

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 30 July 2025 16:14:46 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 30/07/2025 4:14 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. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION received 4th July 2025 concerning landscapes, LVIA, and transport technical notes to address National Highways, WSCC Highways and Landscapes responses and amended outline masterplan, illustrative masterplan and parameter plan on building heights.

---

**Case Officer:** Joanne Fisher

---

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

**Address:** 2 Paynesfield Bolney Haywards Heath West Sussex

---

### Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Neighbour or general public

---

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

---

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Objection to Planning Application: Foxhole Farm, Bolney - Proposed 200 home Development

1. Conflict with Local Planning Policy

1.1 Bolney Neighbourhood Plan

The Bolney Neighbourhood Plan clearly envisages only around 40 new homes by 2031. A scheme of this size-200 units-is therefore grossly disproportionate and falls materially outside the development boundary and planned scale of growth as defined by Policy BOL1 and site allocations. It conflicts with the locally determined housing requirement and undermines the plan led system.

1.2 Adopted Mid Sussex District Plan

Despite references to emerging policy, the site is not allocated in the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan (Policies DP6-DP9), and the draft version is still under examination and not determinative. Premature reliance on draft policies cannot outweigh the adopted statutory framework. The proposal therefore directly breaches policies on housing delivery and settlement hierarchy.

2. Infrastructure Capacity and Technical Impacts

2.1 Highways Safety on A272

The H

The commissioned Highway safety raises formal objections, citing significantly increased risk at the A272 junction and impact on road safety. Despite these assessments, the applicant's documentation omits this critical professional objection. Policy DP21 requires new development to minimise hazards from additional traffic and ensure safe access. The A272 access point at Bolney Petrol Station has been a focus of collisions during 2024-25, reinforcing these concerns.

2.2 NHS Service Capacity

Correspondence from the NHS Integrated Care Board states local services are already at full capacity, and will be unable to cope without substantial external financial contributions. This cannot be deferred indefinitely and must factor into impact assessments in line with District Plan Policy DP20. At current capacity levels, the NHS explicitly opposes additional population unless robust funding for service expansion is secured. There is no reference to any Section 106 support to help in this regard.

3. Dubious Value of Proposed Community "Sweeteners"

The developer's offer of a community hub, orchard, and open space are presented as mitigation and enhancement. However:

- Local residents rarely request such facilities, with household gardens and private allotments common and under utilised; demand is low.
- These are typical "planning gain" concessions that often satisfy consultation requirements but fail to meet Regulation 122 tests: they are not necessary, nor directly related to mitigation, and often unreasonably large for the scale and type of development.
- National media and planning watchdogs report this pattern: large

---

developments routinely deliver amenities promised at approval years later or not at all. For example, recent housing schemes in Essex and Surrey saw play areas, shops and community buildings undelivered or delayed, prompting enforcement notices and council stop orders (The Guardian).

Even in practice, developers frequently renegotiate or fail to deliver S106 secured amenities once consent is granted-as captured by local campaigns and research. On Reddit, one user recounted:

"The finished half was meant to have a new GP surgery, Community Centre and sports pitch. Yet, they're nowhere to be seen..." (Reddit)

And:

"Often the 106 will be written to pacify local opposition ... We will build this lovely nature reserve... Then they don't." (Reddit)

These experiences highlight the risk that the "sweeteners" here are nothing more than paper promises, undermining the integrity of the planning process.

#### 4. Other Environmental and Technical Impacts

- Flood risk and surface water: The proposed drainage strategy underestimates historic flood events and lacks clear maintenance regimes, contrary to Policy DP23.

- Agricultural land loss: The site represents productive farmland, and its loss conflicts with district level policy on safeguarding greenfield agricultural resources.

- Landscape character: The density and scale of housing would impose undue visual intrusion into Bolney's rural setting, conflicting with landscape protection provisions in the Neighbourhood Plan and DP25.

#### 5. Community Views and Democratic Integrity

The scale of this development at five times the level anticipated by the Neighbourhood Plan threatens Bolney's community identity and cohesion. Over 270 residents, Bolney Parish Council, and the Bolney Action Group have formally lodged objections, stressing local democratic values-a material consideration under the statutory framework.

Reasons for Refusal

Issue Policy Contravened Impact

Over scale housing Bolney NP (BOL1), District Plan Ignores locally identified needs

Road safety objection District Plan DP21, LHA advice Elevated collision risk

NHS capacity breach DP20, NHS statutory responses Services at full stretch

Non delivered "sweeteners" S106 tests (CIL Reg 122), DP3

Inadequate mitigation, risk of non delivery

Flood risk DP23 Insufficient drainage proposals

Agricultural land loss DP24 Conflicts with protection of farmland

Visual harm DP25 Adverse landscape character impact

Conclusion

The Foxhole Farm proposal fails to meet key requirements of the adopted development plan, undermines the locally owned

---

Neighbourhood Plan, disregards formal expert objections relating to highways and health infrastructure, and relies on speculative benefits unlikely to materialise. Approval would set a damaging precedent and overrule clear local policy intent and community will. For these reasons, refusal is strongly justified.

---

References to Mid Sussex planning policies are made with the understanding that the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP20-DP25 and the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan BOL1 apply. The objection also highlights the common pattern-documented in national reporting and local case examples-of developers failing to deliver Section 106 obligations in practice, undermining community trust and the planning system.

---

Kind regards