

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 July 2026 09:29:51 UTC+01:00
To: "Deborah Lynn" <deborah.lynn@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1560

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/07/2026 9:29 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The Rear Of The Byre The Street Bolney Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5PG
Proposal:	Erection of 5 detached dwellinghouses and outbuildings, including new garage to serve The Byre. Please note amended address.
Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Bolney Lodge Foxhole Lane Bolney
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to application PP-15033963 (Mid Sussex ref DM/26/1560): erection of five detached houses and outbuildings on land behind The Byre, The Street, Bolney I write as a long-standing resident of Bolney to object to this application. I know the site and its surroundings well, and I own and care for a Grade II listed property in the village, so I am familiar at first hand with what the setting of heritage assets requires. By original training I am a civil and structural engineer, and several of the concerns set out below draw on that

background. I would ask the Council to refuse the application for the following reasons.

The principle: the wrong development in the wrong place

This is a proposal for five large executive houses on what was, until recently, paddock and stable land beyond the built edge of the village. Bolney has no evident need for a development consisting solely of four- and five-bedroom detached houses; such properties are beyond the reach of ordinary local families and do nothing to meet genuine local housing need. The loss involved is also asymmetric: open land on the edge of a village, once built over, is gone permanently. That irreversibility demands a compelling justification, and none is offered here.

Nor is this untested ground. The Council's own review of candidate housing sites has already examined this land and concluded it was unsuitable for allocation, in part on heritage grounds. Nothing material has changed. Having reached that considered view through its own plan-making process, the Council should hold to it rather than allow a speculative application to achieve by the back door what the plan process properly declined. Heritage and the character of the village

The site sits immediately adjacent to the Grade II listed Daltons Farm and the Bolney Conservation Area. The significance of a listed farmhouse of this kind is inseparable from its rural setting: the open paddock land around it is part of what the listing protects in substance, even where it lies outside the curtilage. A line of large modern executive houses pressed against that setting, together with a new access road threading past it, would erode precisely the relationship between farmhouse and countryside that gives the building its meaning. The intensification of traffic through the narrow access would compound that harm to both the listed building's setting and the Conservation Area.

The effect on existing residents

The rear gardens and windows of the homes fronting The Street currently enjoy a quiet outlook over open paddock. The proposal would replace that with five houses and, more intrusively still, an access road running directly along the rear of those homes - bringing headlights sweeping across gardens and windows, engine noise, comings and goings at all hours, artificial lighting, and overlooking from new first-floor windows. The change in the lived experience of those households would be profound, and it falls on them entirely for the benefit of five new executive properties. A new road and public footpath running along the back of existing gardens also raises legitimate security concerns for those properties.

Ecology and lighting

The applicant's own surveys confirm the presence of rare, light-averse bats foraging and commuting along the site's boundaries and ditch, together with slow-worms and dormice on the land and its shared boundary with the neighbouring Foxhole Farm site, and great crested newts in a pond nearby. That shared boundary functions as a wildlife corridor between the two sites. New street and domestic lighting along the access and around the houses

would illuminate land that is currently dark - and it is telling that the mitigation on which the ecological case depends, the promised "dark corridors", has not actually been secured as part of the application. A detailed lighting scheme simply does not exist. The Council is being asked to take the most important protective measure on trust.

Access, highway safety and emergency access

The access from The Byre is narrow, sits immediately opposite the children's playground and playing field, and lies effectively within the turning area used by vehicles entering and leaving the Rawson Hall car park. Adding the daily traffic of five large households to that pinch point is neither safe nor suitable. The access provides no segregation for pedestrians or cyclists, which matters most for the people least able to protect themselves: children from the new houses walking to the playground, the playing field, Rawson Hall or school, and disabled or partially-sighted residents. As an engineer I would regard a Road Safety Audit as a basic prerequisite for judging an access of this character; none has been submitted.

The width of the access also raises a practical emergency-services question the application does not answer: whether appliances can pass one another, and whether an ambulance could get past a fire appliance attending an incident. No one should be asked to live at the end of an access where that is in doubt.

Refuse collection points the same way. Council vehicles will not drive up an access of this width, so the wheelie bins, food waste caddies and other refuse of five large houses would have to be dragged to the junction with The Street on collection days and left standing at the mouth of the access - unsightly, and liable to obstruct both The Street and the Rawson Hall turning area.

Sustainability and the footpath the applicant relies on

The application's answer to the site's car-dependence is that residents could walk to local facilities along public footpath BOL/44Bo/1. That path is unsurfaced, unlit and prone to flooding, and crosses a stream on a basic wooden bridge with no handrail. It is not a route a reasonable person would use after dark, in winter, with a young child, or with limited mobility. It cannot honestly be presented as a genuine alternative to the car, and without it the site is simply an unsustainable location whose residents will drive for medical facilities, shops, work and education. The proposal should in any event provide sufficient resident and visitor parking that overspill does not end up on The Street.

Surface water and drainage

Replacing soft, absorbent paddock with roofs, a road, driveways and parking converts land that currently soaks up rainfall into hard surfaces that shed it. The same footpath the applicant relies on already floods, which tells the Council something about how this land behaves in wet weather. I have seen no analysis that satisfies me that run-off from the developed site would not aggravate flooding and drainage problems on The Street and

neighbouring land, and my professional instinct is that it would. The application is not ready to be determined. Finally, and quite apart from its merits, the application is materially incomplete. The statutory biodiversity form has been submitted with mandatory fields left blank; the lighting scheme on which the protection of the bats depends has not been provided; and no Road Safety Audit or landscape assessment has been submitted. Having spent much of my career in the governance of public bodies, I would say plainly that a decision-maker cannot properly determine an application on information this incomplete. If the Council is not minded to refuse outright, it should at the very least decline to determine the application until every required document has been provided and independently checked.

Conclusion

This proposal offers the wrong houses, in the wrong place, served by an inadequate and unsafe access, at real cost to the setting of a listed building, to protected wildlife, and to the amenity of existing residents - and it does so on an application that is not even complete. I urge the Council to refuse it.

Kind regards