

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2026 21:05:20 UTC+00:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0317

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/03/2026 9:05 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Glebelands Field Lodge Lane Bolney West Sussex
Proposal:	A phased development of up to 9 self build dwellings.
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Durstons Lodge Lane, Bolney Haywards Heath
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	In my view the proposal fails at the most basic level because the principle of development - that is, whether housing should be allowed on this site at all - is not established. The site sits outside the Built-Up Area Boundary and is therefore countryside where Policy DP6 applies. In practical terms, what is proposed would read as a small suburban cul-de-sac sitting with its back to the village, accessed from a country lane and clearly outside the village boundary. It is not a natural infill opportunity but development of an open field, and its proximity to the settlement does not make it an appropriate location for general market housing, irrespective of the proposed self-build delivery model.
-----------	---

The location is also inherently unsustainable. Future occupiers would be heavily reliant on the private car for day-to-day needs. Lodge Lane is a narrow, unlit rural route without footways and with constrained width and visibility. I live on Lodge Lane in one of the nearby listed buildings and therefore experience the constraints of the lane at first hand, including its limited width, lack of footways and regular conflict between vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders. Pedestrians would need to walk in the carriageway to reach village services, and public transport provision is sparse. Even at this modest scale, the proposal would add traffic and introduce genuine highway safety concerns, while intensifying use of a lane that functions as an important recreational route (its the village's accessible route to the countryside as the A272 and the A23 create an inaccessible boundary). These are fundamental rather than minor constraints.

There would also be clear and lasting harm to countryside character. The field forms part of the open rural setting to this part of the village and contributes to the transition towards the High Weald National Landscape. Residential development here would urbanise that edge and erode the loose-grained settlement pattern that currently defines it, contrary to Policies DP12 and DP15. No special justification for new homes in this countryside location has been demonstrated. The Council's self-build register records interest below the number of plots proposed, and the village has already been planned to accommodate a substantial new housing allocation.

The proposal would impact the setting of nearby listed buildings, and MSDC's heritage officer has previously said that their significance derives in part from their surviving rural surroundings. The development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Bolney Conservation Area, where openness and low density have been identified as key attributes.

Finally, the Council's own earlier assessments are instructive. The site has previously been identified as having limited capacity for change, with concerns relating to access, landscape impact and proximity to heritage assets, and those underlying constraints remain. They reinforce the conclusion that the site is not a suitable location for development in principle.

For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with the development plan on principle, sustainability, landscape and heritage grounds, and there are no material considerations sufficient to outweigh that conflict. Planning permission should therefore be refused.

Kind regards