

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 July 2026 18:05:24 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1477

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/07/2026 6:05 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To Nightingales The Street Bolney West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of single dwellinghouse, associated car parking and landscaping.
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: High Gables The Street Bolney Haywards Heath West Sussex

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Planning Application DM/26/1477
Land Adjacent to Nightingales, The Street, Bolney
Objection

I write as the owner and occupier of High Gables, the property immediately adjoining the application site to the south. My objection is based upon my direct experience of the site over many years and the likely impact of this proposal upon my property, neighbouring residents and the character of this sensitive part of Bolney.

Following a detailed review of the application documents, I am also aware that separate representations have been submitted addressing the detailed planning policy considerations and procedural deficiencies within this application. I do not seek to repeat those submissions. Instead, my comments are intended to complement them by explaining the direct site-specific impacts experienced from the adjoining property and why the material inconsistencies within the application prevent both neighbouring residents and the Local Planning Authority from properly assessing the proposal.

As the occupier of the property most directly affected by the proposed development, I believe it is important that the application is determined on the basis of a single, complete and internally consistent set of documents that has been available for public scrutiny throughout the consultation process. If material amendments or clarification are required to address the issues identified within the submitted documents, those changes should not be resolved solely through post-consultation correspondence with the applicant but should instead be subject to a fresh period of public consultation before any determination is made.

Whilst I recognise that development within the village may in some circumstances be appropriate, I do not believe this proposal has demonstrated that such a substantial dwelling can be accommodated on this elevated and sensitive site without unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity, the character of the settlement edge and the transition to the High Weald National Landscape.

1. The application cannot presently be assessed on a clear and consistent basis

Before addressing the planning merits of the proposal, I wish to express my concern regarding the consistency of the application itself.

Having reviewed the submitted documents, I was surprised to find that fundamental aspects of the proposal are described differently across the various reports and plans.

These include, amongst other matters:

- differing descriptions of the dwelling as both a three-bedroom and four-bedroom property;
 - inconsistent site area figures between the application documents and supporting technical reports;
 - inconsistencies within the drainage documentation and the assumptions upon which the proposed drainage strategy relies;
-

- inconsistencies affecting parking provision and the assessment of compliance with local parking standards;
- differing information that influences biodiversity and other technical assessments.

Individually, some of these matters might be regarded as drafting errors. Collectively, however, they create genuine uncertainty regarding the proposal that is actually being assessed.

This is of particular concern because these inconsistencies directly influence material planning considerations including drainage, parking provision, biodiversity, dwelling size and the overall planning balance.

Planning decisions should be based upon a coherent and internally consistent application. Where different documents describe materially different proposals or rely upon differing technical assumptions, neither the public nor statutory consultees can reasonably be expected to comment upon the development that is ultimately determined.

2. Surface water drainage

My principal concern relates to surface water drainage.

High Gables lies immediately downhill from the application site and we already experience significant surface water runoff from the higher ground during periods of prolonged or intense rainfall. This is an existing and recurring issue affecting our property and gives rise to serious concern that any increase in runoff resulting from development on the site could materially worsen the situation.

Unlike the applicant's consultants, I experience the site's drainage characteristics at first-hand. I therefore have genuine concern that any increase in the rate or volume of surface water runoff from the application site, however unintended, would directly affect my property, which lies immediately downhill.

The proposal introduces a substantial dwelling together with new hardstanding, parking areas, access and associated development immediately above neighbouring properties.

The submitted drainage information acknowledges that infiltration testing has not yet been completed and that detailed drainage calculations remain outstanding. In my view, this does not demonstrate that the proposed drainage strategy is deliverable or that it can ensure neighbouring properties will not be adversely affected by increased runoff.

Given the site's elevated position and the existing drainage

problems experienced by properties lying downhill, I believe these matters should be fully resolved before planning permission is granted rather than deferred to planning conditions.

Should the assumptions underpinning the proposed drainage strategy ultimately prove to be incorrect, it is neighbouring properties such as High Gables that would bear the consequences.

Given the acknowledged uncertainty surrounding the proposed drainage strategy, together with the existing drainage conditions experienced by downhill neighbouring properties, I respectfully submit that the absence of completed infiltration testing and detailed drainage calculations should weigh heavily against the proposal at this stage.

If the completed infiltration testing or drainage calculations require any material amendment to the proposed drainage strategy, I respectfully request that the revised information be submitted as part of a revised application package, re-advertised where appropriate, and made available for a further period of public consultation before the application is determined. As the neighbouring property most directly affected by these matters, I consider it essential that I, and other consultees, have the opportunity to comment on the drainage strategy that the Council ultimately relies upon in reaching its decision.

3. Topography, settlement edge and landscape setting

The submitted Design and Access Statement places considerable emphasis upon the fact that the proposed ridge height remains below that of Strawdust.

Whilst this may be factually correct, I do not believe it addresses the principal planning issue.

The application site occupies elevated ground at one of the most sensitive points on the northern edge of the built-up area, immediately adjoining the High Weald National Landscape.

The visual impact of a building is determined not simply by ridge height but by its overall mass, its position on the landform, the surrounding topography and its relationship with neighbouring development.

Because the proposed dwelling would occupy one of the highest parts of the site, its apparent scale and visual prominence would be significantly greater than suggested by the submitted street scene drawings.

The proposal should therefore be assessed in the context of its contribution to the transition between the village and the

surrounding countryside rather than by reference to ridge height alone.

4. Character of this part of Bolney

This proposal occupies a particularly sensitive location where the built form of the village gives way to open countryside adjoining the High Weald National Landscape.

The existing gap between Nightingales and Strawdust contributes to this transition and forms part of the spacious, semi-rural character that distinguishes this section of The Street.

The proposal would replace this open break with a substantial two-storey dwelling on elevated ground between two existing bungalows.

Although the applicant has sought to demonstrate that the ridge remains below that of Strawdust, this does not overcome the visual impact created by the overall mass of the building, its elevated position and its prominence within the landscape.

In my opinion, the proposal would materially alter the character of this part of the village, introducing a more urban form of development at one of the most visually sensitive points on the settlement edge.

5. Highway access

The proposed dwelling would rely upon an existing narrow farm access track which already serves a significant number of residential properties.

There are no formal passing places and vehicles frequently have to reverse to allow opposing traffic to pass.

The addition of further residential traffic, together with construction traffic, will inevitably increase pressure upon an already constrained access.

Whilst these matters are addressed in greater detail within other representations, they reinforce my concern that the practical implications of the proposal have been understated.

6. Why the inconsistencies matter

My concern is not simply that inconsistencies exist within the submitted documents.

It is that they relate directly to matters which influence the planning assessment.

For example, uncertainty regarding whether the proposal is to be assessed as a three or four-bedroom dwelling directly affects parking provision and compliance with local parking standards. Similarly, differing site areas and differing technical assumptions raise legitimate questions as to whether drainage, biodiversity and landscape assessments have all been undertaken using the same understanding of the application site.

As the occupier of the adjoining property, I should be able to understand precisely what development is proposed and comment upon it with confidence. At present I do not believe that is possible.

7. Procedural fairness

I appreciate that some of these inconsistencies may ultimately be capable of clarification.

However, where those clarifications alter material aspects of the proposal, they should not be dealt with solely through correspondence between the applicant and the Local Planning Authority after the public consultation period has closed.

If the Council concludes that amendments or clarification are required regarding the dwelling size, parking provision, drainage strategy, biodiversity calculations, site area or any other material planning consideration, I respectfully request that the applicant be required to submit revised documentation and that the amended proposal be re-advertised and subject to a fresh period of public consultation before any determination is made.

It would be procedurally unfair for neighbouring residents and statutory consultees to comment upon one proposal whilst planning permission is ultimately granted for another. I therefore respectfully request that no material amendment to the application is accepted without providing affected residents with the opportunity to review and comment upon the revised proposal.

8. Site visit

Finally, I respectfully request that the Case Officer undertakes a site visit from High Gables before determining the application.

The relationship between the application site, the changing ground levels, the existing pattern of development, the settlement edge and the High Weald National Landscape cannot, in my opinion, be fully appreciated from the submitted drawings alone.

Similarly, the existing surface water runoff experienced by downhill properties is difficult to understand without viewing the site in person.

I would be pleased to facilitate access should this assist the Council's assessment.

Conclusion

My objection is not based upon opposition to development in principle.

Rather, it is based upon the view that this particular proposal has not demonstrated that a substantial dwelling can be introduced onto this elevated and environmentally sensitive site without harm to neighbouring amenity, drainage conditions, the character of the settlement edge and the important transition to the High Weald National Landscape.

Equally importantly, I do not believe the application presently provides one clear, complete and internally consistent proposal upon which the Council can properly reach a decision. For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Should the Council conclude that the identified inconsistencies can be resolved through amendments or revised technical information, I respectfully request that these changes are not be dealt with through post-consultation correspondence alone, but instead require the submission of revised application documents, re-advertisement where appropriate, and a further period of public consultation before any determination is made.

I trust the Council will give careful consideration to both the planning merits of the proposal and the importance of ensuring that any decision is made only after the public has had the opportunity to comment upon a complete, accurate and internally consistent application.

Kind regards