rural business immediately to the west of the application site, whose current access would be blocked.

The application makes no assessment of these impacts. Development that displaces and disrupts established rural businesses plainly fails to comply with Policy DP12, which requires development in the countryside to maintain the rural and landscape character of the district.

15. Rights of Way – Footpath Impact

The application form answers ‘No’ to the question of whether the proposals require any diversions, extinguishments, or creation of rights of way. This answer requires

careful scrutiny. Both Drawing 103 (Existing Site Plan TRPA) and Drawing 352 (Proposed Site Plan TRPA) submitted with the application clearly show a public footpath (BOL-3BO) running along the eastern boundary of the site, together with a Public Footpath sign marker. On both drawings, the red application boundary clips the line of this footpath at both the north-eastern and south-eastern corners.

I can confirm from approximately 25 years of personal observation that the public footpath at this location passes to the west (left) of the metal gate on the eastern boundary. The photograph below illustrates the established route of the footpath.



Figure 4: The public footpath passing to the west (left) of the metal gate on the eastern boundary. The footpath waymarker is visible on the wooden post at left. The footpath's actual route may differ from any recorded line, and a formal survey should be required before this application is determined.

I request that the Council formally consult WSCC's Footpaths Department as part of this determination to establish the definitive route and whether the proposed development would affect it. A formal survey may be required to confirm the definitive line.

16. Excessive Roof Height and Risk of Intensification

The elevations and section drawings submitted on Drawing 302A show a notably steep hipped roof with an excessive ridge height. Compared with neighbouring dwellings along The Street, this roofline appears disproportionately high relative to the floor plan footprint. The sections reveal a substantial internal void between the first-floor ceiling level and the ridge that could readily accommodate a loft conversion to provide additional habitable accommodation.

It is a legitimate concern that if planning permission is granted, the applicant may seek to exploit permitted development rights or submit a future planning application for a

loft conversion to create a third floor of habitable space. This would result in a dwelling significantly larger and more dominant than the two-storey dwelling currently proposed, which would be disproportionate to the plot and constitute clear overdevelopment of this countryside site. I request that if permission is granted, a condition be imposed removing all permitted development rights in respect of roof alterations and requiring any future changes to the roof structure – including any loft conversion – to be the subject of a separate full planning application.

17. Adequacy of Parking and Driveway Design

The planning statement (paragraph 4.6) claims that the semi-circular in/out driveway provides parking for up to three vehicles and removes the need for on-site turning. I question whether the driveway as shown on the submitted plans is, in practice, wide enough for vehicles to pass parked cars. If the driveway is occupied by parked vehicles, other vehicles using the in/out arrangement would likely be unable to manoeuvre past them, potentially requiring vehicles to reverse onto The Street – in direct contradiction of the claimed improvement in highway safety and Policy DP21.

The semi-circular in/out forecourt driveway is also entirely out of character with properties in the immediate vicinity, which have simple, modest access arrangements befitting a rural lane. A prominent semi-circular gravelled forecourt would introduce a suburban character at odds with the rural vernacular of this part of Bolney, contrary to Policy DP26 (Character and Design) and Policy BOLD1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

18. Waste and Cycle Storage – No Provision

The application form answers ‘No’ to both questions in the Waste Storage and Collection section. No provision whatsoever has been made for refuse or recycling storage. For a three-bedroom family home, adequate, screened waste storage is a standard requirement under MSDC’s design guidance, and Mid Sussex District Council’s own waste service already deploys a smaller than standard collection vehicle in this part of The Street because of access difficulties. The absence of any bin storage provision on the submitted plans should be addressed before any permission is granted.

No secure covered cycle storage is shown on the plans. Policy DP21 and national sustainable transport policy both support the provision of cycle storage for new residential development. Cycle storage provision should be secured by condition if permission is granted.

19. EV Charging Provision

The application makes no reference to electric vehicle (EV) charging provision. Under Part S of the Building Regulations (applicable to new dwellings from 2022) and NPPF paragraph 114, new residential development is expected to incorporate EV charging infrastructure. No EV charging point is shown on the submitted plans or mentioned in the application documents. This should be addressed by condition or by requiring revised plans before determination.

20. External Lighting Condition

Given the proximity of the site to the High Weald National Landscape boundary

██████████ I request that if permission is granted a condition be imposed preventing the installation of any external artificial lighting other than PIR-activated security lights on short timers that do not illuminate beyond the boundary of the site. Permanent ambient external lighting would be harmful to the ecological value of the site and surrounding land and contrary to the precautionary approach required by NPPF Chapter 15 and Policy BOLE1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan.

21. Conclusion

For all the reasons set out above, I strongly urge the Council to refuse this planning application. The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows: this is a departure from the Development Plan with no sufficient material considerations to justify permission; the principle of development in the countryside is not established under Policies DP12, DP15, or DP6; rural businesses are negatively impacted; the self-build credentials are inadequately evidenced; there is a material discrepancy in the applicant's stated address and a reasonable doubt that the correct ownership certificate has been completed and all relevant landowners notified under section 65(6) of the TCPA 1990; the setting of the High Weald National Landscape and Grade II Listed Buildings is inadequately assessed – MSDC's own conservation officer has confirmed, in respect of DM/24/2215, that the surviving rural setting makes a strong positive contribution to the special interest of nearby listed properties and to the special character of the northern conservation area; the proposed materials are contrary to BOLD1; the roof height creates a risk of future intensification; highway safety on this unadopted 60 mph road is wholly unaddressed and the applicant's claim of improved visibility is incorrect; public pedestrian routes are unsafe and the development is unsustainable, conflicting with Policy DP21 and paragraphs 8, 11 and 109–111 of the NPPF; the application contains material inaccuracies regarding contamination, flood risk, surface water disposal, and possibly rights of way; the proposed surface water drainage to a combined sewer fails to comply with the Policy DP41 hierarchy and would deprive local wildlife ponds of their main water source; and no waste storage, cycle storage, or EV charging provision has been made. Photographic evidence is provided in support of several of these grounds.

In the event – which is firmly opposed – that the Council is minded to grant planning permission, I request that the following conditions be imposed as a minimum: (a) removal of all permitted development rights in respect of roof alterations and loft conversions, requiring a full planning application for any such future changes; (b) no external artificial lighting other than PIR security lights on short timers contained within the site boundary; (c) provision of EV charging infrastructure; (d) provision of screened waste bin and recycling storage; (e) provision of covered cycle storage; (f) the full suite of contaminated land conditions recommended by the Council's own Contaminated Land Officer; (g) a formal survey and, if required, a diversion order in respect of public footpath BOL-3BO shown on Drawings 103 and 352; and (h) surface water drainage to be managed in accordance with the Policy DP41 hierarchy, with surface water retained within the site's natural drainage pattern to continue feeding nearby wildlife ponds, and not discharged to any combined sewer.

I would be grateful to be notified of the decision on this application and of any committee meeting at which it is to be considered. I reserve the right to make further representations as additional information is submitted.

Note that of the 8 houses along this part of The Street, 1 is for sale, 4 are owned by close relatives of the applicant (sister, aunt, two cousins) at least 3 of whom have their own development plans, 1 is owned by somebody who never responds to planning applications (either to support or object), so realistically there might only be two impartial responses, despite even some of the relatives being opposed to, and severely affected by, this particular development proposal.

All information to the best of my knowledge.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the applicant.

Planning Application Reference: DM/26/0764

Deadline for representations: 27 April 2026