

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 July 2026 22:32:43 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 07/07/2026 10:32 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:	Durstons Lodge Lane Bolney
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to object to planning application DM/26/1477 for the following reasons. 1. The Council should be consistent with its recent decisions: The most important consideration is that Mid Sussex District Council has already considered very similar proposals for isolated dwellings in this part of Bolney and has consistently concluded that they should be refused. Recent decisions, including DM/26/0111 and DM/25/2970, demonstrate that despite the current housing land supply position, the Council has found that the limited benefit of a single dwelling does not outweigh conflict

with countryside and settlement boundary policies.

While I recognise that every planning application must be determined on its own merits and that the Council is not bound by its previous decisions, consistency in decision-making remains an important public law principle. Residents and applicants alike are entitled to understand why apparently comparable cases are treated differently, and any departure from the Council's recent approach should therefore be supported by clear and cogent planning reasons. In the absence of such reasons, I consider it would be difficult to justify a different outcome in this case.

2. The site lies outside the village envelope and forms part of the countryside:

Although the Heritage Statement and supporting documents present the site in a way that suggests it forms part of an established cluster of housing, that is not the reality on the ground.

The site lies outside the Bolney Built-up Area Boundary and is therefore countryside for planning purposes. The photographs and viewpoints selected within the application give the impression that this is simply a gap between existing houses, whereas they largely omit the wider context of the surrounding open fields and undeveloped land.

In reality, this proposal represents further encroachment into the countryside beyond the defined settlement boundary. The openness of this area is one of its defining characteristics and is an important part of the transition between the village and the surrounding rural landscape.

3. The location is unsustainable and is served only by an unsuitable private track:

The proposed dwelling would be accessed via the unadopted section of The Street. This is not a conventional road but a narrow private track which is in poor condition, being heavily potholed, frequently waterlogged and unsuitable for increased traffic.

West Sussex County Council has acknowledged that this is effectively a three-car dwelling. In reality, the development would generate considerably more vehicle movements than those of its occupants alone. Delivery vans, postal vehicles, tradespeople, refuse collection and visitors would all need to use this already constrained access.

The location is inherently car-dependent. There are no realistic alternatives to private vehicle use for most journeys, and the condition of the access track only reinforces that dependence. Whilst the Highway Authority has not raised a formal highway safety objection, I do not consider that alters the fact that this is an unsustainable location for additional residential development.

4. Surface water drainage and runoff:

The application site occupies elevated ground on a slope which falls towards Lodge Lane. I live at Durstons, a listed building lower down the catchment, and already experience significant surface water runoff during periods of heavy rainfall.

Any additional hard surfacing, changes in levels or alterations to drainage have the potential to increase runoff reaching lower

properties. Given the existing drainage issues in this area, I object to any development that could exacerbate these problems or increase the risk to neighbouring properties, including listed buildings.

Until it can be clearly demonstrated that the proposal will not worsen existing drainage conditions, I do not believe planning permission should be granted.

5. The heritage impacts have been understated:

I do not agree with the conclusions reached in the applicant's Heritage Statement.

The Council's own Conservation Officer has previously recognised that this part of Bolney possesses an important semi-rural character and that development on this site would harm the setting of nearby heritage assets. In my view, that assessment better reflects the character of the area than the applicant's conclusion that there would be little or no heritage harm.

As the owner of Durstons, a listed building nearby, I consider that the openness of this site contributes positively to the wider historic setting of surrounding heritage assets. Development would erode that setting and would further suburbanise what remains a distinctly rural approach to this part of the village.

For these reasons, I do not accept that the proposal would result only in limited heritage harm. I believe the Heritage Statement understates both the contribution this site makes to the setting of nearby listed buildings and the significance of the harm that would result from its development.

I therefore ask the Council to refuse planning permission.

Kind regards