

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 April 2026 13:09:25 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0764

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2026 1:09 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Franc Jean Farm The Street Bolney Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5PJ
Proposal:	Proposed single dwelling (self/custom build)
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: High Gables The Street Bolney Haywards Heath West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	**FORMAL OBJECTION - Planning Application Ref: DM/26/0764** **Proposed single dwelling (self/custom build) at Land at Franc Jean Farm, The Street, Bolney** Dear Sir/Madam, I write to submit a further and supplementary objection to the above application. This representation is intended to complement, not repeat, existing objections by focusing on key policy and

evidential weaknesses that have not been adequately addressed within the application material.

1. Impact on the Setting of the High Weald National Landscape (AONB)

The application site lies immediately adjacent to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now National Landscape), with the northern boundary of the site directly abutting land that contributes to its setting. The applicant's own Design and Access Statement confirms that the site is bounded to the north by trees and the AONB .

This proximity engages the highest level of protection under national policy. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF requires that great weight be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes and their settings.

The proposal fails to properly assess or address this policy requirement:

- * No Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted.
- * There is no analysis of views into or out of the AONB.
- * The urbanising influence of a new dwelling, including lighting, domestic activity, and associated paraphernalia, has not been considered.

Development at this sensitive edge location would introduce a suburbanising encroachment into the rural transition zone, fundamentally altering the character of the landscape at the interface with the AONB. This harm is structural and cannot be mitigated through landscaping alone.

2. Mischaracterisation of the Site as Within the Built-Up Area

The application repeatedly asserts that the site lies within or at the edge of the built-up area. However, this is a mischaracterisation.

The site sits at the extreme northern tip of the settlement boundary and functions in practical and visual terms as countryside. The boundary in this location has clearly been drawn to prevent further encroachment northwards.

Allowing development here would:

- * Undermine the purpose of the defined settlement boundary,
 - * Erode the clear distinction between village and countryside, and
-

* Create pressure for further incremental expansion beyond the boundary.

This is a classic case of "edge creep", where a single dwelling establishes a precedent that is difficult to resist in future decisions.

3. Failure to Demonstrate Genuine Self-Build Status

The application relies heavily on the claim that the proposal constitutes a self-build or custom build dwelling. However, the evidence provided is minimal and does not demonstrate compliance with the statutory definition.

The submitted statement merely asserts that the dwelling will be built by the applicant for personal use . There is no supporting detail regarding:

- * The applicant's level of involvement in design,
- * Procurement or construction arrangements,
- * Whether a serviced plot model or developer-led build is proposed.

Without this evidence, the Council cannot be satisfied that the proposal meets the definition set out in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015.

This is not a technicality-it is central to the planning balance, as several claimed policy benefits depend on this classification.

4. Incorrect Reliance on Biodiversity Net Gain Exemption

The application asserts that Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) does not apply on the basis that the development is self-build .

However, this exemption is contingent on the development genuinely meeting the self-build definition. As outlined above, this has not been demonstrated.

In the absence of robust evidence:

- * The exemption cannot be relied upon,
- * The proposal should be subject to the statutory requirement to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain.

No biodiversity metric, baseline assessment, or enhancement strategy has been provided. This represents a significant omission in light of the Environment Act 2021 requirements.

5. Loss of Rural Land and Ongoing Functional Use

The application presents the site as previously agricultural but no longer in active use. This is not supported by the broader evidence.

The site forms part of a wider farmstead, with access routes and surrounding land continuing to support rural and agricultural activity. The introduction of a residential dwelling in this location would:

- * Interrupt functional access patterns,
- * Introduce potential land use conflict between residential and rural operations,
- * Result in the incremental erosion of the working countryside.

The proposal therefore cannot be characterised as the redevelopment of redundant or previously developed land.

6. Inadequate Consideration of Public Rights of Way

The submitted plans indicate the presence of a public footpath in close proximity to, and potentially interacting with, the site boundary .

There is no clear assessment of:

- * The precise alignment of the right of way,
- * Whether the development would obstruct, constrain, or diminish its use,
- * The need for diversion, protection, or enhancement measures.

Given the statutory protection afforded to public rights of way, this omission is significant. The application should not be determined without clarity on this issue.

7. Suburbanisation of a Rural Edge Location

The proposed layout and design introduce a distinctly suburban form into a sensitive rural edge:

- * A formalised driveway and turning arrangement,
 - * Standardised house form and proportions,
 - * Use of modern materials such as UPVC windows and engineered finishes .
-

While individually these elements may appear minor, collectively they represent a shift away from the organic, low-density character of this part of Bolney.

This suburbanisation is particularly harmful at a settlement edge where the transition to open countryside should remain soft and informal.

8. Failure to Properly Assess Landscape Transition and Edge Condition

The site occupies a transitional position between built form and open countryside. This type of location requires especially careful handling to maintain a defensible and appropriate settlement edge.

The application does not demonstrate:

- * How the development reinforces a clear and enduring boundary,
- * How it avoids creating pressure for further outward expansion,
- * How it responds to the wider landscape structure.

Instead, it introduces built form into a currently open edge condition, weakening the integrity of the boundary.

9. Precedent and Cumulative Harm

Perhaps most importantly, the proposal must be considered in terms of its precedent.

Approval would make it significantly more difficult to resist:

- * Further subdivision of plots in this location,
- * Additional dwellings extending northwards,
- * Gradual encroachment toward and into the AONB setting.

This cumulative effect is precisely what settlement boundaries and countryside protection policies are designed to prevent.

Conclusion

This application fails to demonstrate compliance with key national and local planning policies. In particular:

- * It gives rise to unacceptable harm to the setting of the High Weald National Landscape,

- * It represents unjustified encroachment into the countryside,
- * It relies on unsubstantiated claims regarding self-build status and biodiversity exemptions,
- * It fails to adequately address rights of way, landscape transition, and cumulative impact.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Kind regards