

Joanne Fisher

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2025 13:08
To: Joanne Fisher
Subject: Re: Objection to DM/25/1129: Foxhole Farm in Bolney

[REDACTED]

P.S. Joanne, one additional comment, as I know that housing targets are important. In Bolney we already have a site, which has been developed in two phases already, which would take (I believe) c40/50 new houses (much more proportionate) and upon which you would get much less objection. The site is at the lower end of the Old London road in Bolney, and has already been developed into Churchfield View and Magdalene Rise. This site was also identified in the neighbourhood development plan as the preferred location for village development and has much better access than Foxhole Farm.

Why wouldn't MSDC just give approval to finish that development?

BTW, I am told that as of today you will have had 357 objections to Foxhole Farm, surely these cannot be ignored Joanne?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Hello Joanne,

Firstly please can you confirm safe receipt of this (1 day late) objection email and that my comments will be considered. Thank you.

I have been away working so missed the deadline (July 30th) for objections to this proposal. But we have had confirmation from our local MP, Alison Bennett a few days that late submissions will be considered as your (additional papers) notification letter was not received by many residents.

I am writing to once again register my strongest objection to this development, and am pasting below by initial objection comments, all of which still stand. There remains no doubt in mind that this site is by far the least suitable and sustainable in the overall MSDC plan and I am unsure why it has got this far. The mood of the village, who have raised monies for independent advice, is very angry about the Foxhole Farm proposal, which doesn't appear to comply with most technical requirements, as highlighted in the response from our local PC a few days ago.

Anyway, on to my latest objection, which is in three parts:

1) Our local PC has just submitted an excellent and well crafted objection to you. Can I just say that I totally support all of their arguments, so see no point in reiterating them. The village is strongly behind the PC stance and I am sure will take matters further if outline permission is granted.

2) The latest papers which have been lodged horrify me even more as the knock on impacts of the Foxhole Farm development are now having **DIRECT AND NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE EXISTING HEART OF BOLNEY VILLAGE**, which is simply unfair.

The proposed changes to the street are simply retrofitted clumsy solutions which will cause chaos:

a) Creating the "landing areas" either side of the road there the pedestrians can walk through from FF to the village won't work. Parents and children will arrive on a busy street which has few proper pavements and will be exposed to traffic as they head for the school or pub. We simply do not have the infrastructure to accommodate a step change in pedestrian traffic.

b) The proposed traffic "stop" points will cause traffic jams in what is already a busy street, often made "one way" by parked cars. Any large vehicles (e.g. oil & parcel deliveries) will need to stop and block the street, which will be frustrating for drivers and super dangerous for pedestrians, including many children.

c) The idea of digging away the large earth bank at "Bankside" to create parking will likely disturb village utilities and cause chaos to residents. It will be a major earthwork undertaking.

3) So, in summary, refusal of this application is justified on clear and material planning grounds (per PC response) as well as non compliance with both the adopted local and neighbourhood plans. There are unacceptable highway safety risks for the FF/A272 access point (see my previous comments below), material flood and water supply risks as well as a total lack of local infrastructure for any new residents to rely on. Any approval would totally undermine the plan led system and has attracted huge local opposition from local residents. I believe that the FF proposals have attracted the greatest number of objections than any other element of the MSDC plan, and surely those directly affected deserve to be heard.

Finally Joanne, please do come to Bolney, walk and drive up "The Street", stroll along the A272 where the new junction is proposed and imagine what the proposals will bring to our lovely rural village. The junction will be built on a 200 metre stretch of road between a blind bend and a falling hill which already has a pedestrian crossing, a garage, a cross roads and many residential houses on it. How can that possibly be deemed safe?

Please consider the 100's of resident objections with empathy.

Thanks,

BELOW IS MY PREVIOUS OBJECTION TEXT, ALL OF WHICH STILL STANDS, PLEASE DO READ.

I am commenting to strongly object to the proposed housing development at Foxhole Farm in application number DM/25/1125 (DPA14 in Mid Sussex draft District plan) because it is unsound and unsustainable in the context of the National planning policy.

We have been working with an independent planning consultant on this site and he is squarely of the opinion that Foxhole Farm is CLEARLY THE LEAST SUSTAINABLE SITE IN THE LATEST DRAFT MSDC PLAN. We have no infrastructure and the new road junction will be a death trap, the pre application must be rejected.

I am a resident of the village and live on the main residential street, "The Street".

Positioning comments:

1) Wates (the developers) have completely ignored their stated (see website) practice of consulting with the local residents. Any suggestion that they have done so is not true. This absence of debate has been a huge frustration for the residents.

2) Wates have submitted various "supporting documents" to position their plans. Can I suggest that much content in these (e.g. the traffic flow surveys, likely queue times etc) are highly disingenuous and mis-represented. I would strongly urge you to come to the section of road in question, the safety risks are clear.

3) In the core of Bolney village there are currently c 270 dwellings (others in the surrounding lanes), so this proposal adds c74% more dwellings as an ugly carbuncle on the side of a lovely "linear" village, which already has very little supporting infrastructure. This is simply unreasonable and ridiculous, the houses should be built adjacent to existing infrastructure(s).

POLICY DP6 OF THE ADOPTED MSDC PLAN MAKES IT CLEAR THAT DEVELOPMENT MUST TAKE PLACE ADJACENT TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE. FOXHOLE FARM IS A GREEN FIELD SITE WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE.

By the way, to suggest that "Cross Post" is part of the Bolney settlement is totally wrong. It is a hamlet of its own and there is clear green space between Cross Post and Bolney. Again, Wates have been disingenuous and run this argument for their own commercial reasons.

4) The proposed development is on A VIRGIN GREEN FIELD SITE outside of the accepted and enforced village boundary. We are not "nimbys", we have seen perhaps 70 new houses (so c26% growth) built in the last 3/5 years, but they have been in small groups in much more sympathetic/accessible locations. This is the template for future housing developments around Bolney, several sites are available.

5) Note: There are two other Bolney locations which were shortlisted by MSDC (London road and land adjacent to Bolney Place) which would provide c50 new houses in much more appropriate locations. These were ignored. WHY?

My reasons for objecting are:

1) The proposal is in blatant contravention of the SUSTAINABILITY dimensions of National policy and Transport Policy DP21. The proposal is in no way sustainable and will clearly add huge strain to a village with almost zero infrastructure. The proposal is opportunistic in the extreme and the timing is clearly to coincide with the hiatus in the inspectorate reviewing the MSDC plan.

Bolney is surrounded by busy roads and has very modest local infrastructure. It has no shops (there are two garages but too far away for many residents to walk), no post office, no doctors and a very poor (see timetable:<https://www.metrobus.co.uk/services/MB/273>) bus service. Buses are occasional, unreliable and take a long time. A bus trip to the Brighton hospital would take c1 hour, with a long walk at the other end.

It is obvious that the 200 houses proposed will have to use cars to access all required services. So perhaps another 500 cars a day trying to access the A272, an already super busy road.

National policy requires that new development should offer access to facilities by foot, walking or public transport. We have no cycle paths, very few pavements (some are "virtual" which are totally unsafe from passing cars) and therefore cars will be the only option. We have a poor bus service. SO THIS DEVELOPMENT CANNOT (DOES NOT) COMPLY WITH THIS POLICY.

Also, if "affordable" housing is to be provided, how will people who cannot afford normal rental costs be able to afford a car? In which case, how do they get around? Surely any social housing organisation would be reluctant to purchase the affordable houses in such a "remote" location?

Wates make many irresponsible suggestions. For example, the idea that anyone would cycle along the A272 for a haircut in Cowfold is simply ridiculous, I am a regular and confident cyclist (c70 miles pw) but I would not cycle on the A272. It is narrow, very busy and would cause huge traffic queues, please come and take a look.

Wates say they "could" do many things in partial defence of their proposal. "Could" doesn't mean anything without commitment, actions and costings. There are no costings against their reference to Education provision, Community Buildings, Sports, Play space, sustainable transport measures, Highways works etc etc. The absence of costings would suggest a lack of preparation and commitment to explore further.

Here is a local MSDC example of how developer promises frequently evaporate into thin air with the passage of time: <https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/property-news/1130-new-surrey-homes-left-29870298>.

NOTE: To try to support the "sustainability" sweeteners of the development, Wates make reference to various new on site facilities which they will provide. They suggest:

- i) A COUNTRY PARK: We have 2 large recreation fields already and are surrounded by lovely countryside. WE DON'T NEED A NEW COUNTRY PARK.
- ii) Community ALLOTMENTS: most local houses have gardens, I have never heard anyone ask for an allotment. WE DON'T NEED ALLOTMENTS.
- iii) COMMUNITY FACILITY We have a large and underutilised new village hall in the centre of the village. WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER ONE.
- iv) WORKING HUB: The new village hall has a working hub room. It was never used so has been released for other use. HOME WORKING HAS KILLED DEMAND.
- v) EDUCATIONAL FACILITY: We have a thriving primary school which has capacity (c10-16 places currently). WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER SCHOOL.

In summary on sustainability, this development conflicts with the National framework because all the new residents will need cars to get anywhere. It is the wrong development, in the wrong place, it is far too remote from local infrastructure.

2) ACCESSIBILITY and ROAD SAFETY is actually my other primary concern.

I have taken a screenshot of the proposed Wates access plan (see their Access and Safety report) and it clearly creates an over busy, over crowded and unsafe strip of the A272. PLEASE JUST COME AND SEE FOR YOURSELF, THAT SHORT STRETCH OF ROAD IS CROWDED, BUSY AND DANGEROUS.

The ACCESS TO FOXHOLE FARM is on a stretch of road which is c150/200 metres (educated guess) between the blind bend to the West and the falling road to the East. So the "visibility" strip is around 150/200 metres on a single line of sight.

In this 150/200 metre stretch of road would now be several residential houses, 2 pedestrian crossings, one petrol station, one busy crossroads and now a major new road junction serving Foxhole Farm. This is simply crazy on such a busy road (c18k vehicles a day back in 2017 according to "road traffic stats") and such a short visibility line.

The queue/wait time to exit the new site will be long, estimated by our independent consultant as between 6-10 minutes. Trying to exit the bottom of the existing Bolney main street (where I live) at busy times is horrid, frequently waiting many minutes to turn right onto the A272. The Wates estimates on exit times/volumes from the new site are misleading and should be challenged, traffic turning right will have a huge wait and will stop all cars behind. We have our own resident traffic expert and they have done their own report, which will be submitted directly to the Highways Authority.

When the tanker comes to refill the existing petrol station on this strip of road, the traffic frequently backs up along the West bound A272 and round the blind bend towards Bolney.

Cars turning right into the new settlement will be in danger from oncoming traffic and the existing residents of the houses all along that stretch of road will be in real danger as they enter/exit their houses. As for Pedestrians, crossing the road will be messy and slow, one pedestrian crossing is far too close to the blind bend and the other is right outside the petrol station!

The new site will only have a single access point for an estimated c700 people/300+ cars. This is unsafe, if the entry point is blocked then accident&emergency services would be unable to enter the site. There is no access from Foxhole Lane (western border) which is a single track road. This safety risk is unacceptable.

There is a proposal to have two pedestrian/cycle access points from the new development to the Bolney "Street". The Street (where I live) has few pavements and several "virtual" pavements (just a line drawn on the road) which are dangerous for the existing residents to use. Mothers have to take their children to school down this road and having (up to 700) extra people using these walkways defies sense. It will be dangerous for walkers and cars.

3) HERITAGE. Bolney has a lovely Grade 1 listed church which as a direct line of site to the proposed development site, which sits on a raised ridge. The site will be clearly visible from the Church, as well as many local residences. Readily available photos clearly show that Wates claims that there is a "glimpse" line of sight are a lie.

4) DRAINAGE AND WATER NEUTRALITY. Foxhole Farm (the corner of which is c 20 metres from my garden) frequently floods, as do the connecting residents gardens. Where will all the natural rainwater go after all these houses are built?

Bolney frequently suffers from cuts to water supply (we have one right now, on June 8th), either due to pipe damage or because we are at the "end of the line" and there is not enough water. Please look at the water company supply stats, we also lost our water as recently as last week, so how will another 200 houses be supplied reliably? THIS IS A VERY SERIOUS POINT, WHERE WILL THE RESIDENTIAL WATER SUPPLY COME FROM?

In overall summary, I would like you to reject the pre application from Wates for land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney because the proposal (which lacks a huge amount of detail to make it believable) will be UNSOUND in the light of the National sustainability framework. Accessibility will also be a huge safety issue due to the short "sightline" of very short section of the A272 involved. The A272 is simply too busy a road to "empty" this development on to.

Thank you for reading my concerns, please do come to Bolney to see for yourself. I hope my arguments will then come to life.