

Comments on planning application DM/25/1129 – Land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney

Introduction

1.1 Bolney Parish Council (from hereon ‘the Parish Council’) wishes to make the following comments in relation to planning application ref: DM/25/1129 for land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney (from hereon the ‘Proposed Development’). The application is described as:

‘Outline application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved), for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings, including affordable housing; a community building (use class F1) encompassing land for education provision, together with associated access, ancillary parking and landscaping; the creation of a vehicular access point from the A272 Cowfold Road, and pedestrian and cycle only access to The Street; and creation of a network of roads, footways, and cycleways through the site; together with the provision of countryside open space, children’s play areas, community orchard, and allotments; sustainable drainage systems and landscape buffers’.

1.2 The Parish Council considers that the proposed application does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹, the Adopted Development Plan², the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan³ nor the Submission Draft Regulation 19 Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 (‘the Local Plan Review’)⁴. The Parish Council raises concerns in relation to:

- Settlement Hierarchy;
- Settlement Character;
- Countryside;
- Landscape and Visual;
- Impact on Heritage Assets;
- Agricultural Land Quality;
- Transport; and

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework-2>

² Mid Sussex District Council (2018) Mid Sussex District Plan. Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3406/mid-sussex-district-plan.pdf>

³ Bolney Parish Council (2016) Bolney Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2031. Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3321/bolney-neighbourhood-plan.pdf>

⁴ Mid Sussex District Council (2023) Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 – 2039: Submission Draft (Regulation 19). Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/a4rft3j0/district-plan-review-reg-19-web-version-with-hyperlinks.pdf>

- Planning Obligations.

1.3 Due to the lack of compliance with the development plan and other material considerations, Bolney Parish Council **Objects** to the planning application. More detail is provided beneath the sub-headings below.

Settlement Hierarchy

1.4 Bolney is identified in Adopted District Plan 'Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy' as a '*medium sized village providing essential services*' (Category 3). The Plan makes clear that most development should be focussed to larger towns, with only limited growth in villages to meet local needs. The Plan states that '*within defined built up area boundaries, development is accepted in principle, outside these boundaries the primary objective... is to secure [countryside] protection by minimising... development that does not need to be there*'.

1.5 The Proposed Development lies outside Bolney's built up area boundary, in open countryside. It is not allocated in the adopted Plan and has not been allocated in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. Instead, the proposal would extend the village into the countryside. This disregards Policy DP6's requirement that outside the built-up area boundary new housing should be limited to sites identified in the development plan or neighbourhood plan to meet local needs. Policy BOLBB1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan requires development to be contained within the built-up area boundary unless certain provisions are met. The Proposed Development does not meet any of these criteria and is therefore in conflict with the policy.

1.6 Whilst it is recognised that the Local Plan Review proposes to allocate development at Foxhole Farm in proposed policy DPA14, this is not adopted policy. Furthermore, in accordance with the findings of the Planning Inspector in relation to the failure of the Local Plan Review to meet legal requirements under the Duty to Co-operate⁵, the proposed allocation has not been reviewed and found sound by the Planning Inspectorate. We therefore consider it has very little if any weight in demonstrating the encroachment into the countryside is necessary, let alone acceptable.

Settlement Character

1.7 Adopted District Plan Policy 'DP26: Character and Design' requires that new development '*reflects the District's distinctive towns and villages, retains their separate identity and character*' and protects valued open spaces and landscapes. A new 200 house estate would overwhelm Bolney's character. According to the 2021 Census, the village currently has a population under 650 living in 259 households. Adding 200 houses (roughly 450-500 people⁶) is out of scale with the existing settlement. Furthermore, the Adopted District Plan explicitly expects infilling or very modest expansion only and requires new development to be of '*appropriate nature and scale*' so as not to harm a settlement's character (Policy DP6). The proposal is clearly at odds with this requirement as it would almost double the size of the settlement.

⁵ Latest Update: 2 June 2025. Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/mid-sussex-district-plan/district-plan-review/>

⁶ Based on an average household size of 2.37 in accordance with [ONS Data](#).

1.8 In the response to the applicant's Pre-application Enquiry (Heritage Statement Appendix 2⁷), the Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Conservation Officer stated that Bolney is a Sussex village which has developed over many centuries resulting in a linear settlement with a north-south alignment surrounded by open land and fields, such as, the proposed development site. A development of 200 homes on open fields adjacent to the village will permanently alter the ancient linear settlement pattern of the village therefore conflicting with DP26 of the Adopted District Plan.

1.9 It is also considered that the objective set out in Local Plan Review Policy DPA14 to '*retain the character of footpath 44Bo*' which runs along the Proposed Development's northern boundary has been disregarded by the proposals, a point which is agreed by the MSDC Conservation Officer.

Countryside

1.10 The primary objective of the Adopted District Plan with respect to the countryside (as per Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside) is to secure its protection by minimising the amount of land taken for development and preventing development that does not need to be there.

1.11 'Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside' states that '*the countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty*' and that development in the countryside will only be permitted if it maintains or enhances landscape quality and is necessary (e.g. for agriculture or is supported by a specific policy reference). Foxhole Farm is comprised of Agricultural Land Grade 2 and Grade 3 land in a valued rural landscape. The High Weald Character Assessment 'Field and Heath' identifies the fields of Foxhole Farm as being Medieval Field System. A development of this size would harm Bolney's rural views and setting.

Landscape and Visual

1.12 Concerns were upheld by the Planning Inspector in a recent appeal decision⁸ at land south of Henfield Road, Albourne (APP/D3830/23/3319542), where proposals to introduce a public open space were found to result in a change of use and visual appearance from agricultural land to managed parkland. In paragraph 46 the Inspector noted that this change would be detrimental to the rural character of the area and would erode the contribution the site made to the setting of the Conservation Area and several listed buildings. The Parish Council considers that the same principle applies in this case and that the proposals would result in unacceptable harm to both the landscape character and the historic environment.

1.13 The Parish Council disagree with the Applicant that the site does not form part of the setting of the High Weald National Landscape. Although the site is not in the High Weald AONB or immediately about the High Weald designated area, it does lie

⁷ Pegasus (2025) Heritage Statement Part 2. Available at:

https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicAccess_Live/Document/ViewDocument?id=B61F84279FF34BC49DA69103DD0E343B

⁸ The Planning Inspectorate (2023) Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/W/23/3319542 Decision. Available at:

<https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewDocument.aspx?fileid=54286437>

within National Character Area 122 High Weald. The northern part of the Parish of Bolney lies within the AONB. The High Weald Management Plan specifically states on page 17 that the High Weald Management Plan *'may be applied to the designated area and its setting especially when the setting falls within the High Weald National Character Area'* see footnote 9.

1.14 Adopted District Plan policy DP16: 'High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)' sets out that *'Development on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular should not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location or design'*. Bolney Neighbourhood Plan Policy 'BOLE2 – Protect and Enhance the Countryside' requires development to ensure landscape impacts are acceptable.

1.15 The introduction of substantial built development on this currently open site would result in a significant and irreversible change to the local landscape character. The site forms part of a wider rural setting that contributes to the transition between the developed edge of Bolney and the High Weald National Landscape. The scale, extent and form of the proposal would erode the rural character of the area, introducing a substantial built development that would be at odds with the existing landscape pattern.

1.16 The Parish Council further highlight the landscape impact arising from the proposed creation of public open space at the centre of the site. As noted by MSDC's Conservation Officer (Appendix 2 of the applicant's Heritage Statement⁹) in the response to the applicant's pre-application enquiry, the development would have a suburbanising effect on the currently open, agricultural character of the site. In particular, *'the transformation of the central field to parkland incorporating the vehicle access road providing the only car access to the northern section of the new housing will...have a significant effect on the rural nature of this part of the site'*. The Conservation Officer concludes that the mitigation strategies proposed would not remove the harm caused.

1.17 The Proposed Development is therefore considered to be subject to the guidelines of the High Weald Management Plan 2024 to 2029 which does not support large development within the designated National Landscape or within its setting.

1.18 The proposal therefore conflicts with Adopted District Plan Policy DP16, Bolney Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLE2 and with the objectives of the High Weald Management Plan 2024 – 2029.

Impact on Heritage assets

1.19 In recognition of the special architectural and historic interest of the village, two parts of Bolney are designated within the Bolney Conservation Area. Development affecting conservation areas should be compliant with Adopted District Plan Policy DP35. In addition, there are several listed buildings within the village. Development affecting listed buildings should be compliant with Adopted District Plan Policy DP34. These designated heritage assets are also protected by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Bolney Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLD1 – Design of New Development and Conservation specifically sets out that development must *'not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of any heritage*

⁹ Pegasus (2025) Heritage Statement Part 2. Available at: https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicAccess_Live/Document/ViewDocument?id=B61F84279FF34BC49DA69103DD0E343B

assef'. Additionally, it is a requirement of Local Plan Review Policy DPA14 for new development at the site to provide an appropriate layout and design which protects the setting of nearby Grade II listed building, 'Walnut and Well Cottage', and Bolney Conservation Areas (North and South).

1.20 The southern part is close to the Grade 1 Listed Church and the southern section of The Street where there are several Listed Buildings and is known as 'the Historic Core'. The northern part of the Bolney Conservation Area is said to be '*characterised by low density development, with trees, hedges and open spaces making an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area*'. See the MSDC 'Conservation Areas in Mid Sussex¹⁰' document on the MSDC website.

1.21 The MSDC document continues 'the following effects in particular, contribute to the character of the Conservation Area:

- The lack of a uniform building line which adds variety and interest reflects the gradual growth of the village and enhances its semi-rural character;
- The variety of age and style of the buildings and the use of natural and traditional building materials;
- Attractive walling;
- Attractive countryside views; and
- Views in and out of the Conservation Area.

1.22 The agricultural fields at Foxhole Farm are one of the major contributors to the rural character of the village and integral to the setting of the Conservation Area and as such, development of this size would cause detrimental harm to the Conservation Area and its setting. In particular the site is visible from the Grade 1 Listed Church and it is considered that the development will have a harmful impact on the setting of this Listed Building.

1.23 Similarly, Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLD1 requires new development to be designed to a high quality which reflects Bolney's rural nature and responds to the heritage and distinctive character by way of height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings and the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape). The suburban scale, nature and grain of the Proposed Development (as set out in the submitted parameter plans) is not compliant with this policy. A new housing estate built using modern building materials will be out of character with the linear nature of the village and of the existing buildings and will be contrary to Policy DP35 which requires developments to protect the setting of a Conservation Area and in particular, the views into and out of the Conservation Area.

1.24 As confirmed in the Conservation Officer's pre-application response¹¹, there is concern that the nature and scale of the development would cause 'mid-high' harm to the setting of the Conservation Area, particularly due to the prominence of new

¹⁰ Mid Sussex District Council (2018) Conservation Areas in Mid Sussex. Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3710/conservation-areas-in-mid-sussex.pdf>

¹¹ Pegasus (2025) Heritage Statement Part 2. Available at: https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicAccess_Live/Document/ViewDocument?id=B61F84279FF34BC49DA69103DD0E343B

built form within the northern and southern fields. While proposed screening may reduce visual prominence, it cannot eliminate the loss or diminishment of the wider rural setting and views, which are integral to the heritage significance of the area.

1.25 Paragraph 215 of the NPPF sets out that *'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'*. The Parish Council considers that the harm arising from the proposed development (outlined in detail elsewhere in this document) together with its clear conflict with the adopted development plan, significantly outweighs any 'public benefits' claimed by the applicant. As such, these benefits do not justify the harm caused.

1.26 The proposal is therefore in conflict with the Adopted District Plan, the Local Plan Review, the Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF.

Agricultural Land Quality

1.27 Policy DP12 of the Adopted District Plan requires that *'Agricultural land of Grade 3a and above will be protected from non-agricultural development proposals. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, detailed field surveys should be undertaken and proposals should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality'*. As set out the application documentation, the site includes areas of land which have been identified as 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land – Grades 2 and 3a. The Planning Statement suggests that an agricultural land assessment has been undertaken but the Parish Council has been unable to identify this within the submitted documentation for verification. The Planning Statement for the Proposed Development argues that the amount of agricultural land affected by the built development is small, but does not clarify the true loss of BMV agricultural land as the areas under the proposed open spaces will also be lost to agricultural use. This is a cause for concern which should be investigated in more detail. The loss of BMV is not acceptable as this conflicts with Policy DP12 of the Adopted District Plan.

Transport

1.28 Policy DP21 of the Adopted District Plan sets out the strategic objective to ensure that development is accompanied by the necessary infrastructure to support development and to create sustainable communities which includes a sustainable transport network and ease of access to local services and facilities. Bolney Neighbourhood Plan policy BOLT1 – 'Transport Impact of Development' requires development to demonstrate *'a) that any additional traffic generated by the proposal has an acceptable impact on the Parish's pedestrians, cyclists, road safety and will not lead to increased congestion; and b) vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian access into, within and exiting any development is safe and has adequate visibility; and c) any available opportunities are taken to provide safe pedestrian or cycle routes from the development to key facilities in Bolney village'*.

1.29 The NPPF states the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth and that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable. Bolney is defined as a 'Category 3' settlement within Policy DP6 of the Adopted District Plan. There are at least nine other settlements considered to be more sustainable than Bolney.

1.30 The provision of services and social opportunities within the village is akin to its current scale and size. The application will almost double the number of current homes in the village, creating a demand which is out of step with the level of facilities currently provided. It is the Parish Council's view that the Proposed Development fails Adopted District Plan Policy DP21, Bolney Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLT1 and the objectives of the NPPF. Bolney village is not sustainably located: There is a limited bus service (with no bus at all to Cowfold, the nearest village with some services and facilities), no cycle routes in the village or any suitable cycling infrastructure to connect the village to Cowfold or Cuckfield for medical services and other essential services. The consequence is that residents are reliant on private cars to access facilities to meet their daily needs. The applicant's proposed car share scheme, possible bus timetable changes and travel vouchers do not offer genuine choices of travel and will therefore not improve the sustainability of the village. Instead, the residents of the 200 new homes will themselves be dependent on private cars to access basic services and for daily activities such as work, grocery shopping and leisure thereby adding to the congestion on the roads in the village and increase concerns about highways safety. In summary, this location is clearly unsustainable for the number of homes proposed in the Proposed Development.

1.31 The inclusion of a community hub building within the proposals is intended as infrastructure to support the new development, however, this facility is understood to be utilised for a specific charity and not as a general purpose asset for the wider community. This does not address the wider infrastructure shortfalls that limit the sustainability of the village. Moreover, the village already benefits from an existing community hall, limiting the need for a second facility of this nature.

Proposed Improvements to The Street:

1.32 The Parish Council has already raised concerns about pedestrian safety on The Street with the applicant during the District Plan Review and with MSDC in the Neighbourhood Plan process. Large sections of The Street do not have raised pavements for pedestrians but instead pedestrians use a red painted 'virtual' pavement and share the road surface with vehicles. At one point, outside the Eight Bells pub and the adjacent listed property Walnut and Well, there is no pedestrian pavement of any kind on either side of the road. Most of the length of The Street only has some form of pavement along one side of the road alone.

1.33 The applicant is proposing to improve pedestrian amenity along The Street with the addition of two uncontrolled pedestrian crossings in the form of 'kerbed built outs' with a one-way shuttle working arrangement to help with traffic calming. These kerbed built outs appear to depend on raised pedestrian pavements on either side of the highway, but at both points of The Street earmarked for the location of such a crossing, there is no existing raised pavement and little space between residential property boundaries and driveway accesses to create one. The proposals are therefore completely unworkable in practice and pedestrian safety on The Street will remain a major issue.

Access to Bolney Primary School

1.34 Access to Bolney Primary School is already made challenging for a number of reasons. The only highway link to the school uses Church Lane which is a narrow, single track lane with no room for two way traffic. The length of the single track part of the lane is approximately 160m, meaning drivers cannot see what vehicles may be approaching when they enter into it. The narrow nature of the lane also causes conflict with pedestrians and cyclists who are forced to be within the carriageway. There is an alternative access to the school via a Public Right of Way from The Street but this involves two flights of steps and is therefore not easily used by those with pushchairs, buggies and for those with mobility impairments. The additional pupils arising from the development would put even greater pressure on the routes to the school which will result in greater user conflict. This has not been considered adequately in the TA, which simply states the Proposed Development is within 2km of the primary school.

1.35 As set out above the proposed crossing points will do very little to improve the overall safety and efficiency of travelling to school as they do not join up with any other raised pavements for pedestrians.

Highways and Access

1.36 Adopted District Plan policy DP21 sets out that '*development will be required to support the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026*', which are:

- A high quality transport network that promotes a competitive and prosperous economy;
- A resilient transport network that complements the built and natural environment whilst reducing carbon emissions over time;
- Access to services, employment and housing; and
- A transport network that feels, and is, safer and healthier to use.

1.37 The Proposed Development includes the creation of a vehicular access point from the A272 Cowfold Road. The Transport Assessment (TA) confirms that a T-junction arrangement with a ghost island right turn lane has, the applicant says, 'been agreed' as suitable for serving the development proposals. The applicant also proposes moving the existing pelican crossing 25m to the east closer to a bend in the road and adding a new non-signalised pedestrian crossing with 2m central refuge just to the west of the proposed site entrance onto the A272, close to the entrance to a petrol station forecourt.

1.38 The immediate area surrounding the proposed access has multiple conflict points. Within a short distance of the proposed junction lie an uncontrolled crossing, a garage/petrol station entrance, the entrance to an industrial estate, a pelican crossing and several private drives all joining the A272. These turning movements already create hazards on this stretch of the A272. Introducing a new major access and right turn lane amid these existing accesses will further complicate vehicle movements and line of sight. For example, vehicles slowing to turn into the garage or side roads may be obscured by each other or by the

proposed ghost island lane, increasing the risk of collision. The Parish Council is also concerned for the safety of pedestrians if the existing pelican crossing is moved towards the east closer to a blind corner and questions the merits of installing a non-signalised pedestrian crossing close to the entrance of the petrol station with a proposed central refuge, which could hinder safe access into and out of the petrol station forecourt and industrial estate.

1.39 In addition to the entrances to the service station and the industrial estate, Foxhole Lane and Bolney Chapel Road meet the A272 at a crossroads just west of the site. All these accesses are within a few hundred metres of each other. Here, they are effectively 'back-to-back' on the A272. The Parish Council notes that the A272 at Bolney already has significant congestion and safety problems in peak hours and this site would add a number of extra turning movements.

1.40 The TA provided to support the Proposed Development has been found to include a number of errors and inconsistencies, as follows:

- Page 59 of the TA summarises five years of local collisions: 38 total incidents (28 slight, 10 serious, 0 fatal) on the nearby network. It concludes no pattern requiring remedial action. However, local reports differ, stating that up to three collisions per month have been recorded on this short section of A272, including a recent crash on the 25 May 2025¹² as well as several near misses with pedestrians when vehicles on the A272 have failed to stop at the red lights at the pelican crossing. This discrepancy suggests that either not all incidents are captured in the TA or that driver behaviour (e.g. wrong turn or panic) is worse than assumed. At a minimum, it indicates that any additional turning traffic risks further incidents.
- As a statutory consultee, National Highways (NH) has also expressed concern. They have requested that the application should not be granted permission for a period extending until 28 August 2025 to allow further analysis of impacts. Crucially, NH note that *'The status of Burgess Hill Northern Arc development (planning reference DM/18/5114/DM/21/3279) should be clarified as it is understood the mitigation at the A272 Cowfold Road / London Road priority junction was to be implemented prior to 400 dwellings being occupied. As the mitigation has not yet been implemented, our understanding is that this development is not yet complete'*.
- The TA states that the trip generation for the proposed community building has been calculated using trip rates from the 07/Q Community Centre land use category within TRICS and that it could be expected to generate 7 vehicular trips during the AM peak and 6 trips during the PM peak. However, given the proposed use of the building for Kangaroos, which provides programmes and activities focussed on meeting the need of those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), it is anticipated that the trip generation will be significantly higher than that of a typical community centre. A more robust approach would be to undertake a survey of an existing Kangaroos facility to better understand the likely travel demand and trip patterns associated with this specific use.

¹² <https://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/emergency-incident/collision-between-car-and-motorbike-on-a272-in-west-sussex-5145885>

1.41 Attached is an assessment prepared by the Parish Council which challenges the applicant's TA, and in particular, the applicant's TA methodology and residential trip rates. The conclusion of the assessment is that the applicant's trip data significantly underestimates the actual traffic movements that will be created by this proposed development and therefore the true impact the development will have on the local highway network.

1.42 In the context of the above it is our assessment that the development does not comply with Policy DP21 of the Adopted District Plan.

1.43 The NPPF sets out that development should be refused if '*cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe*'. In accordance with the above points, it is our opinion that the current proposals fail to demonstrate this will not be the case and therefore the proposal is in conflict with the NPPF. It also fails to comply with the Adopted District Plan (policy DP21) and the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (policy BOLT1).

Planning Obligations

1.44 The Parish Council comments on the applicant's Draft Heads of Terms for Section 106 Agreement as follows:

- The Parish Council is pleased to see the provision for affordable housing for people with a Bolney connection;
- The provision of a community building: The Parish Council prefers the use of the community building to be a more general one and not be specified for the use only by the charity Kangaroos. If, for example, the charity was to fail financially before it is able to move into the facility, the Parish Council does not want to be left with an empty building on site with restricted use. The Parish Council requests the wording to be 'the provision of a community building';
- Although the Parish Council welcomes a financial contribution to improve pedestrian safety on The Street, it notes the applicant makes no financial provision towards a cycle network connecting the village to nearby settlements to access facilities and services. This must be included;
- Likewise, there must be a financial contribution towards the highway improvements which will be necessary to make access to the site from Cowfold Road/the A272 safe for road users and for the residents and businesses located on the relevant stretch of the A272;
- There must be a financial contribution towards pedestrian pavements and crossings on the A272 near the proposed access to the development site;
- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary local sewer network upgrade to accommodate the new homes;

- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary off-site ground water drainage network upgrade along the A272 and to the drainage ditch running behind the residential properties on Cowfold Road to prevent flooding;
- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary local drinking water supply network upgrade to accommodate the new homes;
- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary local electricity network upgrade to accommodate the new homes;
- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary local telephone and broadband network upgrade to accommodate the new homes;
- There must be a financial contribution to the cost of the necessary improvements to the Rawson Hall to increase capacity to accommodate the residents of the new homes;
- The provision of three years free membership to the proposed car club should be available to both new and existing residents of the village, in the interests of integrating the new residents into the existing community so as not to create a 'them and us' scenario;
- Likewise, the Bus Taster Passes/Sustainable Travel vouchers should be provided to the whole community, not just residents of the new site;
- The geographical area for financial contributions to the services listed in the document must be increased from 5km to 10km. Bolney is such a remote settlement that there are no secondary or sixth form educational facilities within 5km, nor library services, waste or recycling facilities, for example;
- The suggestion that any contributions not spent within 5 years to be repaid to the developer must be removed.

For all the reasons above, Bolney Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this planning application.