

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 03 March 2026 20:45:33 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 8:45 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:	Glebelands Lodge Lane Bolney
----------	------------------------------

### Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I am writing to vociferously object to the application for Planning Permission in Principle (DM/26/0317).

My objections are based on the following grounds:

1. Conflict with the Mid Sussex District Plan (DP6, DP12 & DP15)  
The site lies outside the built-up area boundary of Bolney and is located within the countryside. Policy DP6 is clear: "Development for any purpose other than those listed in Policy DP12... will be resisted." DP6 works as a gatekeeper to protect the countryside, and any support for this application would constitute a

fundamental breach of the wider planning strategy.

By proposing nine houses here, the applicant is asking the Council to ignore its own hierarchy. If this were approved, it would set a legal precedent that the boundaries for Category 3 settlements are "open for interpretation," which threatens the rural buffer of every village in Mid Sussex.

The addition of a housing development cluster of nine homes on a peripheral greenfield site does not "support the service center" of Bolney; rather, it creates an isolated pocket of housing that relies on the A272 and A23 for basic needs.

This proposal fails the DP6 requirement for development to be "delivered at a scale that is appropriate to the form and character of the settlement."

Under Policy DP12, development is restricted to maintain the quality and character of the rural landscape. This proposal does not meet any of the exceptional criteria for countryside development.

Furthermore, Policy DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside) seeks to prevent the incremental "urbanisation" of rural lanes like Lodge Lane.

Further, its specific location proposal would represent back-land development of an open agricultural field. Such a housing development would be a suburban form of development, inconsistent with the rural nature of the location and incongruous with the historic pattern of the village.

It should be noted that national guidance (NPPF) and local policy DP6 do not state that the need for self-build plots creates a "free pass" to build outside settlement boundaries. The Council's duty is to provide a supply of plots, but that supply is meant to come from allocated sites (large developments that must set aside 5-10% for self-build), not from random speculative applications on protected land.

Policy DP6 classifies settlements to ensure development is directed toward areas with existing infrastructure (shops, schools, and transport). Bolney has no shops (albeit 2 garages, which should not be defined as 'shops' for purposes of serving residential needs). The primary school is at capacity and has no scope for enlargement, and public transport is limited to infrequent bus services.

As a category 3 settlement area, the limited level of growth that Bolney can be expected to support should be within its existing Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB).

---

## 2. Conflict with the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan

The Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (made in 2016) specifically identifies sites for housing to meet local needs. Glebelands Field is not an allocated site. Approving this application would undermine the community-led planning process and the spatial strategy agreed upon by the Parish and District. There are other potential sites in the village which offer more appropriate opportunities to fulfill housing needs, which could be delivered with more local support.

Further, this proposed development is part of site 749 in the 2022 SHELAA sites. It was previously rejected at stage 2(c). MSDC's conclusions were that:

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

The site was rejected for development at the pre-application stage 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. These considerations and the council's previous decisions remain unchanged and relevant.

## 3. Sustainability and Transport

The site is poorly connected to the core services of Bolney village.

Residents would be entirely dependent on private vehicles for commuting, shopping, and education, which directly contradicts NPPF Paragraph 109 regarding the promotion of sustainable transport. The increased traffic on Lodge Lane, a narrow rural road, poses a safety risk to existing pedestrians and cyclists.

## 4. Environmental and Heritage Impact

The development of a greenfield site will result in the loss of biodiversity and the fragmentation of local wildlife corridors. Furthermore, the introduction of nine modern dwellings in this specific location will negatively impact the "setting" of nearby

---

heritage assets (including several listed buildings within very close proximity) and the historic rural character of the parish.

#### 5. Actual Demand for Self-Build Housing

While the application cites the Council's "duty" to provide self-build plots, it should be noted that the Council is currently demonstrating a robust 5-year supply through the evidence submitted to the 2021-2039 District Plan Examination. In addition the Council is already meeting its "Right to Build" obligations by requiring self-build plots on larger, allocated sites.

Furthermore, the Council's "Right to Build" obligations for self build plots are being strategically met through allocations in the emerging Plan and the Site Allocations DPD. There is no deficit in supply that justifies a departure from Policy DP6. Granting permission for DM/26/0317 would create a "policy void" where settlement boundaries are ignored, undermining the very spatial strategy the Council is currently defending at examination.

The applicant claims this proposal addresses a high demand for self-build opportunities. However, evidence from the Mid Sussex Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Register (Analysis as of Oct 2024/2025) shows that only 7 individuals on the entire register expressed an interest in Bolney. A proposal for 9 dwellings therefore exceeds the known local demand.

Furthermore, any actual need is already being addressed through Policy DPH10 and the recent allocation/approval at Foxhole Farm, which will provide a more sustainable and policy-compliant route for self-builders.

There is no 'unmet need' in Bolney Parish that justifies a departure from Policy DP6 and the destruction of greenfield land at Glebelands Field.

In conclusion this application is a clear departure from the Development Plan. It offers no overriding public benefit to outweigh the permanent loss of countryside and the resulting harm to the character of Bolney. I urge the Council to refuse this application.

---

Kind regards