

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 March 2026 17:36:06 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 03/03/2026 5:36 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:	Weald Chase The Street Bolney
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: All information to the best of my knowledge.

Application: Permission in Principle - DM/26/0317 - Land on the North Side, Lodge Lane, Bolney
Proposal: A phased development of 1-9 self build plots
Applicant: LIVEDIN
Planning Authority: Mid Sussex District Council

1. Introduction

I object to the Permission in Principle (PiP) application DM/26/0317 for "a phased development of up to 9 self build

dwellings" at Glebelands Field, Lodge Lane, Bolney. This site is fundamentally unsuitable under the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 because constraints arise from location, heritage setting, landscape sensitivity, and highway safety, all of which must be assessed at the PiP stage and cannot be deferred to Technical Details Consent (TDC).

The proposal conflicts with the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (BNP), the Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and is inconsistent with MSDC's own evidence base and previous decisions on this site. These conflicts are determinative at the PiP stage.

The application is considered to be unacceptable in relation to proposed location.

1. The principle of introducing dwellings onto this site would harmfully impact on the character of the area by developing a valued, existing, undeveloped, green space (currently used for grazing) which makes an important and positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area, whilst providing an important undeveloped landscape buffer between the settings of the listed buildings of Yew Tree Cottage, The Thatched House and Durstons, and the surrounding countryside, ancient woodland to the west, and approaches to Bolney from the west, northwest and southwest of the site; the introduction of dwellings would also impact the setting of other listed properties such as Bolney Lodge; the introduction of dwellings would also result in future pressure to expand development west, further into undeveloped agricultural land/countryside. The application is therefore contrary to policies DP12, DP15 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policies BOLBB1, BOLE2 and BOLH2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF. MSDC's own conservation officer, when consulted re. DM/24/2215, emphasised that the surviving rural setting makes a strong positive contribution to the special interest of nearby listed properties, and in terms of the northern conservation area said that the surviving rural setting of the northern part of the Area will be considered to make a strong positive contribution to its special character.

2. The proposed development is located within the countryside and occupies a location which is distant from readily accessible local services. As such future occupiers will be heavily reliant on the private car to meet their daily needs. Bus services from any part of Bolney are extremely limited. The development thereby conflicts with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, and paragraphs 8, 11 and 109-111 of the NPPF.

3. The proposal is contrary to policy DP6 of the District Plan as the proposal is neither sustainable, nor contiguous with the existing built-up area of the settlement of Bolney. The BNP clearly shows the built-up area boundary to the east of the Field House and the Thatched House, and far to the east of Weald Chase, High Gables etc. Even if the red outline on the plan of the

proposal were contiguous with the back gardens of any of the nearby properties (which it is not), it still would not be contiguous with the built-up area boundary. Instead, the proposal is akin to back-land development, disrupting the prevailing pattern of development, and is contrary to policy DP26 of the District Plan.

4. Lodge Lane has no pavement for pedestrians, it is an unlit village lane, with constrained width, poor visibility, and limited passing opportunities. The road is used by pedestrians, dog-walkers and horse-riders as well as cars. It has a double-bend in the middle with high hedges/walls and extremely poor visibility, which is already very dangerous. The proposed development shows a new access onto Lodge Lane, very close to this double-bend. A new access point at this location is a high-risk, highway safety issue. The combined effect of national standards, Manual for Streets (MfS), and local highway authority guidance is that an access must not be created where required visibility splays and forward visibility/sight lines cannot be achieved. In practice, this makes any new access at this location unacceptable. In addition most of Lodge Lane falls outside the 20mph zone and therefore the national speed limit applies, so 60mph for most vehicles), the Stopping Sight Distance and Visibility Splay Y Distance would be roughly 22-25m in each direction. The development thereby conflicts with paragraphs 110(a) and 111 of the NPPF, BNP BOLT1 and DP21. Pedestrians from the 9 new dwellings proposed would have to use Lodge Lane to reach bus stops etc (the footpath through the back of the Field House is a mud bath and not suitable for increased usage) which increases the already high-risk highway safety issue further. This is a location-based constraint that cannot be solved at TDC.

5. The field north of Lodge Lane was the location of a proposal for 75 dwellings in 2024. This application, DM/26/0317, is for a "phased development of up to 9 self build dwellings" at one end of the field. It is reasonable to believe that this is to be an example of salami-slicing. A 2025 judicial review challenge described salami-slicing as "the artificial division of a larger development into multiple smaller applications to avoid environmental scrutiny", holding that this breached the EIA Regulations 2017 and established case law. A 2023 Court of Appeal decision on a bridge scheme warned developers and LPAs of the importance of correctly identifying the scope of the project, highlighting the risk of unlawfully slicing applications. The courts have repeatedly emphasised that EIA must consider cumulative and in-combination effects, and that LPAs cannot treat interconnected phases as unrelated. Even where applications are submitted separately, the authority must still consider cumulative environmental effects. Failure to do so can invalidate the permission. The government's Permission in Principle guidance states "Local planning authorities should consider whether the cumulative environmental impact of 2 or more adjoining sites proposed for a grant of permission in principle amount to EIA or Habitats development". Beyond EIA, the LPA should consider that salami-slicing could artificially avoid affordable housing

requirements, section 106 obligations, major development requirements, SuDS design, detailed attenuation modelling, parking, access and highways thresholds, BNG and open-space requirements.

6. MSDC should have regard to previous decisions.

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

- a. The site is located in an area with low capacity for change.
- b. It is unclear whether a safe approach can be achieved for the site due to the location of the access.
- c. Although adjacent to the built-up area, the site lays in a rural setting and feels detached from the rest of the village.
- d. Low/medium potential for change in landscape terms
- e. 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.
- f. Listed buildings in close proximity to the south and curtilage of two grade II listed properties.
- g. The site is not currently available
- h. Access to a main service centre is only likely by private car.

7. MSDC should have regard to previous decisions.

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.

8. The government's Permission in Principle guidelines state "A decision on whether to grant permission in principle to a site following a valid application or by entering it on Part 2 of a brownfield land register must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the National Planning Policy Framework and national guidance, which indicate otherwise". As has been shown above, multiple relevant policies in the Mid Sussex District Plan, the NPPF, the BNP, as well as highways requirements etc, indicate that this application should be refused. These are principle level constraints that cannot be resolved at TDC.

9. The applicant relies on the Council's housing land supply shortfall and the "tilted balance." However, the tilted balance is not an automatic approval mechanism. Even under Paragraph 11(d), development must not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Harm to heritage assets and countryside character attracts substantial weight. The impact of 9 dwellings is large on this site, but modest in the overall scheme of things and does not materially address district-wide shortfall.

Conclusion

This site fails the Permission in Principle test because constraints arise from location, landscape, heritage, and highway safety-all of which must be assessed at the PiP stage and cannot be deferred.

The proposal conflicts with the Mid Sussex District Plan, Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, NPPF, MSDC's SHELAA evidence, and previous decisions.

I therefore request that Permission in Principle be refused.

Kind regards