

use of resource, beneficial only to the rent-seeking development company. It deeply concerns me that should this proposal go ahead, many key longevity issues will have been ignored for the short-term profit making and arbitrary goal setting involved in housing developments.

I would like to make it clear that I am not against housing in general - I am about to graduate into a world where it is almost impossible for first-time buyers to afford homes. I would not reject a sane development plan in Bolney, but this development is not sane [REDACTED] a pioneering example of how to actually achieve sustainable development and help first-time buyers afford homes. The space is used well, clearly designed with cycling, walking, and public transport in mind. The development came with a superstore, a primary school, a town square for shops and restaurants, and improved bus services. This is how development should be - actively seeking out potential issues and tackling them before they lower the welfare of all. In comparison, the proposal at foxhole farm feels like slapping a plaster on a gunshot wound - it's not remotely sustainable or addressing any of the key issues with the lack of housing crisis.

1. Loss of Agricultural and Community Land

Foxhole Farm has been used for grazing and equestrian activities by locals and sits next to working farmland and vineyards like Apple Farm and Bolney Wine Estate. That's part of Bolney's identity-this land is not just open space; it's productive, and part of our rural life. Once it's gone, it's gone forever.

I do not believe that calculations of the intrinsic value that this space holds have been sufficiently weighted by the proposal. Biodiversity is at an all-time low in Sussex, so we should be doing all we can to protect the few green spaces that remain. There are also

2. Bolney Is Not Built for This Scale of Development

Having lived here my whole life, and am well versed with the power cuts, water cuts, internet failures, lack of adequate transportation, and general lack of infrastructure in this village. However, many residents choose to move to Bolney because they relish the rustic charm. The development at Foxhole Farm would render Bolney a space that is no longer charmingly rustic while making zero attempt to fix any of the infrastructure issues, likely contributing to many. If people want to live in a town with access to infrastructure they choose to live in a town, if they want to live in a rustic village and give up some of the privileges of consistent infrastructure they will do so instead. Creating a miniature town out of an old village with shockingly bad infrastructure is useful to no one.

This plan would double the size of the village, completely changing its rural identity. The site was rejected during the Neighbourhood Plan process, which involved local input and thoughtful planning. The rejection was passed for a reason - Bolney is simply not equipped for a development of this scale.

3. Dangerous Roads, Incomplete Traffic Analysis

I sadly know firsthand about the devastating consequences of road traffic accidents. Unfortunately, accidents like this are not uncommon in and around Bolney. I have witnessed multiple accidents and near misses on this road, which is already poorly designed, busy and unsafe. The location of the proposed access- near a crossroads and petrol station-is extremely poor. The developer's traffic report doesn't properly account for added pressure from projects like Rampion 2 in neighbouring Cowfold and fails to consider the knock-on effects of extra traffic on narrow country lanes. The knock-on effects are not even just the horrific loss of life and tragedy that car accidents bring, but additional pressure on the NHS, on ambulance, fire, and police services, already stretched thin due to bad road design such as this. There are simply so many interaction effects here that I am concerned to notice the plan does not consider.

4. No Infrastructure for Daily Life

Bolney has no doctors, dentists, pharmacy, Post Office or public library, and very limited public transport. Without a car living here simply doesn't work. On top of that, we often experience water supply failures and frequent power cuts-issues that are frustrating and disruptive even now, without 200 more homes added. Earlier this week there was a water-cut in Bolney that lasted 24 hours. It's lucky this happened on a Sunday, but with the cut occurring from 5am in the morning, these sorts of issues do have significant impacts on commuters. Are we really expecting the new residents in these 'affordable houses' to cycle to and from work in

Haywards Heath or Burgess Hill, and come home to a water cut? As a teenager, on many

was a power cut that lasted multiple days. As an adult, I have narrowly avoided having to go into my internship shower-less as I was able to work from home. However, most people do not have the privilege of being able to do their work online, and the frequent water cuts can certainly cause stress for commuters. Issues such as these have clearly not been thought about in detail.

5. Schools under pressure

The proposed development puts pressure on the local primary and secondary schools. Donating land for a new school is not a solution-there's no funding or commitment to actually build or run one. This just pushes more pressure onto surrounding schools and families, contributes further to the traffic issues, and demonstrates even more that housing isn't affordable. If residents have to make hour round car trips to drop off their children at school twice a day because there are not enough places locally, can we really claim this is affordable? Such action is not possible for families where both parents work, and not remotely possible for families who cannot afford cars.

6. "Affordable" Housing That Isn't Truly Affordable

The idea that living in Bolney could ever be 'affordable' is shocking, and strikes me as completely ignorant of the cost-of-living crisis that people face. It is impossible to get anywhere safely without a car - the idea that people could safely cycle along 50-70mph roads to get to Burgess Hill or Haywards Heath is simply obscene, and the public transport available will not do for commuters. If each family buying a house requires a car, that's a big additional cost. Houses in locations requiring cars are simply not affordable houses.

Even if the future residents didn't have cars and chose to cycle, where are they expected to buy their food? The nearest Lidl is 6 miles away, and the nearest Aldi is 12 miles. Even Tesco, which cannot really be called an affordable shop in the same sense as Lidl and Aldi, is 6 miles away. I cycle when I am at university, as Cambridge has invested in safe cycle paths and infrastructure ensuring cycling is a safe mode of transport. At average cycling speed that's 25 minutes to the Lidl or Tesco, and 25 minutes back, along very unsafe roads and laden with food shops. If the development was really affordable, it would be attracting homeowners who have no other choice and have to make this unsafe journey. But I assume that the developers know that they will not be attracting such individuals, because their proposal is not affordable. Building unaffordable homes on green spaces does not fix the housing crisis, it simply destroys the environment for the sake of developers and landowners wallets. The presentation of a development such as this as 'affordable' and somehow a redistributive good is genuinely appalling and out of touch.

As a young person looking to buy a house in the future, faced with sky high prices, I am particularly disgusted by the ignorance of this part of the proposal. These homes do not fix the housing crisis for young people and first-time buyers - it places more money into the hands of landowners. If anything, the crisis deepens when we build unaffordable housing such as this, providing ample opportunity for wealthy landlords to buy up the housing that no one else can afford, and push up rents, exacerbating the crisis.

7. Offers That Don't Fit Bolney

Proposed features like allotments and a community building sound useful, but they're not what the village is asking for. We don't need allotments in a place surrounded by countryside, and we already have Rawson Hall, a great community space. Building a new hall that no one wants when we already have a community hall is a massive waste of resource, and I do not remotely understand how it has been justified. Aspects of the development plan such as this are what concern me the most - the whole development stinks of rent seeking behaviour, generating issues with no plan how to fix them. I would rather see plans pushed through with more houses and no community building, because then there is at least some continuity with the 'we need more houses' argument. The new hall would simply split activities with the Rawson Hall, which makes both halls worse off, and could lead to the closure of one. I do not think that the proposal has seriously considered the long-term impacts of two halls in a relatively small village. Once again, this is simply massive resource waste poorly veiled as a useful project.

8. Environmental Harm That Can't Be Undone

This development would bring more cars, noise, light pollution, and habitat disruption. The quiet lanes around Bolney are used every day by walkers, riders, and wildlife. That peace and connection to nature is one of the most valuable things about living here, and it will be permanently damaged.

In Summary

I understand the need for more housing, but this application is in the wrong place, at the wrong scale, and with the wrong priorities. It doesn't reflect the needs of Bolney's residents and would lead to long-term damage to the environment and community life here. Please reject Planning Application DM/25/1129.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Kind regards