

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2026 20:16:32 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 8:16 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:	Morningside Lodge Lane Bolney
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>Re:-DM/26/0317</p> <p>I am writing to object to this Planning Permission in Principle for the above application.</p> <p>1 The site is countryside outside the built-up area boundary and is not a sustainable or appropriate location for housing. The proposal would represent back-land development of an open agricultural field, creating a suburban form of development disconnected from the village's historic pattern.</p> <p>2 The site would have limited safe walking routes and vehicle access from Lodge Lane as it is a narrow rural lane. Lodge Lane is the village's key access route for pedestrians, dog walkers,</p>
-----------	--

cyclists and horse-riders to access the wider countryside as there is limited access on the east (A23) and south (A272). Any further increase in traffic, construction and residential to Lodge Lane would endanger those using it.

3 Development would extend the village into open countryside, opening the route to potential further development on rural land further harming the landscape character and the transition to the High Weald National Landscape.

4 There would be harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings and to the character of the Bolney Conservation Area. The Council has previously identified the site as having low capacity for change, and these constraints are still valid concerns. Some neighbours to the site were not informed of the application and there are no notices on the site.

5 Under the Mid Sussex DP6, land on the edge of a settlement but outside the boundary is treated as countryside, so development is generally resisted unless it meets specific exceptions or wider planning balance justifies it. Open-market housing simply because a site is next to a village is not supported in principle.

- This is a countryside location; although this looks as if it is tucked into the village envelope, it is outside the village boundary.

- This is 'back-land development', i.e. open field bordered by back gardens accessed from outside the village, in effect a suburban cul-de-sac outside a linear village not genuine 'infill' which is a small gap in a continuous built-up frontage.

6 This was site 749 in the 2022 SHELAA sites. The site was rejected at stage 2(c). MSDC's conclusions were that:

- The site is located in an area with low capacity for change.

- It is unclear whether a safe approach can be achieved for the site due to the location of the access.

- Although adjacent to the built-up area, the site lays in a rural setting and feels detached from the rest of the village.

- Low/medium potential for change in landscape terms

- Site is adjacent to an area of ancient woodland or within a 15m buffer form an area of an ancient. Development of the site may result in some harm.

- Listed buildings in close proximity to the south and curtilage of two grade II listed properties.

- The site is not currently available

- Access to a main service centre is only likely by private car.

The site was rejected for the development of 75 houses at the pre-application stage in March 2024 on the basis that it was not included in the District Plan, that the roads around the site would be adversely affected by additional traffic generated and there is insufficient infrastructure (Water/BT/Electricity etc) to cope with the development.

Although the site is now available - the other considerations and the council's previous decisions remain unchanged and relevant. Bolney village has been allocated 200 new houses at Foxhole Farm and doesn't need these.

For these reasons I think this proposal should be rejected.

Kind regards